RETHINKING RESILIENCE: INSIGHTS FROM THE GIVING ECOSYSTEM

A Lookback at 2022 Trends in Global Generosity
GivingTuesday Data

We measure generosity and its substantial actual impact, saving and improving lives.

The GivingTuesday Data Commons is a groundbreaking research collaboration between 300+ organizations and 50+ global data labs focused on uncovering new trends and insights on giving and generosity. We explore giving behaviors, contexts and patterns, movement growth, and altruistic motivations in order to identify and share the best practices that help drive increased generosity at a global scale. The Data Commons’ design and structure models the distributed leadership and peer learning environment that are the foundations of the GivingTuesday movement.

In the United States, the project has generated an unprecedented level of collaboration between stakeholders including academics, donation platforms, and payment processors. Through nine Data Commons working groups, as well as 12 research hubs on our collaborative online data platform, we are unearthing new insights about the social sector and the giving economy and have produced tools to help improve effectiveness across these sectors. GivingTuesday is able to provide our Data Commons collaborators with access to the data collected for their own research, analysis and benchmarking, giving them freedom to create their own reports and to visualize trends.

Learn more: www.givingtuesday.org/data
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Letter From Our Chief Data Officer

I recently met someone at an industry event who grew up in a lower-income community in America. They told me something that really stayed with me: they never knew they were poor until they left home, because they always had something to give and someone was always giving them something.

Always being able to give – and always being given to – might be the most profound definition of wealth I've ever heard. It also demonstrates how elastic and inadequate financially-oriented definitions of generosity can be.

Our 2022 Lookback Report makes it clear that in many communities, giving to others is not an optional ‘extra’ but rather a first principle of community membership. Our goal at the GivingTuesday Data Commons is to map all that giving – to map the global giving ecosystem – in all of its complexity and diversity.

Why? Because we're convinced that the current understanding of our ‘philanthropic sector’ is too narrow and exclusive, resulting in a skewed perspective. This perspective not only limits the impact and sustainability of social sector organizations dependent on public generosity, but also unfairly elevates the impact of certain individuals and demographics when it comes to shaping policies and priorities within those organizations.

Here at the Data Commons, we aim to bring the same sorts of data-driven tools to the social sector that the business sector has had for decades. We're working to enable the development and implementation of far more effective evidence-based campaigns and create opportunities to move beyond outdated transactional models and explore more diverse, distributed, responsive, and enduring relational strategies.
And we are convinced that now is the time to act on this insight, so that nonprofits can capitalize on a larger and more loyal pool of donors this year and beyond.

Our research reveals that broadening outreach and engagement to include previously under-represented demographics can significantly improve organizational resilience, especially in times of economic volatility and uncertainty.

Beyond this, we're now leveraging our Global Hubs – by engaging local teams, talent, and collaborators – to build infrastructure and conduct new research that will vastly expand on these findings.

Human generosity is remarkably abundant, even if most of it has historically flown under the research radar. We're confident that by developing new tools to understand and promote radical generosity, we can help grow everyone's social capital and empower changemakers everywhere to create better communities and a better world.

If you'd like to join our efforts, give us a call. We've got plenty of exciting projects in the pipeline.

*Woodrow Rosenbaum*
Executive Summary

This 2022 Lookback Report is our most audacious attempt yet to map the global giving ecosystem. In it, we analyze and present giving behaviors and data drawn from thousands of people in Asia, Africa, Europe, South America, and North America.

Producing this report has been challenging, but also inspiring: our data consistently shows that people are fundamentally generous and that globally, the majority of people choose to give.

In fact, 83.6% of people worldwide donated to others in one way or another in 2022.

Some donated their time. Some gave things they owned. Some gave their voices, advocating on behalf of a cause. Some gave money. Remarkably, all over the world, most people (56%) gave in at least 3 of those ways.

Moreover, 57% of people gave to all 3 recipient types that we tracked: formal charities, informal groups, and individuals.

Giving behaviors change constantly due to shifting social, cultural, political, demographic, and economic drivers, but using data to unpack these complex circumstances has led us to a few key insights:

- **Human generosity is vast in scale and extraordinarily diverse in its scope.** Giving is an important part of every community, and most people of all ages and economic status all around the world regularly and willingly participate in the giving ecosystem.
• **2022 saw an uptick in volunteering everywhere**, a familiar consequence of economic instability as people volunteer to help out or in the hope of landing jobs. Moreover, as COVID-19 finally started to fade from view, people began gathering in groups once again.

• **In 2022, younger generations everywhere were more generous than older generations**, giving more often and in more ways. Older generations still donate more dollars in some countries, but in others it is younger generations who are the most financially generous.

• **We saw a reduction in large donor results in Q4 2022.** Large donors are historically more responsive to economic downturns and the end of 2022 saw notable stock market declines.

• **In the USA, both donors and dollars were down in 2022**, a double-whammy not seen since 2010.

This last trend, taken together with suggestions that similar patterns are emerging in some other countries, along with the overall dynamism of the giving ecosystem and existing data showing that nonprofits with a broader and more diverse donor base achieve greater resilience during economic downturns, all point to our key conclusions:

• **We are seeing a downturn in both dollars and donors in the nonprofit sector but we do not believe this is an inevitability.**

• **Now is the time for nonprofits to broaden target demographics to include previously under-solicited groups** in order to build loyalty and relevance and to tap into the powerful cross-generational willingness to give that is present in nearly every community.

