



Scientific Report on Project #22230021  
Financed by the Visegrad Fund

# Motivation for Volunteering and to Help to Solve Crises in V4 Countries

Švecová Lenka et al.

Cabańska Judyta, Diatková Nataša, Dostál Jakub, Idczak Piotr,  
Findor Andrej, Kalman Judit, Krajčová Jana, Maialeh Robin,  
Musialkowska Ida, Potluka Ota, Strečanský Boris, Šumpíková  
Markéta, Švecová Lenka

language proofreading: Mc Donnell David

2024



## Table of Contents

Opening Remarks .....	4
The Introduction to the Philanthropy Explored in This Study.....	5
Philanthropy for Older People and Philanthropy by This Age Group.....	7
Motivation of Young People to Volunteer ( <i>in the Visegrad Countries</i> ) on a Regular Basis and in the Crisis Situations .....	11
Are Levels of Engagement in Philanthropic Activities in the V4 Countries Higher Among the Educated? .....	16
Religiosity and Philanthropic Giving.....	18
Differences in Donations Patterns between Countries: Patterns in Philanthropic Engagement.....	22
The Influence of Economic Situation on Donations: A Comparative Study of V4 Countries .....	26
About the survey.....	30
Sociodemographic data .....	31
Involvement in volunteering and donation in V4 countries .....	33
Structure of questions in the survey .....	34
Question Q100 – Formal volunteering (in the past 24 months) .....	34
Question Q100A – Formal volunteering (all time) .....	34
Question Q460A – Informal volunteering (in the past 24 months) .....	34
Question Q470A – Informal volunteering (all time).....	34
Question Q570 – Donation (in the past 24 months) .....	34
Survey results.....	35
Differences in V4 countries regarding the involvement of citizens in volunteering and donor activities .....	35
The influence of gender on involvement in volunteering and donor activities .....	38
The influence of gender on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Slovakia .....	40
The influence of gender on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Hungary.....	42
The influence of gender on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Poland .....	44
The influence of gender on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Czechia .....	46
The influence of age on involvement in volunteering and donor activities.....	48
The influence of age on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Slovakia.....	51
The influence of age on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Hungary .....	54
The influence of age on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Poland.....	57
The influence of age on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Czechia.....	60
The influence of municipality size on involvement in volunteering and donor activities.....	63
The influence of municipality size on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Slovakia.....	66
The influence of municipality size on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Hungary .....	68
The influence of municipality size on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Poland .....	71

---

The influence of municipality size on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Czechia.....	74
The influence of education on involvement in volunteering and donor activities .....	76
The influence of education on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Slovakia .....	78
The influence of education on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Hungary.....	80
The influence of education on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Poland .....	82
The influence of education on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Czechia .....	84
The influence of income on involvement in volunteering and donor activities .....	86
The influence of income (personal, household) on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Slovakia .....	90
The influence of income (personal, household) on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Hungary.....	94
The influence of income (personal, household) on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Poland .....	98
The influence of income (personal, household) on involvement in volunteering and donor activities in Czechia .....	102
Formal volunteering.....	106
Formal volunteering in general.....	107
Formal volunteering in crises events .....	113
Informal volunteering .....	118
Informal volunteering in general .....	119
Informal volunteering in crises events.....	122
Responsibility – respondents’ opinions .....	124
Donation .....	127
Donation in general.....	128
Donation in crises events.....	132
List of Tables .....	134

## OPENING REMARKS

This scientific report focuses on the motivations for volunteering and responses to crisis situations in the Visegrad (V4) countries—Czechia, Slovakia, Poland, and Hungary. Volunteering in these countries plays a crucial role in fostering community cohesion, providing support to vulnerable groups, and ensuring responses to crises such as natural disasters or social emergencies, as demonstrated in recent years (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic, floods in Czechia and Poland, and the war in Ukraine). The study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing citizens' engagement in philanthropic activities and offers a detailed comparison among the V4 countries. These findings are especially important for shaping policies and support programs aimed at strengthening volunteering and crisis management within the region.

The structure of this report is designed to give readers a systematic overview of the main areas of the topic studied. The report begins by focusing on charitable activities related to older generations and the philanthropic efforts undertaken by this age group. The following chapters examine in detail the motivations of young people for regular volunteering as well as their responses to crisis situations. The report also discusses the influence of religious beliefs. An important component of the analysis is the level of engagement among citizens based on their education level and socioeconomic status, which enables a deeper understanding of the factors influencing volunteer work.

Readers will further gain insights into the impact of key demographic factors on the level of engagement in volunteering and donation across the V4 countries. The report thoroughly examines how different age groups engage in volunteer activities, with an emphasis on generational differences in engagement levels. It also explores the influence of gender, revealing distinct patterns of involvement among men and women in both formal and informal volunteering as well as donation activities. The role of settlement size is also fundamental—the report investigates whether citizens in smaller villages or towns exhibit higher or lower engagement compared to residents of large cities. Special attention is devoted to education level, which is often linked to a higher willingness to engage in philanthropic activities. Lastly, the study includes the impact of income, both personal and household, enabling a better understanding of how socioeconomic status affects individuals' ability and willingness to contribute financially or with time to support those in need.

Overall, the report provides a comprehensive overview of how these demographic factors influence volunteering and donation within the V4 countries and offers a detailed comparison between each nation. This approach facilitates a deeper understanding of the differences and similarities in attitudes toward philanthropy across various social groups throughout the region.

I would like to express our gratitude to everybody who contributed to the realization of this study. Special thanks go to the Visegrad Fund, which funded this research and enabled us to explore important questions about volunteering and civic engagement in the V4 region.

On behalf of the entire authorship team

Lenka Švecová

## THE INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILANTHROPY EXPLORED IN THIS STUDY

Economic theories regarding market and state failures underscore the need for non-profit organizations (NPOs), which play a critical role where the public sector or market mechanisms fail to adequately meet the needs of diverse population groups. NPOs effectively bridge these gaps in supply and demand, establishing a system of support (Ben-Ner, 2006). Volunteering within this sector makes a vital contribution to social and economic development, enhancing both individual and community well-being (Kim et al., 2018). Volunteers engaged in these activities also benefit personally; such experiences offer them skill development, stronger social connections, and valuable work experience that can significantly enhance employability (Grönlund, 2011). The availability, capacity, and willingness to volunteer are closely tied to human and social capital (Wilson, 2000), and these benefits are particularly recognized among more educated groups within the population.

Volunteering can be broadly defined as any activity undertaken voluntarily to benefit another person, group, or cause (Wilson, 2000, p. 215), encompassing two primary types – formal and informal. Formal volunteering involves individuals engaging “within a formal nonprofit group or volunteering program of a larger organization that supports or directs their activities” (Smith et al., 2016, p. 1396). Conversely, informal volunteering occurs independently of formal institutions, often within local communities, families, or social networks (Einolf et al., 2016, p. 223). This type of volunteering is typically emotionally and value-driven, with activities that are often spontaneous and directed at making a positive impact on the world (Musick & Wilson, 2003). Formal volunteering is associated with a higher level of professionalization and specialization, potentially amplifying its societal impact. In contrast, informal volunteering is more commonly linked to personal satisfaction and stronger social bonds (Haski-Leventhal & Bargal, 2008, p. 97). Unlike formal volunteering, informal volunteering usually requires no specific skills or training, enabling broader engagement, particularly in response to crises such as natural disasters, pandemics (Trautwein et al., 2020), or other emergencies (Whittaker et al., 2015).

Philanthropic activities also include donation, which represents financial or material support to nonprofit organizations, charitable projects, or individuals in need. While volunteering involves a commitment of personal time, effort, and work directly for a cause or community, donation focuses on providing financial resources or other assets without requiring the donor’s direct involvement in activities. Thus, donations and volunteering differ in the form of contribution – volunteers invest time and skills, while donors primarily provide financial or material support, which can help organizations optimize resources and expand their reach. These two forms of philanthropy can complement each other and often work synergistically to promote a wide range of socially beneficial initiatives.

### **Specifics of Volunteering in Central Europe**

The V4 countries have undergone significant economic and social transformations after 1990. This dynamic shift towards a more open society, often supported by international nonprofits, has created unique conditions for the growth of the civic sector. In this context, volunteering plays a pivotal role in addressing societal and economic challenges, such as insufficient support for vulnerable population groups (Šašková & Mertová, 2012). However, current data indicate that the V4 countries lag behind the EU average in terms of volunteering participation rates (CAF, 2024), raising questions about differences in citizens’ willingness to engage in voluntary activities.

In the 1990s, volunteering in Central European countries was predominantly spontaneous, often taking the form of neighborly assistance and frequently associated with activism, which gradually transitioned into more formal structures due to initiatives from international organizations such as Greenpeace or emerging political parties. The most significant surge in informal volunteering in this region occurred during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020, with widespread activities like sewing masks and delivering medicines and food to seniors. Another wave of informal support arose following the Russian invasion of Ukraine, triggering spontaneous support for Ukrainian refugees and even direct volunteering within Ukraine (Mishchuk & Vlasenko, 2023; Sengupta, Verghese & Rys, 2023).

## References:

- Ben-Ner, A. (2006). For-Profit, State and Non-Profit: How to Cut the Pie Among the Three Sectors. In J.-P. Touffut (Ed.), *Advancing Public Goods*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- CAF. (2024). *World giving index 2024*. Retrieved from [https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/inside-giving/wgi/wgi\\_2024\\_report.pdf](https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/inside-giving/wgi/wgi_2024_report.pdf)
- Einolf, C. J., Prouteau, L., Nezhdina, T., & Ibrayeva, A. R. (2016). Informal, Unorganized Volunteering. In D. H. Smith, R. A. Stebbins, & J. Grotz (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of volunteering, civic participation, and nonprofit associations* (pp. 223-241). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haski-Leventhal, D., & Bargal, D. (2008). The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers. *Human Relations*, *61*(1), 67-102. doi:10.1177/0018726707085946
- Grönlund, H. (2011). Identity and volunteering intertwined: Reflections on the values of young adults. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *22*(4), 852-874. doi:10.1007/s11266-011-9184-6.
- Kim, E., Fredline, L., & Cuskelly, G. (2018). Heterogeneity of sport event volunteer motivations: A segmentation approach. *Tourism Management*, *68*, 375-386. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2018.04.004.
- Mishchuk, Z., & Vlasenko, R. (2023). *Ukrainian refugees in Visegrad countries: Societal attitudes and challenges of accommodating people fleeing the war*. Retrieved from
- Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2003). Volunteering and depression: the role of psychological and social resources in different age groups. *Social Science & Medicine*, *56*, 259–269.
- Smith, D. H., Stebbins, R. A., & Grotz, J. (Eds.). (2016). *The Palgrave handbook of volunteering, civic participation, and nonprofit associations*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Šašková, H., & Mertová, J. (2012). Care for vulnerable and disadvantaged children in the Czech Republic. *European Journal of Social Work*, *15*(5), 664-678. doi:10.1080/13691457.2011.577735
- Sengupta, D., Verghese, A. K., & Rys, M. (2023). Motivations of volunteering during crises—Perspectives of Polish youths during the Ukrainian refugee crisis. *Administrative Sciences*, *13*(2). doi:10.3390/admsci13020053
- Trautwein, S., Liberatore, F., Lindenmeier, J., & von Schnurbein, G. (2020). Satisfaction With Informal Volunteering During the COVID-19 Crisis: An Empirical Study Considering a Swiss Online Volunteering Platform. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *49*(6), 1142-1151. doi:10.1177/0899764020964595
- Whittaker, J., McLennan, B., & Handmer, J. (2015). A review of informal volunteerism in emergencies and disasters: Definition, opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *13*, 358-368.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 215-240.

## PHILANTHROPY FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND PHILANTHROPY BY THIS AGE GROUP

### Introduction

As the population ages, the issues of inclusion of the older generation or taking care of those people are becoming quite fundamental, though not as acute as disaster relief. The proportion of older people in the European population is gradually increasing. In the EU, the ratio of almost thirty people aged 20 to 64 for every ten people over 65 in 2022 will become less than twenty in 2045 (European Commission, 2023). Closely related to this change is the impact of aging on the availability of health and social care staff, as highlighted by an OECD study (OECD & European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies, 2024). Aging will increase health spending and challenge ensuring sufficient health and social care staff.

Therefore, this chapter focuses on volunteering. On the one hand, it can provide older people with an opportunity for social involvement when directly involved. The second aspect is that older people can be supported by volunteers if they need such help. We expect that sooner or later, public health and social care systems will reach their limits, and the help of volunteers can be a welcome boost to social care assistance.

We will focus on both formal volunteering (represented by organizations, both public and non-profit sectors) and informal volunteering, which lacks this organizational dimension but is more spontaneous (informal volunteering means helping people outside the household. This can be done on the broader family, in the neighborhood, for friends, etc.).


### Where do the V4 countries stand on volunteering?

Our data set invites direct comparisons between the countries involved. This comparison is not only between the V4 countries themselves but also with Switzerland (Lamprecht, Fischer, & Stamm, 2020). We chose Switzerland because volunteering is relatively widespread there, as can be seen in Graph 1. First, we compared the proportions of people in the population who volunteered recently or at any time in the past.


The comparison of engagement across age categories between the V4 countries and Switzerland (Graph 1) shows two aspects directly visible from the graph. The first observation is that the proportion of volunteers decreases more or less with increasing age in the V4 countries, while it remains relatively constant in Switzerland. The youngest generation in the V4 countries is comparable to the Swiss generation in its involvement in volunteering. This observation is not the case for the older generations. Central Europeans are significantly less engaged in the older generations than the Swiss ones. We associate this phenomenon with the fact that in the period before the change of communist regimes, unpaid work was organized on a compulsory basis, and therefore some people may feel that it is again a "compulsory" voluntary involvement. In addition, the economic status of individuals has an impact on volunteering. The unemployed will find it difficult to accept unpaid work (Taniguchi, 2006), or alternatively, in economically weaker communities, the infrastructure and relationships that support volunteering will not be built at all, which would initiate volunteering in crises (Lim & Laurence, 2015). Thus, the involvement of the youngest generation gives hope that the V4 countries have come closer to the state of affairs in this social area that is common in Western European countries.

The second significant aspect is that the Czech population is significantly more engaged than those in the other three V4 countries. This aspect is not only the case at the moment of data collection but is a long-term trend (for example, a comparison of volunteering in 2012 and 2024 prepared by Charities Aid Foundation CAF, 2012; CAF, 2024).

Graph 1: Comparison of the Long-Term Formal Volunteering: Switzerland and V4



Graph 2: International Comparison of Recent Volunteering



However, these strong differences are not so apparent if we look at how people have engaged over the past few months (graph 2). We add that while the last four months were considered "recent" in the Swiss survey, in our survey in the V4 countries, it was two years. Thus, the participation rate is overestimated in this respect compared to the Swiss one.

**Volunteering by and for the 65+ age group in the Czech Republic**

The share of 76.9% of the 65+ age group has ever volunteered in some form (see Tab 1). Informal volunteering is easier to initiate because it does not require as many resources beyond time (Pettigrew, Jongenelis, Jackson, & Newton, 2019). This issue is borne out in our data, where three-quarters of people 65+ have engaged in informal volunteering somehow. This share compares to approximately 40 percent in formal volunteering through organizations.



Tab. 1: Formal and Informal Volunteering of 65+

n=91		Informal volunteering		
		No	Yes	Total
Formal volunteering	No	23.1 %	36.3 %	59.3 %
	Yes	1.1 %	39.6 %	40.7 %
	Total	24.2 %	75.8 %	100.0 %

At the beginning of this section, we mentioned population aging as a hidden societal threat. Let us see how volunteering can contribute to reducing this threat (we do not assume it will eliminate it completely). Among the answers to the question of what target group Czech volunteers recruited from the 65+ age group are dedicated to; two areas clearly dominate outside the environment (see table 2 for details). These are the categories 'people with disabilities and people with care needs' and 'older people'. It is, therefore, primarily about intra-generational solidarity, as people are aware of their problems and those faced by their relatives or peers. The choice of these two categories of volunteering is more than half that of younger generations, where, on the contrary, taking care of children and young people plays a primary role.

Less visible, though still existing, differences between generations are evident in the case of informal volunteering. These differences between formal and informal volunteering for older people or people in need of care show (see Tab. 2 a 3) that informal volunteering is easier to implement (or at least to start) than formal volunteering. However, the two forms of care volunteering can be very complementary (Taniguchi, 2011).

Tab. 2: Types of Organizations People Engage with in Czechia

	People of 65+			Others		
	n	Responses (%)	Respondents (%)	n	Responses (%)	Respondents (%)
Children and young people	9	12.0	24.3	129	22.2	26.8
Families	5	6.7	13.5	64	11.0	13.3
People with disabilities and people in need of care	10	13.3	27.0	46	7.9	9.6
Older people	8	10.7	21.6	47	8.1	9.8
People with a migrant background, foreigners	2	2.7	5.4	14	2.4	2.9
Refugees, temporary admissions	5	6.7	13.5	18	3.1	3.7
Asylum seekers	1	1.3	2.7	5	0.9	1.0
People who are financially or socially disadvantaged	5	6.7	13.5	23	4.0	4.8
Women	1	1.3	2.7	39	6.7	8.1
Men	1	1.3	2.7	40	6.9	8.3
Population in general, not one specific group of people	9	12.0	24.3	61	10.5	12.7
Environment, animals	11	14.7	29.7	50	8.6	10.4
People/animals affected by natural disasters	4	5.3	10.8	17	2.9	3.5
Other groups of people/target groups	4	5.3	10.8	29	5.0	6.0
<b>Total (responses)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>202.7</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>121.0</b>
<b>Total (respondents)</b>	<b>91</b>			<b>481</b>		

Note: Respondents could choose more than one topic to which they volunteer.

Tab. 3: Selection of Results for Informal Volunteering

	People 65+			Others		
	n	Responses (%)	Respondents (%)	n	Responses (%)	Respondents (%)
Children and young people	16	15.5 %	17.6 %	78	15.8 %	16.2 %
Older people	24	23.3 %	26.4 %	76	15.4 %	15.8 %
People with disabilities and people in need of care	11	10.7 %	12.1 %	38	7.7 %	7.9 %
Care for the ill	11	10.7 %	12.1 %	43	8.7 %	8.9 %
Assistance for others	18	17.5 %	19.8 %	106	21.4 %	22.0 %

### References:

- CAF. (2012). *World giving index 2012*. Retrieved from <https://www.cafonline.org/about-us/publications/2012-publications/world-giving-index-2012>
- CAF. (2024). *World giving index 2024*. Retrieved from [https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/inside-giving/wgi/wgi\\_2024\\_report.pdf](https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/inside-giving/wgi/wgi_2024_report.pdf)
- European Commission. (2023). *The 2024 ageing report – Underlying assumptions and projection methodologies*. Retrieved from <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2765/960576>
- Lamprecht, M., Fischer, A., & Stamm, H. (2020). *Freiwilligen-Monitor Schweiz 2020*. Zürich: Seismo Verlag.
- Lim, C., & Laurence, J. (2015). Doing good when times are bad: volunteering behaviour in economic hard times. *Br J Sociol*, 66(2), 319-344. doi:10.1111/1468-4446.12122
- OECD, & European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. (2024). *Country Health Profiles*. Retrieved from Paris/Brussels: [https://health.ec.europa.eu/state-health-eu/country-health-profiles\\_en](https://health.ec.europa.eu/state-health-eu/country-health-profiles_en)
- Pettigrew, S., Jongenelis, M., Jackson, B., & Newton, R. U. (2019). “Charity Begins at Home”: Informal Caring Barriers to Formal Volunteering Among Older People. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations*, 30(5), 921-931. doi:10.1007/s11266-018-0017-8
- Taniguchi, H. (2006). Men’s and women’s volunteering: Gender differences in the effects of employment and family characteristics. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(1), 83-101. doi:10.1177/0899764005282481
- Taniguchi, H. (2011). The Determinants of Formal and Informal Volunteering: Evidence from the American Time Use Survey. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations*, 23(4), 920-939. doi:10.1007/s11266-011-9236-y

## MOTIVATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE TO VOLUNTEER (*IN THE VISEGRAD COUNTRIES*) ON A REGULAR BASIS AND IN THE CRISIS SITUATIONS

The population of the Visegrad countries is often characterized by lower levels of civil society traits, including a reduced readiness to offer help compared to Western European societies. The legacies of the past have had long-lasting impacts on bottom-up participation and involvement. Despite ongoing transitions, these legacies still influence, to some extent, people's attitudes and decisions, hindering efforts to break free from the path dependence of the past. However, the young Visegrad population represents a segment of society that was not directly affected by the communist regime and did not experience the hardships of real socialism. This generation was born into conditions of democracy and freedom, shaped by a free-market economy. Their existence revolves around common European values, ensuring full involvement in social, economic, cultural, and political processes, including participation in decision-making. This means that the reality of Visegrad youth is fully embedded in democratic capitalism, which offers both the opportunities and threats typical of this system, as well as the responsibilities and challenges necessary to sustain it.

The younger generation is generally satisfied with their lives and is more progressive, globalized, and optimistic about the future. Unlike the older generation, which experienced the transition characterized by high unemployment and economic restructuring, today's youth has grown up in more prosperous and competitive economies. While they benefit from greater economic opportunities and integration with the European Union, they also face challenges such as housing shortages, precarious employment, and the gig economy. They often have higher economic aspirations and are more entrepreneurial, with a strong orientation towards global opportunities (Swadźba & Horáková Hirschler, 2019). This generation has more access to global perspectives and is often more critical of government narratives. The majority strongly supports EU and NATO membership, valuing the economic opportunities, freedoms, and security that come with membership (Milo & Klingová, 2018).

Young people openly advocate for remaining within these organizations. They generally have a stronger belief in democracy, the free market, and individual freedoms, although they show a certain distance toward active politics and a relatively high level of mistrust toward political institutions and elites (Harring et al., 2022). Along with high confidence in international alliances, the younger generation of the four countries expresses strong trust in the army and police. There is also a relatively high level of trust in the judiciary and civil society organizations compared to political institutions and the media (Harring et al., 2022).

Regarding social values among Visegrad youth, there is a noticeable tendency toward individualization. A person's career and self-realization are focal points of life planning, alongside the need for a fulfilling existence and a sense of personal well-being. The subjective sense of well-being among young people is influenced by their financial resources, their level of satisfaction with their education, and how comfortable they feel within their families and social circles (Harring et al., 2022).

The younger generation in the Visegrad countries tends to be more open to immigration and multiculturalism than the older generation, although nationalist and populist rhetoric has also found support among some youth groups. While many young people, particularly in cities, support more open borders and are exposed to international cultures through education and travel, others, especially in more rural areas or those exposed to populist political messaging, may be more skeptical of immigration due to concerns about national identity or economic competition (Harring et al., 2022).

People's involvement in formal or informal activities aimed at providing direct or indirect help to others or taking actions for the benefit of society lags behind Western Europe. The V4 countries share concerns about the low rate of youth participation in voluntary activities relative to other European nations (with some countries having

participation rates of approximately 30–40%, and the EU average being 24%) (Milo & Klingová, 2018). Engagement in civil society initiatives in these countries has been influenced by cultural or historical factors.

In addition to the low profile of volunteering, a common problem throughout the V4 countries is the lack of recognition of volunteering's value by society. Career models that favor paid work after graduating from school have made volunteering less accessible. In this context, volunteering was not traditionally considered a necessary component of social involvement. Moreover, the challenging financial circumstances faced by young people often led them to prioritize gainful employment. However, the emergence of a new mindset on volunteering in recent years is largely due to the younger generation, who have different perspectives on civic engagement and little recollection of the former political order.

Despite a general increase in volunteering among Visegrad youth, a distinction can be made between young people who see volunteering primarily as a civic duty and those who engage in it for personal or professional development, such as gaining skills or networking opportunities (Milo & Klingová, 2018).

This evolving landscape of motivations reflects broader changes in how volunteering is perceived and valued. Attitudes to volunteering have changed over the years. The traditional (old-type) motivations of volunteering are based on altruistic values (e.g., being useful for society and helping others) and on the importance of social interactions and community. The modern motivations include career development, personal growth, work experience, professional improvement, gaining information, developing and practicing skills, finding a job more easily, increasing human capital (Bocsi et al., 2017).

Volunteering often responds to a variety of situational triggers, with crises and wars being major motivators. These extreme conditions create urgent needs that mobilize individuals to offer their time and skills to help affected communities.

In the aftermath of natural disasters or humanitarian crises, the scale of destruction and human suffering can lead to a surge in volunteering. Individuals are motivated by a strong desire to contribute to relief efforts, assist with recovery and provide support where it is most needed. Similarly, in times of war, the devastation caused by conflict can inspire individuals to volunteer to provide humanitarian aid, work for peace or assist displaced populations.

The scale of the global humanitarian crisis worsened significantly in 2022. The number of people estimated to be in need of humanitarian assistance increased by a third to an estimated 406.6 million people. Humanitarian action had to respond to new and worsening crises, including the conflict in Ukraine, climatic shocks in Pakistan and East Africa. Complex, protracted crises are increasingly the norm, with three-quarters of people in need facing at least two risk dimensions of conflict: climate and socio-economic vulnerability—an increase from 61% in 2021. As a result, a growing majority of people in need (83%) now live in a country experiencing a protracted crisis (Development Initiatives, 2023). This situation fosters volunteerism.

The war in Ukraine has led to increased volunteering efforts in all European countries, including V4 countries with the special focus on the neighboring nations. This crisis in turn has, in turn, impacted social capital in these nations, in the following way:

1. Strengthened community bonds: Volunteer initiatives have brought people together, fostering new connections and networks (Krzyzanowski & Pemstein, 2023).
2. Increased trust: Collaborative efforts have built trust between individuals and organizations within V4 societies (Novotný & Klvaňová, 2022).
3. Enhanced civic engagement: The crisis has motivated more people to participate in civic activities, potentially leading to long-term engagement (Bárdi & Kováts, 2023)
4. Facilitated cross-border cooperation: Volunteering has strengthened regional ties by connecting V4 countries and Ukraine (Wolczuk & Žeruolis, 2022).

5. Impact on skill development: Volunteers have gained new skills and experiences, contributing to the development of human capital within their communities (Koudelková, & Svobodová, 2023).
6. Improved institutional capacity: NGOs and grassroots organizations have expanded their capabilities, potentially leading to more effective civil society in the future (Markowski & Tworzecki, 2022).
7. Challenges to social cohesion: While volunteering has largely positive effects, differing views on the conflict and refugee influx may create some societal tensions and require development of migration policies (Bernát & Sik, 2023).

Our survey has shown the greatest involvement of young people in volunteering activities. The data indicates that the highest participation rate is among the young generation (51.6%), which gradually decreases with age, reaching 25.2% in the oldest age group. This trend is consistent across all V4 countries.

The main motivator for formal volunteering is the desire to help other people (60.4%). The second most important motivation is that volunteers enjoy the activity (40.7%). In Hungary, this applies to 29.5% of volunteers, in Poland to 30.1%, in Slovakia to 35.9%, and in Czechia even 58.7%. The third main motivator is the possibility to create change with others (35.7%), which is stronger in Czechia and Poland (around 42%). Furthermore, the opportunity to meet other people during the volunteering activities is also significant (32.2%). In Czechia, a higher percentage of volunteers report this (43.0%), compared to the lowest in Hungary (23.2%). Other significant motivators include the opportunity to give something back to others (29.4%), which is most notable in Poland (41.7%), and the chance to change things they dislike (28.9%), with the highest in Czechia (36.7%).

Motivations for volunteering vary across the V4 countries. In Slovakia, the primary motivator is the opportunity to help others (57.7%), while other motivators rank significantly lower: enjoying the activity (35.9%), meeting other people (30.8%), and making a difference together with others (26.3%). In Hungary, motivations are similar, with the added emphasis of giving something back (24.2%). For Poles, this feeling is even stronger (43.1%). In addition to the above, Czechs often see volunteering as an opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills (39.9%) and to develop themselves (27.6%).

Motivations for volunteering can also vary depending on the situation in which help is given. The most significant motivators for formal volunteering activities due to political events—such as the wars in Syria, Ukraine, Sudan as well as the unrest in Iran and Bangladesh—include: the need to help other people (54.2%), making a difference together with others (47.9%), and the opportunity to give something back to others (46.9%).

For natural disasters (both inside and outside their own country, such as floods and fires), the dominant motivator for formal volunteering is the need to help others (64.7%).

The main motivators for informal volunteering include the need to help others (65.4%, with Hungary reaching as high as 75.5%), followed by fulfilling a sense of usefulness (36.2%, highest in Czechia at 44.3%), and the need to give back to others (33.5%, highest in Poland 42.6%). Enjoyment of the activity ranks at 27.4% (highest in Czechia 37.3%).

The findings align with other researchers' observations and findings. Among the motivations for volunteering among young people are:

- **Empathy and Humanitarian Concerns:** Young people often express a strong desire to help those in need, especially in acute crises. For example, at the Poznań University of Economics and Business, Poland, team members' participation in numerous activities reflected this motivation. The proximity of the conflict makes the suffering more tangible and immediate (Kováčová & Soós, 2023).

- **Sense of Social Responsibility:** Many young people feel a moral obligation to contribute to society, especially during crises. The war has heightened awareness of global citizenship among youth. (Nowak & Cichocki, 2022).
- **Skill Development and Career Advancement:** Volunteering provides opportunities to gain practical skills and experience. Some young people view crisis volunteering as valuable for future employment prospects. This aspect applies to non-crisis volunteering as well (Szabó & Oross 2023).
- **Personal Growth and Self-Discovery:** Volunteering during a crisis offers opportunities for personal development and self-reflection. Young people often report increased confidence and a sense of purpose through their volunteer work. (Juhász & Szikra 2022).
- **Social Connection and Peer Influence:** Young people are often motivated by the opportunity to meet like-minded individuals. Social media and peer networks play a significant role in mobilizing youth volunteers (Václavíková & Macková, 2022).
- **Political and Ideological Motivations:** Some young volunteers are driven by political beliefs or ideological commitments. The crisis has sparked discussions about democracy, human rights, and European values among youth (Buzogány & Varga, 2023).
- **Cultural Exchange and Learning:** The crisis had provided opportunities for intercultural experiences with Ukrainian refugees. The chance to learn about different cultures and perspectives is often a motivation for youth (Klimczuk & Tomczyk, 2023).
- **Desire for Immediate Impact:** Young volunteers often express a preference for tangible, immediate results of their efforts. The acute nature of the crisis allows for visible, short-term impacts of volunteer work (Rácz & Nagy, 2022).

#### References:

- Bárdi, L., Kováts, A. (2023). From crisis response to sustained civic participation: Volunteering patterns in Hungary post-2022. *East European Politics and Societies*, 37(3), 512-530.
- Bernát, A., Sik, E. (2023). Divergent narratives and social polarization: The impact of the Ukraine war on Hungarian society. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 36(2), 275-293.
- Bocsi, V., Fényes, H., Markos, V. (2017). Motives of volunteering and values of work among higher education students. *Citizenship Social and Economics Education* 16(2):117-131 <https://doi.org/10.1177/20471734177170>
- Buzogány, A., & Varga, M. (2023). Ideological drivers of youth activism: A comparative study of V4 countries' responses to the Ukraine war. *East European Politics*, 39(2), 218-236.
- Development Initiatives. (2023). *Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2023*. <https://devinit.org/resources/global-humanitarian-assistance-report-2023>
- Harring, M., Lamby, D., Bíró-Nagy, A., & Szabó, A. (2022). *Youth study. Growing up in Central Eastern Europe. An international comparison of the living conditions of young people in Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia*. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung e.V. <https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/19880.pdf>
- Klimczuk, A., Tomczyk, Ł. (2023). Intercultural learning through crisis: Youth volunteers and Ukrainian refugees in Poland. *Intercultural Education*, 34(3), 395-411.)
- Koudelková, P., Svobodová, A. (2023). Skills acquisition through crisis volunteering: A study of Czech and Slovak volunteers. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 34(2), 389-405.
- Kováčová, L., Soós, S. (2023). Empathy as a driver: Young volunteers' responses to the Ukrainian refugee crisis. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 26(4), 512-528.

