

**ASIAN PHILANTHROPY**  
**A FOUR-COUNTRY STUDY**

*Fifth International Conference  
of the International Society  
for Third-Sector Research*

*Cape Town*

*7 – 10 July 2002*

**Mark Lyons**  
**Susan Hocking**  
**University of Technology, Sydney**  
mark.lyons@uts.edu.au

## **Introduction**

Asia is the world's most populous and culturally diverse region. Little is known of philanthropic practices in Asian countries. While each of the different world religions that can be found in Asia gives strong encouragement to philanthropy, the extent to which philanthropy is practiced has not been systematically studied. Such a study has practical benefits. International aid has been an important source of income for many third sector organisations in the region, but this is a diminishing source. Many have speculated that this source can be readily replaced by donations from the growing middle classes in these countries – although the 1997 economic crisis that had such a damaging effect on many Asian economies, dramatically reducing income and wealth for many while plunging more into deeper poverty, indicated how fragile such a replacement might be.

As a first step toward both exploring the dimensions of giving and the various methods of fundraising used by nonprofit organisations, the Asia Pacific Philanthropic Consortium organised funding for an extensive project “Investing in Ourselves: Giving and Fundraising in Asia”. The project was undertaken by research teams in seven countries and coordinated by Venture for Fundraising in the Philippines. It involved the preparation of approximately 16 cases of fundraising strategies pursued by nonprofit organisations in each of these seven countries (a total of 112 cases in all), and surveys of giving in four of those countries. Country reports have been or will soon be published. The Asia Development Bank published an overview report in May 2002 (APPC 2002). The research reported here draws on those four country surveys; the two authors of this paper were consultants to the four country teams responsible for the research in their own countries.

## **Methodology**

Surveys were conducted in four countries: India, Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand. Basic demographic and economic variables for these four countries are contained in Appendix 1.

*Objectives.* These surveys had four objectives

- To provide data to assist nonprofit organisations in each country to identify and utilise more successful methods of fundraising;
- To provide data for each country to assist policy formulation on voluntary organisations;
- To establish benchmark data for later surveys of philanthropic giving in each country; and
- To provide comparable data to enable results from each country to be compared.

The primary aim, then, was to produce data for use in each country; deriving comparable data was only one of four objectives.

*Timing and Partners.* The project was funded from several sources, and money for different components became available at different stages. This had little effect on the comparability of results, but it did affect the timing of the surveys.

The Philippines part of the project was funded and began well before funding for the other countries became available and before survey consultants for the project were appointed. At the same time, a group from the University of the Philippines was undertaking the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Project (CNP), which included a survey on giving and volunteering. It was decided to pool the funding for the two surveys in order to survey a larger sample of the population than would be possible for either survey on their own. The University of the Philippines team used as a starting point the model survey instrument developed for the CNP, but considerably extended it. The survey was administered by the population health group at the University of the Philippines to a stratified random sample of the whole population.

When the teams for the other three countries met with one of the survey consultants in Manila in August 2000 to plan the survey for those three countries, the Philippines survey had already been completed and some data was available. Unfortunately, the Philippines survey had been able to collect data from only a small number of relatively wealthy Filipinos, those in socio-economic classes A and B. Obtaining responses from these strata had proved extremely difficult.

Prior to the meeting, the survey consultants reviewed the survey instrument and concluded that it was too complicated. They developed a simpler model instrument that focused solely on giving, rather than both giving and volunteering. In addition to questions seeking information on levels and recipients of giving, questions were also asked about reasons for giving and methods of fundraising experienced by the respondent and their effectiveness.

At the inception meeting several important decisions were made. It was agreed:

- To use the model instrument developed by the consultants, but to collect data on giving to religious organisations and purposes in a separate section, reflecting the perceived importance of religious giving in each country;
- That teams in each country could add additional questions that reflected specific institutional and cultural characteristics of their country; and
- That it would be more effective to concentrate resources on surveying a sample of households of higher socio-economic status in the major urban centres. These were the groups of the population from which the largest quantum of giving was expected to come.