• **Proactively increasing diversified engagement today will position nonprofits to increase donations of dollars and other contributions later this year.** This work will strengthen resilience and reduce the adverse effects of steadily growing competition for a shrinking pool of increasingly cautious large donors who may be retreating in the face of economic uncertainty and volatility.
METHODOLOGY & DATASETS

This report reflects the integration of a number of datasets into our Data Commons. Please visit each link to learn more about each dataset and to request access to the data or our dashboards.

- **Growth in Giving Fundraising Data**, with the Association of Fundraising Professionals - transaction-level fundraising data with more than 241 million transactions that are continuously updated by fundraising software partners (in alphabetical order) Bloomerang, DonorPerfect, Keela, and NeonOne. This dataset was used in the Monetary Giving section of this report, specifically on nonprofit fundraising.

- **2022 USA Giving Survey** - Our landmark survey on Giving in the USA. The survey includes giving types, giving structures, giving sentiment, and demographics. It is an online survey of Americans with a sample size of 5,000, weighted against age and income. This dataset was used throughout this report to highlight giving behaviors in the USA within the past year.

- **2022 Global Omnibus Survey** - Similar to the USA Giving Survey, but less detailed and across seven countries: US, Canada, UK, Mexico, Brazil, Kenya, and India. It is an online survey of 1,000 people for each country. Respondents are weighted differently for each country, with typical weighting profiles factoring in age, income, and education. This dataset was used in the Global Giving section, specifically to report on global behaviors in different countries.

- **Golden Volunteer Data** - Golden Volunteer provided GivingTuesday aggregated data and valuable insights about volunteering trends in the past year in the US.

- **2022 GivingTuesday’s GivingPulse** - GivingPulse investigates a broad range of giving behaviors and sentiments through weekly surveys which give us insights into the state of generosity through nearly real-time monitoring and analyses. This is a weekly, online survey of a sample of ~100 American adults, aged between 18 and 85 years and who have lived in the USA for at least 12 months, aggregated monthly. GivingPulse is a key data source for this 2022 Lookback Report to highlight giving behaviors in the USA within the past year.
DEFINITIONS

Giving Types - In this report, we provide data that captures a range of giving behaviors. These behaviors have been organized into 4 categories that we call Giving Types:

- **Money** - any gift of money to an individual or organization outside of family
- **Time** - all forms and contexts of voluntary giving of time to an individual or organization outside of family
- **Items** - any gift of a material object — such as such as food, clothing, personal products, or furniture — to an individual or organization outside of family
- **Advocacy** - any proactive advocacy, public endorsement, or promotion of a cause

For improved legibility, we sometimes refer to Giving Types as ‘types of giving’ or ‘ways of giving.’

Recipient Groups - In this report, we also provide data that captures giving to a range of recipients. These recipients have been organized into 3 categories that we call Recipient Groups:

- **Registered Organizations** - legally registered charitable or nonprofit organizations
- **Structured Organizations** - organized and structured community groups, associations, clubs, etc. that are not legally registered entities
- **Unstructured Giving** - unstructured community groups and individuals

**Formal Giving** means donations to **Registered Organizations only. Informal Giving** means donations to either **Structured Organizations** or **Unstructured Giving**.

**Note on the use of the United Kingdom**: Our 2022 UK data excludes Northern Ireland.
Global Giving

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **Giving behaviors are highly culturally dependent, with radically different giving ecosystems found in different places.** Of the countries we surveyed, Kenya was by far the most generous across all metrics.

- **In every country we surveyed, the vast majority of people donated through both formal and informal channels.** The wealthiest countries nonetheless saw a significantly greater reliance on formal giving channels.

- **Kenyans and Indians volunteer at twice the rate of people in Europe and North America,** though in all countries volunteering happens more often in unstructured community settings than in formal organizational ones.

Giving takes place everywhere, yet everywhere it is distinct

In surveying thousands of people in each of 5 continents over the past 12 months, we discovered some **important national differences in giving habits.** Mapping these differences not only helps us to understand giving in a global context, it also offers us opportunities to learn from one another about what works and why when it comes to promoting giving.
The most inescapable insight is that although giving cultures vary widely from country to country, we consistently find the most generosity in less wealthy countries (i.e. those with lower Gross National Income per capita).

Kenya in particular demonstrated a near universal commitment to generosity across all metrics, with India not far behind. By way of contrast, giving in the United Kingdom in 2022 – to name but one example – occurred far more sparingly across every type and recipient group.
Beyond these broad comparisons, we found many more specific comparative insights.

For example, in Mexico, India, Kenya, and Brazil, people most often give money directly to individuals in need, doing so much more frequently than they give to formal charities and informal groups like community associations. The opposite is true in Canada and the United Kingdom, where money is much more often given to organizations (directly or through an intermediary). In the USA, giving occurs more often through formal organizations, although direct in-person giving is also commonplace.

Meanwhile, when it comes to how many people give to formal charities, informal groups, or ad hoc causes in any way (including time, things, and advocacy as well as money), we saw relatively balanced support for giving across each of these three recipient groups in every country. The only exception to this result is the United Kingdom, where giving to formal charities is 50% more common than to any other recipients.

For detailed data visualizations offering insights into a wide range of other giving behaviors in other countries, please see the Appendices.

Next, we will walk you through a number of high-level conclusions we have drawn from 2022 giving data.
KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Globally, most people who give do so both formally and informally.
- However, in the USA, Canada, and especially the UK, there is a significant minority of donors who only give to registered charities.
- Older generations are less likely to donate money or items through informal organizations or directly to individuals.

PREVALENCE OF GLOBAL GIVING, BY FORMALITY

For detailed data visualizations offering insights into a wide range of other giving behaviors in other countries, please see the Appendices.
We tracked Informal Giving to unregistered organized groups or individuals and compared it to Formal Giving to registered charities.