- Krzyzanowski, U., Pemstein, D. (2023). Civic engagement and social cohesion in V4 countries during the Ukraine crisis. *Journal of East European Studies*, 45(2), 178-195.
- Juhász, B., Szikra, D. (2022). Transformative experiences: Personal growth narratives of young volunteers in the Ukrainian refugee response. *Journal of Youth Development*, 17(4), 122-140.
- Markowski, R., Tworzecki, H. (2022). The evolution of Polish civil society organizations in response to the Ukraine crisis. *East European Politics*, 38(4), 645-664.
- Milo, D., & Klingová, K. (2018). *Globsec youth trends: How Young Central Europeans View the World*. GLOBSEC Policy Institute. <https://www.globsec.org/what-we-do/publications/globsec-youth-trends-how-young-central-europeans-view-world>
- Novotný, J., & Klvaňová, R. (2022). Trust-building through volunteerism: A comparative study of V4 responses to Ukrainian refugees. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 16(1), 23-41.
- Nowak, M., Cichocki, P. (2022). Global citizenship and local action: Polish youth volunteers in the face of the Ukrainian crisis. *Citizenship Studies*, 26(3), 342-359.
- Rácz, A., Nagy, Á. (2022). Immediate gratification in crisis volunteering: Motivations of Slovak youth in refugee assistance programs. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 33(6), 1231-1246.
- Swadźba, U., Horáková Hirschler, N. (2019). Value of work in the experience of the young generation of Visegrad countries. *Economics and Sociology*, 12(1), 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2019/12-1/10>
- Szabó, A., Oross, D. (2023). Volunteering as a career strategy: Hungarian youth engagement in refugee assistance. *Young*, 31(3), 275-292., interviews to candidates to the Leaders School Programme at PUEB, 2024.
- Václavíková, T., Macková, A. (2022). Networks of compassion: Social media and youth volunteering in the Czech Republic during the Ukraine crisis. *New Media & Society*, 24(8), 1876-1894.
- Wolczuk, K., Žeruolis, D. (2022). Transnational volunteerism and its impact on V4-Ukraine relations. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 74(6), 1021-1040.

## ARE LEVELS OF ENGAGEMENT IN PHILANTHROPIC ACTIVITIES IN THE V4 COUNTRIES HIGHER AMONG THE EDUCATED?

### Education and Its Relation to Volunteering

Human capital, particularly education, plays a critical role in the effectiveness of volunteer engagement. Resources such as knowledge, skills, and work experience (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Hager & Brudney, 2011; Haski-Leventhal et al., 2018) substantially increase the likelihood that individuals will become active volunteers (Chambré, 2020; Einolf & Yung, 2018). These resources, which volunteers can offer to organizations – including education (Forbes & Zampelli, 2014) – often lead to training and development provided by the organizations themselves, furthering volunteers’ personal and professional growth.

Education, as a fundamental component of human capital, is one of the most significant determinants of volunteering (Helms & McKenzie, 2013). Education facilitates social connections and civic values that serve as key determinants of volunteerism (Oesterle et al., 2004). Educated individuals often possess greater confidence in their abilities, while lower self-confidence can act as a barrier to volunteer involvement (Lasby, 2004; Son & Wilson, 2012). Research conducted across 17 OECD countries has demonstrated that volunteer activity is more common among educated groups, with the size of the less-educated population affecting volunteering rates among the more educated (Gesthuizen & Scheepers, 2012).

### Research Results

Our research confirms that education significantly impacts engagement in formal volunteering, both in general and over the past 24 months in V4 countries. Engagement levels increase with higher education levels – see Table 122, Table 123. The effect of education on informal volunteering was similarly confirmed over both short-term periods – see Table 124 – and irrespective of time – see Table 125. Higher education is associated with increased engagement in these activities, with statistically significant findings.

Education was also statistically correlated with donor activities, with more educated individuals more likely to participate in donation and charitable contributions – see Table 126.

In summary, the overall rate of participation in volunteering (both formal and informal) and donor activities correlates with education level. Higher education corresponds to a higher likelihood of involvement, as university-educated individuals more frequently participate in both formal and informal volunteer activities, as observed across all V4 countries. Educated individuals demonstrate greater engagement, though results vary by country and are not always statistically conclusive.

A strong relationship was also found between education and involvement in formal volunteering and donor activities. Higher education levels are associated with greater engagement, with an engagement rate of 80.2% among university-educated individuals – see Table 127. When all forms of volunteer activities are considered, this figure rises to 86.7% – see Table 128, with results again being statistically significant.

A more detailed analysis shows that these conclusions apply to the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia, with Hungary displaying some unique characteristics. The highest rate of university-educated engagement was recorded in the Czech Republic, where 87.6% of university-educated individuals participated, compared to only 63.2% among those without secondary education – see Table 155. When all forms of volunteer activity are included, the rate of engagement among the university-educated reaches 94.7% – see Table 156.



## Conclusion

This study confirms that education has a fundamental influence on the level of engagement in volunteer activities, both formal and informal, as well as in donation. Higher education is associated with an increased likelihood of participation in all forms of philanthropic activity, which is evident across the Visegrad countries. More educated individuals are better equipped to offer their knowledge and skills, thus contributing to the effectiveness and impact of volunteer and charitable efforts. The significance of this finding lies not only in fostering community ties and social cohesion but also in developing human capital that supports sustainable societal progress. Based on these insights, it can be concluded that investing in education has far-reaching effects on enhancing civic engagement and effectively meeting societal needs through philanthropic activities.

## References:

- Brown, E., & Ferris, J. M. (2007). Social Capital and Philanthropy: An Analysis of the Impact of Social Capital on Individual Giving and Volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 85-99. doi:10.1177/0899764006293178
- Chambré, S., M. (2020). Has volunteering changed in the United States? Trends, styles, and motivations in historical perspective. *Social Service Review*, 94(2), 373-421. doi:https://doi.org/10.1086/708941
- Einolf, C. J., & Yung, C. (2018). Super-volunteers: Who are they and how do we get one? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(4), 789-812. doi:10.1177/0899764018760400
- Forbes, K. F., & Zampelli, E. M. (2014). Volunteerism. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2), 227-253. doi:10.1177/0899764012458542
- Gesthuizen, M., & Scheepers, P. (2012). Educational differences in volunteering in cross-national perspective. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(1), 58-81. doi:10.1177/0899764010394203
- Hager, M. A., & Brudney, J. L. (2011). Problems recruiting volunteers: Nature versus nurture. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 22(2), 137-157. doi:10.1002/nml.20046
- Haski-Leventhal, D., Meijs, L. C. P. M., Lockstone-Binney, L., Holmes, K., & Oppenheimer, M. (2018). Measuring volunteerability and the capacity to volunteer among non-volunteers: Implications for social policy. *Social Policy & Administration*, 52(5), 1139-1167. doi:10.1111/spol.12342
- Helms, S., & McKenzie, T. (2013). Gender Differences in Formal and Informal Volunteering in Germany. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(4), 887-904. doi:10.1007/s11266-013-9378-1
- Oesterle, S., Kirkpatrick Johnson, M., & Mortimer, J. T. (2004). Volunteerism during the transition to adulthood: A life course perspective. *Social Forces*, 82(3), 1123-1149.

## RELIGIOSITY AND PHILANTHROPIC GIVING

### Religiosity and philanthropic behaviour in general

Faith and religion are among the factors influencing philanthropic behavior (Yao, 2015). However, as Casale and Baumann (2015, p. 102) wrote, it is also “one of the most widely discussed determinants of prosocial behavior”. Some authors also imply that the problem might be more complex than some studies assume, such as those using religious attendance as a proxy for religiosity (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Casale & Baumann, 2015; Neumayr & Handy, 2019). Bomark (2023) also suggests that being part of a religious group can be a basis for other activities, such as volunteering. Religious teachings usually encourage believers to empathize with people facing challenging circumstances (Casale & Baumann (2015, p. 102). Another thing is that faith-based organizations increasingly focus on addressing problems like poverty or inequality. According to Casale & Baumann (2015, p. 102), this growing solidarity is “likely to be internalized by members and reflected in their prosocial behavior”

### Religious attendance and philanthropic behaviour

According to Bekkers and Wiepking (2011, p. 340), the literature suggests that “church membership and attendance are associated with giving”, though some studies hint the opposite. The research of Neumayr and Handy (2019, p. 790) focused on Austria and showed that in their research, religious affiliation was “not a predictor for giving to religious causes”. Even more surprisingly, religious affiliation was in their research “negatively related to giving to social services and Environmental Issues, implying religiously affiliated donors being less likely to give toward these two causes” (Neumayr & Handy, 2019, p. 790). However, Neumayr and Handy (2019) also used another variable, religious attendance, where the results differed. Casale & Baumann (2015, p. 102) use the frequency of religious attendance, noting that the higher frequency of religious attendees to give “may not be indicative of greater prosocial tendencies, but simply that those attending religious services are more frequently asked”.

Concerning Religious Attendance and the research of Neumayr and Handy (2019), there was “a positive and significant relation with giving to religious causes, both for incidence and intensity” (Neumayr & Handy, 2019, p. 790). There was also “a significant and positive association with the decision to give to Social Services but negatively with giving to Health, Animal Welfare, and Culture and Education” (Neumayr & Handy, 2019, p. 790, 794). Most importantly, their research showed that “religious affiliation is positively and significantly associated with the decision to give, but negatively and significantly with the total amount donated”, which means that “religiously affiliated donors in Austria are more likely to give, but may not feel the need to support religious causes” (Neumayr & Handy, 2019, p. 796). Moreover, “religiously affiliated donors in Austria are more likely to give, but may not feel the need to support religious causes” (Neumayr & Handy, 2019, p. 796). As was said above, “Religious Attendance is positively related to donor choice to religious causes”, while Neumayr and Handy (2019, p. 796) interpret it “as it results in social pressure and awareness of religious causes that need support as well as many collections for donations take place during Roman Catholic services”.

### Church scandals and pro-social behaviour

However, since trust is an important factor in philanthropic behavior (Gill & Thomas, 2023; Wiepking, 2021; Neumayr & Handy, 2019; Konrath & Handy, 2018; List & Price, 2009), the credibility of churches as institutions who act as receivers or mediators of help is also important. Bottan and Perez-Truglia (2015) focused on the effects of religious abuse scandals on religious participation and charitable giving. The data on the Catholic church in the USA showed that the abuse scandals significantly declined religious participation. However, its effects on religious or pro-social beliefs were not significant. Bottan and Perez-Truglia (2015, p. 118) interpreted their results in a way “that changes in religious participation during adulthood may have a small or no effect on deep beliefs and attitudes. However, studying this matter on the international level can be conceptually tricky because data on the

Czech Republic and the USA suggests that the number of church sexual abuse scandals in the USA is disproportionately larger than in the Czech Republic (see Vintrová, 2022; Bottan & Perez-Truglia, 2015). The possible explanation for this is a different methodology, but also the fact that in the Soviet bloc, there might be hesitations towards the government, judicial system, and media, together with the negative experiences with the psychology and psychiatry under the communist regime, where it was sometimes used as an act of repression (Vintrová, 2022).

### **Atheism or non-traditional religiosity in the context of philanthropic behaviour**

Similarly, with other fields of research, international comparison stands and falls with a comparability of the data. The problem of faith-based research, not only in the context of philanthropic behavior, is that it often uses traditional standardization, such as church membership or attendance to church services, as a proxy for religiosity (see Austin et al., 2022; Neumayr & Handy, 2019, p. 790; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). It can work to some extent in some contexts. However, if standard measures do not easily capture a country's religiosity, it can be vastly misleading. An example is the Czech Republic, a country often seen as strongly atheistic (see Václavík et al., 2018), and national data shows that both church membership and trust in churches are relatively low (Dostál & Hyánek, 2024). Accepting the conclusion that the country is mostly atheistic will lead us to find the drivers of philanthropic behavior elsewhere.

However, as Václavík, Hamplová & Nešpor (2018, p. 112) wrote, “truly atheistic attitudes are held only by a small minority of people”, explaining that so-called Czech atheism “tends to be confused with other religious phenomena, such as deinstitutionalized religiosity and apathy towards religion (religious apatheism)”. However, perhaps the most significant fact is that “significant part of the “secular” and “non-church” Czechs believe in the existence of the supernatural” and that supernatural things can influence their life (Hamplová, 2008, s. 704). There are, however, other factors about Czech religiosity, often misunderstood as atheism. These are relatively lower levels of commitment in people's religiosity, deep individualization of the religiosity and low level of institutionalization of religious life (Václavík, Hamplová & Nešpor, 2018). What still needs to be clarified from the literature is whether these are religious-specific factors or are part of broader social values, which may or may not be part of motivation towards philanthropic behaviour.

### **Religious heterogeneity and charitable donations**

Andreoni et al. (2016, p. 58) interpret the results of their research in a way “that the recent and continuing demographic changes across North America and Europe may have a significant and sizable impact on charitable services provided through voluntary contributions of individuals”. They further explain with further diversification of the communities, including the faith and religion, charity revenues may fall. Andreoni et al. (2016, p. 58) found “a negative relationship between religious heterogeneity and amount donated, possibly driven by Catholics that donating more when their group share rises in the population”.

### **Research results in the context of the literature review**

This section discusses the results of the results in the context of the literature review above. Looking at the characteristics in the table below, it is clear that the Czech Republic has very different characteristics on religion. This results solely would support the hypothesis of the atheistic nation. However, among the 96 per cent of respondents with no declared religion, there is unknown part of people with deinstitutionalized religiosity (Václavík, Hamplová & Nešpor, 2018). These people would believe in supranatural things and that they are impacting their lives, but they do not identify themselves with a certain religion.

Tab. 1: Demographic Data - gender, religion

Country	Gender				Religions						Total
	Male		Female		Christianity		Others		No		
Poland	292	48.7%	308	51.3%	470	78.3%	10	1.7%	120	20.0%	600
Czechia	280	49.2%	300	50.8%	22	3.8%	0	0%	558	96.2%	580
Hungary	234	51.8%	218	48.2%	295	65.3%	11	2.4%	146	32.3%	452
Slovakia	195	48.5%	207	51.5%	295	73.4%	15	3.7%	92	22.9%	402
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>	<b>49.2%</b>	<b>1033</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	<b>1082</b>	<b>53.2%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>2034</b>

On the also hand, as Dostál and Hyánek (2024) noted, there are a growing number of people in the Czech Republic who do not identify themselves with a certain denomination, but see themselves as believers. Very likely, there is a significant number of people among them who identify themselves as Christians, or share at least some of Christian faith. This could also be the explanation why the share of Christians in our sample is so low.

Different kind of religiosity in the Czech Republic, not confused with the atheism (see (Václavík, Hamplová & Nešpor, 2018; Hamplová, 2008) can also be part of the explanation why motivation of people to philanthropic behaviour is different in the Czech Republic compared to other V4 countries. For example, 43 % residents in the Czech Republic mentioned they participate in formal volunteering because they meet other people in the process, while the V4 average was 32.2% and all the other V4 countries had between 23 and 31 %. This makes sense, considering the significantly less institutionalized religiosity in the Czech Republic, with many people lacking their religious community.

Another motive for formal volunteering was the fact that respondents are enjoying the activity. The Czech data shows that 58.7 % respondents mentioned this reason, while the V4 area was 40.7 % and the other V4 countries have this reason included from 30 to 36 %. The possible explanation could be that Czech respondents faced lesser pressure from the church institutions and co-believers and are feeling freer in deciding which kind of volunteering activity to do. On the other hand, the lesser extent of religiosity in the Czech Republic is obvious also in the data on motivation, because the Czech respondents mentioned Religious, spiritual conviction as a reason for formal volunteering in 6.6 % cases, while the V4 average was 9.3 % and other V4 countries having values from 8,4 to 16 %. However, if the level of atheism was really so higher in the Czech Republic, the differences would very likely be much more different.

Among other factors which are very significantly different for the Czech Republic were individualistic motives such as personal development, expanding the knowledge or building personnel network. This is likely connected with the prevailing individual character of the Czech Religiosity. However, the causality among these two is not clear. There is a documented distrust to churches in the Czech Republic (see Dostál and Hyánek, 2024) and individualization of the religion in the Czech Republic (Václavík, Hamplová & Nešpor, 2018), but we do not know whether these individual motives recorded in our research are coming from different religious patterns, or they are both impacted by the sociological characteristics and cultural patterns.

Anyway, distinguishing between atheism and different kinds of religiosity can help the future research to identify, why there are differences among countries with similar characteristics like the V4 countries in the motivation to philanthropic behavior. Also, knowledge from other disciplines can be helpful.

#### References:

- Andreoni, J., Payne, A. A., Smith, J., & Karp, D. (2016). Diversity and donations: The effect of religious and ethnic diversity on charitable giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 128, 47-58.
- Austin, T. S., King, D. P., Bergdoll, J., & Fulton, B. R. (2022). Defining and Estimating the Scope of US Faith-Based International Humanitarian Aid Organizations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 1-20.

- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving — religion, education, age, and socialization. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337–365
- Bottan, N. L., & Perez-Truglia, R. (2015). Losing my religion: The effects of religious scandals on religious participation and charitable giving. *Journal of Public Economics*, 129, 106-119.
- Casale, D., & Baumann, A. (2015). Who gives to international causes? A sociodemographic analysis of US donors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(1), 98-122.
- Dostál, J., & Hyánek, V. (2024). Church charity fundraising in a decreasingly religious society: Case of the Three Kings Collection in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing*, 29(1), e1815.
- Gill, A., & Thomas, M. D. (2023). The dynamic efficiency of gifting. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 19(1), 70-85.
- Hamplová, D. (2008). Čemu Češi věří: dimenze soudobé české religiozity. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, 44(04), 703-723.
- Konrath, S., & Handy, F. (2018). The development and validation of the motives to donate scale. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(2), 347-375.
- List, J. A., & Price, M. K. (2009). The role of social connections in charitable fundraising: Evidence from a natural field experiment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 69(2), 160-169.
- Neumayr, M., & Handy, F. (2019). Charitable giving: What influences donors' choice among different causes? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30, 783–799
- Václavík, D., Hamplová, D., & Nešpor, Z. R. (2018). Religious situation in contemporary Czech society. *Central European Journal for Contemporary Religion*, 2(2), 99-122.
- Vintrová, M. (2022). The Catholic Church in the Czech Republic and Sexual Abuse of Minors. *The Person and the Challenges. The Journal of Theology, Education, Canon Law and Social Studies Inspired by Pope John Paul II*, 12(1), 95-109.
- Wiepking, P. (2021). The global study of philanthropic behavior. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32(2), 194-203.
- Yao, K. (2015). Who gives? The determinants of charitable giving, volunteering, and their relationship. *Wharton Research Scholars*, 126, 1-34.

## DIFFERENCES IN DONATIONS PATTERNS BETWEEN COUNTRIES: PATTERNS IN PHILANTHROPIC ENGAGEMENT

Collected data indicate differences in involvement in formal or informal volunteering or donation patterns among the V4 countries. These differences are statistically significant and thus, it can be concluded that these behaviors are country dependent.

### **The Czech dominance in philanthropic behavior in V4 context**

The data show, that the Czech Republic has the highest level of engagement which is on average higher than the level of engagement in the other V4 countries and above the average for the V4 as a whole. 66,1% of participants in V4 have been involved in some form of philanthropy, formal volunteering or donation in their lifetime, with the highest proportion in Czechia (76,7%) and lowest (60,7%) in Slovakia (Tab 15). When looking at the period of last 24 months, the V4 average shows 52,9%, however, the donor engagement in Czechia exceeds the average (64,5%), all the other countries are below the average (Tab 14). The regularity of donations is highest in Poland (17,2%), followed by Slovakia (10,1%) and Czechia (6,5%).

### **Differences in donations and their average**

Another statistically significant difference is that more than a quarter of Slovaks and Poles have never been involved in donor activity compared to 4,66% in HU and 13,1% in Czechia (Tab 265). Yet, the average size of contributions (in categories € 141-270 and above €270) is higher in Czechia and Slovakia compared to Poland and Hungary (Tab 267). What might have contributed to this difference?

In case of Slovaks, who have been less familiar with donation activity, those who give, give higher amounts, compared to Poles, whose proportion of donors is higher and give on average smaller amounts. Czechs give higher amounts more frequently.

The variations in sizes of donations may be a result of a complex interplay of personal, organizational and situational factors. Variety of research efforts identify various factors influencing the charitable giving and its size. It is connected with ease of operations, legal and fiscal framework, cultural expectations (religiosity, social influence, peer pressure) donor socio-economic background (income levels), share of public funding on civil society activity, as well as to the effectiveness and level of fundraising practices (Wiepking et al. 2021). Forces that drive charitable giving: (1) awareness of need; (2) solicitation; (3) costs and benefits; (4) altruism; (5) reputation; (6) psychological benefits; (7) values; (8) efficacy (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011).

### **Giving for young and migrants is lower in Slovakia and Hungary**

Slovakia and Hungary show lower orientation of donations for young people (7,4% in Slovakia), migrants and refugees (6,8% in Slovakia and 3,2% in Hungary) compared to the other two countries. Both countries are known in the past for their stringent migration policies and relatively hostile attitude of their respective government on the topic of international migration. The data may hint towards the consequences of lasting influence of media and social media on public opinion by negative representations of migrating peoples.

### **Poverty as a driver for giving**

The data suggest that proportion of population living in poverty level correlates with the lower frequency of donations to people affected by poverty.

The people affected by poverty is the least popular reason for donations in Czech Republic compared to the rest of V4 countries (Tab 271). This can be correlated with lower levels of poverty in Czechia in comparison to its V4 neighbors. Eurostat (2024)<sup>1</sup> reports 11,5% of the population of Czech Republic living at risk of poverty or social exclusion, compared to higher percentages in Slovakia (13,5%), Hungary (19,5%) and Poland (16,6 %).

Also, Hungary shows lower preference for donations for people with disabilities than Slovakia, Poland, and Czech Republic (Tab 269, 270, 271). Whether is it a result of a better policies of the state towards people with disabilities or some other reason, remains for further research.

### **Uneven focus on donations for environmental causes**

Data show lower preference for environment (16,1%) as a donation cause in Slovakia for the last 24 months or in the past, which is significantly lower compared to the rest of the V4. Could Slovakia be an outlier in the V4 in perceiving environment through survival value lens more than through self-expression lens?

The concept of post-materialist, self-expression values vs. survival values (Inglehart 2009) may be used in exploring the difference between Slovakia and the rest of V4 perceiving environment as an intrinsic value important for self-expression, rather than for survival.

Inglehart's theory of values posits that people prioritize needs based on scarcity, with materialist concerns dominating in times of insecurity and post-materialist values emerging as basic needs are met (Babula, 2007). Environmental causes in charitable giving can be interpreted as either survival or self-expression values, depending on the context. In societies facing immediate environmental threats, such giving may reflect survival values. This might apply to Slovakia as well with more "rough" or "wild" environment than its neighbors. However, in more secure societies, environmental philanthropy often aligns with self-expression values, alongside other post-materialist concerns like freedom and quality of life (Inglehart, 2007). The cultural context plays a crucial role in determining whether pro-social values translate into civic involvement, with universalism predicting engagement only in self-expression-oriented societies (Radkiewicz et al., 2008)

Another way of explaining Slovakia as outlier in V4 context in donations for environmental causes is its lower economic footing translated in low personal income. De Vriert (2007) suggests that societies with lower incomes tend to prioritize survival values over self-expression values. Thus, environmental causes as a motivation for charitable giving may be more prevalent in societies with higher incomes and less demanding or threatening environment, aligning with self-expression values. However, the relationship between environmental giving and self-expression is complex and influenced by various factors beyond climate and economics.

### **Donations and Crises**

Donations in crises events shows also significant cross-country differences. War in Ukraine and Covid were seen as most significant events in Poland (50%) and Czechia (38%), followed by Slovakia (29%) and Hungary (16%) (Tab 274). Local events being important as well. Donations from 14,2% of Poles and 13,3% of Czechs fund military support, more than Slovaks (9,1%) and Hungarians (3,1) (Tab 275).

### **Responsibility differences**

Participants in both Slovakia (60,9%) and Hungary (66,66%) believe significantly more that the state shall take more responsibility than participants in Poland (50,8%) and Czechia (55%). On the other hand, participants in Poland (58,7%) and Czechia (59,5%) believe more that it is relatives and people from the social environment who shall take responsibility for the initiative for volunteering compared to Slovakia (41,3%) and Hungary (49,1%) (Tab 259). In

<sup>1</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Living\\_conditions\\_in\\_Europe\\_-\\_poverty\\_and\\_social\\_exclusion#Key\\_findings](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Living_conditions_in_Europe_-_poverty_and_social_exclusion#Key_findings)

general, it can be concluded that people with lower incomes, lower education and higher age place more responsibility and tasks on the state. These findings are statistically significant.

### **Religion and church as a factor shaping the intensity of philanthropy (volunteering and donations activities) in Slovakia (Tab 227)**

Research consistently shows that religion is a key factor supporting charitable giving. Religious individuals tend to donate more to both religious and secular causes compared to non-religious people. Religion is considered as one of the key institutional contextual factor affecting philanthropy and emerges as a consistent predictor of charitable giving across multiple studies (Vaidyanathan, Hill, and Smith 2011; Bekkers and Wiepking 2011; Wiepking et al. 2021).

The data show that reasons for donations in Slovakia differ from the rest of V4 with church being the fourth most important reason after fighting diseases, people with disabilities and people affected by poverty. The relatively high ranking of church as a purpose of donation, begs for questions.

In Slovakia, the largest share (25%) of participants is involved in formal volunteering in religious community and church-related organizations, followed by sports (24,2). Similar pattern is found in Hungary (21,5%, 20,7% respectively). Unlike Poland (12%, 19,6%) and Czech Republic (6,9% and 29%). In Poland the largest involvement in formal volunteering is in social, charitable NPOs. The children and young people and older people are the most frequent target groups of formal volunteering in Slovakia, in both cases higher than the V4 average (Tab 232).

The target group of refugees and people with migration backgrounds as reasons for donations is significantly lower in Slovakia and Hungary than in Poland and Czechia, suggesting a common pattern in the relationship to this target group (Tab. 231, 237). This suggests the strong in-group tendency, that reaches beyond the religious universalistic calls to national churches.

Joint pattern of Hungary and Slovakia is in involvement in formal volunteering in crisis events – War in Ukraine (3%, 4%) (Tab 245), in contrast to Czechia (11%) and Poland (20%). Similar results are in informal volunteering (Tab 250), where the care of people with a migration background is only in 3,7% of activities in Slovakia (1,7% in Hungary) in comparison with 10,3% in Poland and 6,1% in Czechia. Similarly, the responsiveness to crises events via informal volunteering is lower in Slovakia and Hungary compared to Poland and Czechia (Tab 255). Religious and spiritual convictions in motivation structure are significantly higher in Slovakia compared to other V4 countries (16% vs 6,4-8,8%). However, the top two motivators are similar to the rest of V4 – a possibility to help other people and the enjoying of the activity.

### **References**

- Bekkers, René, and Pamala Wiepking. 2011. "A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40 (5): 924–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927>.
- Babula, Michael. 2007. "Political Values in a Threat Environment". *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 2007;40(2):319-324. doi:10.1017/S1049096507070527.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 2009. "Postmaterialist Values and the Shift from Survival to Self-Expression Values." In , edited by Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, 1st ed., 223–39. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199270125.003.0012>.
- Radkiewicz, P., Zavała, A.G., & Skarżyńska, K.M. (2008). Pro-social basic human values and civic involvement. The moderating role of survival vs self-expression cultural context. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 39, 226-235.
- Vaidyanathan, Brandon, Jonathan Hill, and Christian Smith. 2011. "Religion and Charitable Financial Giving to Religious and Secular Causes: Does Political Ideology Matter? | Semantic Scholar." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2011.01584.x>.



- Vliert, Van de. 2007. "Climates Create Cultures." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 1 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00003.x>.
- Wiepking, Pamala, Femida Handy, Sohyun Park, Michaela Neumayr, René Bekkers, Beth Breeze, Arjen de Wit, et al. 2021. "Global Philanthropy: Does Institutional Context Matter for Charitable Giving?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary*

## THE INFLUENCE OF ECONOMIC SITUATION ON DONATIONS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF V4 COUNTRIES

### Introduction

The economic situation of individuals and households is a crucial determinant of their capacity and willingness to engage in altruistic behaviors such as donating and volunteering. Economic theory suggests that individuals with higher incomes are more likely to participate in philanthropic activities due to their greater disposable income and ability to meet their own needs comfortably. Conversely, lower-income individuals might be less involved in donation activities due to financial constraints. This report explores these dynamics within the V4 countries, focusing on how different income groups participate in donation activities and volunteering.

### Methodology

Data were collected from surveys conducted in the V4 countries, examining the involvement of individuals in formal and informal volunteering and donation activities over the last 24 months. Participants were categorized into five income groups, and their engagement levels were compared using Pearson's chi-squared tests to determine statistical significance. See more in chapters on pages 86 and 127.

### Results

#### *Involvement in Formal Volunteering*

##### Czechia

In Czechia, there is no significant dependence on personal or household income for involvement in formal volunteering within the last 24 months. The chi-squared test results for personal income (Table 213) and household income (Table 214) indicate no statistically significant relationship. When considering past involvement in formal volunteering, the dependence on income remains statistically insignificant for both personal (Table 215) and household income (Table 216).

##### Hungary

Similar to Czechia, Hungary shows no significant dependence on personal or household income for formal volunteering within the last 24 months. The chi-squared test results (Tables 185, 186) support this conclusion. Even when considering past involvement, the chi-squared test results (Tables 187, 188) indicate no statistically significant relationship.

##### Poland

In Poland, there is no significant dependence on personal income for formal volunteering within the last 24 months (Table 199). However, there is a statistically significant relationship between household income and formal volunteering (Table 200). This pattern remains consistent when considering past involvement in formal volunteering, with no significant dependence on personal income (Table 201) but a significant relationship with household income (Table 202).

## Slovakia

In Slovakia, there is no significant dependence on personal or household income for formal volunteering within the last 24 months (Tables 171, 172). The same pattern is observed when considering past involvement in formal volunteering, with no statistically significant relationship between income and volunteering (Tables 173, 174).

### *Involvement in Informal Volunteering*

## Czechia

In Czechia, personal and household income does not significantly affect involvement in informal volunteering within the last 24 months (Tables 217, 218). This pattern remains consistent when considering past involvement, with no significant dependence on personal (Table 219) or household income (Table 220).

## Hungary

In Hungary, there is no significant dependence on personal or household income for informal volunteering within the last 24 months (Tables 189, 190). The chi-squared test results indicate no statistically significant relationship. This pattern remains consistent when considering past involvement (Tables 191, 192).

## Poland

In Poland, personal income does not significantly affect involvement in informal volunteering within the last 24 months (Table 203). However, there is a significant relationship between household income and informal volunteering (Table 204). This pattern is also observed when considering past involvement in informal volunteering, with no significant dependence on personal income (Table 205) but a significant relationship with household income (Table 206).

## Slovakia

In Slovakia, there is no significant dependence on personal or household income for informal volunteering within the last 24 months (Tables 175, 176). The same pattern is observed when considering past involvement, with no statistically significant relationship between income and informal volunteering (Tables 177, 178).

### *Involvement in Donation Activities*

## Czechia

In Czechia, differences in donation activities are observed across income groups, with household income showing a significant influence (Tables 221, 222). Personal income does not significantly affect donation involvement (Table 221), while household income does (Table 222).

## Hungary

In Hungary, there are significant differences in donation activities between different household income groups, particularly with the highest income group contributing the most (Tables 193, 194). Personal income does not significantly affect donation involvement (Table 193), but household income does (Table 194).

## Poland

In Poland, rising incomes (both personal and household) significantly increase donation rates (Tables 207, 208). The chi-squared test results show a significant relationship between both personal income (Table 207) and household income (Table 208) and donation involvement.

## Slovakia

In Slovakia, there is no statistically significant dependence on income for donation activities, although higher income households are generally more engaged (Tables 179, 180). The chi-squared test results indicate no significant relationship between personal income (Table 179) or household income (Table 180) and donation involvement.

### *Combined Volunteering and Donation Involvement*

The relationship between income level and involvement in both formal volunteering and donation activities, as well as any volunteering activity, was examined for each country.

## Czechia

In Czechia, there is a significant relationship between household income and involvement in combined volunteering and donation activities (Table 222), but not with personal income (Table 223).

## Hungary

In Hungary, there is no significant relationship between income level and involvement in combined volunteering and donation activities (Tables 195, 196). However, higher household income levels are generally associated with higher engagement.

## Poland

In Poland, household income shows a significant relationship with involvement in combined volunteering and donation activities (Table 210), whereas personal income does not (Table 209). This pattern is consistent across different types of volunteering activities.

## Slovakia

In Slovakia, there is no significant relationship between income level and involvement in combined volunteering and donation activities (Tables 181, 182).

### **Between-Country Comparison**

The analysis reveals significant variations in how household income influences philanthropic behavior across the V4 countries. The most pronounced differences are observed in Poland, where household income significantly impacts both formal volunteering and donation activities. In Poland, individuals from higher-income households are markedly more engaged in these activities compared to their lower-income counterparts, suggesting that economic capacity is a crucial determinant of philanthropic behavior. The significant chi-squared test results for household income and formal volunteering (Table 200) and donation involvement (Table 208) support this conclusion.

In contrast, Slovakia and Hungary show less variation in engagement based on income levels. In Slovakia, neither personal nor household income significantly influences involvement in formal volunteering (Tables 171, 172), informal volunteering (Tables 175, 176), or donation activities (Tables 179, 180). Similarly, in Hungary, there is no significant relationship between personal or household income and engagement in formal volunteering (Tables 185, 186), informal volunteering (Tables 189, 190), or donation activities (Tables 193, 194). These findings suggest that other socio-cultural factors might play a more prominent role in influencing philanthropic behaviors in these countries.