As a result of this last decision, it was decided to undertake a further survey of households in the National Capital Region (NCR) of the Philippines, using the model survey instrument, to ensure the compatibility of the Philippine data with those from other countries. It may have been possible to merge the two data sets for some variables but this would have been technically difficult and was not done. It was thought that the second stage of the Philippine data would provide a more appropriate benchmark for future studies.

In India, fieldwork was conducted in October and November 2000. The survey was conducted by AC Nielsen on behalf of the Sampraadan Indian Centre for Philanthropy.

In Indonesia, the survey was conducted in September, October and November 2000 and managed by the Public Interest Research and Advocacy Center (PIRAC).

In the Philippines, the second survey was conducted in February 2001 by Taylor Nelson Sofres on behalf of Venture for Fundraising.

In Thailand, the survey was conducted during April, May and June 2001 and managed by the Centre on Civil Society and Philanthropy of the National Institute for Development Administration (NIDA).

**Definition and Scope.** In the survey the following definition of giving was used: “We would like to ask you about giving and donating money. By this we mean a voluntary contribution, one that is unrelated to the purchase of goods and services for yourself. For example, some people and families donate money to help the poor; others give to cancer research, for hunger relief or (use salient examples in the context of your country)”

People make gifts of money and goods to **individuals**, such as members of their family, friends and beggars, and to organisations. These organisations include **religious organisations** such as mosques and temples and **other voluntary organisations**, such as social service or environment organisations. Although a major objective of the survey was to collect data that would assist these other voluntary organisations to undertake more effective fundraising, it was considered important to collect data on giving to individuals and religious organisations to place giving to other organisations in its wider context. Unfortunately, because of the way the data were collected and aggregated in two countries, it was not possible to aggregate the data across all three groups; the results below report data separately for the three destination groups.

In addition, respondents were asked about their giving to different groups of individuals, from relatives, friends and beggars. They were also asked to recall their giving to different groups of nonprofit organisations, grouped according to the ICNPO derived categories used in the CNP, though excluding giving to religious organisations, which was collected separately in the survey. Religious organisations were those that specifically assisted religious worship, such as mosques, temples, shrines and churches. Gifts are often made to individual religious leaders, such as monks. These were included. It was acknowledged that on some occasions people making gifts to religious organisations intended these to be utilised in some other activity pursued by the organisation, such as a health clinic, but it was not possible to separate these from other donations. The Indonesian data understate levels of giving to religious organisations and other charitable bodies because of a decision of the Indonesian team to separately report *Zakat* giving. This refers to the strong obligation the Islamic religion imposes on its wealthy adherents to give a certain portion of the wealth each year, an obligation that the government of Indonesia seeks to facilitate. Gifts can be made to mosques or other approved organisations.

The survey also contained questions about reasons for giving; methods of fundraising experienced by respondents and whether they had given in response to any of these.

**Sampling.** As noted, the original meeting of project teams decided to limit the scope of the survey to higher income classes in the major cities – the middle and upper classes;

those who had the most to give. This limitation was necessary, but created difficulties for comparing data across countries. Although all four countries use a socio-economic stratification system which divides their populations into what are called A, B, C, D and E classes, each country defined these in slightly different ways. In India, socio-economic status is defined by the level of occupation and income. In the Philippines the classification is based on family income, type of dwelling unit, occupation and educational background of the household head. A similar method is used in Indonesia. In Thailand, classification is based on income but uses occupation as a proxy for income level. In the surveys reported here, for Thailand and the Philippines, no distinction was made between classes A and B in recording the data. In India, Indonesia and the Philippines, interviews were also conducted with respondents from class C.

As well, cost considerations created variations in the size of samples and the number of locations from which data was collected. In India, samples were drawn from the four mega-metros and ten other cities with a population of more than one million. The four mega-metros were Delhi, Chennai (formerly known as Madras), Kolkata (Calcutta) and Mumbai (Bombay). The ten other cities were chosen to represent the five major regions in India. The results from these cities were used to represent the 22 cities in India with a population of more than 1 million. 6 400 interviews were conducted.

