



Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://rasp.hipatiapress.com>

Religious vs Secular Volunteering Motivations: A Study on European Elders

Antonio Ariza-Montes¹, Pilar Tirado-Valencia¹, Vicente Fernández-Rodríguez¹, & Mark A. Hager²

1) Universidad Loyola Andalucía. Spain

2) Arizona State University. United States of America

Date of publication: January 30th, 2018

Edition period: January 2018- June 2018

To cite this article: Ariza-Montes, A., Tirado-Valencia, P., Fernández-Rodríguez, V., & Hager, M. A. (2018). Religious vs Secular Volunteering Motivations: A Study on European Elders. *Research on Ageing and Social Policy*, 6(1), 82-111. doi: 10.4471/rasp.2018.3136

To link this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.447/rasp.2018.3136>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to [Creative Commons Attribution License](#) (CCAL).

Religious vs Secular Volunteering Motivations: A Study on European Elders

Antonio Ariza-Montes
Universidad Loyola Andalucía

Pilar Tirado-Valencia
Universidad Loyola Andalucía

Vicente Fernández-Rodríguez
Universidad Loyola Andalucía

Mark Hager
Arizona State University

(Received: 2 December 2017; Accepted: 23 December 2017; Published: 30 January 2018)

Abstract

Volunteering is difficult to define and typify because of the great variety of interpretations, motivations, socio-demographic variables and cultural aspects that shape the volunteer profile. This work aims to analyze the differential and inter-related impact of socio-demographic and contextual variables, and cultural values on elder volunteer in Europe. We thus conduct an empirical study involving the use of a logistic regression model that shows, in probabilistic terms, traits that characterize senior and retired volunteers. Further, we study which variables motivate senior volunteers to a determined type of volunteering. Results from the European Value Study help to explain variable influence on volunteering and confirm that cultural values impact among elder people, both, election to volunteering activities and decisions regarding which kind of activity volunteers are drawn to.

Keywords: social values, volunteering, elderly, types of volunteering

Motivaciones del Voluntariado Religioso vs Secular: Un Estudio en Mayores Europeos

Antonio Ariza-Montes
Universidad Loyola Andalucía

Pilar Tirado-Valencia
Universidad Loyola Andalucía

Vicente Fernández-Rodríguez
Universidad Loyola Andalucía

Mark Hager
Arizona State University

(Recibido: 2 diciembre 2017; Aceptado: 23 diciembre 2017; Publicado: 30 enero 2018)

Resumen

El voluntariado es difícil de definir y tipificar debido a la gran variedad de interpretaciones, motivaciones, variables sociodemográficas y aspectos culturales que configuran su perfil. El objetivo de este trabajo es: analizar el impacto diferencial e interrelacionado de las variables sociodemográficas y contextuales, y los valores culturales en el voluntariado de las personas mayores en Europa. Se lleva a cabo un estudio empírico: modelo de regresión logística que muestra los rasgos característicos de los voluntarios. Además, estudiamos qué variables motivan a los voluntarios mayores a un tipo determinado de voluntariado. Los resultados del European Value Study confirman que los valores culturales tienen un impacto entre las personas mayores, tanto en la elección de las actividades de voluntariado como las decisiones sobre el tipo de voluntariado por el que se sienten atraídos.

Palabras clave: valores sociales, voluntariado, mayores, tipos de voluntariado

Participation in civic action is an indication of the capacity of a society to identify its most salient issues and its commitment toward engaging them. The decision to volunteer or otherwise engage in civic action is highly complex. Although the subject is central to nonprofit, philanthropic, and community action studies, the decision to volunteer has escaped simple summary due to the great variety of interpretations, motivations, socio-demographic variables, and cultural aspects that shape the volunteer profile (Musick & Wilson, 2008).

Understanding volunteer motivations is critical to actors interested in engaging and maximizing the value that volunteers bring to communities. A large proportion of volunteers are elders. According to the Theory of Socioemotional Selectivity (Carstensen, 1993), that people, as they grow older, become more selective and spend more time in emotionally positive activities, such as volunteering activities. So, better knowing this group motivations to volunteer becomes a key issue to engage them (Ariza-Montes, Tirado-Valencia, Fernández-Rodríguez, & Leal-Rodríguez, 2017).

This paper seeks to add to our understanding of the decision to volunteer, made by elders, in three ways. One, it explores the differences between what we call socio-demographic or context forces and personal values that encourage or inhibit volunteerism.