Czechia presents an intermediate case. While there is no significant dependence on personal income for formal volunteering (Table 213) or informal volunteering (Tables 217, 218), household income significantly influences

donation activities (Table 222). This partial dependence indicates that while economic factors do affect donation behaviors, they are not the sole determinants of volunteering engagement in Czechia. The nuanced relationship between economic status and philanthropic activities points to the importance of considering a broader range of influences beyond economic capacity alone.

### **Discussion and Theoretical Background**

The findings of this study align with several economic and sociological theories that explain altruistic behavior. Economic theories of altruism, particularly those proposed by Becker (1974), suggest that individuals with higher income levels are more likely to engage in charitable activities due to their greater financial capacity. This theory is most evident in Poland, where higher household incomes are strongly correlated with increased participation in both formal volunteering and donation activities. The financial security and disposable income of higher-income households enable them to contribute more to charitable causes.

In contrast, the relatively lower impact of income on volunteering in Slovakia and Hungary suggests that other factors might be at play. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) posits that altruistic behaviors are motivated by the expectation of reciprocal benefits, such as social recognition or enhanced social capital. In these countries, socio-cultural norms and the role of state and community organizations may influence these behaviors more than economic capacity.

Czechia presents a different dynamic where household income significantly influences donation activities but not volunteering. This mixed result indicates that while economic capacity enables individuals to contribute financially, other factors such as personal values, social networks, and the presence of robust volunteering infrastructure might drive volunteering activities. The nuanced relationship between economic status and philanthropic behaviors in Czechia underscores the importance of considering both economic and non-economic factors when analyzing these behaviors.

Additionally, cultural factors and historical legacies significantly influence philanthropic engagement in the V4 countries. Community norms and the role of local organizations in promoting volunteering and donations might mitigate the impact of economic disparities, particularly in Slovakia and Hungary. In Czechia, while economic capacity significantly influences donation behaviors, other factors like social networks and personal values are more critical in driving volunteering activities.

### **Conclusion**

This study highlights the varying influence of economic situations on donation activities across V4 countries. While higher income generally correlates with increased engagement in donations, the strength of this relationship varies by country, with Poland showing the most pronounced differences. These insights underscore the need for tailored approaches in promoting philanthropic activities, considering the socio-economic contexts of each country.

### **References**

- Becker, G. S. (1974). "A Theory of Social Interactions." *Journal of Political Economy*, 82(6), 1063-1093.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). "Exchange and Power in Social Life." New York: John Wiley & Sons.

## ABOUT THE SURVEY

Data collection took place as part of a survey focused on volunteering and donation in V4 countries associated with sudden events and crises. The data were collected in V4 countries, namely in Czechia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia. The survey was conducted by the SC & C (survey agency) in collaboration with other survey agencies in the participating countries.

Data collection occurred in all countries using a combination of CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interviewing) and CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) methods. The data are representative of the population 18 and older in each participating country (representativeness was ensured by applying socio-demographic quotas for gender, age, education, and type of housing).

*Table 1: Numbers of Respondents and Types of Surveys*

Country	Total	CAWI	CATI	Average Filling Time (min.)
Slovakia	402	272	130	14
Hungary	452	302	150	14
Poland	600	400	200	13
Czechia	580	432	148	18
Total	<b>2034</b>	<b>1406</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>15</b>

### Collection Dates

- **Czechia:** collection date 25 October – 6 November 2023; 6,371 respondents were contacted, and 9% of those contacted completed the survey.
- **Slovakia:** collection date 23 October – 7 November 2023; 3,498 respondents were contacted, and 11% of those contacted completed the survey.
- **Poland:** collection date 31 October – 9 November 2023; 29,463 respondents were contacted, and 2% of those contacted completed the survey.
- **Hungary:** collection date 31 October – 6 November 2023; 12,058 respondents were contacted, and 4% of those contacted completed the survey.

Since the willingness to respond to sociological researches varies in individual countries, significantly more potential respondents had to be contacted in Hungary and Poland than in Czechia and Slovakia.

Respondents in all countries were asked to consent to the processing of personal data at the beginning of the questionnaire. In the CATI part, the interviewer read the personal data processing principles to the respondents and they expressed their consent verbally.

## SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table 2: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Gender

Gender/Country	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Male	195	48.5%	234	51.8%	292	48.7%	280	49.2%	1001	49.2%
Female	207	51.5%	218	48.2%	308	51.3%	300	50.8%	1033	50.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Table 3: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Age

Age/Country	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
18 – 24	43	10.7%	32	7.1%	74	12.3%	41	7.1%	190	9.3%
25 – 34	66	16.4%	61	13.5%	129	21.5%	98	16.9%	354	17.4%
35 – 44	81	20.1%	85	18.8%	135	22.5%	94	16.2%	395	19.4%
45 – 54	65	16.2%	81	17.9%	114	19.0%	133	22.9%	393	19.3%
55 – 64	67	16.7%	70	15.5%	89	14.8%	115	19.8%	341	16.8%
65+	80	19.9%	123	27.2%	59	9.8%	91	15.7%	353	17.4%
Missing							8	1.4%	8	0.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	
Average age	46.8		50.5		43.0		47.8		46.8	
Min	18		18		18		18		18	
Max	84		85		87		79		87	
St.D.	16.6		16.7		15.1		15.1		16.0	
Shapiro-Wilk W (p-value)	2.84x 10 <sup>-7</sup>		4.79x 10 <sup>-8</sup>		4.56x 10 <sup>-9</sup>		1.72x 10 <sup>-7</sup>		5.39x 10 <sup>-18</sup>	

Table 4: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Municipality Size

Size/Country	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
< 500 inhabit.	21	5.2%	16	3.5%	50	8.3%	0	0.0%	87	4.3%
500 – 5000	139	34.6%	111	24.6%	79	13.2%	200	34.5%	529	26.0%
5001 – 20000	82	20.4%	100	22.1%	113	18.8%	99	17.1%	394	19.4%
20001 – 100000	113	28.1%	106	23.5%	174	29.0%	144	24.8%	537	26.4%
> 100001	47	11.7%	119	26.3%	184	30.7%	137	23.6%	487	23.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Table 5: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Education

Edu. /Country	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
None	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%
Primary school	35	8.7%	20	4.4%	24	4.0%	35	6.0%	114	5.6%
Second. – no FE	95	23.6%	106	23.5%	175	29.2%	185	31.9%	561	27.6%
Second. – +FE	188	46.8%	245	54.2%	290	48.3%	190	32.8%	913	44.9%
University	84	20.9%	81	17.9%	109	18.2%	170	29.3%	444	21.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

*Table 6: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Personal Income*

Income/Country	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
1	127	31.6%	110	24.3%	165	27.5%	141	24.3%	543	26.7%
2	81	20.1%	53	11.7%	123	20.5%	114	19.7%	371	18.2%
3	59	14.7%	86	19.0%	107	17.8%	116	20.0%	368	18.1%
4	47	11.7%	78	17.3%	118	19.7%	79	13.6%	322	15.8%
5	88	21.9%	125	27.7%	87	14.5%	116	20.0%	416	20.5%
Missing values	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	2.4%	14	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

*Table 7: Decisive Amounts for Determining Personal Income Groups in V4 Countries*

Category of Personal Income	SK (EUR)	HU (HUF)	PL (PLN)	CZ (CZK)
1	<529	<296 000	<2342	<19 000
2	530 – 676	296 001 – 370 000	2343 – 3069	19001 – 24000
3	677 – 805	370 001 – 460 000	3070 – 3809	24001 – 30000
4	806 – 982	460 001 – 590 000	3810 – 4918	30001 – 37000
5	>983	>590 000	>4918	>37000

*Table 8: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Household Income*

Income/Country	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
1	122	30.3%	142	31.4%	165	27.5%	171	30.4%	600	29.8%
2	77	19.2%	71	15.7%	128	21.3%	112	19.9%	388	19.2%
3	62	15.4%	69	15.3%	107	17.8%	120	21.4%	358	17.8%
4	55	13.7%	79	17.5%	111	18.5%	82	14.6%	327	16.2%
5	86	21.4%	91	20.1%	89	14.8%	77	13.7%	343	17.0%
Missing values	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	3.2%	18	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Note: Household income was calculated as twice the value of personal income. The dependence between the personal and household income is clearly demonstrated. Pearson's chi-squared test = 799.372 (16 df, p-value =  $8.62749 \times 10^{-160}$ ).



## **INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONATION IN V4 COUNTRIES**

## STRUCTURE OF QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY

### QUESTION Q100 – FORMAL VOLUNTEERING (IN THE PAST 24 MONTHS)

We are now interested in any voluntary activity you do for an association, for an organization or a public institution. Voluntarily tasks and work are performed unpaid or for a small compensation. Have you performed one or more such activities in the past 24 months?

### QUESTION Q100A – FORMAL VOLUNTEERING (ALL TIME)

We are now interested in any voluntary activity you do for an association, for an organization or a public institution. Voluntarily tasks and work are performed unpaid or for a small compensation. Have you performed one or more such activities previously?

### QUESTION Q460A – INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING (IN THE PAST 24 MONTHS)

We are now interested in any voluntary activity work you do outside any organization or a public institution (direct help to neighbors, family, friends, and other people). Have you performed one or more such activities in the past 24 months?

### QUESTION Q470A – INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING (ALL TIME)

We are now interested in any voluntary activity you do outside any organization or a public institution (direct help to neighbors, family, friends, and other people). Have you performed one or more such activities previously?

### QUESTION Q570 – DONATION (IN THE PAST 24 MONTHS)

In addition to voluntary work, there is also the opportunity to donate money or help in-kind. Have you made such donations in the past 24 months?

## SURVEY RESULTS

### DIFFERENCES IN V4 COUNTRIES REGARDING THE INVOLVEMENT OF CITIZENS IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES

In the past 24 months, 32.6% of respondents have been involved in formal volunteering activities (see Table 9), with a further 13.4% of those not involved having been involved in the past (see Table 10), giving a total of 41.7% (see Table 11).

Czech citizens were the most involved in formal volunteering in the past 24 months (37.4%). A higher level of involvement is also confirmed for Czech citizens in the earlier period (49.3%). Lower levels of involvement in the last two years are reported by all other V4 countries (Poland 30.7%, Hungary 29.9% and Slovakia 31.8%), while in the long-term involvement in formal volunteering in Poland (36%) and Slovakia (38.8%) is lower than the V4 average.

Table 9: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Yes	128	31.8%	135	29.9%	184	30.7%	217	37.4%	664	32.6%
No	274	68.2%	317	70.1%	416	69.3%	363	62.6%	1370	67.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.77106 (3 df, p-value = 0.0324949).

Table 10: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (If Not Involved in the Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Yes	28	10.2%	55	17.4%	32	7.7%	69	13.4%	184	13.4%
No	246	89.8%	262	82.6%	384	92.3%	294	86.6%	1186	86.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>274</b>		<b>317</b>		<b>416</b>		<b>363</b>		<b>1370</b>	


Pearson's chi-squared test = 28.1137 (3 df, p-value = 3.43782 x 10<sup>-6</sup>).

Table 11: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Yes	156	38.8%	190	42.0%	216	36.0%	286	49.3%	848	41.7%
No	246	61.2%	262	58.0%	384	64.0%	294	86.6%	1186	58.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 23.2433 (3 df, p-value = 3.59314 x 10<sup>-5</sup>).

Figure 1: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)



In terms of informal volunteering, the rate of involvement in the past 24 months is higher than the rate of formal volunteering (48.3%), with Czechia having the highest informal involvement (59.1%), followed by Hungary (51.5%), Slovakia (40.8%) and Poland (40.3%) – see Table 12. Irrespective of the timeliness of involvement, the level of informal volunteering in V4 countries is 58.6%, with the highest level in Czechia (69.1%), followed by Hungary (62.8%), Slovakia (53%) and the lowest in Poland (48.8%) – see Table 13.

Table 12: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Yes	164	40.8%	233	51.5%	242	40.3%	343	59.1%	982	48.3%
No	238	59.2%	219	48.5%	358	59.7%	237	40.9%	1052	51.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 58.5089 (3 df, p-value =  $1.42803 \times 10^{-11}$ ).

Table 13: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Yes	213	53.0%	284	62.8%	293	48.8%	401	69.1%	1191	58.6%
No	189	47.0%	168	37.2%	307	51.2%	179	30.9%	843	41.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 58.6797 (3 df, p-value =  $1.12531 \times 10^{-12}$ ).

Similar conclusions can be drawn for donations - see Table 14. Overall, 52.9% of respondents have donated in the past 24 months. Donor engagement in Czechia is well above the V4 average (64.5%). Donor engagement is lower in the other V4 countries: Poland (51.2%), Slovakia (47.8%) and Hungary (45.1%).

Table 14: Donation Involvement in V4 countries (Past 24 Months)

Donation	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Yes	192	47.8%	204	45.1%	307	51.2%	374	64.5%	1077	52.9%
No	210	52.2%	248	54.9%	293	48.8%	206	35.5%	957	47.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 47.1624 (3 df, p-value =  $3.20985 \times 10^{-10}$ ).

In total, 66.1% of respondents have been involved in their lifetime in some form of philanthropy, formal volunteering or donation, with the highest proportion in Czechia (76.7%). This percentage does not differ significantly from the other V4 countries, with 62.3% in Poland, 62.2% in Hungary and 60.7% in Slovakia – see Table 15. If we include informal volunteering, 77.8% of respondents were involved in some activity (formal volunteering, informal volunteering or donating), with the highest in Czechia (87.9%), followed by Hungary (79.7%), Slovakia (73.4%) and in Poland (69.7%) – see Table 16.

Table 15: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
ForV. & Don.	104	25.9%	113	25.0%	149	24.8%	215	37.1%	581	28.6%
ForV. or Don.	140	34.8%	168	37.2%	225	37.5%	230	39.7%	763	37.5%
No	158	39.3%	171	37.8%	226	37.7%	135	23.3%	690	33.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.4667 (6 df, p-value =  $6.01271 \times 10^{-9}$ ).

Table 16: Involvement in Formal or Informal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
ForV. & InforV & Don.	88	21.9%	92	20.4%	127	21.2%	177	30.5%	484	23.8%
ForV. or InforV or Don.	207	51.5%	268	59.3%	291	48.5%	333	57.4%	1099	54.0%
No	107	26.6%	92	20.4%	182	30.3%	70	12.1%	451	22.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 72.0179 (6 df, p-value =  $1.57549 \times 10^{-13}$ ).

All of the above findings are statistically significant. Thus, it can be concluded that the level of involvement in volunteering and donation activities is country dependent. Czechia has the highest level of engagement, which is on average higher than the level of engagement in the other V4 countries and above the average for the V4 as a whole.

**THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES**

The role of gender in involvement in formal volunteering does not play a significant role, the ratio of men and women involved in V4 countries is approximately the same (31.3% and 32% – see Table 17- Past 24 Months, and 41.2% and 42.2% at any time - see Table 18). The exception is Slovakia (see below), where the rate of involvement of men in formal volunteering activities was higher than that of women (and this finding is statistically significant).

Table 17: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	333	31.3%	331	32.0%	664	32.6%
No	668	66.7%	702	68.0%	1370	67.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.346464 (1 df, p-value = 0.5561).

Table 18: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	412	41.2%	436	42.2%	848	41.7%
No	589	58.8%	597	57.8%	1186	58.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.229824 (1 df, p-value = 0.6316).

Gender plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering, with the proportion of women in V4 countries being higher (50.2% past 24 months, 62.8% at any time) – see Table 19 and Table 20. The exception is Slovakia, where the findings are the opposite, although not statistically significant (see below).

Table 19: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	457	45.7%	525	50.2%	982	48.3%
No	544	54.3%	508	49.2%	1052	51.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.4386 (1 df, p-value = 0.0196964).

Table 20: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	553	55.2%	638	62.8%	1191	58.6%
No	448	44.8%	395	38.2%	843	41.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.89724 (1 df, p-value = 0.00285602).

The dependence is also confirmed for donor activity, with women (55.6%) contributing more than men (50.2%) – see Table 21.

Table 21: Involvement in Donation in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	503	50.2%	574	55.6%	1077	52.9%
No	498	49.8%	459	44.4%	957	47.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.76792 (1 df, p-value = 0.0163213).

Although due to women's greater involvement in donation, the proportion of women involved in formal volunteering and/or donation is higher - 67.8% overall (30% in both activities, 37.8% in one activity) than men's 64.4% (27.1% in both, 37.3% in one activity), and this finding is not statistically significant – see Table 22. In the case of any volunteering activity, the differences are already statistically significant, with women being more involved (80.2%) than men (75.4%) – see Table 23.

*Table 22: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Total</b>	
<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>	271	27.1%	310	30.0%	581	28.6%
<b>ForV. or Don.</b>	373	37.3%	390	37.8%	763	37.5%
<b>No</b>	357	35.7%	333	32.2%	690	33.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.32883 (2 df, p-value = 0.18930).

*Table 23: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Total</b>	
<b>ForV. &amp; InforV &amp; Don.</b>	222	22.2%	262	25.4%	484	23.8%
<b>ForV. or InforV or Don.</b>	533	53.2%	566	54.8%	1099	54.0%
<b>No</b>	246	24.6%	205	19.8%	451	22.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1001</b>		<b>1033</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.52238 (2 df, p-value = 0.0232561).

It can therefore be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities is gender dependent, with women being more involved, statistically significant in the case of overall involvement, in informal volunteering and donation.

**THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN SLOVAKIA**

In Slovakia, more men (36.9%) than women (27.1%) were involved in formal volunteering activities in the past 24 months, and the conclusion is statistically significant – see Table 24. If we exclude the time factor, the conclusion is similar, although at a lower level of significance – see Table 25.

Table 24: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	72	36.9%	56	27.1%	128	31.8%
No	123	63.1%	151	72.9%	274	68.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.50712 (1 df, p-value = 0.033754). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.0416681).

Table 25: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	84	43.1%	72	34.8%	156	38.8%
No	111	56.9%	135	65.2%	246	61.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.90892 (1 df, p-value = 0.0880907). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.10).

The role of gender in involvement in informal volunteering does not play a role in Slovakia, although the proportion of men involved in informal volunteering in the past 24 months would be higher (43.1%) than women (38.6%), regardless of time there are no longer differences – see Table 26 and Table 27.

Table 26: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	84	43.1%	80	38.6%	164	40.8%
No	111	56.9%	127	61.4%	238	59.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.845709 (1 df, p-value = 0.366438). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.416716).

Table 27: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	102	52.3%	111	53.6%	213	53.0%
No	93	47.7%	96	46.4%	189	47.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.0697539 (1 df, p-value = 0.791695). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.841653).

Gender does not play a role in Slovakia in terms of donor activity; the proportion of men (48.2%) and women (47.3%) involved is approximately the same – see Table 28.

Table 28: Involvement in Donation in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	94	48.2%	98	47.3%	192	47.8%
No	101	51.8%	109	52.7%	210	52.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.0299129 (1 df, p-value = 0.862688). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.920472).



Involvement in formal volunteering or donating does not depend on gender, with 61.5% of men and 59.9% of women involving themselves in one or both activities in Slovakia – see Table 29. The findings do not differ for any volunteering activity, with women being involved almost as much (73.9%) as men (72.8%) – see Table 30.

*Table 29: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>	58	29.7%	46	22.2%	104	25.9%
<b>ForV. or Don.</b>	62	31.8%	78	37.7%	140	34.8%
<b>No</b>	75	38.5%	83	40.1%	158	39.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.26295 (2 df, p-value = 0.19564).

*Table 30: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
<b>ForV. &amp; InforV &amp; Don.</b>	49	25.1%	39	18.8%	88	21.9%
<b>ForV. or InforV or Don.</b>	93	47.7%	114	55.1%	207	51.5%
<b>No</b>	53	27.2%	54	26.1%	107	26.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>402</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.92054 (2 df, p-value = 0.23217).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities in Slovakia is not dependent on gender, with women engaging more, but it is statistically significant only for formal volunteering.

**THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN HUNGARY**

In Hungary, men and women were similarly involved in formal volunteering activities in the past 24 months (31.1% and 30.2%) – see Table 31. Disregarding the factor of time, the involvement rate of women is higher (42.2%) than that of men (33.6%), the dependence is not statistically confirmed – see Table 32.

Table 31: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	91	31.1%	93	30.2%	135	29.9%
No	201	68.9%	215	69.8%	317	70.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.0662734 (1 df, p-value = 0.796842). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.859438).

Table 32: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	98	33.6%	92	42.2%	190	42.0%
No	136	66.4%	126	57.8%	262	57.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.00478739 (1 df, p-value = 0.944838). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 1).

Gender plays a role in the involvement in informal volunteering in Hungary, the proportion of men involved in informal volunteering in the past 24 months would be lower (45.7%) than women (57.8%) – see Table 33. The differences are significant even if we do not take into account the time aspect, women 69.3%, men 56.8% - see Table 34.

Table 33: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	107	45.7%	126	57.8%	233	51.5%
No	127	54.3%	92	42.2%	219	48.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 6.58484 (1 df, p-value = 0.0102851). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.0111173).

Table 34: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	133	56.8%	151	69.3%	284	62.8%
No	101	43.2%	67	30.7%	168	37.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.46478 (1 df, p-value = 0.00629177). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.00652911).

Gender does not play a role in donor activity in Hungary, the proportion of active men (48.2%) and women (47.3%) is approximately the same – see Table 35.

Table 35: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	101	43.2%	103	47.2%	204	45.1%
No	133	56.8%	115	52.8%	248	54.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.760641 (1 df, p-value = 0.383132). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.395944).

Involvement in formal volunteering or donating is not gender dependent; 62.8% of men and 61.5% of women in Hungary are involved in one or both activities – see Table 36. The findings are not different for any volunteering activity, with women being slightly more involved (82.6%) than men (76.9%) – see Table 37, but the conclusion is not statistically significant.

Table 36: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>	52	22.2%	61	28.0%	113	25.0%
<b>ForV. or Don.</b>	95	40.6%	73	33.5%	168	37.2%
<b>No</b>	87	37.2%	84	38.5%	171	37.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.0879 (2 df, p-value = 0.213536).

Table 37: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
<b>ForV. &amp; InforV &amp; Don.</b>	42	17.9%	50	22.9%	92	20.4%
<b>ForV. or InforV or Don.</b>	138	59.0%	130	59.6%	268	59.3%
<b>No</b>	54	23.1%	38	17.4%	92	20.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>452</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.15465 (2 df, p-value = 0.20653).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities in Hungary does not depend on gender, both genders are involved approximately equally, with greater differences (statistically significant) in informal activities.

### THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN POLAND

In Poland, more men (31.1%) than women (28.4%) were involved in formal volunteering activities in the past 24 months – see Table 38. Absent the factor of time, on the contrary, the involvement rate of women is higher (37.3%) than that of men (34.6%), but the dependence is not statistically confirmed – see Table 39.

Table 38: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	73	31.2%	62	28.4%	184	30.7%
No	161	68.8%	156	71.6%	416	69.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.409302 (1 df, p-value = 0.522324). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.538652).

Table 39: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	101	34.6%	115	37.3%	216	36.0%
No	191	65.4%	193	62.7%	384	64.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.491507 (1 df, p-value = 0.483256). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.497047).

Gender plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering in Poland, the proportion of men involved in informal volunteering in the past 24 months would be lower (37.3%) than women (43.2%) – see Table 40, however the conclusion is not statistically significant. Nevertheless, the differences are significant when time is not taken into account, women 53.2%, and men 44.2% – see Table 41.

Table 40: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	109	37.3%	133	43.2%	242	40.3%
No	183	62.7%	175	56.8%	358	59.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.13379 (1 df, p-value = 0.144084). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.15723).

Table 41: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	129	44.2%	164	53.2%	293	48.8%
No	163	55.8%	144	46.8%	307	51.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.93362 (1 df, p-value = 0.026339). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.0276472).

Gender plays a role in donor activity in Poland, with women (55.2%) contributing more than men (46.9%) – see Table 42. This finding is statistically significant.

Table 42: Donation Involvement in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	137	46.9%	170	55.2%	307	51.2%
No	155	53.1%	138	44.8%	293	48.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.10984 (1 df, p-value = 0.0426345). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.0498358).

Involvement in formal volunteering or donating differs by gender, with 58.5% of men and 65.9% of women in Poland engaging in one or both activities, but the finding is not statistically significant – see Table 43. The conclusions do not differ for any volunteering activity either, women are involved by more (72.8%) than men (66.4%) – see Table 44, this conclusion is statistically significant at the 10% significance level.

Table 43: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
ForV. & Don.	67	22.9%	82	26.6%	149	24.8%
ForV. or Don.	104	35.6%	121	39.3%	225	37.5%
No	121	41.5%	105	34.1%	226	37.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.50308 (2 df, p-value = 0.17351).

Table 44: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	Male		Female		Total	
ForV. & InforV & Don.	52	17.8%	75	24.4%	127	21.2%
ForV. or InforV or Don.	142	48.6%	149	48.4%	291	48.5%
No	98	33.6%	84	27.2%	182	30.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>		<b>308</b>		<b>600</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.98754 (2 df, p-value = 0.0825979).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities in Poland is gender-specific, with more women than men involved, except for the last 24 months in the form of formal volunteering. However, most of the findings are not statistically significant.

### THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN CZECHIA

In Czechia, women (40.0%) were more involved in formal volunteering activities in the past 24 months than men (34.6%) – see Table 45. If we exclude the time factor, the participation rate of women is also higher (52.3%) than that of men (46.1%), but the dependence is not statistically confirmed – see Table 46.

*Table 45: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months)*

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	97	34.6%	120	40.0%	217	37.4%
No	183	65.4%	180	60.0%	363	62.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.77504 (1 df, p-value = 0.18276). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.198121).

*Table 46: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Formal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	129	46.1%	157	52.3%	286	49.3%
No	151	53.9%	143	47.7%	294	50.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.27199 (1 df, p-value = 0.13173). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.135625).

The role of gender in involvement in informal volunteering in Czechia does not play a significant role, the proportion of men involved in informal volunteering in the past 24 months would be slightly lower (56.1%) than for women (62.0%), but the findings are not statistically significant - see Table 47. The differences are also not apparent when considering the time aspect, women 70.7%, men 67.5% - see Table 48.

*Table 47: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months)*

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	157	56.1%	186	62.0%	343	59.1%
No	123	43.9%	114	38.0%	237	40.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.10652 (1 df, p-value = 0.1446673). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.151695).

*Table 48: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Informal Vol.	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	189	67.5%	212	70.7%	401	69.1%
No	91	32.5%	88	29.3%	179	30.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.680635 (1 df, p-value = 0.409368). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.419523).

Gender plays a role in donor activity in Czechia, with women (67.7%) contributing more than men (61.1%) – see Table 49, and significance is confirmed at the 10% level.

*Table 49: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months)*

Donation	Male		Female		Total	
Yes	171	61.1%	203	67.7%	374	64.5%
No	109	38.9%	97	32.3%	206	35.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.75061 (1 df, p-value = 0.0972172). Fisher Exact Test (p-value = 0.09999494).

Involvement in formal volunteering or donating differs by gender, with 79.7% of women and 73.6% of men engaging in one or both activities in Czechia, but the finding is not statistically significant – see Table 50. The conclusions do not differ for any volunteering activity, with women engaging in more (90.3%) than men (85.4%) – see Table 51, but this conclusion is also not statistically significant.

*Table 50: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Total</b>	
<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>	94	33.6%	121	40.3%	215	37.1%
<b>ForV. or Don.</b>	112	40.0%	118	39.3%	230	39.7%
<b>No</b>	74	26.4%	61	20.3%	135	23.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.11431 (2 df, p-value = 0.12782).

*Table 51: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Total</b>	
<b>ForV. &amp; InforV &amp; Don.</b>	79	28.2%	98	32.7%	177	30.5%
<b>ForV. or InforV or Don.</b>	160	57.1%	173	57.7%	333	57.4%
<b>No</b>	41	14.6%	29	9.7%	70	12.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>		<b>300</b>		<b>580</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.9192 (2 df, p-value = 0.140915).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteer (formal and informal) and donor activities in Czechia is partly dependent on gender, with more women involved than men, but the findings are not statistically significant.

## THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES

The level of involvement in formal volunteering in the past 24 months is age-specific in V4 countries. The data shows that the highest participation rate is among the young generation (51.6%), which gradually decreases to the oldest age group (25.2%) – see Table 52. This correlation can be observed in all V4 countries (see below). Abstracting from the timeliness of participation, 63.2% of the youngest generation participated, 47.2% of the 25-34 age group and the participation rate is around 37-38% – see Table 53. The findings are statistically significant.

Table 52: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	98	51.6%	92	48.4%	190
25 – 34	133	37.6%	221	62.4%	354
35 – 44	125	31.6%	270	68.4%	395
45 – 54	114	29.0%	279	71.0%	393
55 – 64	103	30.1%	239	69.9%	342
65+	89	25.2%	264	74.8%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>1370</b>	<b>67.4%</b>	<b>2026*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 47.469 (5 df, p-value = 4.55838 x 10<sup>-9</sup>).

Table 53: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	120	63.2%	70	36.8%	190
25 – 34	167	47.2%	187	52.8%	354
35 – 44	146	37.0%	249	63.0%	395
45 – 54	146	37.2%	247	62.8%	393
55 – 64	131	38.4%	210	61.6%	341
65+	133	37.7%	220	62.3%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>843</b>		<b>1183</b>		<b>2026*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 51.2314 (5 df, p-value = 7.75436 x 10<sup>-10</sup>).

Age also plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering, with young people having the highest level of involvement in the past 24 months (52.6%), followed by a gradual decline in involvement, with involvement of the 35-44 age group at only 44.6%, and then an increase thereafter, with the oldest age group, 65+, being involved at 53.8% - see Table 54. Analogous findings are also found for engagement at an earlier time (youngest generation 63.2%, 35 to 44 age group 50.6% and oldest age group 69.1%) – see Table 55. These findings are statistically significant.

Table 54: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	100	52.6%	90	47.4%	190
25 – 34	161	45.5%	193	54.5%	354
35 – 44	176	44.6%	219	55.4%	395
45 – 54	176	44.8%	217	55.2%	393
55 – 64	173	50.7%	168	49.3%	341
65+	190	53.8%	163	46.2%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>976</b>		<b>1050</b>		<b>2026*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.8287 (5 df, p-value = 0.0372115).



*Table 55: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	120	63.2%	70	36.8%	190
<b>25 – 34</b>	196	55.4%	158	44.6%	354
<b>35 – 44</b>	200	50.6%	195	49.4%	395
<b>45 – 54</b>	212	53.9%	181	46.1%	393
<b>55 – 64</b>	213	62.5%	128	37.5%	341
<b>65+</b>	244	69.1%	109	30.9%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>1185</b>		<b>841</b>		<b>2026*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 35.1673 (5 df, p-value =  $1.39327 \times 10^{-6}$ ).

Statistical dependence was not confirmed for donor activity, but differences in donation rates can be traced. The youngest generation has the lowest level of involvement (this group usually does not have enough money, they are at the beginning of their careers), then the 35 to 44 category (they take care of children), therefore their level of donation is lower, but the differences between the categories are not significant (49.1% to 57.5%) – see Table 56.

*Table 56: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Donation</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	94	49.5%	96	50.5%	190
<b>25 – 34</b>	192	54.2%	162	45.8%	354
<b>35 – 44</b>	194	49.1%	201	50.9%	395
<b>45 – 54</b>	215	54.7%	178	45.3%	393
<b>55 – 64</b>	196	57.5%	145	42.5%	341
<b>65+</b>	181	51.3%	172	48.7%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>1072</b>		<b>954</b>		<b>2026*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.17966 (5 df, p-value = 0.207618).

There is a relationship between age and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Although the younger generation is less involved in donation activities, their level of involvement is by far the highest (75.3%). On the other hand, the lowest level of involvement is in the 35-44 age group – Table 57. In the case of any volunteering activity, the differences are even more marked, with 84.7% of the youngest age group involved in some form of volunteering or donating, while the 35 to 44 age category has the lowest rate (61.9%) – see Table 58.

*Table 57: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>18 – 24</b>	71	37.4%	72	37.9%	47	24.7%	190
<b>25 – 34</b>	117	33.1%	125	35.3%	112	31.6%	354
<b>35 – 44</b>	96	24.3%	148	37.5%	151	38.2%	395
<b>45 – 54</b>	111	28.2%	139	35.4%	143	36.4%	393
<b>55 – 64</b>	91	26.7%	145	42.5%	105	30.8%	341
<b>65+</b>	91	25.8%	132	37.4%	130	36.8%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>577</b>		<b>761</b>		<b>688</b>		<b>2026*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 24.7913 (10 df, p-value = 0.00575551).