Through this comparison, we found that although there are major national differences in the number of people who give, those who do give tend to give both formally and informally in every country.

Countries shown in order of increasing Gross National income (GNI) per capita, from Kenya ($2,010) to USA ($70,430). People tend to increase their formal giving as per capita GNI increases.

In the USA, generational differences in giving behaviors generally align with a wide range of other demographic characteristics. For example, those who more often report giving money formally to charities and nonprofits are often older, retired, married and higher-income. Those who report more often giving informally, either on an ad hoc basis or to informal groups such as community groups, are more often younger, single, and lower-income.

For detailed data visualizations offering insights into a wide range of other demographic giving data, please see the Appendix A.
These demographic differences also manifest as differences in attitudes towards giving. The older group reports greater trust in the value of charities and nonprofits (and the services they provide) than the younger group, which has doubts about the efficiency and reliability of charities and nonprofits.

**THIS RAISES SOME INTERESTING QUESTIONS:**

- Do these findings demonstrate that older and wealthier individuals are more willing to give to charities than younger, lower-income givers, or do they reflect the fact that the older group is solicited by charities far more often than the younger one?

- To what extent do assumption, habit, and bias shape the behaviors of fundraisers in choosing whom to solicit? Do nonprofits target high-income individuals out of necessity, or habit?

- Could the recognition that giving occurs across the entire spectrum of society inspire more diverse outreach tactics and a deeper, broader, and more resilient donor base?

Next year the Data Commons will begin unpacking these questions and examining more of the underlying assumptions shaping common fundraising practices.
The invasion of Ukraine by Russia in February 2022 had an enormous impact on giving worldwide, primarily due to the sudden appearance of nearly 8 million Ukrainian refugees - of whom 80-90% were women and children.

THESE REFUGEES HAVE BEEN TAKEN IN BY DOZENS OF COUNTRIES:

In Poland, hundreds of thousands of individuals stepped forward to open their homes to the 1.5 million Ukrainian refugees who have crossed their borders since the war began.¹

In the EU, residency rights, work permits, and access to health care, schools, and housing have been offered to over 4 million refugees.²

Nearly 3 million refugees have ended up in Russia, although many report being taken there against their will, and in some cases have been stripped of their rights.³

³ “Forcible Transfer of Ukrainians to Russia”, Human Rights Watch, 1 September 2022.
Nonetheless, within the nonprofit sector in Russia, Russian philanthropy adapted and persevered, supporting human rights, addressing torture and police violence, and assisting over 3 million Ukrainian refugees. This is all despite facing reduced donations, increased technical challenges, and new political obstacles in 2022 due to the war. For example, a community of major giving platforms and local payment services collaborated to create a comprehensive research platform for online giving, despite the Russian government branding this the work of ‘foreign agents.’

As Russian philanthropy looks to the future, they plan to engage big foundations, improve non-monetary aid tracking, and delve deeper into donor behavior to encourage corporate donors to support NGOs through matching campaigns, ultimately fostering stronger communities and more effective support networks.

In the USA, Ukraine appeared to be top of mind for GivingPulse respondents for the three months following the beginning of the invasion in February. Over this interval, people who were aware of Ukraine were more likely to direct their support internationally and to causes related to immigration and refugee support and emergency/crisis relief. Support in all three of these categories dropped off near the end of May for all respondents.

Likewise, according to our annual USA survey, the self-reported donation rate to international aid organizations increased around 20% in 2022, the largest increase of any organizational cause area. Although we cannot tell how much of this particular year-over-year increase is Ukraine-specific, it does appear that on an annual basis, Americans were much more focused on international aid in 2022 than they were in 2021, and that much of this support was concentrated in the months of March, April, and May compared with any other time of year.

---

4 The information in this paragraph was provided by GivingTuesday’s Russia leaders.
People who were aware of Ukraine were more likely to direct their support internationally and to causes related to immigration, refugee support, and emergency/crisis relief.
KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Generational giving patterns play out differently from country to country. Assumptions about the universality of giving behaviors and demographics can be usefully questioned.
- How people donate money varies sharply along generational lines, as well as along national/cultural ones.
- Generosity is highest among younger generations.

GIVING BY GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Birth Year</th>
<th>Age in 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Gen-Z</td>
<td>1997-2012</td>
<td>11-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>1981-1996</td>
<td>27-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen-X</td>
<td>1965-1990</td>
<td>43-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>1946-1964</td>
<td>59-77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents to our Global Omnibus Survey were at least 16 years old.

Perhaps the most surprising finding of our survey was how widely giving behaviors vary by generation from country to country.

For example, when comparing how different generations give money to registered charities, we found a remarkable diversity of giving profiles.
These findings provoke other interesting questions and insights as well. For example: in Canada, Boomers give significantly more to registered charities than each of the 3 other generations, whereas in the USA, Millennials give almost equally to Boomers. This gap could be an opportunity for Canadian fundraisers to rethink how they engage Millennials, and for American fundraisers to do the same with Gen X.
Meanwhile, we find that in both Brazil and Mexico, the most active donors of money to registered charities are the youngest generation, Gen-Z. Does this mean that this is where the money is or that charities in these countries do a poor job of soliciting money from older generations? And why are Mexican Boomers by far the least generous demographic of any we surveyed?

If we look at a global overview of giving by generation, we continue to see an enormous range of responses to our survey. This chart tracks which of the 4 generations gives most often in the 12 giving types we tracked, sorted by country.