Second, the paper considers how the influence of personal values on volunteering by elders might differ according to venue. We contend that religious volunteering (Lim & MacGregor, 2012) and participatory activism (Petrova & Tarrow, 2007) are both influenced by personal values, but in different ways. So, we contemplate whether certain values guide elder volunteers to a particular type of volunteering.

Third, consistent with our contention that the decision to volunteer differs across context and prevailing values schemes, we focus our attention on Europe. Taking into account the specificities of elder volunteers, stated by many recent research (Hong, Morrow-Howell, Tang, & Hinterlong, 2009; Wei, Donthu, & Bernhardt, 2012; Hong & Morrow-Howell, 2013; Van Ingen & Wilson, 2017), we focus our study on this group.

Throughout this introduction, the study interest is justified, the variables included in the proposed model are given, and the specific objectives of the research are outlined. After the methodology is described, we present results

of our data analysis. The paper ends with a discussion of results and implications of the research.

Justification

Literature regarding the decision to volunteer identifies several categories of factors: personal characteristics, family status and demographic variables, socioeconomic status and community commitment, among others (eg. Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Guterbock & Fries, 1997; Hall, et al. 1998; Putnam, 2000; Hall, McKeown, & Roberts, 2001; Musick & Wilson, 2008; Voicu & Voicu, 2009; Grizzle, 2015; Ariza-Montes et al., 2017). Traditionally, these factors have been grouped into various domains, including family and personal socio-demographic variables (age, family status, income, skills) and contextual variables (employment status, job characteristics, population, etc.). These elements describe the human capital, social capital, and cultural capital of the volunteer, whose influence on the activity of volunteering in general has been demonstrated in numerous previous studies (eg. Wilson & Musick, 1997; Brown & Ferris, 2007; Wang & Graddy, 2008). In this paper, we consider these categories jointly as socio-demographic or context variables that describe the conditions of prospective volunteers.

However, condition and context are not the only forces that determine volunteering. These socio-demographic forces might be likened to Herzberg's (1964) hygiene factors in his two-factor theory of workplace satisfaction, where such forces as socioeconomic status, family circumstances, and opportunity provide the conditions for volunteerism, but not the motivation (Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1997; Hager & Brudney, 2013). Motivations become salient when hygiene (our socio-economic or context forces) are met. The motivational perspective is common in studies of volunteerism (Snyder & Omoto, 2008; Mannino, Snyder & Omoto, 2011). Motivations include beliefs and values embedded in culture (Musick, Wilson, & Bynum, 2000; Plagnol & Huppert, 2010). Within the motivational perspective, the evolution of cultural values, influenced by religious traditions, social norms, and economic and technological development have been the subjects of Inglehart (1997, 2003), Inglehart and Baker (2000), and Inglehart and Welzel (2005).

A distinction between secular and traditional values emerges in a different conception of developed societies to undeveloped ones according to its policies and political, social, and religious beliefs. Research on modernization and its impact on cultural change has generated two schools of thought. The first one emphasizes the convergence of cultural values toward secularization as a result of modernization, anticipating the loss of importance of the traditional values and its replacement by secular values (Bradshaw & Wallace, 1996). A second perspective emphasizes the persistence of traditional values despite economic and political changes, and argues that these values are independent of conditions or context (DiMaggio, 1994; Inglehart & Baker, 2000). These perspectives underlie our inquiry.

In the case of elder people, and according to the Theory of Socioemotional Selectivity, other elements as personal capabilities acquire special relevance to understand, not only the propensity to volunteer, but the selection of activities to participate in (Wei et al., 2012). Those capabilities are related to physical and cognitive functioning, time, income/assets, knowledge and skills, social support and transportation (Hong et al., 2009). A recent study of Maki and Snyder (2017) underline the individuals' interests, as a motivational trigger throughout the satisfaction obtained; the Volunteer Interest Typology should be fruitful in elder volunteers.

Not only the personal capabilities and interest may help to manage voluntarism more effectively, but institutional capabilities (Hong & Morrow-Howell, 2013) also become a key element in the success of volunteering programs, as so as organizations may adjust their own capabilities to the volunteers' needs satisfaction (Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown, & Aisbett, 2016), mainly for elder volunteers. The search for a balance of interest become crucial for volunteer management (Studer, 2016).