*Table 58: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	56	29.5%	105	55.3%	29	15.3%	190
<b>25 – 34</b>	96	27.1%	180	50.8%	78	22.0%	354
<b>35 – 44</b>	75	19.0%	209	52.9%	111	28.1%	395
<b>45 – 54</b>	87	22.1%	208	52.9%	98	24.9%	393
<b>55 – 64</b>	82	24.0%	194	56.9%	65	19.1%	341
<b>65+</b>	84	23.8%	200	56.7%	69	19.5%	353
<b>Total</b>	<b>480</b>		<b>1096</b>		<b>450</b>		<b>2026</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson’s chi-squared test = 24.6766 (10 df, p-value = 0.00599332).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities depends on age, with the youngest generation being the most involved, the age group 35 to 44 having the lowest level of involvement, and then the level of involvement increasing, with the oldest generation having the second highest level of involvement. Reasons for this include greater time freedom for the youngest and oldest age groups, and for the least engaged group, time-consuming care for children, parents/grandparents, development and emphasis on career development.

**THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN SLOVAKIA**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering in the past 24 months in Slovakia is age-related. The data shows that the highest participation rate is among the young generation (46.5%), the lowest is among the 35-44 age group (23.5%) – see Table 59. Abstracting from the actual participation rate, 62.8% of the youngest generation participated, 28.4% of the 25 to 34 age group, with the second most engaged group being the oldest age group 65+ – see Table 60. The findings are statistically significant.

Table 59: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	20	46.5%	23	53.5%	43
25 – 34	27	40.9%	39	59.1%	66
35 – 44	19	23.5%	62	76.5%	81
45 – 54	19	29.2%	46	70.8%	65
55 – 64	17	25.4%	50	74.6%	67
65+	26	32.5%	54	67.5%	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.9003 (5 df, p-value = 0.053393).

Table 60: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	27	62.8%	16	37.2%	43
25 – 34	32	48.5%	34	51.5%	66
35 – 44	23	28.4%	58	71.6%	81
45 – 54	21	32.3%	44	67.7%	65
55 – 64	19	28.4%	48	71.6%	67
65+	34	42.5%	46	57.5%	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>246</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 21.4127 (5 df, p-value = 0.000676769).

Age also plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering, with the highest level of involvement in the past 24 months among people aged 65+ in Slovakia (66.7%), and higher involvement among the youngest age group (46.5%) or the 35-44 age group (43.2%) – see Table 61. Absent the time involvement in informal volunteering, there is a relationship between age and involvement, with the oldest generation being the most involved (70.9%) – see Table 62. These findings are statistically significant only regardless of time horizon.

Table 61: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	20	46.5%	23	53.5%	43
25 – 34	26	39.4%	40	60.6%	66
35 – 44	35	43.2%	46	56.8%	81
45 – 54	24	36.9%	41	63.1%	65
55 – 64	19	28.4%	48	71.6%	67
65+	40	66.7%	20	33.3%	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>382</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.33165 (5 df, p-value = 0.13888).

*Table 62: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	23	53.5%	20	46.5%	43
<b>25 – 34</b>	33	50.0%	33	50.0%	66
<b>35 – 44</b>	39	48.1%	42	51.9%	81
<b>45 – 54</b>	34	52.3%	31	47.7%	65
<b>55 – 64</b>	28	41.8%	39	58.2%	67
<b>65+</b>	56	70.9%	23	29.1%	79
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>		<b>188</b>		<b>401</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.6808 (5 df, p-value = 0.0177695).

Statistical dependence was not confirmed for donor activity, but differences in donation rates can be traced. The youngest generation has the lowest level of involvement (this group usually does not have enough money, they are at the beginning of their career), then the 35 to 44 category (they take care of children), therefore their level of donation is lower, however, the differences between the categories are not significant (37.0% to 51.5%) – see Table 63.

*Table 63: Donation Involvement in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Donation</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	20	46.5%	23	53.5%	43
<b>25 – 34</b>	34	51.5%	32	48.5%	66
<b>35 – 44</b>	30	37.0%	51	63.0%	81
<b>45 – 54</b>	33	50.8%	32	49.2%	65
<b>55 – 64</b>	35	52.2%	32	47.8%	67
<b>65+</b>	40	50.0%	40	50.0%	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>210</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.06826 (5 df, p-value = 0.40761).

There is a relationship between age and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation. The level of involvement in formal volunteering and donation activities is by far the highest among the youngest generation (79.1%). On the other hand, the lowest level of involvement is among the 35-44 age group (43.2%) – see Table 64. In the case of any volunteering activity, the differences are even more pronounced, with 86% of the youngest and 81.2% of the oldest engaging in some form of volunteering or donating, while the 35 to 44 age category has the lowest rate (58%) – see Table 65.

*Table 64: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	13	30.2%	21	48.8%	9	20.9%	43
<b>25 – 34</b>	24	36.4%	18	27.3%	24	36.4%	66
<b>35 – 44</b>	18	22.2%	17	21.0%	46	56.8%	81
<b>45 – 54</b>	14	21.5%	26	40.0%	25	38.5%	65
<b>55 – 64</b>	13	19.4%	28	41.8%	26	38.8%	67
<b>65+</b>	22	27.5%	30	37.5%	28	35.0%	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>158</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 25.2683 (10 df, p-value = 0.00485944).

*Table 65: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	11	25.6%	26	60.5%	6	14.0%	43
<b>25 – 34</b>	19	28.8%	33	50.0%	14	21.2%	66
<b>35 – 44</b>	16	19.8%	31	38.3%	34	42.0%	81
<b>45 – 54</b>	13	20.0%	33	50.8%	19	29.2%	65
<b>55 – 64</b>	9	13.4%	39	58.2%	19	28.4%	67
<b>65+</b>	20	25.0%	45	56.3%	15	18.8%	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 21.512 (10 df, p-value = 0.017793).

It can therefore be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteer (formal and informal) and donor activities is age dependent, with the youngest generation being the most involved, the 35-44 age group having the lowest level of involvement, and then increasing, with the oldest generation having the second highest level of involvement.

**THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN HUNGARY**

The rate of involvement in formal volunteering in the past 24 months in Hungary is dependent on age (the finding is statistically significant). The data shows that the highest involvement rate is among the young generation (46.9%), and then the involvement rate decreases until the oldest age group 65+ (21.1%) – see Table 66. Abstracting from the timeliness of engagement, 62.5% of the youngest generation are engaged, then engagement rates decline – see Table 67.

Table 66: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	15	46.9%	17	53.1%	32
25 – 34	23	37.7%	38	62.3%	61
35 – 44	29	34.1%	56	65.9%	85
45 – 54	25	30.9%	56	69.1%	81
55 – 64	17	24.3%	53	75.7%	70
65+	26	21.1%	97	78.9%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>		<b>317</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.4948 (5 df, p-value = 0.0286018).

Table 67: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	20	62.5%	12	37.5%	32
25 – 34	29	47.5%	32	52.5%	61
35 – 44	35	41.2%	50	58.8%	85
45 – 54	30	37.0%	51	63.0%	81
55 – 64	27	38.6%	43	61.4%	70
65+	49	39.8%	74	60.2%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>		<b>262</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.70394 (5 df, p-value = 0.17333).

Age also plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering, but the findings are not statistically significant. The highest level of involvement in the past 24 months in Hungary is among the 65+ category (57.7%), with higher involvement among the youngest age group (56.3%) or the 55-64 age group (54.3%) – see Table 68. Absent from the time involvement in informal volunteering, there is a relationship between age and involvement, with the oldest generation being the most involved (74.0% and 71.4%), followed by the youngest (65.6%) – see Table 69. These findings are statistically significant.

Table 68: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	18	56.3%	14	43.8%	32
25 – 34	25	41.0%	36	59.0%	61
35 – 44	41	48.2%	44	51.8%	85
45 – 54	40	49.4%	41	50.6%	81
55 – 64	38	54.3%	32	45.7%	70
65+	71	57.7%	52	42.3%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>		<b>219</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.62285 (5 df, p-value = 0.34466).

*Table 69: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	21	65.6%	11	34.4%	32
<b>25 – 34</b>	31	50.8%	30	49.2%	61
<b>35 – 44</b>	47	55.3%	38	44.7%	85
<b>45 – 54</b>	44	54.3%	37	45.7%	81
<b>55 – 64</b>	50	71.4%	20	28.6%	70
<b>65+</b>	91	74.0%	32	26.0%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 17.2216 (5 df, p-value = 0.00409819).

Statistical dependence was not confirmed for donor activity, but differences in donation rates can be traced. The youngest generation has the lowest level of involvement (this group is usually under-resourced, they are at the beginning of their careers), but the differences between the categories are not significant (37.5% to 51.4%) – see Table 70.

*Table 70: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Donation</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	12	37.5%	20	62.5%	32
<b>25 – 34</b>	27	44.3%	34	55.7%	61
<b>35 – 44</b>	40	47.1%	45	52.9%	85
<b>45 – 54</b>	33	40.7%	48	59.3%	81
<b>55 – 64</b>	36	51.4%	34	48.6%	70
<b>65+</b>	56	45.5%	67	54.5%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>		<b>248</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.65806 (5 df, p-value = 0.75253).

There is a relationship between age and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation, but it is not statistically significant. The level of involvement in formal volunteering and donation activities is by far the highest among the youngest generation (71.9%). Conversely, the lowest level of involvement is among the 45 to 54 age group (54.3%) – see Table 71. In the case of any volunteering activity, the differences are even more evident, with 87.1% of the 55 to 64 age category, 84.4% of the youngest and 82.9% of the oldest engaging in some form of volunteering or donating, while the 45 to 54 age category has the lowest rate (69.1%) – see Table 72.

*Table 71: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>18 – 24</b>	9	28.1%	14	43.8%	9	28.1%	32
<b>25 – 34</b>	17	27.9%	22	36.1%	22	36.1%	61
<b>35 – 44</b>	18	21.2%	39	45.9%	28	32.9%	85
<b>45 – 54</b>	19	23.5%	25	30.9%	37	45.7%	81
<b>55 – 64</b>	17	24.3%	29	41.4%	24	34.3%	70
<b>65+</b>	33	26.8%	39	31.7%	51	41.5%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>171</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.7678 (10 df, p-value = 0.55427).

*Table 72: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	8	25.0%	19	59.4%	5	15.6%	32
<b>25 – 34</b>	12	19.7%	35	57.4%	14	23.0%	61
<b>35 – 44</b>	12	14.1%	55	64.7%	18	21.2%	85
<b>45 – 54</b>	15	18.5%	41	50.6%	25	30.9%	81
<b>55 – 64</b>	16	22.9%	45	64.3%	9	12.9%	70
<b>65+</b>	29	23.6%	73	59.3%	21	17.1%	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>92</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.2966 (10 df, p-value = 0.2657).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities in Hungary is age-dependent, with the oldest citizens being the most involved and, in some areas, the youngest generation, but most of the findings are not statistically significant.



### THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN POLAND

The rate of involvement in formal volunteering in the past 24 months in Poland is dependent on age (the finding is statistically significant). The data shows that the highest involvement rate is among the young generation (51.4%), and then the involvement rate decreases to the oldest age group 65+ (20.3%) – see Table 73. Abstracting from the actuality of engagement, 62.2% of the youngest generation engaged, and then the engagement rate drops to 22% for the oldest age category – see Table 74.

Table 73: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	38	51.4%	36	48.6%	74
25 – 34	45	34.9%	84	65.1%	129
35 – 44	40	29.6%	95	70.4%	135
45 – 54	27	23.7%	87	76.3%	114
55 – 64	22	24.7%	67	75.3%	89
65+	12	20.3%	47	79.7%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>		<b>416</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 23.0926 (5 df, p-value = 0.000324086).

Table 74: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	46	62.2%	28	37.8%	74
25 – 34	55	42.6%	74	57.4%	129
35 – 44	43	31.9%	92	68.1%	135
45 – 54	34	29.8%	80	70.2%	114
55 – 64	25	28.1%	64	71.9%	89
65+	13	22.0%	46	78.0%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>		<b>384</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 34.7558 (5 df, p-value = 1.68329 x 10<sup>-6</sup>).

Although age also plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering, the findings are not statistically significant. The highest level of involvement in the past 24 months in Poland is among young people (48.6%), with higher involvement among the 55-64 age group (41.6%) – see Table 75. Absent from the time involvement in informal volunteering, there is a relationship between age and involvement, with the youngest generation being the most involved (62.2%), followed by the 55-64 age category (53.9%) – see Table 76. Again, these findings are not statistically significant.

Table 75: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	36	48.6%	38	51.4%	74
25 – 34	52	40.3%	77	59.7%	129
35 – 44	53	39.3%	82	60.7%	135
45 – 54	43	37.7%	71	62.3%	114
55 – 64	37	41.6%	52	58.4%	89
65+	21	35.6%	38	64.4%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>358</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.12227 (5 df, p-value = 0.68114).

*Table 76: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	46	62.2%	28	37.8%	74
<b>25 – 34</b>	64	49.6%	65	50.4%	129
<b>35 – 44</b>	55	40.7%	80	59.3%	135
<b>45 – 54</b>	52	45.6%	62	54.4%	114
<b>55 – 64</b>	48	53.9%	41	46.1%	89
<b>65+</b>	28	47.5%	31	52.5%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>293</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.275 (5 df, p-value = 0.067808).

Statistical dependence was not confirmed for donor activity, and differences in donation rates cannot be fully traced. The 35-44 generation has the lowest level of involvement, but the differences between the categories are not significant – see Table 77.

*Table 77: Donation Involvement in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Donation</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	39	52.7%	35	47.3%	74
<b>25 – 34</b>	66	51.2%	63	48.8%	129
<b>35 – 44</b>	63	46.7%	72	53.3%	135
<b>45 – 54</b>	61	53.5%	53	46.5%	114
<b>55 – 64</b>	48	53.9%	41	46.1%	89
<b>65+</b>	30	50.8%	29	49.2%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>		<b>293</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.68915 (5 df, p-value = 0.89026).

There is a correlation between age and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation, but it is statistically significant. The level of involvement in formal volunteering and donation activities is by far the highest among the youngest generation (73%). Conversely, the lowest levels of involvement are in the 45-54 and 55-64 age categories (64%) – see Table 78. There are also differences in involvement in any form of volunteering or donating, with 81.1% of the youngest age group involved in some form of volunteering or donating, while the 35 to 44 age category has the lowest rate (61.5%) – see Table 79.

*Table 78: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	31	41.9%	23	31.1%	20	27.0%	74
<b>25 – 34</b>	39	30.2%	43	33.3%	47	36.4%	129
<b>35 – 44</b>	32	23.7%	42	31.1%	61	45.2%	135
<b>45 – 54</b>	22	19.3%	51	44.7%	41	36.0%	114
<b>55 – 64</b>	16	18.0%	41	46.1%	32	36.0%	89
<b>65+</b>	9	15.3%	25	42.4%	25	42.4%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>		<b>225</b>		<b>226</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 26.9192 (10 df, p-value = 0.00268211).

*Table 79: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	25	33.8%	35	47.3%	14	18.9%	74
<b>25 – 34</b>	34	26.4%	56	43.4%	39	30.2%	129
<b>35 – 44</b>	26	19.3%	57	42.2%	52	38.5%	135
<b>45 – 54</b>	18	15.8%	65	57.0%	31	27.2%	114
<b>55 – 64</b>	16	18.0%	47	52.8%	26	29.2%	89
<b>65+</b>	8	13.6%	31	52.5%	20	33.9%	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>		<b>291</b>		<b>182</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 21.9051 (10 df, p-value = 0.0155956).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities in Poland is age-dependent, with the youngest age group being the most involved, and the level of involvement in formal volunteering decreasing, while the level of involvement in informal and donation activities is lowest among the 35-44 age generation.

**THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN CZECHIA**

The involvement rate in formal volunteering in the past 24 months in Czechia depends on age (the conclusion is statistically significant). The data shows that the highest level of involvement is among the younger generation (61%), then the level of involvement decreases to the oldest age category 65+ years (27.5%) with the exception of the 55-64 years category (40%) – see Table 80. Abstracting from the timeliness of engagement, 65.9% of the youngest generation engaged, then the decline in engagement rates is analogous to engagement in the previous 24 months – see Table 81.

Table 80: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	25	61.0%	16	39.0%	41
25 – 34	38	38.8%	60	61.2%	98
35 – 44	37	39.4%	57	60.6%	94
45 – 54	43	32.3%	90	67.7%	133
55 – 64	46	40.0%	69	60.0%	115
65+	25	27.5%	66	72.5%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>		<b>363</b>		<b>572*</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 15.5874 (5 df, p-value = 0.00812635).

Table 81: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	27	65.9%	14	34.1%	41
25 – 34	51	52.0%	47	48.0%	98
35 – 44	45	47.9%	49	52.1%	94
45 – 54	61	45.9%	72	54.1%	133
55 – 64	60	52.2%	55	47.8%	115
65+	37	40.7%	54	59.3%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		<b>291</b>		<b>572</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.5862 (5 df, p-value = 0.126751).

Age also plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering in Czechia, and the findings are statistically significant. The highest involvement rates in the past 24 months have the two oldest age categories (68.7% for the 55-64 category, 63.7% for the 65+ category) and young people (63.4%) have – see Table 82. If we abstract from the time involvement in informal volunteering, there is a relationship between age and involvement, the relationships are similar – see Table 83, but the differences are not statistically significant.

Table 82: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
18 – 24	26	63.4%	15	36.6%	41
25 – 34	58	59.2%	40	40.8%	98
35 – 44	47	50.0%	47	50.0%	94
45 – 54	69	51.9%	64	48.1%	133
55 – 64	79	68.7%	36	31.3%	115
65+	58	63.7%	33	36.3%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>337</b>		<b>235</b>		<b>572</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.5708 (5 df, p-value = 0.0411659).

*Table 83: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	30	73.2%	11	26.8%	41
<b>25 – 34</b>	68	69.4%	30	30.6%	98
<b>35 – 44</b>	59	62.8%	35	37.2%	94
<b>45 – 54</b>	82	61.7%	51	38.3%	133
<b>55 – 64</b>	87	75.7%	28	24.3%	115
<b>65+</b>	69	75.8%	22	24.2%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>395</b>		<b>177</b>		<b>572</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.77267 (5 df, p-value = 0.081939).

Statistical dependence was not confirmed for donor activity, and differences in donation rates cannot be fully traced. The youngest generation has the lowest level of involvement, but the differences between categories are not significant – see Table 84.

*Table 84: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Donation</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	23	56.1%	18	43.9%	41
<b>25 – 34</b>	65	66.3%	33	33.7%	98
<b>35 – 44</b>	61	64.9%	33	35.1%	94
<b>45 – 54</b>	88	66.2%	45	33.8%	133
<b>55 – 64</b>	77	67.0%	38	33.0%	115
<b>65+</b>	55	60.4%	36	39.6%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>369</b>		<b>203</b>		<b>572</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.53305 (5 df, p-value = 0.77151).

There is a correlation between age and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation, it is statistically significant, but the correlation cannot be fully traced. The level of involvement in formal volunteering and donation activities is by far the highest among the 35-44 age generation (83%). Conversely, the lowest level of involvement is among the 65+ age group (71.4%) – see Table 85. For any volunteering activity, there are also visible differences in involvement, with 92.6% of the 35-44 age category, 90.4% of the 55-64 age category and 90.2% of the youngest age category involved in some form of volunteering or donating, while the 45-54 age category has the lowest rate (82.7%) – see Table 86. However, these findings are not statistically significant.

*Table 85: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>18 – 24</b>	18	43.9%	14	34.1%	9	22.0%	41
<b>25 – 34</b>	37	37.8%	42	42.9%	19	19.4%	98
<b>35 – 44</b>	28	29.8%	50	53.2%	16	17.0%	94
<b>45 – 54</b>	56	42.1%	37	27.8%	40	30.1%	133
<b>55 – 64</b>	45	39.1%	47	40.9%	23	20.0%	115
<b>65+</b>	27	29.7%	38	41.8%	26	28.6%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>211</b>		<b>228</b>		<b>133</b>		<b>572</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 20.494 (10 df, p-value = 0.0249119).

*Table 86: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>18 – 24</b>	12	29.3%	25	61.0%	4	9.8%	41
<b>25 – 34</b>	31	31.6%	56	57.1%	11	11.2%	98
<b>35 – 44</b>	21	22.3%	66	70.2%	7	7.4%	94
<b>45 – 54</b>	41	30.8%	69	51.9%	23	17.3%	133
<b>55 – 64</b>	41	35.7%	63	54.8%	11	9.6%	115
<b>65+</b>	27	29.7%	51	56.0%	13	14.3%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>		<b>330</b>		<b>69</b>		<b>572</b>

\*8 missing values. Pearson’s chi-squared test = 12.6623 (10 df, p-value = 0.243172).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities in Czechia depends on age, the youngest age group is the most involved, the level of involvement in formal volunteering is decreasing, and the level of involvement in informal and donation activities is the lowest among the generation aged 35-44.

## THE INFLUENCE OF MUNICIPALITY SIZE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in V4 countries depends on the size of the municipality, with the lowest level in the smallest municipalities and the highest level in smaller and medium-sized municipalities. Although the conclusion on the dependence of municipality size on the level of involvement in formal volunteering is statistically significant, the differences are not high – see Table 87. Absent the actuality of involvement, the conclusions are very similar – see Table 88.

Table 87: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	21	24.1%	66	75.9%	87
500 – 5000	195	36.9%	334	63.1%	529
5001 – 20000	125	31.7%	269	68.3%	394
20001 – 100000	185	34.5%	352	65.5%	537
> 100001	138	28.3%	349	71.7%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>664</b>		<b>1370</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.2004 (4 df, p-value = 0.0159215).

Table 88: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	31	35.6%	56	64.4%	87
500 – 5000	246	46.5%	283	53.5%	529
5001 – 20000	164	41.6%	230	58.4%	394
20001 – 100000	231	43.0%	306	57.0%	537
> 100001	176	36.1%	311	63.9%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>848</b>		<b>1186</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.915 (4 df, p-value = 0.0116988).

The size of the municipality also plays a role in participation in informal volunteering, with the smallest municipalities and the largest cities having the lowest rates (40.2% and 42.1% respectively) – see Table 89. Analogous findings are also found for involvement in earlier times (lowest 51.7% for the smallest municipalities, highest 63.1% for the smallest municipalities) – see Table 90. These findings are statistically significant.

Table 89: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	35	40.2%	52	59.8%	87
500 – 5000	277	52.4%	252	47.6%	529
5001 – 20000	197	50.0%	197	50.0%	394
20001 – 100000	268	49.9%	269	50.1%	537
> 100001	205	42.1%	282	57.9%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>982</b>		<b>1052</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 14.2876 (4 df, p-value = 0.00643156).

*Table 90: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	45	51.7%	42	48.3%	87
500 – 5000	334	63.1%	195	36.9%	529
5001 – 20000	239	60.7%	155	39.3%	394
20001 – 100000	320	59.6%	217	40.4%	537
> 100001	253	52.0%	234	48.0%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>1191</b>		<b>843</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 15.9604 (4 df, p-value = 0.00307275).

The statistical dependence was confirmed for donor activity, with people from larger cities getting more involved. Citizens of the smallest municipalities have the lowest level of involvement (39.1%), while over 54% of citizens in municipalities with a population of over 20,000 supported donation activities. The findings are statistically significant – see Table 91.

*Table 91: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	34	39.1%	53	60.9%	87
500 – 5000	294	55.6%	235	44.4%	529
5001 – 20000	193	49.0%	201	51.0%	394
20001 – 100000	292	54.4%	245	45.6%	537
> 100001	264	54.2%	223	45.8%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>1077</b>		<b>957</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.4176 (4 df, p-value = 0.0222504).

There is a dependency between the size of the municipality and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation. The smallest municipalities have the lowest engagement rate (49.4%). Conversely, the highest engagement rates are in small towns (69.2%) and larger towns (69.3%) – see Table 92. For any volunteering activity, the differences between municipalities are analogous, with small municipalities having the lowest rates (66.7%), and smaller (80.3%) and medium-sized towns having the highest rates (79.1%) – see Table 93.

*Table 92: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	22	25.3%	21	24.1%	44	50.6%	87
500 – 5000	174	32.9%	192	36.3%	163	30.8%	529
5001 – 20000	108	27.4%	141	35.8%	145	36.8%	394
20001 – 100000	151	28.1%	221	41.2%	165	30.7%	537
> 100001	126	25.9%	188	38.6%	173	35.5%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>581</b>		<b>763</b>		<b>690</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 23.5435 (8 df, p-value = 0.00273225).

*Table 93: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhab.	18	20.7%	40	46.0%	29	33.3%	87
500 – 5000	148	28.0%	277	52.4%	104	19.7%	529
5001 – 20000	94	23.9%	205	52.0%	95	24.1%	394
20001 – 100000	130	24.2%	295	54.9%	112	20.9%	537
> 100001	94	19.3%	282	57.9%	111	22.8%	487
<b>Total</b>	<b>484</b>		<b>1099</b>		<b>451</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 19.0211 (8 df, p-value = 0.0147472).



Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteer (formal and informal) and donor activities depends on the size of the municipality, with people in the smallest municipalities and large cities being the least involved. These findings are statistically significant. However, there are significant differences between countries, for example in Slovakia and Poland the lowest level of involvement is in the smallest municipalities, while in Hungary and Czechia it is the highest (see below).

**THE INFLUENCE OF MUNICIPALITY SIZE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN SLOVAKIA**

The rate of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months is not dependent on the size of the municipality in Slovakia, with the lowest rate in the smallest municipalities (19%) – see Table 94. Absent the actuality of involvement, the findings are very similar – see Table 95.

*Table 94: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Formal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>&lt; 500 inhabit.</b>	4	19.0%	17	81.0%	21
<b>500 – 5000</b>	47	33.8%	92	66.2%	139
<b>5001 – 20000</b>	24	29.3%	58	70.7%	82
<b>20001 – 100000</b>	37	32.7%	76	67.3%	113
<b>&gt; 100001</b>	16	34.0%	31	66.0%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>		<b>274</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.23023 (4 df, p-value = 0.6935).

*Table 95: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Formal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>&lt; 500 inhabit.</b>	6	28.6%	15	71.4%	21
<b>500 – 5000</b>	55	39.6%	84	60.4%	139
<b>5001 – 20000</b>	32	39.0%	50	61.0%	82
<b>20001 – 100000</b>	43	38.1%	70	61.9%	113
<b>&gt; 100001</b>	20	42.6%	27	57.4%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>246</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.26685 (4 df, p-value = 0.86698).

While the size of the municipality plays a role in the involvement in informal volunteering, it is lowest in the smallest municipalities and the largest cities (23.8% and 34.0%) – see Table 96. However, the dependence of municipality size on participation is not statistically significant. The participation rate is also lower for citizens of the smallest municipalities when the factor of time of informal activity does not play a role (42.9%) – see Table 97. The dependence of municipality size on engagement regardless of time is statistically significant.

*Table 96: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>&lt; 500 inhabit.</b>	5	23,8%	16	76,2%	21
<b>500 – 5000</b>	64	46,0%	75	54,0%	139
<b>5001 – 20000</b>	35	42,7%	47	57,3%	82
<b>20001 – 100000</b>	44	38,9%	69	61,1%	113
<b>&gt; 100001</b>	16	34,0%	31	66,0%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>238</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.26317 (4 df, p-value = 0.26135).

*Table 97: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>&lt; 500 inhabit.</b>	9	42.9%	12	57.1%	21
<b>500 – 5000</b>	81	58.3%	58	41.7%	139
<b>5001 – 20000</b>	45	54.9%	37	45.1%	82
<b>20001 – 100000</b>	54	47.8%	59	52.2%	113
<b>&gt; 100001</b>	24	51.1%	23	48.9%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>		<b>189</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 15.9604 (4 df, p-value = 0.00307275).

Statistical dependence was confirmed for donor activity, but no correlation can be traced. Citizens of the smallest municipalities (33.3%) have the lowest level of involvement, while 54.7% of citizens of small municipalities (500 to 5000 inhabitants) supported donation activities. The findings are statistically significant – see Table 98.

*Table 98: Donation Involvement in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	7	33.3%	14	66.7%	21
500 – 5000	76	54.7%	63	45.3%	139
5001 – 20000	41	50.0%	41	50.0%	82
20001 – 100000	43	38.1%	70	61.9%	113
> 100001	25	53.2%	22	46.8%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>210</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.40486 (4 df, p-value = 0.0517392).

While there are differences between municipality size and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation, they are not statistically significant. The smallest municipalities have the lowest engagement rates (47.6%). On the other hand, the highest involvement rates are in large cities (68.1%) – Table 99. In the case of any volunteering activity, the differences between cities are analogous, with the lowest rates in small municipalities (66.7%) and the highest in large cities (87.2%) – see Table 100.

*Table 99: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	3	14.3%	7	33.3%	11	52.4%	21
500 – 5000	43	30.9%	45	32.4%	51	36.7%	139
5001 – 20000	22	26.8%	29	35.4%	31	37.8%	82
20001 – 100000	23	20.4%	40	35.4%	50	44.2%	113
> 100001	13	27.7%	19	40.4%	15	31.9%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>158</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.1359 (8 df, p-value = 0.522044).

*Table 100: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	2	9.5%	12	57.1%	7	33.3%	21
500 – 5000	39	28.1%	64	46.0%	36	25.9%	139
5001 – 20000	17	20.7%	42	51.2%	23	28.0%	82
20001 – 100000	20	17.7%	58	51.3%	35	31.0%	113
> 100001	10	21.3%	31	66.0%	6	12.8%	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.3301 (8 df, p-value = 0.13707).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities varies according to the size of the municipality, with the smallest municipalities (municipalities under 500 inhabitants) having the lowest level of involvement. However, other differences between municipality sizes are no longer relevant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF MUNICIPALITY SIZE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN HUNGARY**

The rate of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months is not dependent on the size of the municipality in Hungary, with the lowest rate in large cities (21%) – see Table 101, this finding is not statistically significant. Absent from the actuality of involvement, the dependence is demonstrated, with more involvement of small municipalities up to 500 inhabitants (50%) and smaller municipalities up to 5000 inhabitants (50.5%), and the least involvement of large cities (31.1%) – see Table 102.

Table 101: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	5	31.3%	11	68.8%	16
500 – 5000	38	34.2%	73	65.8%	111
5001 – 20000	29	29.0%	71	71.0%	100
20001 – 100000	38	35.8%	68	64.2%	106
> 100001	25	21.0%	94	79.0%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>		<b>317</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.33029 (4 df, p-value = 0.11943).

Table 102: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	8	50.0%	8	50.0%	16
500 – 5000	56	50.5%	55	49.5%	111
5001 – 20000	38	38.0%	62	62.0%	100
20001 – 100000	51	48.1%	55	51.9%	106
> 100001	37	31.1%	82	68.9%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>		<b>262</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.7663 (4 df, p-value = 0.0191765).

Although the size of the municipality plays a role in involvement in informal volunteering, it is highest in the smallest municipalities (68.8%) and lowest in large cities (46.2%) – see Table 103. However, the dependence of the municipality size on participation is not statistically significant. The participation rate is highest for citizens of the smallest municipalities even when the factor of time of informal activity does not play a role (87.5%) – see Table 104. However, the dependence of municipality size on participation is not statistically significant.

Table 103: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	11	68.8%	5	31.3%	16
500 – 5000	56	50.5%	55	49.5%	111
5001 – 20000	50	50.0%	50	50.0%	100
20001 – 100000	61	57.5%	45	42.5%	106
> 100001	55	46.2%	64	53.8%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>		<b>219</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.92587 (4 df, p-value = 0.29498).

Table 104: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	14	87.5%	2	12.5%	16
500 – 5000	65	58.6%	46	41.4%	111
5001 – 20000	62	62.0%	38	38.0%	100
20001 – 100000	74	69.8%	32	30.2%	106
> 100001	69	58.0%	50	42.0%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.4757 (4 df, p-value = 0.075627).

Statistical dependence is not confirmed for donor activity, but differences exist between municipality sizes. Citizens of small municipalities with less than 5,000 inhabitants have the lowest participation rate (38.7%). The findings are not statistically significant – see Table 105.

Table 105: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	7	43.8%	9	56.3%	16
500 – 5000	43	38.7%	68	61.3%	111
5001 – 20000	41	41.0%	59	59.0%	100
20001 – 100000	58	54.7%	48	45.3%	106
> 100001	55	46.2%	64	53.8%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>		<b>248</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 6.52333 (4 df, p-value = 0.16332). We do not reject the null hypothesis of independence ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

While there are differences between the size of the municipality and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation, they are not statistically significant. Citizens of medium-sized towns have the highest level of involvement, with a population of 20,000 to 100,000 inhabitants (74.5%) – see Table 106. For any volunteering activity, the differences between cities are marked but not statistically significant. A total of 93.7% of the inhabitants of the smallest settlements, 87.7% of the inhabitants of medium-sized towns (up to 100 thousand inhabitants) have been involved in some form of volunteer or donation activity in their lifetime, while for other settlement sizes the figure is around 76% – see Table 107.