In Indonesia, interviews were conducted in Jakarta and ten other cities. Six of these cities have a population greater than 1 million persons, while the other four cities are state capitals or have particular features of importance for patterns of giving. 2 500 interviews were conducted in Indonesia. In both India and Indonesia, the two most populous countries in the project, identifying regional differences was a particularly important part of the project.

The Thailand survey used purposive sampling in two provinces. There were 800 interviews conducted in Bangkok and 400 in Nakornrachasima. The second survey for the Philippines was undertaken in the National Capital Region (NCR), with 400 respondents.

***Weighting the Data.*** So that the results collected from the sample reflect the distribution of key variables in the population under study, the results were weighted by the appropriate weightings of the selected variable. The ability to use appropriate weights depends on the availability of data about the population surveyed. For example, in India there is extensive census data for each major city by socio-economic class. In other countries, data of this quality are not available.

The Indian results were weighted by AC Nielsen as part of the analysis. This was based on the number of households in each socio-economic class in cities with a population of more than one million. Population estimates for the Philippines were weighted by the proportion in each socio-economic class in the National Capital Region. The weightings for Indonesia were also based on the numbers in the population in each of the socio-economic classes A, B and C in the cities surveyed. For Thailand, the data was weighted using the estimated numbers of individuals in each of the occupational classes.

***Measures.*** Comparing behavioural data across countries is always challenging. For the most part we compare percentages of the population who do something or believe

something or experience something. But for some things we are interested in, we need other measures.

In the case of giving, for questions about reasons for giving and experience of methods of fundraising, simple percentage comparisons are appropriate. To compare data on the extent of giving requires some more complex approaches.

The most important questions to ask of respondents are whether, over a specified period, they gave, to what they gave and the amount they gave. It is also useful to know their level of income. From these questions, data can be determined on:

- The percentage of households in the sample who gave (**giving rate**);
- The average amount given by households who gave (**average amount given by givers**); and
- The average amount given by households in the surveyed population (**average amount given per capita**).

From these estimates the following ratio can be determined:

- The average amount given by the sample as a whole, as a percentage of the average household income of the sample (an indicator of capacity to give). This provides what can be called the **generosity ratio**.

In only one country (India) was census data available to allow estimates of total giving by all in classes A and B. For this reason, no attempt was made to develop and compare estimates of total giving across the four countries.

These measures described above are all useful for cross-country comparisons. But not all these measures are immediately suitable for comparative purposes.

**Purchasing Power Parities (PPPs).** The first and fourth of these measures, being ratios, do not need to be expressed in a common value to enable comparisons between countries. The second and third measures, however, are monetary values and need to be converted from the currency of each country to a common value. The easiest and most frequently used common value is the US dollar. Every country has an official exchange between their own currency and the US dollar. However, exchange rates are affected by many factors that reduce their value for cross-country comparisons. For cross-country comparisons, the international community has developed what are called Purchasing Power Parities (PPPs). These are measures based on what it costs in various local currencies to buy a certain basket of goods and services. To take an example, in 2000, the official currency exchange rate was 43 Indian rupees to buy one US dollar and 40 Thai baht to do the same. However, the amount that a dollar (that is 43 rupees) can purchase in India is greater than a dollar (that is 40 Baht) can purchase in Thailand (or than a dollar can purchase in the United States). In India in 2000, the PPP conversion factor from US dollars was approximately 5 while in Thailand it was approximately 3. That means in India, 43 rupees would purchase about five times as much as a dollar in the United States, while 40 Thai baht would purchase about three times as much as a dollar in the United States. Or, putting it another way, a rupee is more valuable than a baht, and comparisons of amounts given need to reflect that difference.

In the findings reported below, the amounts given are shown in both US dollars as these are more easily converted to local currencies, and Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) as this is the most appropriate measure for cross-country comparisons.