Among the 7 countries we surveyed, Canada was by far the most generationally polarized, as this chart shows. More than any other country, the data shows that the youngest Canadians are overwhelmingly the most generous Canadians.

In addition, this graphic shows that globally, young people are far more active givers than older people. Everywhere except Kenya, the two younger generations vastly outgive compared to the two older generations.

The graph on the right reflects which generation gave most often (per capita) in each of 12 categories of giving, each a combination of gift type (ie time, etc.) and gift recipients (formal, informal, individual).

For detailed data visualizations offering insights into a wide range of other demographic giving data, please see the Appendix B.
SPOTLIGHT: AFRICA

Africa has a tremendously rich and highly diverse culture of generosity. The desire to leverage local, cultural, regional, national, and trans-national giving practices to strengthen civic work has led to a growing demand for open, reliable, and actionable data on generosity in Africa.

As a result, the GivingTuesday Africa Hub, together with other philanthropy and civil society stakeholders, has begun working to dynamically map the vast African giving ecosystem.

COLLECTIVELY, THEY ARE PURSUING — AMONG OTHER GOALS — AN UNDERSTANDING OF:

1. Diaspora resource channels/motivations and behaviors that are heavily influenced by cultures, policies, and experiences outside the continent.

2. An evolving donor community among the middle-class, affiliated networks, and youth philanthropists that draw from contemporary experiences.

3. The value of voice, time, and talent as gifts that are at times of equal or even greater impact than gifts of money.
African giving traditions are very diverse, and steeped in notions of solidarity, mutuality, and reciprocity woven into everyday practices by ordinary people.⁵ They are an integral part of social relations.

African acts of generosity are typically directed to proximate social networks. However, mobile networks, devices, and apps have helped broaden the meaning of “proximate” to include those who share a specific identity/network without geographic limits. Nearly all mobilizing among micro-donors now occurs via mobile apps like WhatsApp⁶, typically activating donations by members of existing chat groups (e.g., extended families, villagers, alumni, co-workers, etc.) but also increasingly mobilizing donors who have no prior connection with the cause or recipient within and across borders. The immense popularity of mobile money also allows a more effortless transfer of gifts and, as a result, mobile money has become a key driver of crowdfunding.⁷

It seems likely that emergent responsive giving modes on the continent provide an opportunity for the Global North to learn about how to mobilize grassroots/diverse giving, a subject we will explore further in future reports.

Other important trends that impacted African giving in 2022 include:
• A growing number of African-founded and led foundations and increased private donor giving across the continent, which indicates that the giving landscape is maturing faster than anticipated, despite widespread systemic challenges and popular suspicion of foundations founded by wealthy elites.⁸

• An increase in intra-national generosity and diaspora giving, which presents a new opportunity to engage government and policy as the essence of the community is being redefined beyond geography.⁹,¹⁰

• An increasing focus on the wide-ranging contributions of youth as organizations seek to harness the energy and potential of young people to drive positive change.¹¹,¹²

• Philanthropists investing in mitigating future crises with more powerful risk management and resilience provisions in new programs.

• An increasing focus on gender equality, sustainability, innovation, and social entrepreneurship to address complex social and environmental challenges.

• Increased flexibility in philanthropy operations with a shift from short-term KPIs to more significant picture aims.

• Calls for closing the race gap in philanthropy following 2020 racial justice protests globally and in Africa. There is greater awareness of systemic inequalities than ever before, including how aid is distributed and administered.¹⁶

• Drive impact (e.g. Genderfund setting structures to consolidate all forms of donors, large and micro.¹³,¹⁴,¹⁵)

---

⁶ In 2020, WhatsApp has the most impact on giving behaviors at 35% higher than any other continent in world.
⁸ Moreover, these foundations tend to give to local or national issues rather than cross-border issues.
¹⁰ Diaspora giving is a common practice on the continent, including in Algeria, Cameroon, Senegal and Tunisia.
¹² For instance, in South Africa, 18 to 24 year-olds are significantly more likely to report that “making a difference” is their main motivation to give, compared to the average giver in the country.
¹⁵ In Central Africa, social entrepreneurship is becoming a major trend affecting giving, which leads people to become more conscious about how they give back to their communities.
KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Those who donate money favor widely different giving channels from country to country.
- The impact of digital donations is enormous, although the specific digital channels favored in various countries also vary widely around the world.
- Worldwide, people most often still give directly to a person in need without using organizations, phones, technology, etc.

### MONETARY GIVING METHODS, BY COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving Methods (%, among those who gave money)</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online, on Org’s website</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online, via intermediary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person (to fundraiser)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By mobile (SMS / transfer)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In store (cashier)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via work payroll</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly to needy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW WE GIVE

In this graphic summarizing our global findings, many striking differences appear. Among them:

- **Over 40% of all donors of money in the USA, Canada, the UK, and India made a donation via the recipient’s website, with many others making donations via 3rd party websites.** In an era that appears to be leaving websites behind in favor of more immediate and interactive digital channels, this is an eye-opening finding.

- **In Kenya, fully 60% of all donors gave money via SMS or some other form of mobile transfer, reflecting Africa’s leading-edge embrace of mobile payment systems.**

- **Although payroll donations are declining elsewhere, in India they remain a significant driver of the giving ecosystem with 21% of donors giving via payroll deductions.** The future of workplace giving remains uncertain, but India’s degree of charitable workplace engagement is a reminder that it remains an area of immense opportunity.

- **In-person donations — either at a dedicated fundraiser or via a cashier at a check-out counter — remain moderately popular ways of donating everywhere.** This suggests that while the digital ceiling remains high yet uncertain for giving, the in-person floor seems somewhat universally stable.