Table 106: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	6	37.5%	3	18.8%	7	43.8%	16
500 – 5000	31	27.9%	37	33.3%	43	38.7%	111
5001 – 20000	22	22.0%	35	35.0%	43	43.0%	100
20001 – 100000	30	28.3%	49	46.2%	27	25.5%	106
> 100001	24	20.2%	44	37.0%	51	42.9%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>171</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.6346 (8 df, p-value = 0.09180).

Table 107: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhab.	5	31.3%	10	62.5%	1	6.3%	16
500 – 5000	24	21.6%	61	55.0%	26	23.4%	111
5001 – 20000	19	19.0%	57	57.0%	24	24.0%	100
20001 – 100000	24	22.6%	69	65.1%	13	12.3%	106
> 100001	20	16.8%	71	59.7%	28	23.5%	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>92</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.92075 (8 df, p-value = 0.27063).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities varies according to the size of the municipality, with people in the smallest municipalities (municipalities with up to 500 inhabitants) being the most involved. However, differences between municipality sizes are no longer statistically significant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF MUNICIPALITY SIZE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN POLAND**

The rate of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months is not dependent on the municipality size in Poland, with the highest rate in medium-sized towns of up to 20,000 inhabitants (39.8%) – see Table 108, this finding is not statistically significant. Abstracting from the actuality of involvement, the findings (not statistically significant) are similar, with the highest involvement in medium-sized towns under 20 thousand inhabitants (43.4%) – see Table 109.

Table 108: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	12	24.0%	38	76.0%	50
500 – 5000	24	30.4%	55	69.6%	79
5001 – 20000	45	39.8%	68	60.2%	113
20001 – 100000	51	29.3%	123	70.7%	174
> 100001	52	28.3%	132	71.7%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>		<b>416</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 6.1553 (4 df, p-value = 0.187846).

Table 109: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	17	34.0%	33	66.0%	50
500 – 5000	26	32.9%	53	67.1%	79
5001 – 20000	49	43.4%	64	56.6%	113
20001 – 100000	63	36.2%	111	63.8%	174
> 100001	61	33.2%	123	66.8%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>		<b>384</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.72361 (4 df, p-value = 0.44470).

While the influence of municipality size does play a role in engagement in informal volunteering, it is highest for medium-sized cities under 20k inhabitants (46.9%) and lowest for large cities (35.9%) – see Table 110. However, the dependence of municipality size on participation is not statistically significant. The highest participation rate is for citizens of medium-sized cities with up to 20 thousand inhabitants (54.0%) and larger cities with up to 100 thousand inhabitants (53.4%) when the factor of time of doing informal activities is considered – see Table 111. However, the dependence of municipality size on participation is not statistically significant.

Table 110: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	19	38.0%	31	62.0%	50
500 – 5000	29	36.7%	50	63.3%	79
5001 – 20000	53	46.9%	60	53.1%	113
20001 – 100000	75	43.1%	99	56.9%	174
> 100001	66	35.9%	118	64.1%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>358</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.64901 (4 df, p-value = 0.32524).

Table 111: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	22	44.0%	28	56.0%	50
500 – 5000	38	48.1%	41	51.9%	79
5001 – 20000	61	54.0%	52	46.0%	113
20001 – 100000	93	53.4%	81	46.6%	174
> 100001	79	42.9%	105	57.1%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>293</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.72869 (4 df, p-value = 0.22034).

Statistical dependence is not confirmed for donor activity, but differences exist between municipality sizes. The lowest level of involvement is for citizens of small villages with up to 500 inhabitants (40.7%); the highest is for towns with up to 100,000 inhabitants (55.7%). The findings are not statistically significant – see Table 112.

Table 112: Donation Involvement in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	20	40.0%	30	60.0%	50
500 – 5000	41	51.9%	38	48.1%	79
5001 – 20000	53	46.9%	60	53.1%	113
20001 – 100000	97	55.7%	77	44.3%	174
> 100001	96	52.2%	88	47.8%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>		<b>293</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.87021 (4 df, p-value = 0.30087).

While there are differences between the size of the municipality and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation, they are not statistically significant. Citizens of larger towns have the highest level of involvement with a population of 20,000 to 100,000 inhabitants (67.2%) – see Table 113. For any volunteering activity, the differences between cities are significant but not statistically significant. A total, 58.0% of residents of the smallest villages (the least) and 72.4% of residents of medium-sized towns up to 100 thousand inhabitants (the most) have been involved in some form of volunteering or donation activity in their lifetime, no statistical significance is confirmed – see Table 114.

Table 113: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhabit.	13	26.0%	11	22.0%	26	52.0%	50
500 – 5000	17	21.5%	33	41.8%	29	36.7%	79
5001 – 20000	32	28.3%	38	33.6%	43	38.1%	113
20001 – 100000	43	24.7%	74	42.5%	57	32.8%	174
> 100001	44	23.9%	69	37.5%	71	38.6%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>		<b>225</b>		<b>226</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.1113 (8 df, p-value = 0.25730).

Table 114: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
< 500 inhab.	11	22.0%	18	36.0%	21	42.0%	50
500 – 5000	15	19.0%	39	49.4%	25	31.6%	79
5001 – 20000	29	25.7%	51	45.1%	33	29.2%	113
20001 – 100000	40	23.0%	86	49.4%	48	27.6%	174
> 100001	32	17.4%	97	52.7%	55	29.9%	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>		<b>291</b>		<b>182</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.15867 (8 df, p-value = 0.41812).



Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities varies according to the size of the municipality, with people in the smallest municipalities (municipalities with up to 500 inhabitants) being the least involved. However, differences between municipality sizes are no longer statistically significant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF MUNICIPALITY SIZE ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN CZECHIA**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Czechia is dependent on the municipality size, with the highest levels in small towns with up to 5,000 inhabitants (43%) and larger towns with up to 100,000 inhabitants (41.0%) – see Table 115, this finding is statistically significant. Abstracting from the actuality of involvement, the findings (but not statistically significant) are similar, with the highest involvement of small towns up to 5,000 inhabitants (54.5%) and larger towns up to 100,000 inhabitants (51.4%) – see Table 116.

Table 115: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
500 – 5000	86	43.0%	114	57.0%	200
5001 – 20000	27	27.3%	72	72.7%	99
20001 – 100000	59	41.0%	85	59.0%	144
> 100001	45	32.8%	92	67.2%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>		<b>363</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.01243 (3 df, p-value = 0.02911261).

Table 116: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
500 – 5000	109	54.5%	91	45.5%	200
5001 – 20000	45	45.5%	54	54.5%	99
20001 – 100000	74	51.4%	70	48.6%	144
> 100001	58	42.3%	79	57.7%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>286</b>		<b>294</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.659 (3 df, p-value = 0.129432).

The effect of municipality size plays a role in engagement in informal volunteering, analogous to that of formal volunteering, with the highest levels for small towns under 5,000 inhabitants (64%) and larger towns under 100,000 inhabitants (61.1%) and the lowest for large towns (49.6%) – see Table 117. However, the dependence of municipality size on participation is not statistically significant. In the absence of time, the engagement rate decreases with the size of the municipality, being highest for small municipalities with up to 5k inhabitants (75%) and lowest for large cities with more than 100k inhabitants (59.1%) – viz Table 118. The dependence of municipality size on engagement is statistically significant.

Table 117: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
500 – 5000	128	64.0%	72	36.0%	200
5001 – 20000	59	59.6%	40	40.4%	99
20001 – 100000	88	61.1%	56	38.9%	144
> 100001	68	49.6%	69	50.4%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>343</b>		<b>237</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.31685 (3 df, p-value = 0.06246).

Table 118: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
500 – 5000	150	75.0%	50	25.0%	200
5001 – 20000	71	71.7%	28	28.3%	99
20001 – 100000	99	68.8%	45	31.3%	144
> 100001	81	59.1%	56	40.9%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>		<b>179</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.97825 (3 df, p-value = 0.0187519).

Statistical dependence is not confirmed for donor activity, and differences between municipality sizes are almost non-existent. Citizens of smaller towns with a population of up to 20,000 have the lowest participation rate (58.8%), while for other settlements it ranges from 64.2% to 67%. The conclusions regarding the effect of municipality size on donor activity are not statistically significant - see Table 119.

Table 119: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
500 – 5000	134	67.0%	66	33.0%	200
5001 – 20000	58	58.6%	41	41.4%	99
20001 – 100000	94	65.3%	50	34.7%	144
> 100001	88	64.2%	49	35.8%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>374</b>		<b>206</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.00994 (3 df, p-value = 0.55192).

While there are differences between municipality size and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation, they are not statistically significant. Citizens of small towns under 5,000 inhabitants have the highest level of involvement (80%) – see Table 120. For any volunteering activity, the results are similar, but also not statistically significant. A total of 91.5% of the inhabitants of the smallest settlements (the most) and 83.9% of the inhabitants of large towns over 100 thousand inhabitants (the least) have been involved in some form of volunteering or donation activity in their lifetime – see Table 121.

Table 120: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
500 – 5000	83	41.5%	77	38.5%	40	20.0%	200
5001 – 20000	32	32.3%	39	39.4%	28	28.3%	99
20001 – 100000	55	38.2%	58	40.3%	31	21.5%	144
> 100001	45	32.8%	56	40.9%	36	26.3%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>215</b>		<b>230</b>		<b>135</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.21117 (6 df, p-value = 0.51703).

Table 121: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
500 – 5000	70	35.0%	113	56.5%	17	8.5%	200
5001 – 20000	29	29.3%	55	55.6%	15	15.2%	99
20001 – 100000	46	31.9%	82	56.9%	16	11.1%	144
> 100001	32	23.4%	83	60.6%	22	16.1%	137
<b>Total</b>	<b>177</b>		<b>333</b>		<b>70</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.90319 (6 df, p-value = 0.1791).

Thus, it can be concluded that although the general level of involvement in volunteer (formal and informal) and donor activities varies according to the size of the municipality, the dependence was not confirmed. In general, residents of large cities are the least involved.

## THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months is dependent on education in V4 countries, with the level of involvement in formal volunteering increasing with increasing education — see Table 122. Abstracting from actuality of involvement, the findings are the same – see Table 123.

Table 122: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
None		0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	30	26.3%	84	73.7%	114
Second. – no FE	150	26.7%	411	73.3%	561
Second. – +FE	296	32.4%	617	67.6%	913
University	188	42.3%	256	57.7%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>664</b>		<b>1370</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 30.9587 (4 df, p-value =  $3.12136 \times 10^{-6}$ ).

Table 123: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	41	36.0%	73	64.0%	114
Second. – no FE	185	33.0%	376	67.0%	561
Second. – +FE	377	41.3%	536	58.7%	913
University	245	55.2%	199	44.8%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>848</b>		<b>1186</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 53.7848 (4 df, p-value =  $5.837 \times 10^{-11}$ ).

The effect of education on engagement in informal volunteering is confirmed both in the short time period – see Table 124 – and regardless of timeliness – see Table 125. With higher education, engagement increases, these findings are statistically significant.

Table 124: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	45	39.5%	69	60.5%	114
Second. – no FE	240	42.8%	321	57.2%	561
Second. – +FE	466	51.0%	447	49.0%	913
University	231	52.0%	213	48.0%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>982</b>		<b>1052</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 17.4846 (4 df, p-value = 0.0005557).

Table 125: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	62	54.4%	52	45.6%	114
Second. – no FE	303	54.0%	258	46.0%	561
Second. – +FE	556	60.9%	357	39.1%	913
University	270	60.8%	174	39.2%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>1191</b>		<b>843</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.4124 (4 df, p-value = 0.02299).

Statistical dependence was also confirmed for donor activity, with more educated people also engaging in more donor activity – see Table 126.

*Table 126: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
None	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2
Primary school	51	44.7%	63	55.3%	114
Second. – no FE	253	45.1%	308	54.9%	561
Second. – +FE	471	51.6%	442	48.4%	913
University	301	67.8%	143	32.2%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>1077</b>		<b>957</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 56.9202 (4 df, p-value =  $1.28582 \times 10^{-11}$ ).

There is a relationship between education and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Increasing education leads to higher involvement, with the involvement rate for university-educated people being 80.2% – see Table 127. In the case of any volunteering activity, the differences are even more significant, with university involvement at 86.7% – see Table 128. The findings are statistically significant.

*Table 127: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2
Primary school	23	20.2%	46	40.4%	45	39.5%	114
Second. – no FE	118	21.0%	202	36.0%	241	43.0%	561
Second. – +FE	250	27.4%	348	38.1%	315	34.5%	913
University	190	42.8%	166	37.4%	88	19.8%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>581</b>		<b>763</b>		<b>690</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 88.0027 (8 df, p-value =  $1.18204 \times 10^{-15}$ ).

*Table 128: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2
Primary school	20	17.5%	60	52.6%	34	29.8%	114
Second. – no FE	101	18.0%	297	52.9%	163	29.1%	561
Second. – +FE	211	23.1%	508	55.6%	194	21.2%	913
University	152	34.2%	233	52.5%	59	13.3%	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>484</b>		<b>1099</b>		<b>451</b>		<b>2034</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 63.4273 (8 df, p-value =  $9.86758 \times 10^{-11}$ ).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteer (formal and informal) and donor activities is dependent on education. The more educated are more involved, not only in donation activities, but also in formal and informal volunteering. In all V4 countries, it is true that the more active are the more highly educated, but conclusions about the correlation are not always clear and statistically valid.

**THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN SLOVAKIA**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Slovakia depends on education, with the most engaged in formal volunteering being the university educated (46.4%) – see Table 129. Absent the timeliness of involvement, the conclusions are the same, but the least educated also have above average involvement – see Table 130.

Table 129: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	10	28.6%	25	71.4%	35
Second. – no FE	27	28.4%	68	71.6%	95
Second. – +FE	52	27.7%	136	72.3%	188
University	39	46.4%	45	53.6%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>		<b>274</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.4354 (3 df, p-value = 0.0152058).

Table 130: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	15	42.9%	20	57.1%	35
Second. – no FE	30	31.6%	65	68.4%	95
Second. – +FE	65	34.6%	123	65.4%	188
University	46	54.8%	38	45.2%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>246</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.7546 (3 df, p-value = 0.005198).

The effect of education on engagement in informal volunteering is evident in immediate engagement (current) - an increasing but a statistically unproven correlation – see Table 131. The same is evident regardless of the period of engagement – see Table 132, but again not statistically significant.

Table 131: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	9	25.7%	26	74.3%	35
Second. – no FE	35	36.8%	60	63.2%	95
Second. – +FE	81	43.1%	107	56.9%	188
University	39	46.4%	45	53.6%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>238</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.42225 (3 df, p-value = 0.14336).

Table 132: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	13	37.1%	22	62.9%	35
Second. – no FE	49	51.6%	46	48.4%	95
Second. – +FE	104	55.3%	84	44.7%	188
University	47	56.0%	37	44.0%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>		<b>189</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.30968 (3 df, p-value = 0.22991).

The statistical dependence of education was also confirmed for donor engagement, with the most educated (60.7%) engaging the most – see Table 133.

Table 133: Donation Involvement in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	16	45.7%	19	54.3%	35
Second. – no FE	38	40.0%	57	60.0%	95
Second. – +FE	87	46.3%	101	53.7%	188
University	51	60.7%	33	39.3%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>210</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.16724 (3 df, p-value = 0.0426788).

There is a relationship between education and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Increasing education generally leads to higher engagement (the exception being people with primary education), with engagement rates for university educated people at 75% and non-graduates at the lowest level (49.5%) – see Table 134. In the case of any volunteering activity, increasing engagement with higher educational level is evident, with 83.3% of university educated people engaged – see Table 135. The findings are statistically significant.

Table 134: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
Primary school	10	28.6%	11	31.4%	14	40.0%	35
Second. – no FE	21	22.1%	26	27.4%	48	50.5%	95
Second. – +FE	39	20.7%	74	39.4%	75	39.9%	188
University	34	40.5%	29	34.5%	21	25.0%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>158</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 19.6389 (6 df, p-value = 0.003210).

Table 135: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
Primary school	8	22.9%	14	40.0%	13	37.1%	35
Second. – no FE	17	17.9%	45	47.4%	33	34.7%	95
Second. – +FE	35	18.6%	106	56.4%	47	25.0%	188
University	28	33.3%	42	50.0%	14	16.7%	84
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 15.893 (6 df, p-value = 0.0143397).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities is dependent on education. The more educated are more involved, not only in donating, but also in formal and informal volunteering (for formal volunteering and donation, the least educated part of the population was also more involved).

**THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN HUNGARY**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Hungary is not dependent on education, with the most involved in formal volunteering being university educated (32.1%) – see Table 136. When we abstract from the actuality of involvement, it is possible to trace an increase in involvement with an increase in educational level although the findings are not statistically significant – see Table 137.

Table 136: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	6	30.0%	14	70.0%	20
Second. – no FE	34	32.1%	72	67.9%	106
Second. – +FE	69	28.2%	176	71.8%	245
University	26	32.1%	55	67.9%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>		<b>317</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.7791 (3 df, p-value = 0.854459).

Table 137: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	7	35.0%	13	65.0%	20
Second. – no FE	43	40.6%	63	59.4%	106
Second. – +FE	98	40.0%	147	60.0%	245
University	42	51.9%	39	48.1%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>		<b>262</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.12022 (3 df, p-value = 0.24877).

There is no evidence of an effect of education on current engagement in informal volunteering – see Table 138. The same conclusion regarding engagement is reached regardless of the period of engagement – see Table 139.

Table 138: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	7	35.0%	13	65.0%	20
Second. – no FE	53	50.0%	53	50.0%	106
Second. – +FE	132	53.9%	113	46.1%	245
University	41	50.6%	40	49.4%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>		<b>219</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.85493 (3 df, p-value = 0.41454).

Table 139: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	12	60.0%	8	40.0%	20
Second. – no FE	66	62.3%	40	37.7%	106
Second. – +FE	158	64.5%	87	35.5%	245
University	48	59.3%	33	40.7%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.81437 (3 df, p-value = 0.84603).

The statistical dependence of education is confirmed for donation activity, with the most educated (63.0%) being the most involved – see Table 140.



*Table 140: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	7	35.0%	13	65.0%	20
Second. – no FE	38	35.8%	68	64.2%	106
Second. – +FE	108	44.1%	137	55.9%	245
University	51	63.0%	30	37.0%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>		<b>248</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 15.0269 (3 df, p-value = 0.00179383).

There is a relationship between education and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Increasing education generally leads to higher engagement (the exception being people with primary education), with the engagement rate for university educated people being 75.3%, and non-graduates being the least engaged (54.7%) – see Table 141. In the case of any volunteering activity, the highest involvement rate for the university educated is 84.0% – see Table 142. However, the findings are not statistically significant.

*Table 141: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
Primary school	5	25.0%	4	20.0%	11	55.0%	20
Second. – no FE	23	21.7%	35	33.0%	48	45.3%	106
Second. – +FE	53	21.6%	100	40.8%	92	37.6%	245
University	32	39.5%	29	35.8%	20	24.7%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>171</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 18.2022 (6 df, p-value = 0.00574616).

*Table 142: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No	Total	
Primary school	4	20.0%	9	45.0%	7	35.0%	20
Second. – no FE	21	19.8%	58	54.7%	27	25.5%	106
Second. – +FE	43	17.6%	157	64.1%	45	18.4%	245
University	24	29.6%	44	54.3%	13	16.0%	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>92</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.4191 (6 df, p-value = 0.07626).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities is not always dependent on education in Hungary. In general, university educated people are more involved, not only in donation activities but also in formal volunteering).

**THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN POLAND**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Poland depends on education, with increasing education the level of involvement in formal volunteering increases – see Table 143. Absent from the actuality of involvement, the findings are the same – see Table 144.

*Table 143: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Formal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	4	16.7%	20	83.3%	24
Second. – no FE	48	27.4%	127	72.6%	175
Second. – +FE	87	30.0%	203	70.0%	290
University	45	41.3%	64	58.7%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>		<b>416</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.7999 (4 df, p-value = 0.03935).

*Table 144: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Formal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	5	20.8%	19	79.2%	24
Second. – no FE	55	31.4%	120	68.6%	175
Second. – +FE	102	35.2%	188	64.8%	290
University	54	49.5%	55	50.5%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>		<b>384</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.8695 (4 df, p-value = 0.00772336).

The effect of education on engagement in informal volunteering is not statistically confirmed in the short term, although a correlation of increasing education is evident from the data – see Table 145, the same conclusions are also the same if we do not take into account the time factor – see Table 146.

*Table 145: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	9	37.5%	15	62.5%	24
Second. – no FE	60	34.3%	115	65.7%	175
Second. – +FE	124	42.8%	166	57.2%	290
University	49	45.0%	60	55.0%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>358</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.76747 (4 df, p-value = 0.2172).

*Table 146: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
None	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2
Primary school	11	45.8%	13	54.2%	24
Second. – no FE	75	42.9%	100	57.1%	175
Second. – +FE	150	51.7%	140	48.3%	290
University	57	52.3%	52	47.7%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>293</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.9887 (4 df, p-value = 0.19998).

The statistical dependence was confirmed for donation activity, more educated people also engage more in donation activity – see Table 147.

*Table 147: Donation Involvement in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
None	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2
Primary school	12	50.0%	12	50.0%	24
Second. – no FE	76	43.4%	99	56.6%	175
Second. – +FE	148	51.0%	142	49.0%	290
University	70	64.2%	39	35.8%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>		<b>293</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.6432 (4 df, p-value = 0.0202116).

There is a relationship between education and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Increasing education leads to higher engagement, the engagement rate for university educated is 76.1% – see Table 148. In the case of any volunteering activity, the findings are similar, with university involvement rates at 78.9% – see Table 149. The findings are statistically significant.

*Table 148: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2
Primary school	3	12.5%	11	45.8%	10	41.7%	24
Second. – no FE	33	18.9%	65	37.1%	77	44.0%	175
Second. – +FE	72	24.8%	106	36.6%	112	38.6%	290
University	41	37.6%	42	38.5%	26	23.9%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>		<b>225</b>		<b>226</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 19.9263 (8 df, p-value = 0.010686).

*Table 149: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
None	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2
Primary school	3	12.5%	13	54.2%	8	33.3%	24
Second. – no FE	28	16.0%	84	48.0%	63	36.0%	175
Second. – +FE	61	21.0%	142	49.0%	87	30.0%	290
University	35	32.1%	51	46.8%	23	21.1%	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>		<b>291</b>		<b>182</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 15.1514 (8 df, p-value = 0.05626).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and donation activities is dependent on education. The more educated are more involved, not only in donation activities, but also in formal and informal volunteering.

**THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN CZECHIA**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Czechia is dependent on education, with the most involved in formal volunteering being the university educated (45.9%) – see Table 150. Absent the timeliness of involvement, the findings are the same – see Table 151.

Table 150: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	10	28.6%	25	71.4%	35
Second. – no FE	41	22.2%	144	77.8%	185
Second. – +FE	88	46.3%	102	53.7%	190
University	78	45.9%	92	54.1%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>		<b>363</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 31.1832 (3 df, p-value =  $7.77782 \times 10^{-7}$ ).

Table 151: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	14	40.0%	21	60.0%	35
Second. – no FE	57	30.8%	128	69.2%	185
Second. – +FE	112	58.9%	78	41.1%	190
University	103	60.6%	67	39.4%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>286</b>		<b>294</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 42.2541 (3 df, p-value =  $3.54367 \times 10^{-9}$ ).

The influence of education on (actual) involvement in informal volunteering is demonstrated, but the correlation cannot be fully traced – see Table 152. This dependence is demonstrated even when the time factor is not taken into account – see Table 153.

Table 152: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	20	57.1%	15	42.9%	35
Second. – no FE	92	49.7%	93	50.3%	185
Second. – +FE	129	67.9%	61	32.1%	190
University	102	60.0%	68	40.0%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>343</b>		<b>237</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.9155 (3 df, p-value = 0.00482).

Table 153: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Informal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	26	74.3%	9	25.7%	35
Second. – no FE	113	61.1%	72	38.9%	185
Second. – +FE	144	75.8%	46	24.2%	190
University	118	69.4%	52	30.6%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>		<b>179</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.0084 (3 df, p-value = 0.0185).

The statistical dependence of education is confirmed for donor activity, with the most educated (75.9%) getting involved and the trend is upwards – see Table 154.

Table 154: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
Primary school	16	45.7%	19	54.3%	35
Second. – no FE	101	54.6%	84	45.4%	185
Second. – +FE	128	67.4%	62	32.6%	190
University	129	75.9%	41	24.1%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>374</b>		<b>206</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 23.6181 (3 df, p-value =  $3.0013 \times 10^{-5}$ ).

There is a relationship between education and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Increasing education generally leads to higher involvement (the exception being people with primary education), with the involvement rate for university educated people being 87.6%, and non-graduates the least (63.2%) – see Table 155. In the case of any volunteering activity, increasing involvement with higher educational attainment is also evident, with 94.7% of university students involved – see Table 156. The findings are statistically significant.

Table 155: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
Primary school	5	14.3%	20	57.1%	10	28.6%	35
Second. – no FE	41	22.2%	76	41.1%	68	36.8%	185
Second. – +FE	86	45.3%	68	35.8%	36	18.9%	190
University	83	48.8%	66	38.8%	21	12.4%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>215</b>		<b>230</b>		<b>135</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 54.4185 (6 df, p-value =  $6.07404 \times 10^{-10}$ ).

Table 156: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & InfV. & Don.		ForV. or InfV. or Don.		No		Total
Primary school	5	14.3%	24	68.6%	6	17.1%	35
Second. – no FE	35	18.9%	110	59.5%	40	21.6%	185
Second. – +FE	72	37.9%	103	54.2%	15	7.9%	190
University	65	38.2%	96	56.5%	9	5.3%	170
<b>Total</b>	<b>177</b>		<b>333</b>		<b>70</b>		<b>580</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 43.0857 (6 df, p-value =  $1.12174 \times 10^{-7}$ ).

Thus, it can be concluded that the general level of involvement in volunteering (formal and informal) and giving activities is dependent on education. The more educated are more involved, not only in donation activities but also in formal volunteering.

## THE INFLUENCE OF INCOME ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in V4 countries is not dependent on income, either personal or household – see Table 157 and Table 158. Abstracting from the timeliness of involvement, the findings are the same, although in the case of household income, a correlation has been shown (involvement in formal volunteering increases with income except for the richest income group) – see Table 159 and Table 160.

Table 157: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	162	29.8%	381	70.2%	543
2	124	33.4%	247	66.6%	371
3	129	35.1%	239	64.9%	368
4	109	33.9%	213	66.1%	322
5	132	31.7%	284	68.3%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>664</b>		<b>1370</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.37844 (4 df, p-value = 0.4966) for variable personal income.

Table 158: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	171	28.5%	429	71.5%	600
2	127	32.7%	261	67.3%	388
3	124	34.6%	234	65.4%	358
4	119	36.4%	208	63.6%	327
5	114	33.2%	229	66.8%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>655</b>		<b>1361</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.47383 (4 df, p-value = 0.112869) for variable household income.

Table 159: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	207	38.1%	336	61.9%	543
2	162	43.7%	209	56.3%	371
3	160	43.5%	208	56.5%	368
4	141	43.8%	181	56.2%	322
5	168	40.4%	248	59.6%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>838</b>		<b>1182</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.77121 (4 df, p-value = 0.311589) for variable personal income.

Table 160: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	219	36.5%	381	63.5%	600
2	165	42.5%	223	57.5%	388
3	159	44.4%	199	55.6%	358
4	149	45.6%	178	54.4%	327
5	143	41.7%	200	58.3%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>835</b>		<b>1181</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.83016 (4 df, p-value = 0.0433878) for variable household income.

The effect of personal and household income has no effect on engagement in informal volunteering; both in the short run – see Table 161 and Table 162 - and regardless of timeliness – see Table 163 and Table 164.

*Table 161: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	254	46.8%	289	53.2%	543
2	190	51.2%	181	48.8%	371
3	180	48.9%	188	51.1%	368
4	152	47.2%	170	52.8%	322
5	199	47.8%	217	52.2%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>975</b>		<b>1045</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.00996 (4 df, p-value = 0.73392) for variable personal income.

*Table 162: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	284	47.3%	316	52.7%	600
2	189	48.7%	199	51.3%	388
3	178	49.7%	180	50.3%	358
4	163	49.8%	164	50.2%	327
5	158	46.1%	185	53.9%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>972</b>		<b>1044</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.5345 (4 df, p-value = 0.820509) for variable household income.

*Table 163: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	301	55.4%	242	44.6%	543
2	230	62.0%	141	38.0%	371
3	227	61.7%	141	38.3%	368
4	183	56.8%	139	43.2%	322
5	240	57.7%	176	42.3%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>1181</b>		<b>839</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.98611 (4 df, p-value = 0.2001889) for variable personal income.

*Table 164: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	333	55.5%	267	44.5%	600
2	231	59.5%	157	40.5%	388
3	220	61.5%	138	38.5%	358
4	194	59.3%	133	40.7%	327
5	199	58.0%	144	42.0%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>1177</b>		<b>839</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.79191 (4 df, p-value = 0.4349) for variable household income.

Statistical dependence is confirmed for donation activity, with people and households with higher incomes engaging more in donation activity – see Table 165 and Table 166.

Table 165: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	251	46.2%	292	53.8%	543
2	205	55.3%	166	44.7%	371
3	196	53.3%	172	46.7%	368
4	182	56.5%	140	43.5%	322
5	235	56.5%	181	43.5%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>1069</b>		<b>951</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 14.4047 (4 df, p-value = 0.00610945) for variable personal income.

Table 166: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	277	46.2%	323	53.8%	600
2	204	52.6%	184	47.4%	388
3	200	55.9%	158	44.1%	358
4	182	55.7%	145	44.3%	327
5	203	59.2%	140	40.8%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>1066</b>		<b>950</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 18.63 (4 df, p-value = 0.000928993) for variable household income.

There is a relationship between income level and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Higher engagement is shown with increasing household income, partly with personal income. People with the lowest incomes have the lowest engagement – see Table 167 and \*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 17.7157 (8 df, p-value = 0.0234622) for variable personal income.

Table 168. For any volunteering activity, the findings are similar, increasing household income increases engagement – see Table 169 and Table 170. The findings are statistically significant.

Table 167: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	131	24.1%	196	36.1%	216	39.8%	543
2	110	29.6%	147	39.6%	114	30.7%	371
3	112	30.4%	132	35.9%	124	33.7%	368
4	105	32.6%	113	35.1%	104	32.3%	322
5	115	27.6%	173	41.6%	128	30.8%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>573</b>		<b>761</b>		<b>686</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 17.7157 (8 df, p-value = 0.0234622) for variable personal income.

Table 168: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	149	24.8%	198	33.0%	253	42.2%	600
2	111	28.6%	147	37.9%	130	33.5%	388
3	107	29.9%	145	40.5%	106	29.6%	358
4	101	30.9%	129	39.4%	97	29.7%	327
5	104	30.3%	138	40.2%	101	29.4%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>572</b>		<b>757</b>		<b>687</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 26.9413 (8 df, p-value = 0.000723687) for variable household income.



*Table 169: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	110	20.3%	286	52.7%	147	27.1%	543
2	92	24.8%	204	55.0%	75	20.2%	371
3	93	25.3%	200	54.3%	75	20.4%	368
4	83	25.8%	168	52.2%	71	22.0%	322
5	98	23.6%	238	57.2%	80	19.2%	416
<b>Total</b>	<b>476</b>		<b>1096</b>		<b>448</b>		<b>2020*</b>

\*14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.7742 (8 df, p-value = 0.08784) for variable personal income.

*Table 170: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	134	22.3%	297	49.5%	169	28.2%	600
2	87	22.4%	214	55.2%	87	22.4%	388
3	90	25.1%	203	56.7%	65	18.2%	358
4	79	24.2%	186	56.9%	62	19.0%	327
5	85	24.8%	192	56.0%	66	19.2%	343
<b>Total</b>	<b>475</b>		<b>1092</b>		<b>449</b>		<b>2016*</b>

\*18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 19.9138 (8 df, p-value = 0.0106672) for variable household income.

Thus, it can be concluded that the level of income (individual or household) has an overall impact on engagement, with a higher income positively influencing engagement, and people with higher incomes being more inclined to donate (this is not the case in Slovakia and Hungary).

Note: The correlation between the personal income and the household income is statistically significant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF INCOME (PERSONAL, HOUSEHOLD) ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN SLOVAKIA**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Slovakia is not dependent on income, either personal or household – see Table 171 and Table 172. Absent the timeliness of involvement, the findings are the same – see Table 173 and Table 174.