These previous studies show, on one hand, the relevance of elder volunteerism due to the physical and mental health benefits provided for volunteers, apart from the positive outcomes for the community obtained. On the other hand, and due to the specificity of this group, a special volunteer management policy should be adopted. Just to help to better define those policies, this paper includes in the analysis something that may be considered part of the self-oriented motivations (Stukas et al., 2016), which is included in the discussion.

Socio-Demographic and Contextual Forces

In discussion above, we liken socio-demographic forces to Herzberg's hygiene factors: context must be satisfied before motivations become pertinent. The most basic biological demographic force is sex. Whether due to nature or nurture, men and women act differently in a wide variety of social settings. Some studies show no difference according to sex regarding the commitment level of volunteers (Hodgkinson, Weitzman, Abrahams, Crutchfield, & Stevenson, 1996), although different patterns are found when sex is analyzed together with age; among older volunteers, men spend more time at volunteering than women (Gallagher, 1994).

That said, the research results considering the dynamics of age and volunteering are inconclusive. Some authors establish a positive relationship (Cappellari & Turati, 2004; Choi & DiNitto, 2012), whereas other studies conclude that volunteerism tends to decrease during the transition from teenager to adult, and reaches the maximum grade between mid-life and maturity (Menchik & Weisbrod, 1987)

Education is a primary driver of civic engagement (Putnam, 2000). Empirical studies are conclusive about the individual impact of educational level on the decision to volunteer. In fact, educational attainment is considered by some authors as the best predictor of volunteerism (Mesch, Rooney, Chin, & Steinberg, 2002; Gómez & Guntherson, 2003; Grønbjerg & Never, 2004; Musick & Wilson, 2008; Gesthuizen & Scheepers, 2012). However, we expect that the role of education in encouraging volunteerism itself depends on context. Authors interpret the connection between education and volunteering in two ways. On the one hand, from a psychological perspective, higher education could have a positive impact on the level of awareness of social problems, an increase in empathy, or the development of self-confidence (Brady, Verba, & Schlozman, 1995; Rosenthal, Feiring, & Lewis, 1998). On the other hand, from a contextual point of view, more educated people could be more willing to work as volunteers (Brady, Schlozman, & Verba, 1999) and to belong to more organizations (Herzog & Morgan, 1993; Putnam, 2000).

Income can provide a status and condition conducive to volunteerism. Some authors have shown that individuals with high socioeconomic status

(as defined by education and level of income) have a greater predisposition toward volunteering (Vaillancourt, 1994; Hall et al., 1998; O'Neill & Roberts, 1999; Hall et al., 2001). However, the amount of time that people spend volunteering is inversely related to the wage level of the individual due to the opportunity costs, which are much higher for higher-income individuals (Wolf, Weisbrod, & Bird, 1993; Cnaan, Handy, & Wadsworth, 1996).

An important conditioning force in some cases is family, which can both facilitate and constrain volunteering behavior. Some studies indicate correlation between devotion to volunteering and marital status (Menchik & Weisbrod, 1987; Vaillancourt, 1994; Day & Devlin, 1996; Mesch et al., 2002; Nesbit, 2012). Menchik and Weisbrod (1987) find a higher rate of volunteering among married people, while Vaillancourt (1994) argues that single women do more volunteering than married women. Nesbit (2012) studied the behavior of volunteers after important family events, concluding that the activity of volunteering decreases after widowhood, although reverses as widows become elderly.

People cannot volunteer for nonprofit organizations in areas that do not have nonprofits, or have nonprofits that do not provide volunteering opportunities. Presumably, urban areas provide a greater concentration of opportunity that matches the individual interests of volunteers. However, some authors find an inverse relationship between the size of the town and the propensity to volunteer. Vaillancourt (1994) finds that volunteering is more common among people living in small towns, ostensibly related to the greater social connectedness of non-urban areas. García and Marcuello (2007) demonstrate this fact, confirming that volunteering is higher in communities with populations between 10,000 and 100,000 inhabitants, followed by the cities whose population is between 100,000 and 400,000 inhabitants.