Methods of giving vary greatly around the world, but giving via an organization’s website or directly to needy individuals are the two most popular methods worldwide.
In 2022, with the support of the Fidelity Charitable Trustees Initiative, the GivingTuesday Data Commons launched GivingPulse, a national weekly survey of American giving behaviors designed to offer the social sector an accurate, up-to-date, evidence-based snapshot reflecting the current state of giving in America at any given time.

Through this project, GivingTuesday is actively seeking to understand and share insights into the nature of generosity in all its forms and to expand the collaborative research environment in the social sector. In time, GivingPulse will allow the sector to explore how various events, interventions, crises, and demographic factors impact or correlate with generosity in near real-time.
This is one example of what GivingPulse can tell us about crisis awareness and how each spike impacts generosity during that week or month. Initial work on this project has included developing, validating, implementing, and iterating the weekly survey as well as beginning to build out pipelines that automatically produce and update dashboards as new data is received.

GivingTuesday will also make the raw and structured GivingPulse data, along with its schemas, summary tables, data visualization dashboards, and analysis tools readily available to researchers through the GivingTuesday Data Commons platform on a monthly basis.

We also intend to make this data available to the public through regular reporting describing and analyzing real-time generosity trends. Implementing clear mechanisms for feedback from these users will also help make iterative improvements to these tools.

We anticipate deploying the GivingPulse model internationally through our regional Hubs and national GivingTuesday partnerships in the coming year.

GivingPulse is a key data source for this 2022 Lookback Report.
SPOTLIGHT: GIVINGTUESDAY

GivingTuesday is an inclusive and pluralistic community of millions of givers that celebrates and uplifts grassroots generosity and generosity as a universally held value.

Around the world and across diverse giving cultures, our network of local leaders in 90 countries and hundreds of communities innovate, collaborate, and inspire radical generosity as a way to build the world they want to live in.

GivingTuesday – held annually on the Tuesday after American Thanksgiving – accounts for an increasingly massive spike in financial donations across countless organizations and causes, with $3.1 billion donated in the USA alone on GivingTuesday 2022. What began as a single day of giving has grown into a far greater annual wave of generosity both leading up to and after GivingTuesday itself.

FEP data proves conclusively that GivingTuesday “lifts” the whole giving season. As one example, organizations who promoted on GivingTuesday activated 40-60% more donors over the whole end-of-year giving season than in previous years.

GivingTuesday donors are sticky. About 40% of GivingTuesday donors give again the following year, and GivingTuesday donors become monthly recurring donors at a slightly higher rate than those acquired from end-of-year giving campaigns. On average, donor acquisition growth rates on GivingTuesday are 4.4x higher than the rest of the year, while retention rates are 2.4x higher, and recurring growth rates are 1.7x higher.
In addition to GivingTuesday's impact on fundraising, it also generates a massive wave of non-monetary generosity. For example on GivingTuesday 2022 in the USA, 11 million Americans donated items, 10 million volunteered, and 15 million actively advocated on behalf of social causes. GivingTuesday’s impact is growing internationally as well, with 70 distinct Dia de Doar community campaigns in Brazil last year, 2x the expected number of campaigns in Hungary, thousands of free meals distributed in the Philippines, and many other countries achieving exciting giving milestones.

**GivingTuesday donors offer lifetime value**, as our data indicates that they give more often over the lifetime of their giving relationship with an organization, compared to donors acquired on December 31 of that year.
What We Give

When people give, they do so in different ways: giving money, giving items (giving of physical goods), giving time (e.g. volunteering), and giving advocacy (e.g. actively endorsing a cause).

 Everywhere we looked, the majority of people engaged in more than one type of giving. In fact, while philanthropy is often discussed solely in monetary terms, the reality is that a small percentage of those surveyed gave only money in 2022. In the USA, that figure was just 8%, the highest incidence of only monetary giving among any country.

For detailed data visualizations offering insights into global giving behaviors, please see the Appendices.
One lesson here is that the giving of money rarely occurs in isolation from other giving behaviors. This runs counter to stereotypical ideas about people (especially wealthy people) giving money to avoid having to give in other ways.

In fact, people are far more likely to give money as part of a broader personal commitment to giving that typically also includes time and/or items.

One notable year-over-year change in giving habits we identified from 2021 to 2022 was the universal increase in ‘supergivers.’ These are individuals who give not just money, things, or time, but all three. In every country we surveyed, their numbers were up. The greatest increases were in Brazil (rising from 26% in 2021 to 39% in 2022) and India (up from 58% to 66%), although this tendency to give across all three types is on the rise everywhere.

Another key lesson here is that giving is not competitive. In fact, it is more likely to be aggregative and synchronistic. The vast majority of people express their generosity in different ways and in different contexts.

For detailed data visualizations offering insights into a wide range of other demographic giving data, please see the Appendix C.
NON-MONETARY GIVING

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Globally, the vast majority of people surveyed had given away items in the past year.
- In most countries, time was given more frequently than other types of giving.
- Of givers who engage in only one form of giving, more engage exclusively in non-monetary giving.

Although in some places (eg. Brazil and the United Kingdom) the giving of things decreased slightly compared to 2021, the giving of things remains by far the most commonplace form of giving in most countries.

In the United Kingdom, the giving of things (62%) dwarfs the giving of time (32%). In the USA and India, the gap is smaller (63% to 42% for the USA and 85% to 74% for India), and in Kenya where giving is omnipresent, it is minimal (92% compared to 90%). Yet, the essential predominance of giving things appears to be universal.