## Findings

Below we present five tables that summarize the major results from the four country surveys. They summarize only data from SES classes A and B, the only data that is comparable across all four countries. These tables present, for each of the major recipient categories (individuals, religious organisations and voluntary organisations), the giving rate, the average amount given by givers, the average amount given per capita of the sampled population, the way the total amount given is divided between these recipient classes and the generosity ratio. Where our data allows it, we have added a line that aggregates giving to all types of recipients.

**Table 1: Giving rate for SES A, A/B and B**

<i>Country</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Voluntary organisations	51	82	88	81
Religious organisations	88	85	93	93
Individuals	73	98	78	91

**Table 2: Average amount given by givers per annum for SES A, A/B and B - \$US (PPP)**

<i>Country</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Voluntary organisations	\$14 (69)	\$42 (183)	\$129 (446)	\$176 (519)
Religious organisations	\$14 (66)	\$45 (197)	\$138 (477)	\$96 (283)
Individuals	\$21 (100)	\$52 (227)	\$203 (702)	\$345 (1018)

**Table 3: Average amount given per capita of the surveyed population per annum for SES A, A/B and B - \$US (PPP)**

<i>Country</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Voluntary organisations	\$7 (35)	\$34 (149)	\$113 (391)	\$143 (421)
Religious organisations	\$12 (58)	\$38 (167)	\$128 (444)	\$89 (263)
Individuals	\$15 (72)	\$51 (222)	\$159 (550)	\$314 (926)

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$34 (165)</b>	<b>\$123 (538)</b>	<b>\$400 (1385)</b>	<b>\$546 (1610)</b>
--------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

---

**Table 4: Percentage given per capita by category of recipient for SES A, A/B and B only**

<i>Country</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Voluntary organisations	21%	28%	28%	26%
Religious organisations	35%	31%	32%	16%
Individuals	44%	41%	40%	58%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

---

**Table 5: Generosity ratio by category of recipient for SES A, A/B and B**

<i>Country</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Voluntary organisations	0.3%	1.6%	1.3%	1.4%
Religious organisations	0.6%	1.8%	1.5%	0.9%
Individuals	0.7%	2.5%	1.8%	3.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>

---

Ten more tables disaggregate some of this data. They compare the rate and level of giving to nonprofit organisations by field of activity; the rate and level of giving to individuals by class of individual; reasons for giving; fundraising methods experienced and those responded to positively; and, finally, the effect of SES on rate and level of giving and on generosity. In these tables, data is from classes A, B and C in all countries but Thailand. Data on motives and experience of fundraising is for giving to other voluntary organisations. However, the positioning of the question in the surveys administered by some countries meant that responses might apply to religious and individual giving as well.

**Table 6: Giving rate to voluntary organisations – socioeconomic classes A, B and C (percentage)**

<i>Field</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand#</i>
Culture & arts	7	5	15	5
Sports & recreation	4	13	36	14
Education	7	30	36	35
Health	5	5	30	23
Social services	18	39	61	51
Environment	1	3	35	13
Development	2	54	10	27

# Classes A/B for Thailand only

**Table 7: Average amount given by givers of the population surveyed to voluntary organisations by field (Purchasing Power Parity) – socioeconomic classes A, A/B, B and C**

<i>Field</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand#</i>
Culture & arts	14	28	177	105
Sports & recreation	21	20	77	271
Education	54	97	134	363
Health	27	33	77	140
Social services	32	58	121	142
Environment	52	148	62	60
Development	39	60	205	164