Table 171: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	36	28.3%	91	71.7%	127
2	24	29.6%	57	70.4%	81
3	23	39.0%	36	61.0%	59
4	15	31.9%	32	68.1%	47
5	30	34.1%	58	65.9%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>		<b>264</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.48924 (4 df, p-value = 0.646564) for variable personal income.

Table 172: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	32	26.2%	90	73.8%	122
2	25	32.5%	52	67.5%	77
3	22	35.5%	40	64.5%	62
4	18	32.7%	37	67.3%	55
5	31	36.0%	55	64.0%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>		<b>274</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.88394 (4 df, p-value = 0.577431) for variable household income.

Table 173: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	45	35.4%	82	64.6%	127
2	28	34.6%	53	65.4%	81
3	26	44.1%	33	55.9%	59
4	21	44.7%	26	55.3%	47
5	36	40.9%	52	59.1%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>246</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.75597 (4 df, p-value = 0.599456) for variable personal income.

Table 174: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	39	32.0%	83	68.0%	122
2	30	39.0%	47	61.0%	77
3	30	48.4%	32	51.6%	62
4	20	36.4%	35	63.6%	55
5	37	43.0%	49	57.0%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>246</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.5825 (4 df, p-value = 0.232572) for variable household income.

The effect of personal and household income does not affect engagement in informal volunteering, both in the short time period – see Table 161 and Table 176- and regardless of timeliness – see Table 177 and Table 178.

*Table 175: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	53	41.7%	74	58.3%	127
2	32	39.5%	49	60.5%	81
3	24	40.7%	35	59.3%	59
4	18	38.3%	29	61.7%	47
5	37	42.0%	51	58.0%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>238</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.280546 (4 df, p-value = 0.991035) for variable personal income.

*Table 176: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	51	41.8%	71	58.2%	122
2	24	31.2%	53	68.8%	77
3	32	51.6%	30	48.4%	62
4	22	40.0%	33	60.0%	55
5	35	40.7%	51	59.3%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>238</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 6.02427 (4 df, p-value = 0.197343) for variable household income.

*Table 177: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	68	53.5%	59	46.5%	127
2	44	54.3%	37	45.7%	81
3	33	55.9%	26	44.1%	59
4	22	46.8%	25	53.2%	47
5	46	52.3%	42	47.7%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>		<b>189</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.01734 (4 df, p-value = 0.907155) for variable personal income.

*Table 178: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	67	54.9%	55	45.1%	122
2	33	42.9%	44	57.1%	77
3	40	64.5%	22	35.5%	62
4	26	47.3%	29	52.7%	55
5	47	54.7%	39	45.3%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>		<b>189</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.47921 (4 df, p-value = 0.11263) for variable household income.

A statistical dependence is also not confirmed for donation activity, although higher-income households are generally more engaged in donations (except for the richest group), but the findings are not statistically significant – see Table 179 and Table 180.

*Table 179: Donation Involvement in the Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	54	42.5%	73	57.5%	127
2	42	51.9%	39	48.1%	81
3	27	45.8%	32	54.2%	59
4	22	46.8%	25	53.2%	47
5	47	53.4%	41	46.6%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>210</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.17834 (4 df, p-value = 0.528436) for variable personal income.

*Table 180: Donation Involvement in the Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	52	42.6%	70	57.4%	122
2	34	44.2%	43	55.8%	77
3	31	50.0%	31	50.0%	62
4	31	56.4%	24	43.6%	55
5	44	51.2%	42	48.8%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>210</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.84685 (4 df, p-value = 0.427129) for variable household income.

There is no proven relationship between income level and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Higher engagement is demonstrated for those with higher personal income. People with the lowest incomes have the lowest engagement – see Table 181 a Table 182. For any volunteering activity, the findings are similar – see Table 183 and Table 184.

*Table 181: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	28	22.0%	43	33.9%	56	44.1%	127
2	18	22.2%	34	42.0%	29	35.8%	81
3	18	30.5%	17	28.8%	24	40.7%	59
4	16	34.0%	11	23.4%	20	42.6%	47
5	24	27.3%	35	39.8%	29	33.0%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>158</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.17077 (8 df, p-value = 0.328095) for variable personal income.

*Table 182: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	25	20.5%	41	33.6%	56	45.9%	122
2	21	27.3%	22	28.6%	34	44.2%	77
3	19	30.6%	23	37.1%	20	32.3%	62
4	14	25.5%	23	41.8%	18	32.7%	55
5	25	29.1%	31	36.0%	30	34.9%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>158</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.7591 (8 df, p-value = 0.457349) for variable household income.

*Table 183: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	23	18.1%	70	55.1%	34	26.8%	127
2	17	21.0%	43	53.1%	21	25.9%	81
3	15	25.4%	28	47.5%	16	27.1%	59
4	13	27.7%	18	38.3%	16	34.0%	47
5	20	22.7%	48	54.5%	20	22.7%	88
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.73263 (8 df, p-value = 0.67715) for variable personal income.

*Table 184: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	23	18.9%	63	51.6%	36	29.5%	122
2	16	20.8%	35	45.5%	26	33.8%	77
3	18	29.0%	32	51.6%	12	19.4%	62
4	14	25.5%	27	49.1%	14	25.5%	55
5	17	19.8%	50	58.1%	19	22.1%	86
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>		<b>207</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>402</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.62343 (8 df, p-value = 0.471091) for variable household income.

Thus, it can be concluded that the level of income (personal or household) does not affect engagement overall.

Note: The dependence between the personal income and the household income is statistically significant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF INCOME (PERSONAL, HOUSEHOLD) ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN HUNGARY**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Slovakia is not dependent on the level of income, either personal or household – see Table 185 and Table 186. Absent the timeliness of involvement, the findings are the same – see Table 187 and Table 188.

Table 185: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	33	30.0%	77	70.0%	110
2	18	34.0%	35	66.0%	53
3	22	25.6%	64	74.4%	86
4	23	29.5%	55	70.5%	78
5	39	31.2%	86	68.8%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>		<b>317</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.29075 (4 df, p-value = 0.862943) for variable personal income.

Table 186: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	40	28.2%	102	71.8%	142
2	21	29.6%	50	70.4%	71
3	18	26.1%	51	73.9%	69
4	28	35.4%	51	64.6%	79
5	28	30.8%	63	69.2%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>		<b>317</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.87697 (4 df, p-value = 0.758374) for variable household income.

Table 187: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	43	39.1%	67	60.9%	110
2	26	49.1%	27	50.9%	53
3	37	43.0%	49	57.0%	86
4	33	42.3%	45	57.7%	78
5	51	40.8%	74	59.2%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>		<b>262</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.57884 (4 df, p-value = 0.81259) for variable personal income.

Table 188: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	51	35.9%	91	64.1%	142
2	30	42.3%	41	57.7%	71
3	31	44.9%	38	55.1%	69
4	41	51.9%	38	48.1%	79
5	37	40.7%	54	59.3%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>		<b>262</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.64596 (4 df, p-value = 0.227194) for variable household income.

The effect of individual and household income does not affect engagement in informal volunteering, both in the short time period – see Table 189 and Table 190 – and regardless of timeliness – see Table 191 and Table 192.

*Table 189: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	53	48.2%	57	51.8%	110
2	31	58.5%	22	41.5%	53
3	43	50.0%	43	50.0%	86
4	41	52.6%	37	47.4%	78
5	65	52.0%	60	48.0%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>		<b>219</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.64684 (4 df, p-value = 0.800351) for variable personal income.

*Table 190: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	71	50.0%	71	50.0%	142
2	38	53.5%	33	46.5%	71
3	30	43.5%	39	56.5%	69
4	47	59.5%	32	40.5%	79
5	47	51.6%	44	48.4%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>		<b>219</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.04328 (4 df, p-value = 0.40018) for variable household income.

*Table 191: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	64	58.2%	46	41.8%	110
2	41	77.4%	12	22.6%	53
3	52	60.5%	34	39.5%	86
4	52	66.7%	26	33.3%	78
5	75	60.0%	50	40.0%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 6.93429 (4 df, p-value = 0.139402) for variable personal income.

*Table 192: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	89	62.7%	53	37.3%	142
2	46	64.8%	25	35.2%	71
3	40	58.0%	29	42.0%	69
4	56	70.9%	23	29.1%	79
5	53	58.2%	38	41.8%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.83143 (4 df, p-value = 0.4293) for variable household income.

The statistical relationship between rising income and donation is not confirmed, although there are significant differences between household income groups, with the richest household groups contributing the most – see Table 193 and Table 194.

*Table 193: Donation Involvement in the Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	39	35.5%	71	64.5%	110
2	25	47.2%	28	52.8%	53
3	42	48.8%	44	51.2%	86
4	39	50.0%	39	50.0%	78
5	59	47.2%	66	52.8%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>		<b>248</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.68813 (4 df, p-value = 0.223681) for variable personal income.

*Table 194: Donation Involvement in the Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	58	40.8%	84	59.2%	142
2	30	42.3%	41	57.7%	71
3	24	34.8%	45	65.2%	69
4	36	45.6%	43	54.4%	79
5	56	61.5%	35	38.5%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>		<b>248</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 14.1736 (4 df, p-value = 0.00676105) for variable household income.

There is no demonstrated relationship between income level and engagement in formal volunteering and/or donation. Higher engagement is observed for households with higher income levels. People and households with the lowest incomes have the lowest engagement – see Table 195 and Table 196. For any volunteering activity, the findings are similar – see Table 197 and Table 198.

*Table 195: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	23	20.9%	36	32.7%	51	46.4%	110
2	16	30.2%	19	35.8%	18	34.0%	53
3	24	27.9%	31	36.0%	31	36.0%	86
4	22	28.2%	28	35.9%	28	35.9%	78
5	28	22.4%	54	43.2%	43	34.4%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>171</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.0164 (8 df, p-value = 0.534864) for variable personal income.

*Table 196: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	31	21.8%	47	33.1%	64	45.1%	142
2	19	26.8%	22	31.0%	30	42.3%	71
3	12	17.4%	31	44.9%	26	37.7%	69
4	21	26.6%	35	44.3%	23	29.1%	79
5	30	33.0%	33	36.3%	28	30.8%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>171</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.3495 (8 df, p-value = 0.10375) for variable household income.



*Table 197: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	18	16.4%	61	55.5%	31	28.2%	110
2	13	24.5%	32	60.4%	8	15.1%	53
3	20	23.3%	51	59.3%	15	17.4%	86
4	17	21.8%	49	62.8%	12	15.4%	78
5	24	19.2%	75	60.0%	26	20.8%	125
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>92</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.63821 (8 df, p-value = 0.469584) for variable personal income.

*Table 198: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	27	19.0%	82	57.7%	33	23.2%	142
2	16	22.5%	39	54.9%	16	22.5%	71
3	9	13.0%	46	66.7%	14	20.3%	69
4	16	20.3%	51	64.6%	12	15.2%	79
5	24	26.4%	50	54.9%	17	18.7%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>268</b>		<b>92</b>		<b>452</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.20786 (8 df, p-value = 0.514381) for variable household income.

Thus, it can be concluded that income level (personal or household) does not affect engagement in volunteering and giving activities overall, but higher-income households are generally more engaged.

Note: The dependence between the personal income and the household income is statistically significant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF INCOME (PERSONAL, HOUSEHOLD) ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN POLAND**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Poland is not dependent on the level of personal income, but a dependency is found for household income (higher involvement is associated with higher household income) – see Table 199 and Table 200. Abstracting from the actuality of engagement, the conclusions are the same – see Table 201 and Table 202.

Table 199: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	44	26.7%	121	73.3%	165
2	38	30.9%	85	69.1%	123
3	38	35.5%	69	64.5%	107
4	36	30.5%	82	69.5%	118
5	28	32.2%	59	67.8%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>		<b>416</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.52267 (4 df, p-value = 0.640581) for variable personal income.

Table 200: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	38	23.0%	127	77.0%	165
2	40	31.3%	88	68.8%	128
3	30	28.0%	77	72.0%	107
4	45	40.5%	66	59.5%	111
5	31	34.8%	58	65.2%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>		<b>416</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.7094 (4 df, p-value = 0.030031) for variable household income.

Table 201: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	57	34.5%	108	65.5%	165
2	44	35.8%	79	64.2%	123
3	40	37.4%	67	62.6%	107
4	41	34.7%	77	65.3%	118
5	34	39.1%	53	60.9%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>		<b>384</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 0.682016 (4 df, p-value = 0.953528) for variable personal income.

Table 202: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	46	27.9%	119	72.1%	165
2	49	38.3%	79	61.7%	128
3	33	30.8%	74	69.2%	107
4	50	45.0%	61	55.0%	111
5	38	42.7%	51	57.3%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>		<b>384</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 11.922 (4 df, p-value = 0.0179396) for variable household income.

The influence of personal and household income has no effect on engagement in informal volunteering, both in the short time period – see Table 203 and Table 204 – and regardless of timeliness – see Table 205 and Table 206 (the exception is the demonstrated relationship, but no correlation, between the level of household income and any engagement in informal volunteering).

*Table 203: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	66	40.0%	99	60.0%	165
2	54	43.9%	69	56.1%	123
3	44	41.1%	63	58.9%	107
4	47	39.8%	71	60.2%	118
5	31	35.6%	56	64.4%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>358</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.49768 (4 df, p-value = 0.827053) for variable personal income.

*Table 204: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	58	35.2%	107	64.8%	165
2	60	46.9%	68	53.1%	128
3	40	37.4%	67	62.6%	107
4	49	44.1%	62	55.9%	111
5	35	39.3%	54	60.7%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>358</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.21143 (4 df, p-value = 0.266284) for variable household income.

*Table 205: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	82	49.7%	83	50.3%	165
2	60	48.8%	63	51.2%	123
3	57	53.3%	50	46.7%	107
4	52	44.1%	66	55.9%	118
5	42	48.3%	45	51.7%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>293</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.97605 (4 df, p-value = 0.740164) for variable personal income.

*Table 206: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	61	37.0%	104	63.0%	165
2	71	55.5%	57	44.5%	128
3	53	49.5%	54	50.5%	107
4	61	55.0%	50	45.0%	111
5	47	52.8%	42	47.2%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>293</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.7985 (4 df, p-value = 0.00796675) for variable household income.

Rising incomes (personal and household) increase donation rates. This finding is statistically significant – see Table 207 and Table 208.

*Table 207: Donation Involvement in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	70	42.4%	95	57.6%	165
2	65	52.8%	58	47.2%	123
3	55	51.4%	52	48.6%	107
4	66	55.9%	52	44.1%	118
5	51	58.6%	36	41.4%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>		<b>293</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 8.19538 (4 df, p-value = 0.0846776) for variable personal income.

*Table 208: Donation Involvement in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	63	38.2%	102	61.8%	165
2	62	48.4%	66	51.6%	128
3	58	54.2%	49	45.8%	107
4	72	64.9%	39	35.1%	111
5	52	58.4%	37	41.6%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>		<b>293</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 22.1245 (4 df, p-value = 0.000189304) for variable household income.

The dependence between the level of income and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation, or any volunteering activity is only demonstrated in relation to household income; this is not the case for personal income. The correlation cannot be fully traced, but the lowest engagement is amongst those individuals and households with the lowest incomes – see Table 209 and Table 210. For any volunteering activity, the findings are similar – see Table 211 and Table 212.

*Table 209: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	34	20.6%	59	35.8%	72	43.6%	165
2	32	26.0%	45	36.6%	46	37.4%	123
3	26	24.3%	43	40.2%	38	35.5%	107
4	30	25.4%	47	39.8%	41	34.7%	118
5	27	31.0%	31	35.6%	29	33.3%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>		<b>225</b>		<b>226</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.64763 (8 df, p-value = 0.686635) for variable personal income.

*Table 210: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	30	18.2%	49	29.7%	86	52.1%	165
2	29	22.7%	53	41.4%	46	35.9%	128
3	22	20.6%	47	43.9%	38	35.5%	107
4	40	36.0%	42	37.8%	29	26.1%	111
5	28	31.5%	34	38.2%	27	30.3%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>		<b>225</b>		<b>226</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 30.127 (8 df, p-value = 0.000200) for variable household income.

*Table 211: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	33	20.0%	74	44.8%	58	35.2%	165
2	28	22.8%	58	47.2%	37	30.1%	123
3	20	18.7%	56	52.3%	31	29.0%	107
4	21	17.8%	62	52.5%	35	29.7%	118
5	25	28.7%	41	47.1%	21	24.1%	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>		<b>291</b>		<b>182</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 7.25681 (8 df, p-value = 0.509195) for variable personal income.

*Table 212: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	29	17.6%	61	37.0%	75	45.5%	165
2	25	19.5%	68	53.1%	35	27.3%	128
3	19	17.8%	58	54.2%	30	28.0%	107
4	30	27.0%	61	55.0%	20	18.0%	111
5	24	27.0%	43	48.3%	22	24.7%	89
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>		<b>291</b>		<b>182</b>		<b>600</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 31.2054 (8 df, p-value = 0.000129155) for variable household income.

Thus, it can be concluded that the level of income (personal or household) does not affect engagement in volunteering activities, but it does have an effect for donation activities in relation to family income.

Note: The dependence between the personal income and the household income is statistically significant.

**THE INFLUENCE OF INCOME (PERSONAL, HOUSEHOLD) ON INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEERING AND DONOR ACTIVITIES IN CZECHIA**

The level of involvement in formal volunteering for the past 24 months in Czechia is not dependent on the level of personal or household income – see Table 213 and Table 214. Absent the timeliness of involvement, the findings are the same – see Table 215 and Table 216.

Table 213: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	49	34.8%	92	65.2%	141
2	44	38.6%	70	61.4%	114
3	46	39.7%	70	60.3%	116
4	35	44.3%	44	55.7%	79
5	35	30.2%	81	69.8%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>209</b>		<b>357</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.9117 (4 df, p-value = 0.296478) for variable personal income.

Table 214: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	61	35.7%	110	64.3%	171
2	41	36.6%	71	63.4%	112
3	54	45.0%	66	55.0%	120
4	28	34.1%	54	65.9%	82
5	24	31.2%	53	68.8%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>208</b>		<b>354</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.84048 (4 df, p-value = 0.30406) for variable household income.

Table 215: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	62	44.0%	79	56.0%	141
2	64	56.1%	50	43.9%	114
3	57	49.1%	59	50.9%	116
4	46	58.2%	33	41.8%	79
5	47	40.5%	69	59.5%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>		<b>290</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.77477 (4 df, p-value = 0.0443974) for variable personal income.

Table 216: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)

Formal Vol.	Yes		No		Total
1	83	48.5%	88	51.5%	171
2	56	50.0%	56	50.0%	112
3	65	54.2%	55	45.8%	120
4	38	46.3%	44	53.7%	82
5	31	40.3%	46	59.7%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>273</b>		<b>289</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.88827 (4 df, p-value = 0.421338) for variable household income.

The effect of personal and household income does not affect engagement in informal volunteering, both in the short time period – see Table 217 and Table 218 – and regardless of timeliness – see Table 219 and Table 220.

*Table 217: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	82	58.2%	59	41.8%	141
2	73	64.0%	41	36.0%	114
3	69	59.5%	47	40.5%	116
4	46	58.2%	33	41.8%	79
5	66	56.9%	50	43.1%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>336</b>		<b>230</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.452128 (4 df, p-value = 0.835087) for variable personal income.

*Table 218: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	104	60.8%	67	39.2%	171
2	67	59.8%	45	40.2%	112
3	76	63.3%	44	36.7%	120
4	45	54.9%	37	45.1%	82
5	41	53.2%	36	46.8%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>		<b>229</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 2.81668 (4 df, p-value = 0.588957) for variable household income.

*Table 219: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	87	61.7%	54	38.3%	141
2	85	74.6%	29	25.4%	114
3	85	73.3%	31	26.7%	116
4	57	72.2%	22	27.8%	79
5	77	66.4%	39	33.6%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>		<b>175</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 6.89827 (4 df, p-value = 0.141363) for variable personal income.

*Table 220: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Informal Vol.</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	116	67.8%	55	32.2%	171
2	81	72.3%	31	27.7%	112
3	87	72.5%	33	27.5%	120
4	51	62.2%	31	37.8%	82
5	52	67.5%	25	32.5%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>387</b>		<b>175</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 3.2129 (4 df, p-value = 0.552849) for variable household income.

There was no correlation between donation and the level of income of the individual or household, although differences between donation activities of different income groups were found – see Table 221 and Table 222.

*Table 221: Donation Involvement in the Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	88	62.4%	53	37.6%	141
2	73	64.0%	41	36.0%	114
3	72	62.1%	44	37.9%	116
4	55	69.6%	24	30.4%	79
5	78	67.2%	38	32.8%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>366</b>		<b>200</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 1.86127(4 df, p-value = 0.761256) for variable personal income.

*Table 222: Donation Involvement in the Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Donation	Yes		No		Total
1	104	60.8%	67	39.2%	171
2	78	69.6%	34	30.4%	112
3	87	72.5%	33	27.5%	120
4	43	52.4%	39	47.6%	82
5	51	66.2%	26	33.8%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>363</b>		<b>199</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 10.871 (4 df, p-value = 0.0267782) for variable household income.

The relationship between income level and involvement in formal volunteering and/or donation or any volunteering activity is only demonstrated in relation to household income; this is not the case for personal income. The correlation cannot be fully traced – see Table 223 and Table 224. In the case of any volunteering activity, the findings are similar – see Table 225 and Table 226.

*Table 223: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	46	32.6%	58	41.1%	37	26.2%	141
2	44	38.6%	49	43.0%	21	18.4%	114
3	44	37.9%	41	35.3%	31	26.7%	116
4	37	46.8%	27	34.2%	15	19.0%	79
5	36	31.0%	53	45.7%	27	23.3%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>		<b>228</b>		<b>131</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 9.45804 (8 df, p-value = 0.30514) for variable personal income.

*Table 224: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Involvement	ForV. & Don.		ForV. or Don.		No		Total
1	63	36.8%	61	35.7%	47	27.5%	171
2	42	37.5%	50	44.6%	20	17.9%	112
3	54	45.0%	44	36.7%	22	18.3%	120
4	26	31.7%	29	35.4%	27	32.9%	82
5	21	27.3%	40	51.9%	16	20.8%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>206</b>		<b>224</b>		<b>132</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 17.0243 (8 df, p-value = 0.029857) for variable household income.



*Table 225: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	36	25.5%	81	57.4%	24	17.0%	141
2	34	29.8%	71	62.3%	9	7.9%	114
3	38	32.8%	65	56.0%	13	11.2%	116
4	32	40.5%	39	49.4%	8	10.1%	79
5	29	25.0%	74	63.8%	13	11.2%	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>		<b>330</b>		<b>67</b>		<b>566*</b>

\* 14 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.2098 (8 df, p-value = 0.142086) for variable personal income. We do not reject the null hypothesis of independence ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

*Table 226: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>Involvement</b>	<b>ForV. &amp; InfV. &amp; Don.</b>		<b>ForV. or InfV. or Don.</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Total</b>
1	55	32.2%	91	53.2%	25	14.6%	171
2	30	26.8%	72	64.3%	10	8.9%	112
3	44	36.7%	67	55.8%	9	7.5%	120
4	19	23.2%	47	57.3%	16	19.5%	82
5	20	26.0%	49	63.6%	8	10.4%	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>168</b>		<b>326</b>		<b>68</b>		<b>562*</b>

\* 18 missing values. Pearson's chi-squared test = 13.9331 (8 df, p-value = 0.083526) for variable household income.

It can therefore be concluded that the amount of income (personal or household) does not influence involvement in volunteer activities, but it has an influence on donor activities in relation to household income.

Note: The dependence between the personal income and the household income is statistically significant.

## FORMAL VOLUNTEERING

## FORMAL VOLUNTEERING IN GENERAL

The highest levels of involvement in formal volunteering (past 24 months) were in sports clubs (23.8%) and social, charitable and non-profit organizations (22.6%), followed by environmental organizations (16.9%), community and neighborhood associations (16.3%) and leisure activities (15.2%) – see Table 227.

The differences across the V4 countries are not significant, with the exception of Slovakia and Hungary, where involvement in leisure activities is replaced by volunteering in religious communities/churches, with 25% in Slovakia and 21.9% in Hungary.

Table 227: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Types of Activities

Type of organizations	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Sports club, association	31	24.2%	28	20.7%	36	19.6%	63	29.0%	158	23.8%
Play/hobby/leisure club	15	11.7%	15	11.1%	32	17.4%	39	18.0%	101	15.2%
Youth organization	9	7.0%	9	6.6%	12	6.5%	22	10.1%	50	7.5%
Cultural club	14	10.9%	14	11.3%	25	13.6%	24	11.1%	88	13.3%
Religious community, church...	32	25.0%	32	21.9%	22	12.0%	15	6.9%	90	13.6%
Social, charitable and NPO	29	22.7%	29	21.5%	42	22.8%	50	23.0%	150	22.6%
Human rights organization	4	3.1%	4	3.0%	12	6.5%	4	1.8%	25	3.8%
Environmental, animal protect.	21	16.4%	21	16.2%	33	17.9%	32	14.7%	112	16.9%
Community, neighborhood assoc.	23	18.0%	23	16.7%	32	17.4%	33	15.2%	108	16.3%
Public service	9	7.0%	9	6.5%	11	6.0%	17	7.8%	42	6.3%
Political or public body	1	0.8%	1	0.7%	4	2.2%	17	7.8%	23	3.5%
Parent council/represent.	10	7.8%	10	7.6%	20	10.9%	11	5.1%	55	8.3%
Political party	2	1.6%	2	1.5%	5	2.7%	7	3.2%	19	2.9%
Interest group	12	9.4%	12	8.6%	1	0.5%	18	8.3%	38	5.7%
Self-help group	5	3.9%	5	3.8%	14	7.6%	8	3.7%	35	5.3%
Crowdfunding (no business)	6	4.7%	6	4.5%	8	4.3%	15	6.9%	36	5.4%
<b>Total (formal volunteering)</b>	<b>128</b>		<b>135</b>		<b>184</b>		<b>217</b>		<b>664</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

The vast majority of respondents are involved in one type of organization (63.4%), about a fifth (20.5%) in two, with only exceptions being involved in more than one. The differences across the V4 countries in the number of types of organizations they are involved in are not significant – see Table 228.

Table 228: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Number of Organization Types

Number of organizations	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
1	78	60.9%	90	66.7%	120	65.2%	133	61.3%	421	63.4%
2	30	23.4%	21	15.6%	37	20.1%	48	22.1%	136	20.5%
3	12	9.4%	12	8.9%	11	6.0%	21	9.7%	56	8.4%
4 and more	8	6.3%	12	8.9%	16	8.7%	15	6.9%	51	7.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>		<b>135</b>		<b>184</b>		<b>217</b>		<b>664</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 5.93233 (9 df, p-value = 0.746671).

The majority of respondents are involved on a temporary basis (72.5%). This does not differ significantly by the type of organization involved, with higher levels of temporary involvement reported by organizations such as play clubs, hobby clubs or leisure activities (84.2%) – see Table 229. In contrast, respondents in political or public authorities (60.9%) report the highest levels of longer-term involvement, the second in organizations associated with parent activities (43.6%) and human rights organizations (40.0%).

Table 229: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Time Perspective

Type of organizations	Time-limited		Time-unlimited		Total	
Sports club, association	111	70.3%	47	29.7%	158	23.8%
Play/hobby/leisure club	85	84.2%	16	15.8%	101	15.2%
Youth organization	35	70.0%	15	30.0%	50	7.5%
Cultural club	67	76.1%	21	23.9%	88	13.3%
Religious community, church...	70	77.8%	20	22.2%	90	13.6%
Social, charitable and NPO	108	72.0%	42	28.0%	150	22.6%
Human rights organization	15	60.0%	10	40.0%	25	3.8%
Environmental, animal protect.	86	76.8%	26	23.2%	112	16.9%
Community, neighborhood assoc.	80	74.1%	28	25.9%	108	16.3%
Public service	26	61.9%	16	38.1%	42	6.3%
Political or public body	9	39.1%	14	60.9%	23	3.5%
Parent council/represent.	31	56.4%	24	43.6%	55	8.3%
Political party	13	68.4%	6	31.6%	19	2.9%
Interest group	28	73.7%	10	26.3%	38	5.7%
Self-help group	28	80.0%	7	20.0%	35	5.3%
Crowdfunding (no business)	27	75.0%	9	25.0%	36	5.4%

The majority of respondents have carried out their volunteering activities for the past 24 months in their place of residence (61.3%) and/or in their immediate neighborhood/district (26.4%) - see Table 230. The differences between the V4 countries are not significant, with countries with more fragmented municipalities (e.g. Czechia) having a slightly higher proportion of involvement in the neighborhood. The results also show that people in Czechia engage in more places (average 2.1) than in the other V4 countries (V4 average 1.9).

Table 230: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Place of Volunteer Activity

Place of volunteer activity	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
In your neighborhood/district	34	21.8%	27	14.2%	59	27.3%	104	36.4%	224	26.4%
At your place of residence	97	62.2%	108	56.8%	127	58.8%	188	65.7%	520	61.3%
At another place (work, weekend)	17	10.9%	29	15.3%	21	9.7%	40	14.0%	107	12.6%
In the region	32	20.5%	46	24.2%	44	20.4%	48	16.8%	170	20.0%
In your country	18	11.5%	24	12.6%	35	16.2%	32	11.2%	109	12.9%
Abroad	8	5.1%	3	1.6%	2	0.9%	8	2.8%	21	2.5%
On the Internet, virtually	14	9.0%	17	8.9%	24	11.1%	28	9.8%	83	9.8%
<b>Number in formal volunteering</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>190</b>		<b>216</b>		<b>286</b>		<b>848</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	
Number of places (on average)	1.7		1.9		1.7		2.1		1.9	

The majority of activities in formal volunteering are focused on children (41.2%), in all V4 countries, although the Czechs (49.7%) and Slovaks (42.9%) are more involved, while the Hungarians (30.5%) are the least involved – see Table 231. This is followed by care for the elderly (24.6%), with the Czechs being the least involved (19.2%), which is due to a relatively advanced social care system. The most active are the Slovaks (30.1%) and the Poles (28.7%). In third place is family care (24.1%), with the Poles being more active than the V4 average (31.0%). The next places of volunteer activities are occupied by people in general without more specifics (21.9%), nature and animal protection (21.6%) and care for the disabled or people in need of care (20.2%). The results also show that people in Czechia are on average involved in more groups (3.1) than in the other V4 countries (the V4 average is 2.9).

Table 231: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries – Target Groups

Place of volunteer activity	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Children and young people	67	42.9%	58	30.5%	82	38.0%	142	49.7%	349	41.2%
Families	30	19.2%	38	20.0%	67	31.0%	69	24.1%	204	24.1%
Disabled people, in need of care	26	16.7%	27	14.2%	60	27.8%	58	20.3%	171	20.2%
Older people	47	30.1%	45	23.7%	62	28.7%	55	19.2%	209	24.6%
People with a migrant background	6	3.8%	6	3.2%	23	10.6%	16	5.6%	51	6.0%
Refugees	5	3.2%	4	2.1%	29	13.4%	23	8.0%	61	7.2%
Asylum seekers	3	1.9%	4	2.1%	6	2.8%	6	2.1%	19	2.2%
Fin. or soc. disadvantaged	20	12.8%	37	19.5%	29	13.4%	28	9.8%	114	13.4%
Women	21	13.5%	20	10.5%	38	17.6%	41	14.3%	120	14.2%
Men	21	13.5%	12	6.3%	28	13.0%	42	14.7%	103	12.1%
Population in general	38	24.4%	47	24.7%	31	14.4%	70	24.5%	186	21.9%
Environment, animals	32	20.5%	42	22.1%	48	22.2%	61	21.3%	183	21.6%
Ppl/anim. affect by nat. dis.	8	5.1%	5	2.6%	24	11.1%	21	7.3%	58	6.8%
Other groups of people	10	6.4%	17	8.9%	15	6.9%	33	11.5%	75	8.8%
<b>Total (formal volunteering)</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>190</b>		<b>216</b>		<b>286</b>		<b>848</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	
Number of groups (on average)	2.6		2.7		2.9		3.1		2.9	

The most frequently mentioned impulse to volunteer comes from the volunteer's own feeling to get involved (32.5%) – see Table 232. In this case, significant differences can be observed between the V4 countries, with almost half of the volunteers in Czechia (48.3%) mentioning this impulse, Slovakia (35.9%) being slightly above the V4 average, and Hungary (26.8%) and Poland (14.4%) being the least likely. The second most mentioned impulse is friends and acquaintances (32.0%), with a higher proportion in Hungary (36.3%) and Poland (36.1%). A request from a (leading) person from an association or volunteer organization (18.6%), based on personal experience (18.4%) or as a suggestion from family members (16.2%) plays a significant role. In all countries (except Czechia 0.7%), local government plays a significant role – Poland (16.2%), Slovakia (15.4%), Hungary (11.6%).