16% of respondents in Mexico gave only things in the past year, a far higher number than any other country we surveyed.
In 2022, almost everyone (96%) who gave time also gave things and money. Yet fewer people gave their time than donated things or money in every country surveyed. This finding suggests that giving time is the gateway to giving of all kinds, including money, a conclusion correlated by Nathan Deitz, who recently wrote that “giving has a significantly smaller influence on volunteering than volunteering has on giving.”

Globally, 71% of survey respondents gave in at least 2 of our 4 tracked types (money, time, items, and advocacy) in 2022. 58% gave in 3 types, and 39% gave in all 4 types. This finding reinforces the immense dynamism and complexity of the global giving ecosystem. Meanwhile, in the USA, over 76% of acts of generosity were non-monetary last year.

Our data partner Golden Volunteer found that in 2022 a higher ratio of one-off volunteers used their app than had been the case in 2021, from which they concluded that organizations may have relied more on their recurring volunteers in 2021 to reduce COVID exposure, whereas in 2022, the retreat of the pandemic likely led to an increase in walk-ups keen to make a difference after the long hiatus of the pandemic.

From our weekly GivingPulse survey, we learned that in the USA, the minority (25%) of givers who engage in non-monetary giving only are more likely to:

- Support local causes and groups;
- Offer unprompted generosity;
- Resist solicitation;
- Have lower-income and disposable income than average
- Be women

Perhaps unsurprisingly, most of those who engage in non-monetary giving only report that giving money to charities places financial strain on them.

---

ADVOCACY

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- As with all types of giving, we find significantly more advocacy in countries with lower per capita incomes.
- When it comes to spreading messages, endorsing, and giving influence to causes, the structure of the cause doesn’t affect participation.
- Advocacy in America is heavily correlated with increased giving, especially in relation to social justice issues and immigration/refugee support.

GLOBAL ADVOCACY

Proportion of people reporting advocating for at least one cause in 2022, by country

- Kenya: 88%
- India: 75%
- Brazil: 64%
- Mexico: 60%
- USA: 36%
- Canada: 36%
- UK: 32%

36% of Americans we surveyed reported that they advocated for at least one cause in the past year.
On average, Americans who self-identify as advocates tend to support more causes than non-advocates. The average number of causes supported by advocates is 2.4, compared to 1.5 for non-advocates.

These self-identified advocates also show marked differences in where they direct their generosity than those who do not identify as advocates.

For example, those who self-identified as advocates (of any cause) were nearly 4x more likely to have recently supported immigration/refugee causes than those who did not identify as advocates. Meanwhile, self-identified advocates were far less likely to have supported religion as a cause than those who say they do no advocacy. Advocates and non-advocates both identify poverty relief as important at a nearly identical rate, suggesting this is an issue that everybody cares about.

Advocates who publicly work to increase awareness of causes and also actively donate to support those causes might identify as activists. Understanding that activists are not a small minority but a far more substantial segment of the general population could be a valuable insight for nonprofits as they seek to activate greater engagement and loyalty.
Global monetary giving is difficult to measure for a variety of reasons, all related to the unavailability of reliable data. This includes:

- **In many countries, the majority of money donated is donated informally**, making it very difficult to track. For example, the near-universal Muslim almsgiving practice known as Zakat generates very little centralized data.

- **In many countries, the sharing of information about giving – whether formal or informal – is discouraged.** This can be due to cultural taboos or to organizational resistance among charities that are not ready to be transparent and collaborative.

- **Even in countries where charitable organizations wish to engage in open data collection and sharing, these processes are often not yet in place or are only in early stages.**

The GivingTuesday Data Commons is working with representatives in over 20 countries to promote the tracking and sharing of monetary and non-monetary giving data as a means of developing evidence-based strategies to promote radical giving that resonate locally, nationally, and globally.

That is why, over the next year, our European leaders, our India Hub, our Africa Hub, and our Latin America and Caribbean Hub are all launching collaborative research spaces to broaden and deepen our insights into regional giving behaviors. We’re building infrastructure, expertise, networks, and tools to increase our understanding of giving globally, and we invite everyone who shares our vision – and our passion – to join our network of giving leaders.
In the coming years, we anticipate that this research network will equip us to share detailed data and insights on monetary giving from around the world.

Currently, however, our most valuable insights into monetary giving – shared below – relate to the USA, as a result of a range of highly valuable partnerships and initiatives.

The Fundraising Effectiveness Project (FEP) is the most significant of these partnerships, enabling the Data Commons to freely provide industry-leading research which aims to meaningfully advance the doing of good. The Fundraising Effectiveness Project - first established in 2006 - and the Growth in Giving database - created in 2012 - are both administered jointly by the Association of Fundraising Professionals and GivingTuesday. FEP reports have historically been made possible by the generous support of four collaborating data providers: Bloomerang, DonorPerfect, Keela, and NeonOne. Our data sourcing network was recently bolstered by the welcome addition of Classy and Community Brands, increasing the fidelity of our datasets and the corresponding integrity of our reporting.

The USA monetary findings in this Lookback Report reflect FEP data, bolstered by insights derived from our weekly GivingPulse survey, which tracks America’s giving behavior across multiple vectors, including monetary giving.
DONORS, DOLLARS, AND DONOR RETENTION IN 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YCY change | YCY change | YCY change

Total change in donors, dollars, and retention for the full year 2022 compared to 2021
Donors

The long-term trend of waning donor participation, which started in 2012, experienced a sharp decline in 2022, with donors declining by 10% year-over-year.