# Classes A/B only for Thailand

**Table 8: Giving rates to individuals by recipient and country (percentage)**

<i>Recipient</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Relatives	14	56	56	51
Friends	12	32	82	29
Beggars	80	81	92	63
Victims of calamities	31	39	41	na
Other	7	na	na	34

na data not collected

**Table 9: Average amount of money given by givers to individuals by recipient and country (PPP)**

<i>Recipient</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Relatives	155	206	354	1287
Friends	90	106	335	533
Beggars	15	26	42	32
Victims of calamities	30	58	160	na
Other	59	na	na	453

na data not collected

**Table 10: Reasons for giving (percentage reporting very important/important)**

<i>Reason</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
A feeling of compassion	91	89	99	90
Giving is easier than volunteering time	75	na	85	37
Giving makes the giver feel good	81	89	99	65
Due to religious beliefs/practice	76	98	76	38
Being asked to give	49	na	55	27
Believing in the cause/organisation	64	46	92	61
To return a favour/passing the kindness	43	na	52	63
Pressured to give	18	1	14	22

na data not collected

**Table 11: Method of fundraising (percentage approached by each method)**

<i>Method of giving</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
In the street, by a person collecting money for an organisation	34	72	61	na
Through an appeal in the mail for an organisation	5	15	39	21
An appeal in the newspaper/media	20	6	18	18
At your door by a person collecting for your organisation	48	81	81	na
By telephone as part of an appeal for an organisation	2	4	6	na
To buy tickets to a special event	11	12	82	na
By a relative/friend/dependant	16	20	76	16
At workplace	22	30	34	11

na data not collected

**Table 12: Effectiveness of fundraising methods (percentage of those approached by this method who gave)**

<i>Method of giving</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
In the street, by a person collecting money for an organisation	63	53	69	na
Through an appeal in the mail for an organisation	57	44	82	na
An appeal in the newspaper/media	35	48	64	na
At your door by a person collecting for your organisation	75	48	86	na
By telephone as part of an appeal for an organisation	57	13	33	na
To buy tickets to a special event	80	68	97	na
By a relative/friend/dependant	81	57	98	na
At workplace	85	70	94	na

na data not collected

**Table 13: Giving rate to voluntary organisations by socioeconomic status (percentage)**

<i>Country</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
SES A	54	86		
SES A/B			88	81
SES B	48	79		
SES C	41	71	84	

**Table 14: Average amount given per capita to voluntary organisations by socioeconomic status (Purchasing Power Parity)**

<i>Socio-economic status</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
SES A	49	258		
SES A/B			391	421
SES B	25	93		
SES C	12	25	218	

**Table 15: Generosity ratio for giving to voluntary organisations by socioeconomic status**

	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
<b>SES A, A/B &amp; B</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
SES A	0.4%	1.7%		
SES A/B			1.3%	1.4%
SES B	0.3%	1.6%		
SES C	0.2%	1.0%	1.1%	

## **Discussion**

What was particularly interesting about the findings was that there were many points of similarity between the countries as well as points of difference.

*Similarities.* Perhaps the most important finding is that in all four countries, almost all high to middle income households made philanthropic gifts in the preceding twelve months. In this regard, these households appear to be as committed to philanthropy as are high to middle income households in northern or developed countries. In making this comparison with developed countries, it should be kept in mind that the comparison with developed countries has the limitation that developed countries tend to collect data on the giving rate for the whole population rather than particular social classes.

Another similarity between all four countries is their uniformly high rate of giving to religious organisations. This suggests that although the four countries have distinct religious traditions, those traditions are strong even among high and middle-income households, precisely those groups most exposed to the secularizing influences of northern culture. Nonetheless, as we shall see below, religious beliefs are not uniformly powerful as a motive for giving.

Overall, there is a high rate of support for individuals in all four countries, but, as we shall see below, the way in which that support is divided between different groups of individuals varies between countries.

Another similarity between our four countries is the effect of socio-economic status on giving. SES has only a small effect on the giving rate, but a greater effect on the average amount given by givers. Overall, these findings are not surprising. Our data is not particularly well suited to study the effect of socio-economic status on generosity, but overall, it appears that the generosity ratio falls slightly between households in SES A and those in SES C.

A final similarity between all our countries is the uniformly high level of importance given to “feeling of compassion” as a motive for giving. All other motives and the various techniques used vary between countries, sometimes in interesting ways, as we shall see below.

*Differences.* Not surprisingly, differences in the dimensions of giving between our four countries outnumber similarities.