Finally, voluntary participation is connected to cultural, political, religious and social contexts (Parboteeah, Cullen, & Lim, 2004; Grönlund et al., 2011; Gil-Lacruz, Marcuello-Servós, & Saz-Gil, 2015). The positioning of a culture on the individualistic-collectivist dimension (Hostfede, 2001), the emphasis on public services for welfare provision (Esping-Andersen, 1999), and the political system or religiosity affect volunteering in different

countries. Some authors have argued that the voluntary sector is stronger in countries with a longer experience of democracy (Curtis, Baer, & Grabb, 2001; Halman, 2003). Musick and Wilson (2008) explain cross-country variations in volunteering on the basis of structural features, such as the method of government, the size of welfare state, the level of income or income disparity, the political regime, the class structure and the size of the non-profit sector. Salamon and Sokolowski (2001) conclude that considerable cross-national variation exists in the total amount of volunteering and in the distribution of that volunteering across service fields. They demonstrated that the size of the nonprofit sector is a good predictor of the amount of volunteering in a country. Gil-Lacruz et al. (2015) argued that others macroeconomic variables, like government expenditure on unemployment, characterizing the countries' welfare systems help us understand contextual differences.

Secular and Traditional Values

If conditions are ripe for volunteerism, then values influence the decision of whether or not to engage community organizations. We next turn our attention to this second dimension of motivation, which we conceive as the deeply seated values that influence our daily decisions and actions. A distinction we employ in our study is between traditional and secular values. There are two more important dimensions that demonstrate that the worldviews of the peoples of rich societies differ systematically from those of political, social and religious norms and beliefs (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). These two dimensions reflect cross national polarization between traditional versus secular-rational orientations toward authority; and survival versus self-expression values. Each society can be located on a global map of cross-cultural variation based on these two dimensions. As result of the studies of Inglehart and Baker (2000), and Inglehart and Welzel (2010), the map of the European countries could be divided on fourth cultural contexts: Catholic Europe, Protestant Europe, English-speaking and Orthodox countries.

Inglehart and Baker (2000) prefer the term "traditional" in a specific sense when describing traditional and secular cultural values. Traditional

societies are somewhat more authoritarian; they show little tolerance to issues such as abortion, divorce and homosexuality; they tend to give more prominence to the dominant role of men in the economy and politics; they reinforce the recognition of the authority of parents and the importance of family. Finally, most of the traditions give a central role to religion. Against this description, secular societies present the opposite characteristics. Modern societies display tensions between adherents to both sets of values.

In the extensive literature about the impact of cultural values on volunteering, the importance of religion and religious orientation have been frequently proposed as an explanation for altruistic dedication (Jackson Bachmeier, Wood, & Craft, 1995; Wilson & Musick, 1997; Grønbjerg & Never, 2004; Jones, 2006; Brown & Ferris, 2007; Wang & Graddy, 2008; Musick & Wilson, 2008; Choi & Dinitto, 2012; Forbes & Zampelli, 2014; Prouteau & Sardinha, 2015). Grønbjerg and Never (2004) observe that the commitment to religion is one of the most important explanatory variables of volunteering among residents of Indiana (United States). They also confirm that religious motivations have a positive impact on the preferences of two types of specific volunteering: that which takes place in religious institutions, but also in the provision of direct services to the community, regardless of the nature of the promoting institution. On the other hand, Prouteau and Sardinha (2015) note that although many studies indicate a relationship between religiosity and commitment to volunteering, the results are sometimes contradictory.

Religiosity is a key determinant of charitable giving, another altruistic indicator. Both Brown and Ferris (2007) and Choi and Dinitto (2012) conclude that demographic variables such as age, marital status, educational level, or race are key in explaining preferences when working with religious or secular causes. Wang and Graddy (2008) show that social capital is created with the maximum confidence in both institutions and individuals. The existence of formal and informal social networks and a higher citizen commitment generally increase the participation in charities. At the same time, some values, such as a predisposition toward social activism, only increase collaboration with secular causes. Others value indications, such as life satisfaction, stimulate donations to religious works.

Although the influence of religion on volunteering has been widely studied, the dichotomy between secular and traditional values has not been yet explored as a conditioning factor. However, the fact that some previous studies have used this classification when predicting other aspects, such as satisfaction at work or in life (Georgellis & Lange, 2012), also suggests a direct relationship with the attitude and motivation of the elder people who choose to devote some of their time to volunteering in general, and to some types more than to others, in particular.

Hypotheses

Our discussion above reveals two central considerations. On one hand, we observe a disparity in results on socio-demographic or context factors that help explain the decision to volunteer. On the other, we observe a lack of studies that considers the differential influence of traditional and secular values on the volunteerism, especially in Europe. Although religiosity and religious motivations for volunteering have been considered extensively, Grönlund (2012) suggests that researchers consider the extent to which other values-oriented ideologies promote volunteering.