Our data shows that the leading cause of overall donor decline in 2022 was an 18% reduction in new donors. However, this decline in new donors was compounded by a shocking decline in donor retention.

The number of new-retained donors fell drastically last year, decreasing 26.4%. New-retained donors are those who donated in the previous year to an organization, but never before. Combined, new and new retained donors accounted for 81% of total donor decline year-over-year. What’s more, the stalwart of retention — repeat-retained — also saw a decline of 3.5%. This brings the total overall donor retention rate for 2022 to 42.6%, the lowest on record.

Almost all of the decrease in donors (~90%) is attributable to losses of donors who donated $500 and below, a group which represents 83% of all donors. The number of Major ($5K-$50K) and Supersize donors ($50K+) decreased the least, but they nonetheless account for a much larger proportion of the decrease in dollars, as Major donors account for 26% of topline dollars while Supersize donors account for 48% of topline dollars (74% combined). Self-reported figures from our US Giving Surveys show the number of donors who contribute more than $5,000 has decreased from 2.2% down to 1.9%.
The long-term trend of waning donor participation, which started in 2012, experienced a sharp decline in 2022, with donors declining by 10% year-over-year.
Dollars

From 2012 to 2021, dollar donations steadily increased. However, giving leveled off through Q3 2022 and then weakened for the first time in Q4 (which is typically the height of the giving season).

Over the past decade, donations have increased by 69% while donors have declined by 19% (not accounting for inflation). Given increased economic uncertainty and heavy reliance on large donations, this trend is unsustainable and the Q4 dip in dollars given may be the canary in the coal mine. Should large donors suddenly retreat further, the impact on an unprepared social sector could be devastating.

Dollars from large donors significantly weakened in Q4, leading to an overall decline.
Dollars from large donors are down significantly (-4.6% YOY), driving negative topline fundraising. This impact reflects the fundraising sector’s reliance on Supersize ($50K+) donors, which accounted for 48.3% of total dollars raised in 2022.

Following the trend from previous quarters, fundraising dollars from Small and Micro donors (sub-$500) are still negative year-over-year. However, in 2022, we saw amounts raised by Midsize ($500-$5K) and Major ($5K-$50K donors decrease for the first time.

DIFFERING METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

GivingTuesday acknowledges that other respected researchers using different methodologies obtain results that can differ from those contained within this report. This is typically the result of differing methodologies. This is, likely because GivingTuesday excludes organizations with over $25M in order obtain a more representative of fundraising in the sector as a whole. For example, GivingUSA’s 2022 report shows a 6.4% drop in giving by individuals, while our FEP data shows a 1.7% decline.
DONOR-ADVISED FUNDS

Donor-advised funds (DAFs) are the fastest-growing form of philanthropy in the United States.18 DAFs support a wide range of individual donors and charitable giving strategies, with assets ranging from under $50,000 to over $1 million facilitating individual and family giving as well as multi-generational philanthropic involvement.

Looking at the most recent available data, 71% of DAF accounts made a grant in a typical year, with 86% making at least one grant over four years. Payout rates vary, with the median rate being 11% among all accounts and 13% among spendable DAFs. A majority of DAF accounts have four-year average payout rates between 5% and 49%, while a smaller percentage have high payout rates of 50% or more.

A small number of large accounts hold most assets and are responsible for most grantmaking from DAFs. Large accounts (those with over $1 million) represent 11% of all accounts and at least 85% of the assets.

18 Data provided by Danielle Vance-McMullen of the DAFRC unless otherwise noted.
Philanthropic leaders and policymakers need reliable empirical data on DAFs to fully understand the opportunities and challenges these tools represent.

That is why the GivingTuesday Data Commons is currently working in partnership with The Donor Advised Fund Research Collaborative (DAFRC) to develop the 2023 National Study on Donor Advised Funds, which will be the most comprehensive research project on DAFs to date. The study will combine data from DAF-sponsoring organizations from across the USA (including community foundations, national sponsors, and others) to provide the most accurate and generalizable reports on DAFs.

Our work aims to enhance public understanding of DAFs and support data-informed policymaking. We also facilitate researcher-practitioner partnerships through data sharing. By analyzing the data, we observe major shifts in giving, such as the rise of LLCs (e.g. the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative) and significant changes in the mid-tier giving landscape.

The GivingTuesday Data Commons is currently working with a team of researchers to gather 2022 data from 150 DAF providers, covering over 50,000 accounts. These aggregated datasets will serve as the foundation for analysis and public-facing reports to be produced by these researchers. The aggregated datasets will then be made available to qualifying researchers.
Spotlight: Strategies For Success

The Time is Now

Nonprofits can no longer afford to hyper-focus on large donor stewardship at the expense of broader approaches.

We cannot wait until the end of the year to build out a more diverse base of support and instead we need to act now to produce a solid end of year. In 2022, the end of year faltered, which is both rare and very dangerous. It could happen again, so now is the time to experiment with new engagement tactics rather than waiting until Q4.

Giving Begets Giving

Remember that people give in many ways and all of them matter. One kind of giving often leads directly to others, showing that giving is not competitive but aggregative. People who give often do so to many recipients and giving time is the most effective gateway to giving money.

Target: DAF Holders

We are seeing weakening financial giving trends among large donors and one way to mitigate that is to deliberately target Donor-Advised Fund holders because there is more money in DAFs than ever before. Don’t miss this boat.