This is nowhere clearer than in comparisons of the average amounts given by those who give. Even when expressed in PPP, Indians in SES classes A and B give far smaller amounts than do Indonesians, while Thais and Filipinos are far in front of both (in that order). This is true of giving to each major category of recipient, with the interesting exception that high to middle income Filipinos give more to religion than do Thais in classes A/B. The differences are even greater when we look at average amount given per capita. Comparisons across countries using SES classes should be treated cautiously as the way SES is measured differs between countries.

There are also limitations in that PPP measures purchasing power, not available income. It is for this reason that we use the generosity ratio to give an additional measure of philanthropic disposition among these SES classes in each country.

The generosity ratio shows a similar pattern to the other data. High and middle income Indians are not as generous as people from similar social strata in the three Southeast Asian countries. Indonesians, however, turn out to be marginally more generous than Filipinos, while the apparent benevolent bent of Thais is shown to be less dramatic than the PPP measures suggest.

When we look at the way members of these strata in each country divide the way they allocate funds between the three main groups of recipients, we see some interesting similarities as well as differences. In all countries, individuals are the main recipients of philanthropy, receiving around 40 per cent of the total given in three countries and a little more than half in Thailand. All four countries give between 20 and 30 per cent to voluntary organisations. It is the proportion given to religious organisations that shows some interesting differences. Indians give the highest proportion to religion, followed by Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand least, less than half the proportion given by Indians.

When we look at giving to other voluntary organisations, India is a particularly marked exception. This is true not only in amounts given, but in the numbers who give (the giving rate). For the three countries in Southeast Asia, the giving rate is very high, as high as or higher than in Northern countries. But in India the giving rate is dramatically lower than the other three. Putting it another way – barely half of the high to middle income Indians in our sample support other voluntary organisations. Or, to put it in a third way, almost one half of Indians from this social stratum that support religious organisations, do not support other voluntary organisations. Neither a scrutiny of the demographics of these two groups, nor of the motives of Indian givers suggest a reason for this difference.

When we turn our attention to the fields in which voluntary organisations are active, we see that voluntary organisations providing social services are the most popular in three countries. In Indonesia, development organisations are the most widely supported, though there may be some overlap with social services. When we look at the data on average amounts given by givers to voluntary organisations in particular fields, we find that in India and Thailand, those supporting voluntary organisations in education give the largest amounts on average (though in India, development organisations receive the same

level of support). In the Philippines, those supporting development give the largest gifts (though those supporting cultural organisations also give large sums).

However, when we look at the average amount given per capita of the population surveyed (a measure which combines the giving rate and the average amount given by givers), it is education that receives the largest amount from our sample in Thailand, while it is social services in India and the Philippines. In Indonesia, it is development NGOs that receive the largest sum from our sample, a little more than is received by voluntary organisations providing education. In India, the level of support for social services would be considerably higher if we counted organisations providing support to victims of calamities as part of the social services.

Of equal interest is that Thais and Filipinos are more likely than households of similar class in the other two countries to give to voluntary organisations in many fields. This supports the proposition that the Philippines and Thailand have a particularly lively and widely spread voluntary sector.

When we look at the support given to different groups of individuals we see some intriguing differences between our four countries. Giving to individuals should be viewed as having two components – giving to those such as relatives, friends and subordinates, with whom the giver has a direct and on-going relationship, and giving to strangers, such as beggars. Interestingly, in three of the four countries, three-quarters or more of the population surveyed gave to beggars (and over 60 per cent in Thailand), though the amounts given are small. Nonetheless, it indicates a high level of direct gift making to needy others, rather than relying on intermediary organisations as is most common in the North. Of course, the needy are ubiquitous in these countries, and those with high incomes would be aware that such people have no other source of income. The percentage supporting beggars in Thailand is likely to be lower than in the other four countries because of government efforts to prevent street begging.