Our three hypotheses follow from our research aims and preceding discussion. First, we propose that both the socio-demographic or context variables and the values-based indicators will have utility for explaining volunteering behavior among European elders. We offer this general hypothesis to guide our inquiry:

H1: The demographic profile and cultural values of elder European volunteers are different from those who do not volunteer.

Second, we consider how different values are associated with different volunteering choices. Specifically, we consider religious volunteerism as traditional and union volunteerism as secular. The contrast of these hypotheses will establish a characterization of the volunteering profile among elder Europeans active in their communities.

H2: Elder people who work as volunteers in religious organizations have a profile where traditional values prevail over secular ones.

H3: Elder people who work as volunteers in unions have a profile where secular values prevail over traditional ones.

Method and Data

Our approach is to use individual-level survey data to test the relationships between individual-level conditions, or values dispositions, and whether elder people volunteered or not. We estimate binary logistic regression models, a class of regression models appropriate for dichotomous (yes/no), dependent variables. This statistical technique estimates the probability that each case dedicating time to volunteering, depending on the variety of independent variables, which are the socio-demographic and values-based characteristics. Taken together, the result is the log-odds that a particular characteristic explains volunteering behavior.

Data for this research is from the most recent wave available (2008) of the European Values Study (EVS), conducted by the EVS Foundation. The study is a longitudinal survey of human values conducted in 1981 (16 countries), 1990 (29 countries), 1999-2000 (33 countries) and 2008 (46 countries). The long periodicity of the survey is because values do not change in the short term, but they remain stable over time. A new survey is currently being conducted. The data will be available to researchers in 2019 or 2020. The study provides us with detailed information about the ideas, beliefs, preferences, attitudes, values, and opinions of citizens throughout Europe. The EVS is a study of adults, surveying only people over an age of 18 years. Data is collected face-to-face, except in Sweden where a mail survey is used. More than 56,000 valid surveys were obtained for the current study. We selected a random subsample of 3,891 retired elders with ages between 65 and 85 years old. For this study, volunteerism is defined as “unpaid voluntary work”; EVS interviewers show respondents a card listing 15 types of different volunteer activities, and asking respondents to ‘look carefully at the following list of voluntary organizations and activities and say which, if any, you are currently doing unpaid voluntary work for’. 46.6 percent of respondents answered ‘yes’ on one of these items. Any person

who devotes some of his or her time to any of these activities is classified as a volunteer, regardless of the amount of time spent. To create our dependent variable, these respondents are coded as 1 (N=1,813), while elder people who did not participate in any of these activities are coded as 0 (N=2,078).

Independent Variables: Socio-demographic (hygiene) Forces

As discussed above, independent variables are characterized as either socio-demographic or cultural. The first socio-demographic variable is sex, coded as 0 for male and 1 for female. Male respondents comprise 46.9 percent of the sample, leaving 53.1 percent female. This gender gap is intensified among elder non-volunteers (43.6 percent for men versus 56.4 percent for women) and decreases among elder volunteers to nearly equalize the two groups (50.7 percent for men and 49.3 percent for women).

The average age of seniors is 72.6 years, with little differences between volunteers (71.9 years) and non-volunteers (73.2 years). Education is recoded by the EVS in three categories: lower, middle, and upper. Approximately half of the sample (50.2 percent) reports a low level of education (57.3 percent for non-volunteers and 42.1 percent for volunteers); 31.3 percent report middle level studies (30.1 percent versus 32.6 percent, respectively) and 18.5 percent report an upper level of education. Consistent with literature citing the positive relationship between education and volunteerism, 'upper education' is less common among elder people who do not volunteer (12.6 percent), and is more frequent among those who do (25.3 percent).

We see the same expected relationship with income. The EVS recodes income levels into three categories that we use in the current study: low, medium, and high. Volunteering is more common among seniors with high-income levels: 35.9 percent of the elder volunteers declare income in the 'high' category. Those selecting 'high' drops to 16.4 percent among elder non-volunteers.

One variable captures the influence of family arrangements: a EVS question asks if the respondent is living with a partner; we code 0 for yes and 1 for no. Just over half of the respondents (54.5 percent) live together with a couple, a ratio that increases among seniors who perform volunteering

(58.3 percent), while it decreases among those who do not volunteer (51.2 percent).

On the other hand, recalling our discussion about the potential issue of the size of place, we consider a simple measure of the size of community. For this variable, home communities with populations up to 20,000 are coded 0 (44.4 percent of volunteers), while those over 20,000 are coded as 1 (55.6 percent of volunteers).