Websites Still Matter

A very significant % of dollars are still donated via organizational websites in many countries. Ensure your website is as relevant, engaging, and usable as possible and optimize it for easy conversions to maximize donations via this key channel.
The Generation Gap in Generosity is Real

Our data shows that different generations practice generosity very differently, so now may be a good time to test out different messages and tactics for different generations. But the goal here can't be to attract new givers in order to fit them into legacy stewardship models: it's about adapting organizational expectations and approaches to offer meaningful engagement opportunities and appealing giving channels that will attract, retain, and inspire young givers on an ongoing basis. This means meeting them on their own turf, and on their own terms. They demonstrably want more ways to engage, including advocating for your cause. Engage more often, offer more modes of engagement, and communicate that they are partners in your mission.

*GivingTuesday is working closely with data partners like GlobalGiving, Classy, Bonterra, Neon One, Bloomerang, Charity Navigator, Paypal, and more to generate new insights based on analysis of aggregated data, metrics, and trends.*

Our new project, **Insights to Action**, will provide actors in the fundraising ecosystem with fresh, evidence-based strategies and concrete tools for increasing the effectiveness of campaigns and products. We plan to share initial results before the start of the end-of-the-year giving season.
Appendices

APPENDIX A: GLOBAL GIVING

GLOBAL GIVING BY GIVING TYPE

UK
- Money: 56%
- Items: 62%
- Time: 34%

Mexico
- Money: 47%
- Items: 66%
- Time: 46%

Kenya
- Money: 93%
- Items: 91%
- Time: 90%

India
- Money: 80%
- Items: 85%
- Time: 74%

Brazil
- Money: 59%
- Items: 74%
- Time: 50%

Canada
- Money: 59%
- Items: 61%
- Time: 36%
GLOBAL GIVING BY RECIPIENT TYPE

Kenya
Registered – 90%
Unregistered – 91%
Registered – 66%
Unregistered – 61%
Registered – 71%
Unregistered – 46%

Individual – 97%

Kenya
Registered – 90%
Unregistered – 91%
Registered – 66%
Unregistered – 61%
Registered – 71%
Unregistered – 46%

Individual – 97%

Kenya
Registered – 90%
Unregistered – 91%
Registered – 66%
Unregistered – 61%
Registered – 71%
Unregistered – 46%

Individual – 97%

USA
Registered – 66%
Unregistered – 54%

Individual – 54%

USA
Registered – 66%
Unregistered – 54%

Individual – 54%

USA
Registered – 66%
Unregistered – 54%

Individual – 54%

If gave to registered
If gave to unregistered
If gave to individual

Also gave to registered

Also gave to unregistered

Also gave to individual

100%
95%
90%
85%
80%
75%
GLOBAL GIVING METHODS

GIVING BY GENERATION

Prevalence of formal giving by generation in each country.

Legend:
- Online direct to charity or organization via their website
- In a store, at the cashier
- Online indirectly via an intermediary platform raising funds (such as GlobalGiving, GoFundMe, GiveIndia, or similar)
- Via an employer, as a payroll deduction
- By phone: SMS (text message) or mobile money transfer
- Gave it directly to the person in need
- In person fund-raiser at live event, religious service, or approached on the street
- In some other way
APPENDIX B: ADVOCACY IN THE USA

Top Four Causes Among Givers

![Bar chart showing top four causes among givers in the USA](source: Giving Pulse)

Relative Mission Preferences, Advocates vs. Non-Advocates, % Difference

% difference in number of people who state a cause is important to them, advocate to non-advocate ratio (USA)

- None of the above
- Other
- Religious
- Poverty relief (homeless, food, heat, shelter) in USA
- Animals/Animal Welfare
- Medicine/Medical (research)
- Emergency relief/crisis or natural disaster
- Health services
- Senior care, advocacy, support
- Education/Literacy
- Poverty relief around the world/internationally
- Arts, culture, music, theatre
- Political/Politician/Public Policy
- Addiction support
- Gender-based domestic violence
- Sport/Athleticism/Exercise
- Human rights
- Climate/Environment
- Equality/Equity/Inclusion/Racism reduction
- Immigration/Refugee support

![Graph showing relative mission preferences](source: Giving Pulse)
APPENDIX C: USA NONPROFIT FUNDRAISING IN 2022

Dollars

Dollars Cumulative YOY Change
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### Dollars Cumulative YOY Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dollars by Donor Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro (&lt;$100)</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small ($100 - $500)</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsize ($501 - $5K)</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major ($5K - $50K)</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersize (&gt;=$50K)</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dollars by Lifecycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New donors</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New retained donors</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat retained donors</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recaptured donors</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Donors

### Donors by Donation Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 donation</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 donations</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 donations</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+ donations</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Donors by Donor Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro (&lt;$100)</td>
<td>-14.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small ($100 - $500)</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsize ($501 - $5K)</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major ($5K - $50K)</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersize (&gt;$50K)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Donors by Lifecycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New donors</td>
<td>-17.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New retained donors</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat retained donors</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recaptured donors</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Donors

### Donors (Monthly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Retention

### Retention by Donor Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro (&lt;$100)</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small ($100 - $500)</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsize ($501 - $5K)</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major ($5K - $50K)</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersize (&gt;$50K)</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Retention by Lifecycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% YOY Change</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New donors</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat donors</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recaptured donors</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organizations

#### Organization Size Impact 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization size</th>
<th>% 2022 Dollars</th>
<th>% Growth (mean)</th>
<th>% Growth (median)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=$100K</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K - $250K</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250K - $1M</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M - $5M</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5M - $25M</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organization Cause Impact 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization cause</th>
<th>% 2022 Dollars</th>
<th>% Growth (mean)</th>
<th>% Growth (median)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, and Humanities</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Animals</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>-25.7%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Societal Benefit</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Related</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, Unclassified</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>