Table 232: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Initiative to Volunteering

Initiative to volunteering	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
from vol organization	20	12.8%	34	17.9%	52	24.1%	52	18.2%	158	18.6%
from friends	45	28.8%	69	36.3%	78	36.1%	79	27.6%	271	32.0%
from members of your family	21	13.5%	35	18.4%	43	19.9%	38	13.3%	137	16.2%
own children are/were active	10	6.4%	17	8.9%	15	6.9%	27	9.4%	69	8.1%
from my employer	8	5.1%	15	7.9%	11	5.1%	21	7.3%	55	6.5%
from the municipality	24	15.4%	22	11.6%	35	16.2%	2	0.7%	83	9.8%
from contact point	7	4.5%	12	6.3%	17	7.9%	9	3.1%	45	5.3%
from the press, radio or TV	9	5.8%	6	3.2%	12	5.6%	13	4.5%	40	4.7%
from social networks/intern.	13	8.3%	23	12.1%	29	13.4%	27	9.4%	92	10.8%
from a sp. platform for vol.	3	1.9%	8	4.2%	10	4.6%	6	2.1%	27	3.2%
from own experiences	36	23.1%	25	13.2%	28	13.0%	67	23.4%	156	18.4%
feeling to get involved	56	35.9%	51	26.8%	31	14.4%	138	48.3%	276	32.5%
I have more time ...	18	11.5%	18	9.5%	8	3.7%	28	9.8%	72	8.5%
no special impulse	23	14.7%	11	5.8%	20	9.3%	46	16.1%	100	11.8%
<b>Other</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>5.2%</b>
<b>Total (formal volunteering)</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>190</b>		<b>216</b>		<b>286</b>		<b>848</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

The main motivator for formal volunteering is the desire to help other people (60.4%) – see Table 233, and this is valid for all V4 countries. The second most important motivation is that volunteers enjoy the activity (40.7%). In Hungary, this is the case for 29.5% of volunteers, in Poland for 30.1%, in Slovakia for 35.9%, but in Czechia, it is

even 58.7%. The third main motivator is the possibility to change things with other people (35.7%), in Czechia and Poland this motivator is stronger (around 42%). Furthermore, the fact that they can meet other people during the volunteering activity is also important (32.2%); however, again in Czechia a higher number of volunteers report this (43.0%), the lowest in Hungary 23.2%. Other significant motivators include the opportunity to give something back to others (29.4%), with the most significant in Poland (41.7%), and to change things they do not like (28.9%), with the most in Czechia (36.7%).

From a V4 country perspective, it is clear that motivations for volunteering differ. In Slovakia, it is mostly about the opportunity to help others (57.7%), other motivators are at a considerable distance: enjoying the activity (35.9%), meeting other people (30.8%), making a difference together with others (26.3%). In Hungary, it is very similar; with the added feeling of giving something back (24.2%). For Poles, this feeling is even the strongest (43.1%). In addition to the above, Czechs see volunteering as an opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills (39.9%) and to develop themselves (27.6%).

On average, each respondent selected 4.8 motivators, with Czechs indicating the most – 6.3, Slovaks the least – 3.9, Hungarians and Poles on average 4.2 motivators.

Table 233: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Motivation


Motivation	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
I can help other people	90	57.7%	116	61.1%	135	62.5%	171	59.8%	512	60.4%
I meet other people in the process	48	30.8%	44	23.2%	58	26.9%	123	43.0%	273	32.2%
I can maintain my personal network	17	10.9%	19	10.0%	23	10.6%	41	14.3%	100	11.8%
I can change something with others	41	26.3%	51	26.8%	90	41.7%	121	42.3%	303	35.7%
I can change things I don't like	34	21.8%	46	24.2%	60	27.8%	105	36.7%	245	28.9%
I want to give stg. back to others	25	16.0%	46	24.2%	93	43.1%	85	29.7%	249	29.4%
Others expect this from me	12	7.7%	9	4.7%	18	8.3%	31	10.8%	70	8.3%
I have been urged/obliged to do it	17	10.9%	11	5.8%	11	5.1%	33	11.5%	72	8.5%
I receive recognition for it	3	1.9%	15	7.9%	20	9.3%	27	9.4%	65	7.7%
It is also useful for my prof. career	17	10.9%	7	3.7%	12	5.6%	45	15.7%	81	9.6%
I am also fin. compensated for it	7	4.5%	4	2.1%	5	2.3%	13	4.5%	29	3.4%
Religious, spiritual conviction	25	16.0%	16	8.4%	19	8.8%	19	6.6%	79	9.3%
I enjoy the activity	56	35.9%	56	29.5%	65	30.1%	168	58.7%	345	40.7%
I have a change from my normal life	22	14.1%	22	11.6%	23	10.6%	51	17.8%	118	13.9%
I can take my problems into my hands	4	2.6%	8	4.2%	19	8.8%	23	8.0%	54	6.4%
I can develop myself personally	21	13.5%	30	15.8%	37	17.1%	79	27.6%	167	19.7%
I can pursue my own interests	15	9.6%	22	11.6%	33	15.3%	47	16.4%	117	13.8%
Expand my knowledge and experience	27	17.3%	32	16.8%	26	12.0%	114	39.9%	199	23.5%
It gives me my own opportunities for responsibility and decision-making	11	7.1%	11	5.8%	18	8.3%	68	23.8%	108	12.7%
None of the above applies	5	3.2%	6	3.2%	6	2.8%	1	0.3%	18	2.1%
<b>Total (formal volunteering)</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>190</b>		<b>216</b>		<b>286</b>		<b>848</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	
Number of motivators	3.9		4.2		4.2		6.3		4.8	

The majority of those involved rate their formal volunteering activity positively on a scale of 0 to 10 (mean 7.53, n=845). It is perceived most positively in Poland and Czechia, and least positively in Hungary – see Table 234 a Figure 2.

Table 234: Perception of experience with formal volunteer activity in V4 countries

Evaluation	SK	HU	PL	CZ	Total
0	3	3	1		7
1		1	1	4	6
2	1	1	4		6
3	1	9	3	2	15
4	8	8	2	8	26
5	16	37	18	27	98
6	14	24	16	17	71
7	24	25	34	42	125
8	28	32	49	76	185
9	24	28	36	48	136
10	37	22	52	59	170
<b>N</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>845</b>
Average	7.56	6.81	7.81	7.79	7.53

Figure 2: Perception of Experience with Formal Volunteer Activity by Individual Country.



Comment: COUNTRY (1-Slovakia, 2-Hungary, 3-Poland, 4-Czechia)

The most frequent reasons for stopping volunteering are health reasons (21.7%, even 40.6% in Poland), followed by work and time reasons (mostly in Czechia), or that the volunteering activity was terminated or no longer relevant – see Table 235.

Table 235: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Reasons for Quitting

Reasons for quitting	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
occupational reasons	2	7.1%	5	9.1%	5	15.6%	14	20.3%	26	14.1%
family reasons	4	14.3%	6	10.9%	7	21.9%	9	13.0%	26	14.1%
health reasons	6	21.4%	10	18.2%	13	40.6%	11	15.9%	40	21.7%
age reasons	3	10.7%	10	18.2%	1	3.1%	11	15.9%	25	13.6%
move to another place	0	0.0%	8	14.5%	1	3.1%	3	4.3%	12	6.5%
school/further education	5	17.9%	2	3.6%	1	3.1%	2	2.9%	10	5.4%
activity was limited	2	7.1%	3	5.5%	1	3.1%	17	24.6%	23	12.5%
no more interest	2	7.1%	2	3.6%	1	3.1%	1	1.4%	6	3.3%
time commitment was too great	0	0.0%	3	5.5%	3	9.4%	19	27.5%	25	13.6%
too much responsibility	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	2	6.3%	1	1.4%	4	2.2%
too much bureaucracy	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	5	7.2%	6	3.3%
too little recognition	1	3.6%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	3	1.6%
financial effort was too great	3	10.7%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	7	3.8%
difficulties with my job	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
difficulties in the group	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	2	1.1%
organization was dissolved	0	0.0%	3	5.5%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	5	2.7%
topic no longer relevant	7	25.0%	4	7.3%	3	9.4%	11	15.9%	25	13.6%
too little support/support	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
other reasons	7	25.0%	14	25.5%	6	18.8%	9	13.0%	36	19.6%
<b>Total (previously involved)</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>55</b>		<b>32</b>		<b>69</b>		<b>184</b>	



## FORMAL VOLUNTEERING IN CRISES EVENTS

Involvement rates in formal volunteering activities related to emergencies (crisis) were lower than for other activities, with 41.7% of respondents involved in formal volunteering activities, while only 6.2% were involved in crisis situations (see Table 236). Higher involvement rates for Czechia and Poland, both relative to the number of respondents and to the number of people involved in formal volunteering activities.

Table 236: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events

	SK	HU	PL	CZ	Total
In formal volunteering in crises	13	16	49	49	127
relative to the total number involved in formal volunteering	8.3%	8.4%	22.7%	17.1%	15.0%
relative to the total number of respondents	3.2%	3.5%	8.2%	8.5%	6.2%
In formal volunteering	156	190	216	286	848
relative to the total number of respondents	38.8%	42.0%	36.0%	49.3%	41.7%
Total number of respondents	402	452	600	580	2034

Some volunteers were simultaneously engaged with different target groups, as shown in Table 238, for each country Table 239, Table 240, Table 241, Table 242.

Table 237: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries – Target Groups in Crises Events

Target groups	SK	HU	PL	CZ	Total	Relative
People with a migrant background	6	6	23	16	51	6.0%
Refugees	5	4	29	23	61	7.2%
Asylum seekers	3	4	6	6	19	2.2%
People/animals affected by natural diseases	8	5	24	21	58	6.0%

Table 238: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity)

Target groups	Refugees	Asylum seekers	People/animals affected by natural diseases
People with a migrant background	29	12	14
Refugees		13	16
Asylum seekers			9

Table 239: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity)

Target groups	Refugees	Asylum seekers	People/animals affected by natural diseases
People with a migrant background	3	3	3
Refugees		3	3
Asylum seekers			6

Table 240: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity)

Target groups	Refugees	Asylum seekers	People/animals affected by natural diseases
People with a migrant background	1	1	0
Refugees		1	0
Asylum seekers			0

*Table 241: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity)*

Target groups	Refugees	Asylum seekers	People/animals affected by natural diseases
People with a migrant background	16	4	9
Refugees		5	10
Asylum seekers			3

*Table 242: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity)*

Target groups	Refugees	Asylum seekers	People/animals affected by natural diseases
People with a migrant background	9	4	2
Refugees		4	3
Asylum seekers			0

Increasing education increases the level of involvement in emergencies – see Table 244. Only 7.3% of those with primary education (PS) engaged in formal volunteering in non-emergency events, compared to 12.4% of those with secondary education (SS), 14.3% of those with secondary education with the matriculation exam (SS+) and 19.2% of those with university education (19.2%).

*Table 243: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries –in Crises Events – Influence of Education*

Education	PS	SS	SS+	UNI	Total
In formal volunteering in crises	3	23	54	47	127
relative to the total number involved in formal volunteering	7.3%	12.4%	14.3%	19.2%	15.0%
relative to the total number of respondents	2.6%	4.1%	5.9%	10.6%	6.2%
In formal volunteering	41	185	377	245	848
relative to the total number of respondents	36.0%	33.0%	41.3%	55.2%	41.7%
Total number of respondents	114	561	913	444	2032

Gender has no effect in emergency involvement in formal volunteering – see Table 244.

*Table 244: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries –in Crises Events – Influence of Gender*

Gender	Male	Female	Total
In formal volunteering in crises	65	62	127
relative to the total number involved in formal volunteering	15.8%	14.2%	15.0%
relative to the total number of respondents	6.5%	6.0%	6.2%
In formal volunteering	412	436	848
relative to the total number of respondents	41.2%	42.2%	41.7%
Total number of respondents	1001	1033	2034

Table 245 shows that in the case of involvement in activities related to emergencies, the dominant involvement is due to the war in Ukraine (10% of all people involved in formal volunteering). However, there are differences between countries, with Poland and Czechia showing the highest levels of involvement for this reason. The second most frequent event was problems related to the COVID-19 pandemic and local events, in Czechia, this was the fire in Hřensko or the tornado in Moravia (in other countries this is a minority).

*Table 245: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Crises Events*

Initiative to volunteering	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
War in Syria	2	1%	0	0%	3	1%	2	1%	7	1%
War in Ukraine	6	4%	5	3%	43	20%	32	11%	86	10%
War in Sudan	3	2%	2	1%	4	2%	2	1%	11	1%
Riots in Bangladesh	3	2%	2	1%	2	1%	1	0%	8	1%
Riots in Iran	3	2%	1	1%	3	1%	1	0%	8	1%
Floods in Pakistan	3	2%	2	1%	5	2%	4	1%	14	2%
Earthquake in Turkey	3	2%	4	2%	10	5%	7	2%	24	3%
Covid-19	4	3%	12	6%	19	9%	10	3%	45	5%
Floods in Slovenia	3	2%	0	0%	6	3%	9	3%	18	2%
Local in country	4	3%	1	1%	4	2%	24	8%	33	4%
Local in country	5	3%	3	2%	2	1%	12	4%	22	3%
<b>Total (formal volunteering)</b>	<b>156</b>		<b>190</b>		<b>216</b>		<b>286</b>		<b>848</b>	

Table 246 shows that there are also differences in terms of education. The higher level of involvement among the more educated population was also reflected in formal volunteering activities. Of all university-educated (UNI) involved, 12% were involved in UA war-related activities, with the highest involvement rates among those with a high school diploma (SS+).

*Table 246: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Crises Events – Influence of Education*

Initiative to volunteering	PS		SS		SS+		UNI		Total	
War in Syria	0	0%	1	1%	3	1%	3	1%	7	1%
War in Ukraine	1	1%	13	7%	38	18%	34	12%	86	10%
War in Sudan	0	0%	2	1%	5	2%	4	1%	11	1%
Riots in Bangladesh	0	0%	1	1%	5	2%	2	1%	8	1%
Riots in Iran	0	0%	0	0%	6	3%	2	1%	8	1%
Floods in Pakistan	0	0%	3	2%	9	4%	2	1%	14	2%
Earthquake in Turkey	0	0%	5	3%	15	7%	4	1%	24	3%
Covid-19	1	1%	6	3%	28	13%	10	3%	45	5%
Floods in Slovenia	0	0%	1	1%	12	6%	5	2%	18	2%
Local in country	1	1%	5	3%	15	7%	12	4%	33	4%
Local in country	1	1%	1	1%	8	4%	12	4%	22	3%
<b>Total (formal volunteering)</b>	<b>41</b>		<b>185</b>		<b>377</b>		<b>245</b>		<b>848</b>	

The most significant motivators associated with formal volunteering activities due to political events, i.e. the wars in Syria, Ukraine, Sudan and the unrest in Iran and Bangladesh, include the need to help other people, and the desire to make a difference – see Table 247.

*Table 247: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – motivation for activities associated with political events*

<b>Motivation</b>	<b>SK</b>		<b>HU</b>		<b>PL</b>		<b>CZ</b>		<b>Total</b>	
I can help other people	5	55.6%	5	62.5%	23	51.1%	19	55.9%	52	54.2%
I meet other people in the process	2	22.2%	1	12.5%	16	35.6%	8	23.5%	27	28.1%
I can maintain my personal network	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	8	17.8%	4	11.8%	15	15.6%
I can change stg. with others	4	44.4%	4	50.0%	23	51.1%	15	44.1%	46	47.9%
I can change things I don't like	4	44.4%	5	62.5%	21	46.7%	15	44.1%	45	46.9%
I want to give stg. back to others	2	22.2%	1	12.5%	17	37.8%	8	23.5%	28	29.2%
the others expect this from me	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	4	8.9%	2	5.9%	9	9.4%
I have been urged/obliged to do it	3	33.3%	1	12.5%	3	6.7%	2	5.9%	9	9.4%
I receive recognition for it	2	22.2%	1	12.5%	6	13.3%	2	5.9%	11	11.5%
It is also useful for my prof. career	4	44.4%	1	12.5%	3	6.7%	5	14.7%	13	13.5%
I am also fin. compensated for it	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	4	8.9%	1	2.9%	7	7.3%
Religious, spiritual conviction	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	8	17.8%	3	8.8%	14	14.6%
I enjoy the activity	3	33.3%	2	25.0%	12	26.7%	10	29.4%	27	28.1%
I have a change from my normal life	2	22.2%	1	12.5%	5	11.1%	3	8.8%	11	11.5%
I can take my problems into my hands	2	22.2%	2	25.0%	13	28.9%	1	2.9%	18	18.8%
I can develop myself personally	3	33.3%	1	12.5%	9	20.0%	6	17.6%	19	19.8%
I can pursue my own interests	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	8	17.8%	3	8.8%	13	13.5%
Expand my knowledge and experience	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	9	20.0%	7	20.6%	19	19.8%
It gives me my own opportunities for responsibility and decision-making	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	7	15.6%	6	17.6%	15	15.6%
None of the above applies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	4.4%	0	0.0%	2	2.1%
<b>Total (FV due to political events)</b>	<b>9</b>		<b>8</b>		<b>45</b>		<b>34</b>		<b>96</b>	

The most important motivators associated with formal volunteering activities due to natural disasters (both inside and outside their own country, i.e. usually floods and fires), include the need to help other people (64.7%) – see Table 248.

*Table 248: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – motivation for activities associated with natural diseases*

<b>Motivation</b>	<b>SK</b>		<b>HU</b>		<b>PL</b>		<b>CZ</b>		<b>Total</b>	
I can help other people	4	44.4%	10	66.7%	20	76.9%	21	60.0%	55	64.7%
I meet other people in the process	2	22.2%	1	6.7%	7	26.9%	9	25.7%	19	22.4%
I can maintain my personal network	3	33.3%	1	6.7%	4	15.4%	2	5.7%	10	11.8%
I can change stg. with others	3	33.3%	4	26.7%	13	50.0%	10	28.6%	30	35.3%
I can change things I don't like	1	11.1%	3	20.0%	10	38.5%	12	34.3%	26	30.6%
I want to give stg. back to others	1	11.1%	3	20.0%	14	53.8%	10	28.6%	28	32.9%
the others expects this from me	2	22.2%	1	6.7%	4	15.4%	1	2.9%	8	9.4%
I have been urged/obliged to do it	1	11.1%	1	6.7%	1	3.8%	2	5.7%	5	5.9%
I receive recognition for it	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	4	15.4%	4	11.4%	10	11.8%
It is also useful for my prof. career	3	33.3%	1	6.7%	1	3.8%	2	5.7%	7	8.2%
I am also fin. compensated for it	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	3	3.5%
Religious, spiritual conviction	3	33.3%	2	13.3%	4	15.4%	3	8.6%	12	14.1%
I enjoy the activity	2	22.2%	4	26.7%	5	19.2%	9	25.7%	20	23.5%
I have a change from my normal life	2	22.2%	2	13.3%	4	15.4%	1	2.9%	9	10.6%
I can take my problems into my hands	1	11.1%	1	6.7%	6	23.1%	4	11.4%	12	14.1%
I can develop myself personally	1	11.1%	5	33.3%	5	19.2%	5	14.3%	16	18.8%
I can pursue my own interests	1	11.1%	3	20.0%	4	15.4%	1	2.9%	9	10.6%
Expand my knowledge and experience	2	22.2%	3	20.0%	6	23.1%	8	22.9%	19	22.4%
It gives me my own opportunities for responsibility and decision-making	2	22.2%	2	13.3%	8	30.8%	4	11.4%	16	18.8%
None of the above applies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	1	1.2%
<b>Total (FV due to natural diseases)</b>	<b>9</b>		<b>15</b>		<b>26</b>		<b>35</b>		<b>85</b>	

The majority of those who have been involved even in crises rate their formal volunteering activity positively on a scale of 0 to 10 (mean 7.79, n=127). There is a significant difference in satisfaction in Slovakia, with those who have been involved even in crises events perceiving their rating significantly better than others – see Table 234 and Table 249.

*Table 249: Perception of experience with formal volunteer activity in V4 Countries during Crises Events*

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>SK</b>	<b>HU</b>	<b>PL</b>	<b>CZ</b>	<b>Total</b>
0		1			1
1				1	1
2					
3		1			1
4	1	1		2	4
5	1	1	3	6	11
6	1		6	2	9
7		1	7	9	17
8	2	7	15	12	36
9	3	1	7	6	17
10	5	3	11	11	30
<b>N</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>127</b>
Average	8.31	7.13	8.02	7.63	7.79

## **INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING**

## INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING IN GENERAL

The most important informal volunteering activities include helping others, running errands, transportation, grass cutting, administrative work, job searching, bookkeeping, legal and economic advice, etc., and similar types of activities are often mentioned by respondents in the miscellaneous category (44.9%, even 61.1% in Hungary) - see Table 250. Other activities are childcare and care for the elderly (about 29% each activity, with a higher level of representation in Poland (37.5%). The level of engagement for people with a migrant background, refugees, asylum seekers or affected by natural disasters is relatively low (average 5.7%, highest in Poland 10.3% and in Czechia 6.1%).

Table 250: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – types of activities

Activities	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Care of children	56	34.1%	38	16.3%	91	37.6%	97	28.3%	282	28.7%
Care of the elderly	50	30.5%	52	22.3%	90	37.2%	102	29.7%	294	29.9%
Care of disab. people	18	11.0%	17	7.3%	37	15.3%	49	14.3%	121	12.3%
Care of the ill people	27	16.5%	23	9.9%	55	22.7%	54	15.7%	159	16.2%
Assistance for others*	71	43.3%	143	61.4%	103	42.6%	124	36.2%	441	44.9%
Assisting with events	34	20.7%	49	21.0%	64	26.4%	107	31.2%	254	25.9%
Care of people with **	6	3.7%	4	1.7%	25	10.3%	21	6.1%	56	5.7%
Other	23	14.0%	35	15.0%	15	6.2%	53	15.5%	126	12.8%
<b>Total (actual inform. vol.)</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>233</b>		<b>242</b>		<b>343</b>		<b>982</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

\*(errands, transport, lawn mowing, administrative work, finding the job, bookkeeping, legal and economic advising etc.).

\*\* migrant background, refugees, asylum seekers or affected by natural disasters.

The vast majority of respondents in their informal activities carry out in their immediate neighborhood (44.4%) or municipality (56.9%) – see Table 251.

Table 251: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – location of activities

Location	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
in your neighborhood	67	40,9%	75	32,2%	117	48,3%	177	51,6%	436	44,4%
at your place of city	89	54,3%	146	62,7%	123	50,8%	201	58,6%	559	56,9%
in another place	26	15,9%	29	12,4%	35	14,5%	54	15,7%	144	14,7%
in the region	24	14,6%	20	8,6%	49	20,2%	32	9,3%	125	12,7%
in your country	12	7,3%	20	8,6%	28	11,6%	42	12,2%	102	10,4%
abroad	4	2,4%	1	0,4%	1	0,4%	5	1,5%	11	1,1%
on the Internet, virtually	6	3,7%	16	6,9%	17	7,0%	17	5,0%	56	5,7%
by someone else	4	2,4%	3	1,3%	5	2,1%	0	0,0%	12	1,2%
<b>Total (actual inform. vol.)</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>233</b>		<b>242</b>		<b>343</b>		<b>982</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

The dominant motivator for informal volunteering is the need to help others (65.4%, with as high as 75.5% in Hungary), followed by fulfilling a sense of usefulness (36.2%, highest in Czechia 44.3%), and the need to give back to others (33.5%, highest in Poland 42.6%). Own pleasure from the activity is 27.4% (highest in Czechia 37.3%). Interestingly, other motivators of Czechs are well above the average values: contact across generations - 32.4%, desire to change things (28.9%), need to do something different with others (28%) or self-development (26.5%) – see Table 252.

Table 252: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – motivation

Motivation	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
I can help other people	105	64.0%	176	75.5%	164	67.8%	197	57.4%	642	65.4%
It brings me together with others	45	27.4%	53	22.7%	69	28.5%	137	39.9%	304	31.0%
It gives me contact with other generations	34	20.7%	32	13.7%	56	23.1%	111	32.4%	233	23.7%
I can maintain my personal network	10	6.1%	34	14.6%	15	6.2%	51	14.9%	110	11.2%
I can make a difference with others	32	19.5%	9	3.9%	30	12.4%	96	28.0%	167	17.0%
I can change things that I don't like	23	14.0%	38	16.3%	41	16.9%	99	28.9%	201	20.5%
I want to give something back to other people	36	22.0%	72	30.9%	103	42.6%	118	34.4%	329	33.5%
It gives me the feeling of being needed	56	34.1%	67	28.8%	80	33.1%	152	44.3%	355	36.2%
My environment expects it from me	9	5.5%	15	6.4%	19	7.9%	47	13.7%	90	9.2%
I have been urged or obliged to do so	8	4.9%	8	3.4%	6	2.5%	54	15.7%	76	7.7%
I receive appreciation and recognition for it	7	4.3%	31	13.3%	20	8.3%	38	11.1%	96	9.8%
The activity is also useful for my professional career	6	3.7%	10	4.3%	5	2.1%	31	9.0%	52	5.3%
I am also financially compensated for it	3	1.8%	8	3.4%	4	1.7%	11	3.2%	26	2.6%
Out of religious, spiritual conviction	21	12.8%	15	6.4%	22	9.1%	22	6.4%	80	8.1%
I enjoy the job	39	23.8%	51	21.9%	51	21.1%	128	37.3%	269	27.4%
I have a change from the rest of my everyday life.	16	9.8%	41	17.6%	14	5.8%	46	13.4%	117	11.9%
I can take my own problems into my own hands	5	3.0%	11	4.7%	14	5.8%	29	8.5%	59	6.0%
I can develop myself personally	12	7.3%	36	15.5%	27	11.2%	64	18.7%	139	14.2%
I can pursue my own interests	7	4.3%	16	6.9%	18	7.4%	29	8.5%	70	7.1%
It allows me to expand my knowledge and experience	24	14.6%	33	14.2%	29	12.0%	91	26.5%	177	18.0%
None of the above applies	9	5.5%	9	3.9%	8	3.3%	10	2.9%	36	3.7%
<b>Total (informal volunteer)</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>233</b>		<b>242</b>		<b>343</b>		<b>982</b>	


The majority of those involved rate their formal volunteering activity positively on a scale of 0 to 10 (mean 7.58, n=1191). The most positive perception is in Poland, the least in Slovakia, but the differences are not significant – see Table 253 and Figure 3: Perception of experience with informal volunteer activity by individual country. Figure 3.

Table 253: Perception of experience with in formal volunteer activity in V4 countries

Evaluation	SK	HU	PL	CZ	Total
0	1			3	1
1			1	2	
2	2	3	5	2	2
3	2	6	4	6	2
4	6	8	3	5	6
5	40	42	25	49	40
6	18	25	27	32	18
7	29	44	46	64	29
8	39	61	63	85	39
9	34	40	41	71	34
10	42	55	78	78	42
<b>N</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>1191</b>
Average	7.43	7,47	7.83	7.55	7.58



Figure 3: Perception of experience with informal volunteer activity by individual country.



Comment: COUNTRY (1-Slovakia, 2-Hungary, 3-Poland, 4-Czechia)

The most frequent reasons for stopping volunteering are health reasons (21.7%, even 40.6% in Poland), followed by work and time reasons (mostly in Czechia), or that the volunteering activity was terminated or ceased to be relevant – see Table 254.

Table 254: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – reasons for quitting

Reasons for quitting	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
occupational reasons	1	2.0%	5	9.8%	5	9.8%	14	24.1%	25	12.0%
family reasons	9	18.4%	6	11.8%	7	13.7%	9	15.5%	31	14.8%
health reasons	16	32.7%	10	19.6%	13	25.5%	11	19.0%	50	23.9%
age reasons	5	10.2%	10	19.6%	1	2.0%	11	19.0%	27	12.9%
move to another place	0	0.0%	8	15.7%	1	2.0%	3	5.2%	12	5.7%
school/further education	1	2.0%	2	3.9%	1	2.0%	2	3.4%	6	2.9%
activity was limited	3	6.1%	3	5.9%	1	2.0%	17	29.3%	24	11.5%
no more interest	2	4.1%	2	3.9%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%	6	2.9%
time commitment was too great	6	12.2%	3	5.9%	3	5.9%	19	32.8%	31	14.8%
too much responsibility	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	2	3.9%	1	1.7%	4	1.9%
too much bureaucracy	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	5	8.6%	6	2.9%
too little recognition	1	2.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	3	1.4%
financial effort was too great	1	2.0%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	2	3.4%	5	2.4%
organization was dissolved	7	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	8	3.8%
other reasons	10	20.4%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	12	5.7%
<b>Total (previously involved)</b>	<b>49</b>		<b>51</b>		<b>51</b>		<b>58</b>		<b>209</b>	

## INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING IN CRISES EVENTS

Voluntary informal activities aimed at people from other countries with a migrant background, refugees or asylum seekers, or care for people affected by natural disasters is quite minority. Overall, 2.8% of respondents do it, and of those who have done informal volunteering activities in the past 24 months, it is 5.7%. The highest levels of involvement are in Poland and Czechia – see Table 255.

Table 255: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events

	SK	HU	PL	CZ	Total
In informal volunteering in crises	6	4	25	21	56
relative to the total number involved in informal volunteer.	3.7%	1.7%	10.3%	6.1%	5.7%
relative to the total number of respondents	1.5%	0.9%	4.2%	3.6%	2.8%
In informal volunteering	164	233	242	343	982
relative to the total number of respondents	40.8%	51.5%	40.3%	59.1%	48.3%
Total number of respondents	402	452	600	580	2034

Increasing education increases the level of involvement in emergencies – see Table 256, however, due to the small sample size these findings cannot be generalized.

Table 256: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events – Influence of Education

Education	PS	SS	SS+	UNI	Total
In formal volunteering in crises	3	5	23	25	56
relative to the total number involved in formal volunteering	6.7%	2.1%	4.9%	10.8%	5.7%
relative to the total number of respondents	2.6%	0.9%	2.5%	5.6%	2.8%
In formal volunteering	45	240	466	231	982
relative to the total number of respondents	39.5%	42.8%	51.0%	52.0%	48.3%
Total number of respondents	114	561	913	444	2032

Gender does not have an effect on involvement in crises in formal volunteering – see Table 257.

Table 257: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events – Influence of Gender

Gender	Male	Female	Total
In formal volunteering in crises	28	28	56
relative to the total number involved in formal volunteering	6.1%	5.3%	5.7%
relative to the total number of respondents	2.8%	2.7%	2.8%
In formal volunteering	457	525	982
relative to the total number of respondents	45.7%	50.8%	48.3%
Total number of respondents	1001	1033	2034

Table 258 shows that when it comes to involvement in emergency-related activities, the dominant involvement is due to the war in Ukraine or Syria. However, there are differences between countries, with Poland (10% in relation to Ukraine) and Czechia (6% in relation to Syria) showing the highest levels of involvement in informal volunteering activities. The third most frequent event was problems was connected with COVID-19 pandemic.

*Table 258: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Crises Events*

<b>Initiative to volunteering</b>	<b>SK</b>		<b>HU</b>		<b>PL</b>		<b>CZ</b>		<b>Total</b>	
War in Syria	2	1%	0	0%	3	1%	19	6%	24	2%
War in Ukraine	6	4%	4	2%	23	10%	1	0%	34	3%
War in Sudan	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	3	0%
Riots in Bangladesh	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	3	0%
Riots in Iran	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%	1	0%	5	1%
Floods in Pakistan	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%	1	0%	5	1%
Earthquake in Turkey	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%	3	1%	7	1%
Covid-19	3	2%	0	0%	10	4%	1	0%	14	1%
Floods in Slovenia	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	7	2%	10	1%
Local in country	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	3	1%	6	1%
Local in country	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	3	0%
<b>Total (informal volunteering)</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>233</b>		<b>242</b>		<b>343</b>		<b>982</b>	

Given the small sample size, more analyses are irrelevant.

## RESPONSIBILITY – RESPONDENTS’ OPINIONS

Discussion on the conclusions of the question: “Who do you think should take more responsibility and tasks when individuals and families are overburdened and need help?”

More than half of the respondents believe that the state should be more involved (57.5%), compared to 2/3 of respondents in Hungary and 60.9% in Slovakia – see Table 259. The second most frequent answer is that family, relatives and people from the social environment (53.3%), with Czechia and Poland having the highest frequency of this answer (59.5% and 58.7%). Out of 2034 respondents, 1170 persons chose only one option; the remaining 864 persons chose more than one option.