Interestingly, the two countries where more than 50 per cent of the sample gives to relatives were the two (Thailand and Indonesia) most affected by the financial crisis that hit a number of Asian countries in 1997. Thailand also stands out for its high level of giving to needy subordinates (a category added by the Thai team). The Philippines was not as badly affected as were Indonesia and Thailand; though while giving to relatives is below 50 per cent, giving to friends is much higher than other countries. India stands out from the rest in the low numbers who give to relatives and friends. These figures suggest that high income Indians have few ties with poorer people, whether relatives or friends. This is perhaps because the growth of a large middle class happened earlier in India than in the Southeast Asian countries (where many of the middle-class have relatives back in their home villages), or perhaps because the financial crisis, which India avoided, impoverished many of this new middle-class in the two countries most affected.

When we turn to motives for giving, we see a great deal of difference between the responses given by our different country samples. Two stand out. One is the greater importance given to religious beliefs in Indonesia, where almost all the sample say that is an important/very important reason for giving. This motive is affirmed by about three-quarters of the sample in India and the Philippines but by less than forty percent in Thailand.

By contrast, over sixty percent of Thais cite “to return a favour/passing the kindness” as a major motive, compared with less than ten percent of Indonesians (and forty to fifty percent of the other two country groups). These differences point to the strength of philanthropy in the Islamic religious tradition and suggest that the Buddhist tradition that dominates in Thailand emphasizes reciprocal obligations rather than direct philanthropy. Interestingly, Thais give proportionately less to religious organisations. This finding may be influenced by the factor that the Thai sample is better educated than the samples in the other countries.

From a practical point of view, the data give some guidance to those who would like to increase the funds raised for other voluntary organisations. Except for India, there are relatively few people who do not give at all. The most fruitful approach in those countries will be to increase the amount given by those who already give. In India there are many who give to religious organisations but do not give to other voluntary organisations. But there are no obvious features that distinguish such people and could help voluntary organisations to target their fundraising appeals.

A more interesting approach can be found in examining the different methods used to raise funds and their success rates (Tables 11 and 12). This data shows, for example, that selling tickets to special events is a highly successful method of fundraising in India, but is used sparingly (on only 11 per cent of our sample). In India, too, approaches at the workplace elicit gifts from 85 per cent of those approached, but only 22 per cent report being approached, suggesting another potentially effective approach to fundraising.

## **Conclusions**

The most important finding is the high rates and levels of giving in all countries; only in India is the giving rate to nonreligious organisations below other countries. This demonstrates conclusively that philanthropy is not just a Northern, or an American practice – a product of Christianity. The rate of giving to religious organisations, far higher than in Northern countries, points to the pervasive influence of religion in these countries and should prompt further study of the influence of religion, and the effect of secularization, on giving (and the third sector more generally).

The study also illustrates the difficulties of conducting reliable comparative research, especially in countries where there is no comprehensive census data to frame populations. Nonetheless, the study laid the groundwork for later surveys in these countries.

## **References**

APPC (Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium) (2002), *Investing in Ourselves. Giving and Fundraising in Asia*, Asian Development Bank, Manila.

## Appendix 1

**Table A.1: Demographic measures by country (2000)**

<i>Measure</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Population (millions)	1005.3	212.6	75.6	62.7
Population growth	1.9%	1.6%	2.0%	1.5%
Life expectancy	62	65	68	71
Urban population	28%	38%	57%	36%
Majority Religion	Hindu	Muslim	Catholic	Buddhist

*Source: Statistics from the World Bank cited in Asia Week, August 2001*

**Table A.2: Economic measures by country (2000)**

<i>Measure</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
GNP (PPP)	\$1 710b.	\$558b.	\$272b.	\$368b.
Per capita GNP (PPP)	2 167	2 685	3 622	5 757
Per capita GNP (nominal USD)	\$452	\$617	\$ 1046	\$1 949
GDP Annual Growth	5.7%	5.1%	3.6%	3.1%
PPP conversion factor for local currency units	9.0	2 299	14.5	13.7
PPP conversion factor for US dollars	4.79	4.35	3.46	2.95

*Source: Statistics from the World Bank cited in Asia Week, August 2001*