Table 259: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries

Initiative to volunteering	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
relatives and people from the social environment (neighborhood, friends)	166	41.3%	222	49.1%	352	58.7%	345	59.5%	1085	53.3%
voluntary organizations (associations, foundations, non-profit organizations)	98	24.4%	130	28.8%	205	34.2%	189	32.6%	622	30.6%
the state (municipalities, cantons, federal government)	245	60.9%	301	66.6%	305	50.8%	319	55.0%	1170	57.5%
business (companies, employers)	45	11.2%	56	12.4%	52	8.7%	53	9.1%	206	10.1%
others	8	2.0%	10	2.2%	12	2.0%	29	5.0%	59	2.9%
I do not know	51	12.7%	34	7.5%	83	13.8%	57	9.8%	225	11.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

If we look at the answers of only those who chose one option, the results are similar and the dependence between the answer to the question and the country is demonstrated. Respondents from Slovakia and Hungary are most inclined towards the role of the state, while Poles and Czechs see the responsibility as being with the family, relatives and the social environment – see Table 260. About a fifth of respondents do not know (19.2%).

Table 260: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries (Only One Choice)

Initiative to volunteering	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
relatives and people from the social environment	67	25.6%	72	28.7%	136	40.5%	126	39.3%	401	34.3%
voluntary organizations	13	5.0%	17	6.8%	24	7.1%	17	5.3%	71	6.1%
the state	121	46.2%	122	48.6%	77	22.9%	111	34.6%	431	36.8%
business	5	1.9%	3	1.2%	8	2.4%	3	0.9%	19	1.6%
others	5	1.9%	3	1.2%	8	2.4%	7	2.2%	23	2.0%
I do not know	51	19.5%	34	13.5%	83	24.7%	57	17.8%	225	19.2%
<b>Total (with one answer)</b>	<b>262</b>		<b>251</b>		<b>336</b>		<b>321</b>		<b>1170</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 63.1162 (15 df, p-value =  $7.28878 \times 10^{-8}$ ).

The influence of age on the answer to the question has been found. Young people give more priority to family, relatives and the social environment, older generations rely more on the state as they get older – see Table 261.

Table 261: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Age

Age	18–24		25–34		35–44		45–54		55–64		65+	
Family	45	39,1%	85	39,4%	82	33,7%	73	31,7%	58	32,6%	57	31,0%
NGOs	9	7,8%	17	7,9%	18	7,4%	12	5,2%	10	5,6%	5	2,7%
State	33	28,7%	56	25,9%	84	34,6%	94	40,9%	76	42,7%	85	46,2%
Bus.	5	4,3%	9	4,2%	0	0,0%	3	1,3%	0	0,0%	2	1,1%
Others	3	2,6%	3	1,4%	8	3,3%	4	1,7%	1	0,6%	4	2,2%
?	20	17,4%	46	21,3%	51	21,0%	44	19,1%	33	18,5%	31	16,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>115</b>		<b>216</b>		<b>243</b>		<b>230</b>		<b>178</b>		<b>184</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 53.6562 (25 df, p-value = 0.000736).

The effect of gender on the answer to the question has not been found, although the results show that men prefer the responsibility of the state more than that of family, relatives and the social environment – see Table 262.

Table 262: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Gender

Gender	Male		Female		Total
Family	191	47.6%	210	52.4%	401
NGOs	34	47.9%	37	52.1%	71
State	225	52.2%	206	47.8%	431
Business	13	68.4%	6	31.6%	19
Others	13	56.5%	10	43.5%	23
?	110	48.9%	115	51.1%	225
<b>Total</b>	<b>586</b>		<b>584</b>		<b>1170</b>

Pearson's chi-squared test = 4.94256 (5 df, p-value = 0.42293).

People with less education rely more on the state or do not know how to answer – see Table 263. The dependence on education was confirmed.

Table 263: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Education

Educat.	BS		SS		SS+		UNI		Total	
Family	16	22.5%	117	32.1%	183	35.5%	85	39.0%	401	34.3%
NGOs	5	7.0%	22	6.0%	30	5.8%	14	6.4%	71	6.1%
State	24	33.8%	126	34.6%	200	38.8%	81	37.2%	431	36.9%
Business	3	4.2%	4	1.1%	8	1.6%	4	1.8%	19	1.6%
Others	2	2.8%	7	1.9%	11	2.1%	3	1.4%	23	2.0%
?	21	29.6%	88	24.2%	84	16.3%	31	14.2%	224	19.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>		<b>364</b>		<b>516</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>1169</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 24.544 (15 df, p-value = 0.00564).

Dependence was also shown on household income size, although a correlation cannot be fully traced – see Table 264.

*Table 264: Answers to the Question "Who should take more responsibility?" in V4 Countries – Influence of Household Income*

<b>Income</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>Total</b>	
Family	121	33.2%	82	36.0%	61	30.3%	51	28.7%	82	42.9%	397	34.2%
NGOs	12	3.3%	21	9.2%	16	8.0%	17	9.6%	5	2.6%	71	6.1%
State	126	34.6%	74	32.5%	80	39.8%	75	42.1%	73	38.2%	428	36.8%
Business	5	1.4%	3	1.3%	7	3.5%	3	1.7%	1	0.5%	19	1.6%
Others	4	1.1%	3	1.3%	6	3.0%	5	2.8%	5	2.6%	23	2.0%
?	96	26.4%	45	19.7%	31	15.4%	27	15.2%	25	13.1%	224	19.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>364</b>		<b>228</b>		<b>201</b>		<b>178</b>		<b>191</b>		<b>1162</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 53.6885 (20 df, p-value =  $6.432 \times 10^{-5}$ ).

In general, it can be concluded that people with lower incomes, lower education and higher age place more responsibility and tasks on the state. These findings are statistically significant.

## DONATION

## DONATION IN GENERAL

On average, 52.9% of respondents had been involved in donor activity in the past 24 months, with a further 28.7% having been involved previously. Czechs have the highest current involvement (64.5%), while Hungarians (50.2%) have no past involvement. More than a quarter of Slovaks (26.4%) and Poles (28.5%) have never been involved in donor activities – see Table 265.

Table 265: Involvement in Donor Activity

Donor activity	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
past 24 months	192	47.8%	204	45.1%	307	51.2%	374	64.5%	1077	52.9%
sometime in the past, not now	104	25.9%	227	50.2%	122	20.3%	130	22.4%	583	28.7%
sometime in the past or now	296	73.6%	431	95.4%	429	71.5%	504	86.9%	1660	81.6%
never	106	26.4%	21	4.6%	171	28.5%	76	13.1%	374	18.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

Groups 1 to 5 are derived from the average income in a given country and its values are shown in Table 266. Statistical dependence between country and the amount donated was demonstrated - see Table 267. Czech and Slovak citizens donate larger amounts than the average. Most people contribute smaller amounts (the first two categories account for 57% in total).

Table 266: Values for Donation groups in V4 Countries

Category of donation	SK (EUR)	HU (HUF)	PL (PLN)	CZ (CZK)
1	<15	<4 000	<60	<500
2	15 – 30	4 001 – 8 000	61 – 260	501 – 1000
3	31 – 140	8 001 – 40 000	261 – 665	1001 – 5000
4	141 – 270	40 001 – 80 000	666 – 1337	5001 – 10000
5	>270	>80 000	>1337	>10000

Table 267: Average Annual Amounts of Household Donations in V4 Countries

Amount	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
1	52	27.1%	58	28.4%	79	25.7%	89	23.8%	278	25.8%
2	47	24.5%	53	26.0%	127	41.4%	109	29.1%	336	31.2%
3	45	23.4%	61	29.9%	42	13.7%	98	26.2%	246	22.8%
4	14	7.3%	9	4.4%	13	4.2%	37	9.9%	73	6.8%
5	8	4.2%	5	2.5%	11	3.6%	15	4.0%	39	3.6%
6 (missing values)	26	13.5%	18	8.8%	35	11.4%	26	7.0%	105	9.7%
<b>Total (donation)</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>204</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>374</b>		<b>1077</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 52.109 (15 df, p-value =  $5,4187 \times 10^{-6}$ ). When we exclude missing values Pearson's chi-squared test = 44.7343 (12 df, p-value =  $5,4187 \times 10^{-5}$ ).

Table 268 shows that most people do not use donations to reduce their tax liability (67.9% on average), with differences between countries being demonstrated. Czechs use this the least, Slovaks the most. The level of use depends on the legislation of the country.



*Table 268: The Rate of Deduction of Donations from Income for the Purposes of Reducing Tax Liability in V4 Countries*

<b>Deduction</b>	<b>SK</b>		<b>HU</b>		<b>PL</b>		<b>CZ</b>		<b>Total</b>	
<1%	7	3.6%	10	4.9%	26	8.5%	34	9.1%	77	7.1%
1% – 2%	19	9.9%	51	25.0%	116	37.8%	8	2.1%	194	18.0%
2% – 3%	11	5.7%	4	2.0%	13	4.2%	6	1.6%	34	3.2%
3% – 5%	3	1.6%	3	1.5%	11	3.6%	3	0.8%	20	1.9%
>5%	2	1.0%		0.0%	15	4.9%	4	1.1%	21	1.9%
Not used	150	78.1%	136	66.7%	126	41.0%	319	85.3%	731	67.9%
<b>Total (donation)</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>204</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>374</b>		<b>1077</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 227.46 (15 df, p-value = 5,296747 x 10<sup>-40</sup>).

Table 269 shows that the majority of respondents contribute to environmental protection (29.7%), to people affected by poverty (27.9%), to victims of war (27.7%), to people with disabilities (27.7%) and to aid in disasters (21.8%). Differences are evident between countries. On average, people contribute to more than two purposes.

*Table 269: Reasons for Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months)*

<b>Reasons for donation</b>	<b>SK</b>		<b>HU</b>		<b>PL</b>		<b>CZ</b>		<b>Total</b>	
Environment/Nature/Animals	31	16.1%	71	34.8%	106	34.5%	112	29.9%	320	29.7%
People affected by poverty	71	37.0%	83	40.7%	72	23.5%	74	19.8%	300	27.9%
Poverty victims abroad	19	9.9%	7	3.4%	18	5.9%	33	8.8%	77	7.1%
Disaster relief	36	18.8%	16	7.8%	44	14.3%	139	37.2%	235	21.8%
Migrants, refugees	17	8.9%	9	4.4%	78	25.4%	77	20.6%	181	16.8%
Fighting diseases	39	20.3%	54	26.5%	85	27.7%	120	32.1%	298	27.7%
People with disabilities	58	30.2%	35	17.2%	70	22.8%	112	29.9%	275	25.5%
Old people	19	9.9%	20	9.8%	32	10.4%	32	8.6%	103	9.6%
Young people, children	17	8.9%	33	16.2%	71	23.1%	61	16.3%	182	16.9%
Church	35	18.2%	29	14.2%	36	11.7%	30	8.0%	130	12.1%
Politics at national level	3	1.6%	2	1.0%	6	2.0%	8	2.1%	19	1.8%
Culture	7	3.6%	6	2.9%	9	2.9%	15	4.0%	37	3.4%
Sports	6	3.1%	8	3.9%	15	4.9%	21	5.6%	50	4.6%
Education/awareness/information	8	4.2%	14	6.9%	6	2.0%	16	4.3%	44	4.1%
<b>Total (donation)</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>204</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>374</b>		<b>1077</b>	
Number of reasons	2.0		2.0		2.2		2.3		2.2	

In the past, 28.7% of respondents who are no longer involved in donating. Most in the area of environmental protection and helping people affected by poverty – see Table 270.

*Table 270: Reasons for Donation in V4 Countries (in the Past, no Donation Past 24 Months)*

Reasons for donation	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Environment/Nature/Animals	14	7.3%	32	15.7%	30	9.8%	36	9.6%	112	10.4%
People affected by poverty	29	15.1%	56	27.5%	20	6.5%	14	3.7%	119	11.0%
Poverty victims abroad	6	3.1%	5	2.5%	4	1.3%	7	1.9%	22	2.0%
Disaster relief	16	8.3%	9	4.4%	13	4.2%	42	11.2%	80	7.4%
Migrants, refugees	3	1.6%	5	2.5%	17	5.5%	5	1.3%	30	2.8%
Fighting diseases	19	9.9%	27	13.2%	17	5.5%	28	7.5%	91	8.4%
People with disabilities	25	13.0%	30	14.7%	24	7.8%	23	6.1%	102	9.5%
Old people	13	6.8%	12	5.9%	9	2.9%	10	2.7%	44	4.1%
Young people, children	5	2.6%	13	6.4%	24	7.8%	14	3.7%	56	5.2%
Church	18	9.4%	31	15.2%	17	5.5%	7	1.9%	73	6.8%
Politics at national level	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.7%	1	0.3%	3	0.3%
Culture	5	2.6%	5	2.5%	3	1.0%	7	1.9%	20	1.9%
Sports	11	5.7%	15	7.4%	2	0.7%	9	2.4%	37	3.4%
Education/awareness/information	2	1.0%	8	3.9%	3	1.0%	0	0.0%	13	1.2%
Others	3	1.6%	65	31.9%	9	2.9%	6	1.6%	83	7.7%
<b>Total (donation 24 months ago)</b>	<b>104</b>		<b>227</b>		<b>122</b>		<b>130</b>		<b>583</b>	

Compared to past involvement, there is a clear increase in the area of emergencies, both natural disasters (from 7.4% to 19.0%) and war (from 8.4% to 23.4%) – see Table 270, Table 271.

*Table 271: Reasons for Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

Reasons for donation	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Environment/Nature/Animals	45	15.2%	103	23.9%	136	31.7%	148	29.4%	432	26.0%
People affected by poverty	100	33.8%	139	32.3%	92	21.4%	88	17.5%	419	25.2%
Poverty victims abroad	25	8.4%	12	2.8%	22	5.1%	40	7.9%	99	6.0%
Disaster relief	52	17.6%	25	5.8%	57	13.3%	181	35.9%	315	19.0%
Migrants, refugees	20	6.8%	14	3.2%	95	22.1%	82	16.3%	211	12.7%
Fighting diseases	58	19.6%	81	18.8%	102	23.8%	148	29.4%	389	23.4%
People with disabilities	83	28.0%	65	15.1%	94	21.9%	135	26.8%	377	22.7%
Old people	32	10.8%	32	7.4%	41	9.6%	42	8.3%	147	8.9%
Young people, children	22	7.4%	46	10.7%	95	22.1%	75	14.9%	238	14.3%
Church	53	17.9%	60	13.9%	53	12.4%	37	7.3%	203	12.2%
Politics at national level	3	1.0%	2	0.5%	8	1.9%	9	1.8%	22	1.3%
Culture	12	4.1%	11	2.6%	12	2.8%	22	4.4%	57	3.4%
Sports	17	5.7%	23	5.3%	17	4.0%	30	6.0%	87	5.2%
Education/awareness/information	10	3.4%	22	5.1%	9	2.1%	16	3.2%	57	3.4%
Others	3	1.0%	66	15.3%	9	2.1%	11	2.2%	89	5.4%
<b>Total (sometime in the past)</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>73.6%</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>95.4%</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>71.5%</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>86.9%</b>	<b>1660</b>	<b>81.6%</b>
<b>Total (respondents)</b>	<b>402</b>		<b>452</b>		<b>600</b>		<b>580</b>		<b>2034</b>	

The majority of donors contribute irregularly, depending on the situation (75.4%), less than a quarter (24.6%) contribute regularly, with Poles contributing most regularly (40.6%) – see Table 272. The differences between countries are statistically significant.

*Table 272: Involvement in Donor Activity – Regularity of Donation*

Donor activity	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Regularly	30	10.1%	24	5.6%	74	17.2%	33	6.5%	161	9.7%
Episodic (ad hoc)	219	74.0%	360	83.5%	255	59.4%	418	82.9%	1252	75.4%
Both	47	15.9%	47	10.9%	100	23.3%	53	10.5%	247	14.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>296</b>		<b>431</b>		<b>429</b>		<b>504</b>		<b>1660</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 91.8683 (6 df, p-value =  $1,2393 \times 10^{-17}$ ).

The most important motives for donating are the desire to help people in crises (52%, even 61% for Czechs) and to contribute to a good cause (48%, even 59% for Czechs) – viz Table 273. The third is alignment with the objectives of the organization to which they contribute (27%).

*Table 273: Motives for Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier)*

<b>I donate money</b>	<b>SK</b>		<b>HU</b>		<b>PL</b>		<b>CZ</b>		<b>Total</b>	
... to contribute something to the common good.	84	44%	65	32%	145	47%	221	59%	515	48%
... so that I can obtain services (e.g.).	3	2%	9	4%	20	7%	3	1%	35	3%
... because I know someone in the organization.	14	7%	9	4%	22	7%	32	9%	77	7%
... because I support the goals of the organization.	29	15%	65	32%	90	29%	107	29%	291	27%
... because I can deduct the donations from my taxes.	4	2%	7	3%	21	7%	9	2%	41	4%
... to help people in an emergency situation.	89	46%	88	43%	157	51%	227	61%	561	52%
... because I or people close to me are affected by the cause the organization cares about.	8	4%	27	13%	27	9%	38	10%	100	9%
... out of religious, spiritual conviction.	34	18%	22	11%	35	11%	27	7%	118	11%
... because I might be glad for support myself.	49	26%	41	20%	51	17%	118	32%	259	24%
... for other reasons.	22	11%	25	12%	24	8%	30	8%	101	9%
<b>Total (donation)</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>204</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>374</b>		<b>1077</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

## DONATION IN CRISES EVENTS

Table 274 shows that in the case of donations, the war in Ukraine has a major influence. Of all donors, 50% have already contributed in Poland and 38% in Czechia (average 36%). The second most important reason is local natural disasters, in Czechia it was the fire in Hřensko (45%).

Table 274: Donation in V4 Countries – Crises Events

Initiative to volunteering	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
War in Syria	7	4%	2	1%	17	6%	5	1%	31	3%
War in Ukraine	56	29%	33	16%	153	50%	142	38%	384	36%
War in Sudan	2	1%	1	0%	6	2%	0	0%	9	1%
Riots in Bangladesh	2	1%	2	1%	4	1%	0	0%	8	1%
Riots in Iran	4	2%	2	1%	3	1%	1	0%	10	1%
Floods in Pakistan	5	3%	0	0%	3	1%	1	0%	9	1%
Earthquake in Turkey	10	5%	20	10%	27	9%	28	7%	85	8%
Covid-19	23	12%	27	13%	39	13%	27	7%	116	11%
Floods in Slovenia	8	4%	3	1%	14	5%	45	12%	70	6%
Local in country	25	13%	20	10%	2	1%	170	45%	217	20%
Local in country	32	17%	31	15%	2	1%	54	14%	119	11%
<b>Total (donation)</b>	<b>192</b>		<b>204</b>		<b>307</b>		<b>374</b>		<b>1077</b>	

The approach to donating to war-affected areas differs across the V4 countries and this difference is statistically significant – see Table 275. In the past 24 months, 38.7% of donors donated to these causes, with the highest rates in Czechia (52.6%) and Poland (46.4%), and the lowest in Hungary (16.2%) and Slovakia (36.8%). The vast majority contribute for humanitarian purposes, but 14.2% of Poles and 13.3% of Czechs also support military aid.

Table 275: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises in V4 countries

Donor activity	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
Only for humanitarian goals	82	27.7%	57	13.2%	138	32.2%	198	39.3%	475	28.6%
Only for military support	10	3.4%	5	1.2%	18	4.2%	6	1.2%	39	2.3%
Both	17	5.7%	8	1.9%	43	10.0%	61	12.1%	129	7.8%
No	187	63.2%	361	83.8%	230	53.6%	239	47.4%	1017	61.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>296</b>		<b>431</b>		<b>429</b>		<b>504</b>		<b>1660</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 162.325 (9 df, p-value =  $2.44057 \times 10^{-30}$ ). We reject the null hypothesis of independence ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ).

In the case of war conflicts, the approach of men and women differs in that they contribute less to military aid (7.2%) than men (13.2%) – Table 276. The findings are statistically significant.

Table 276: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Gender

Gender	Male		Female		Total	
Only for humanitarian goals	224	27.8%	251	29.4%	475	28.6%
Only for military support	25	3.1%	14	1.6%	39	2.3%
Both	81	10.1%	48	5.6%	129	7.8%
No	475	59.0%	542	63.4%	1017	61.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>805</b>		<b>855</b>		<b>1660</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 16.0016 (3 df, p-value = 0.001133). We reject the null hypothesis of independence ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ).

The effect of age on the form of donation in the case of war conflicts is statistically significant. Young people are generally more likely to donate and also contribute more to military aid – see Table 277.

Table 277: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Age

Age	18–24		25–34		35–44		45–54		55–64		65+	
Human.	43	27.4%	68	23.8%	86	28.3%	102	31.4%	91	32.4%	82	27.3%
Milit.	6	3.8%	13	4.5%	9	3.0%	3	0.9%	5	1.8%	3	1.0%
Both	16	10.2%	32	11.2%	20	6.6%	28	8.6%	13	4.6%	20	6.7%
No	92	58.6%	173	60.5%	189	62.2%	192	59.1%	172	61.2%	195	65.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>		<b>286</b>		<b>304</b>		<b>325</b>		<b>281</b>		<b>300</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 29.6792 (15 df, p-value = 0.013132). We reject the null hypothesis of independence ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ).

Table 278: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Education

Educat.	BS		SS		SS+		UNI		Total	
Human.	24	27.0%	118	26.6%	205	27.5%	128	33.4%	475	28.6%
Milit.	5	5.6%	10	2.3%	18	2.4%	6	1.6%	39	2.3%
Both	8	9.0%	32	7.2%	55	7.4%	34	8.9%	129	7.8%
No	52	58.4%	283	63.9%	467	62.7%	215	56.1%	1017	61.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>		<b>443</b>		<b>745</b>		<b>383</b>		<b>1660</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 12.9078 (9 df, p-value = 0.16682).

Table 279: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Household Income

Income	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
Human.	122	26.4%	102	33.6%	83	28.1%	79	27.8%	82	27.4%	468	28.5%
Milit.	6	1.3%	5	1.6%	12	4.1%	11	3.9%	5	1.7%	39	2.4%
Both	22	4.8%	19	6.3%	23	7.8%	31	10.9%	34	11.4%	129	7.8%
No	312	67.5%	178	58.6%	177	60.0%	163	57.4%	178	59.5%	1008	61.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>462</b>		<b>304</b>		<b>295</b>		<b>284</b>		<b>299</b>		<b>1644</b>	

Pearson's chi-squared test = 32.4059 (12 df, p-value = 0.001197).

In general, it can be stated that in war conflicts there are differences between the approach of individual population groups - Czechs and Poles are more involved and contribute more to military aid (It should be noted, however, that this is primarily the war conflict in Ukraine: this cannot be generalized to all types of conflicts). In terms of gender, the differences are not in terms of involvement but in terms of form with men contributing more to military aid. The younger generation is more engaged, also in military aid. Logically, households with the lowest incomes are the least involved. These findings are statistically significant.

Contributions to aid to Ukraine were generally in smaller amounts and differences between countries are not statistically significant – see Table 280.

Table 280: Average Annual Amounts of Household Donations in V4 Countries – War in Ukraine

Amount	SK		HU		PL		CZ		Total	
1	15	26.8%	18	54.5%	60	39.2%	21	28.4%	114	36.1%
2	18	32.1%	6	18.2%	58	37.9%	23	31.1%	105	33.2%
3	11	19.6%	3	9.1%	14	9.2%	12	16.2%	40	12.7%
4		0.0%	1	3.0%	4	2.6%	4	5.4%	9	2.8%
5	1	1.8%	1	3.0%	1	0.7%	1	1.4%	4	1.3%
6 (missing values)	11	19.6%	4	12.1%	16	10.5%	13	17.6%	44	13.9%
<b>Total (donation)</b>	<b>56</b>		<b>33</b>		<b>153</b>		<b>74</b>		<b>316</b>	
Total	402		452		600		580		2034	

When we exclude missing values Pearson's chi-squared test = 18.6153 (12 df, p-value = 0.09824).

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Numbers of Respondents and Types of Surveys .....	30
Table 2: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Gender .....	31
Table 3: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Age.....	31
Table 4: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Municipality Size.....	31
Table 5: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Education.....	31
Table 6: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Personal Income .....	32
Table 7: Decisive Amounts for Determining Personal Income Groups in V4 Countries.....	32
Table 8: Numbers of Respondents in V4 Countries – Structure by Household Income.....	32
Table 9: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months).....	35
Table 10: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (If Not Involved in the Past 24 Months).....	35
Table 11: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	35
Table 12: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months) .....	36
Table 13: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	36
Table 14: Donation Involvement in V4 countries (Past 24 Months) .....	36
Table 15: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	37
Table 16: Involvement in Formal or Informal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	37
Table 17: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	38
Table 18: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	38
Table 19: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months) .....	38
Table 20: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	38
Table 21: Involvement in Donation in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months) .....	38
Table 22: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	39
Table 23: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	39
Table 24: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months) .....	40
Table 25: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	40
Table 26: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	40
Table 27: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	40
Table 28: Involvement in Donation in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	40
Table 29: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	41
Table 30: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	41
Table 31: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	42
Table 32: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	42
Table 33: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	42
Table 34: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	42
Table 35: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months) .....	42
Table 36: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	43
Table 37: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	43
Table 38: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	44

Table 39: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	44
Table 40: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	44
Table 41: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	44
Table 42: Donation Involvement in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	44
Table 43: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	45
Table 44: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	45
Table 45: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months) .....	46
Table 46: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	46
Table 47: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months).....	46
Table 48: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	46
Table 49: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months) .....	46
Table 50: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	47
Table 51: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Gender (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	47
Table 52: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months).....	48
Table 53: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	48
Table 54: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	48
Table 55: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	49
Table 56: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months).....	49
Table 57: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	49
Table 58: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	50
Table 59: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	51
Table 60: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	51
Table 61: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months).....	51
Table 62: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	52
Table 63: Donation Involvement in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	52
Table 64: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	52
Table 65: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	53
Table 66: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months).....	54
Table 67: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	54
Table 68: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	54
Table 69: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	55
Table 70: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months).....	55
Table 71: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	55
Table 72: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	56
Table 73: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	57
Table 74: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	57
Table 75: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months).....	57
Table 76: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	58



Table 77: Donation Involvement in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	58
Table 78: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	58
Table 79: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	59
Table 80: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	60
Table 81: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	60
Table 82: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months).....	60
Table 83: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	61
Table 84: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months) .....	61
Table 85: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	61
Table 86: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Age (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	62
Table 87: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	63
Table 88: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	63
Table 89: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	63
Table 90: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	64
Table 91: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	64
Table 92: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	64
Table 93: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	64
Table 94: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	66
Table 95: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	66
Table 96: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	66
Table 97: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	66
Table 98: Donation Involvement in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	67
Table 99: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	67
Table 100: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	67
Table 101: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	68
Table 102: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	68
Table 103: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	68
Table 104: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	69
Table 105: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	69
Table 106: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	69
Table 107: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	69
Table 108: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	71
Table 109: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	71
Table 110: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	71
Table 111: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	72
Table 112: Donation Involvement in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	72
Table 113: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	72
Table 114: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	72

Table 115: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	74
Table 116: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	74
Table 117: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months).....	74
Table 118: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	75
Table 119: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months) .....	75
Table 120: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	75
Table 121: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Municipality Size (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	75
Table 122: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months).....	76
Table 123: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	76
Table 124: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	76
Table 125: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	76
Table 126: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months).....	77
Table 127: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	77
Table 128: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	77
Table 129: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	78
Table 130: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	78
Table 131: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months).....	78
Table 132: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	78
Table 133: Donation Involvement in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months).....	79
Table 134: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	79
Table 135: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	79
Table 136: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months).....	80
Table 137: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	80
Table 138: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	80
Table 139: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	80
Table 140: Donation Involvement in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	81
Table 141: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	81
Table 142: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	81
Table 143: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	82
Table 144: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	82
Table 145: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months).....	82
Table 146: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	82
Table 147: Donation Involvement in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months).....	83
Table 148: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	83
Table 149: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	83
Table 150: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	84
Table 151: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	84
Table 152: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months).....	84

Table 153: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	84
Table 154: Donation Involvement in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months) .....	85
Table 155: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	85
Table 156: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Education (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	85
Table 157: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	86
Table 158: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months).....	86
Table 159: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	86
Table 160: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	86
Table 161: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	87
Table 162: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	87
Table 163: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	87
Table 164: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	87
Table 165: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	88
Table 166: Donation Involvement in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	88
Table 167: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	88
Table 168: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	88
Table 169: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	89
Table 170: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in V4 Countries by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	89
Table 171: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	90
Table 172: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months) .....	90
Table 173: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	90
Table 174: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	90
Table 175: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	91
Table 176: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	91
Table 177: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	91
Table 178: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	91
Table 179: Donation Involvement in the Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	92
Table 180: Donation Involvement in the Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	92
Table 181: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	92
Table 182: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	92
Table 183: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Slovakia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	93
Table 184: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Slovakia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	93
Table 185: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	94
Table 186: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months).....	94
Table 187: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	94
Table 188: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	94
Table 189: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	95
Table 190: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	95

Table 191: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	95
Table 192: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	95
Table 193: Donation Involvement in the Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	96
Table 194: Donation Involvement in the Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	96
Table 195: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	96
Table 196: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	96
Table 197: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Hungary by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	97
Table 198: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Hungary by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	97
Table 199: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	98
Table 200: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months) .....	98
Table 201: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	98
Table 202: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	98
Table 203: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	99
Table 204: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	99
Table 205: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	99
Table 206: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	99
Table 207: Donation Involvement in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	100
Table 208: Donation Involvement in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	100
Table 209: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	100
Table 210: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	100
Table 211: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Poland by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	101
Table 212: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Poland by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	101
Table 213: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months).....	102
Table 214: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months) .....	102
Table 215: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	102
Table 216: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	102
Table 217: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	103
Table 218: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months) .....	103
Table 219: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	103
Table 220: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	103
Table 221: Donation Involvement in the Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	104
Table 222: Donation Involvement in the Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	104
Table 223: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	104
Table 224: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	104
Table 225: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation in Czechia by Personal Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	105
Table 226: Involvement in Formal Volunteering or Donation Czechia by Household Income (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	105
Table 227: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Types of Activities .....	107
Table 228: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Number of Organization Types .....	107

Table 229: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Time Perspective.....	108
Table 230: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Place of Volunteer Activity.....	108
Table 231: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries – Target Groups.....	109
Table 232: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Initiative to Volunteering.....	109
Table 233: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Motivation.....	110
Table 234: Perception of experience with formal volunteer activity in V4 countries.....	111
Table 235: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Reasons for Quitting.....	112
Table 236: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events.....	113
Table 237: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries – Target Groups in Crises Events.....	113
Table 238: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity).....	113
Table 239: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Slovakia – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity).....	113
Table 240: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Hungary – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity).....	113
Table 241: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Poland – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity).....	114
Table 242: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in Czechia – Target Groups (Concurrent Activity).....	114
Table 243: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries –in Crises Events – Influence of Education.....	114
Table 244: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 countries –in Crises Events – Influence of Gender.....	114
Table 245: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Crises Events.....	115
Table 246: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Crises Events – Influence of Education.....	115
Table 247: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – motivation for activities associated with political events.....	116
Table 248: Involvement in Formal Volunteering in V4 Countries – motivation for activities associated with natural diseases.....	116
Table 249: Perception of experience with formal volunteer activity in V4 Countries during Crises Events.....	117
Table 250: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – types of activities.....	119
Table 251: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – location of activities.....	119
Table 252: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – motivation.....	120
Table 253: Perception of experience with in formal volunteer activity in V4 countries.....	120
Table 254: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – reasons for quitting.....	121
Table 255: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events.....	122
Table 256: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events –Influence of Education.....	122
Table 257: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 countries – in Crises Events – Influence of Gender.....	122
Table 258: Involvement in Informal Volunteering in V4 Countries – Crises Events.....	123
Table 259: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries.....	124
Table 260: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries (Only One Choice).....	124
Table 261: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Age.....	125
Table 262: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Gender.....	125
Table 263: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Education.....	125
Table 264: Answers to the Question “Who should take more responsibility?” in V4 Countries – Influence of Household Income.....	126
Table 265: Involvement in Donor Activity.....	128
Table 266: Values for Donation groups in V4 Countries.....	128

---

Table 267: Average Annual Amounts of Household Donations in V4 Countries .....	128
Table 268: The Rate of Deduction of Donations from Income for the Purposes of Reducing Tax Liability in V4 Countries.....	129
Table 269: Reasons for Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months).....	129
Table 270: Reasons for Donation in V4 Countries (in the Past, no Donation Past 24 Months) .....	130
Table 271: Reasons for Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier) .....	130
Table 272: Involvement in Donor Activity – Regularity of Donation.....	130
Table 273: Motives for Donation in V4 Countries (Past 24 Months or Earlier).....	131
Table 274: Donation in V4 Countries – Crises Events .....	132
Table 275: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises in V4 countries .....	132
Table 276: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Gender .....	132
Table 277: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Age .....	133
Table 278: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Education .....	133
Table 279: Involvement in Donor Activity Connected with Political Crises – Influence of Household Income .....	133
Table 280: Average Annual Amounts of Household Donations in V4 Countries – War in Ukraine .....	133