Finally, we have introduced a categorical variable representing the cultural contexts: Protestant, Catholic, English-speaking and Orthodox. The contexts have been coded in reference to this last. Thus, the results of this variable must be interpreted in relation to Orthodox context, but also show the differences between the other three contexts. The rate of volunteering in the different contexts is as follow: Protestant (65.7 percent), Catholic (48.4 percent), English-speaking (52.8 percent) and Orthodox (29.7 percent).

Independent Variables: Values

Our study draws on nine central content variables from the European Values Study (EVS). Variable 1 asks respondents “How important is God in your life” and asks them to rank this importance on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 10 (very important). Our variable utilizes a three category EVS-recoded measure of low (0), intermediate (1), and high (2). Variable 2 is coded from asking respondents to pick up to five qualities from a list that respondents believe children should be encouraged to learn at home. Respondents choosing “religious faith” or “obedience” are coded as 0 (traditional) and those choosing “independence” or “determination” are coded as 1 (secular). Each individual is considered as traditional or secular if he or she selects at least one of the identifying terms and none of the opposing terms. Variable 3 is drawn from a question asking if respondents feel abortion can be justified always (10), never (1), or some value in between. We collapse to three ordered categories: never (1), sometimes (2 to 6), and usually/always (7 to 10). Variable 4 is drawn from a question asking how proud the respondent is of been a citizen of his or her country. We recode the original EVS question in order of increasing national pride: not at all proud (1), not very proud (2), quite proud (3), and very proud (4).

Variable 5 comes from a question about respect for authority. The interviewer asserts that more respect for authority might take place in the near future, and asks whether this would be a good thing, a bad thing, or irrelevant to the respondent. We code indifferent as 0, against as 1 and in favor as 2. Variable 6 seeks to differentiate respondents into materialist (0) versus postmaterialist (1) camps. Interviewers presented with four options for “what the aims of this country should be for the next ten years”. Those who chose ‘maintain order in the nation’ or ‘fighting rising prices’ were coded as materialist. Those who chose ‘giving people more say in important government decisions’ or ‘protecting freedom of speech’ were coded as postmaterialist. Variable 7 is built from asking respondent “taking all things together, how happy are you?” We code ‘not at all happy’ and ‘not very happy’ as 0, quite happy as 1 and very happy as 2. Variable 8 draws from asking respondents, “generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” Our ‘trust’ variable is coded 0 for those respondents who say ‘you can’t be too careful,’ and 1 for those who say ‘most people can be trusted.’ Variable 9 is a measure of predisposition to political action; for respondents who say they would never sign a petition, we assign a value of 0; for respondents who say they have signed or might sign a petition, we assign a value of 1.

Taken together, these nine variables represent an array of cultural values that we hypothesize will foster or inhibit volunteering behavior once hygiene conditions have set the stage (created the opportunity) for public engagement. We now turn to the empirical tests of our research questions.

Data Analysis

A primary objective of this work is to identify the profile of elder people who participate in volunteering activities in Europe and the factors that influence their preferences when choosing a type of volunteering. This is to find out whether certain socio-demographic characteristics, taking into consideration the secular and traditional values of the person, explain both the propensity to volunteer as well as their choices about what kind of volunteering they do. We conducted an analysis of contingency tables where Pearson's chi-square test is used to examine the bivariate associations

between the dependent variable (volunteerism) and both sets of independent variables (socio-demographic factors and cultural values). This approach is a first cut at parsimony, prompting us to remove variables that display little or no association with the dependent variable.

Next, we estimate a series of logistic regression models designed to test the influence of the remaining variables on the likelihood of volunteerism. These models are presented in Table 1. Model 1 shows the relationship of the socio-demographic variables alone. Almost all variables exhibit a strong relationship with elder volunteerism as can be appreciated in Table 1. Two exceptions are whether the respondent is living alone or with a partner and population size, a couple of factors that appears unrelated to volunteerism in these data. Therefore, volunteering increases among “younger” male seniors with high-education and high incomes who live in a protestant, catholic or English speaking cultural context.

Table 1.
The Influence of Sociodemographic and Cultural Values on the Log-Odds of Volunteering

Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	p-value.	OR	B	p-value.	OR	B	p-value.	OR
Sociodemographic factors									
Gender	-0.195	*	0.822				-0.110	n.s.	0.896
Age	-0.039	***	0.962				-0.32	***	0.968
Couple	0.167	n.s.	1.181				---		
Education	0.381	***	1.463				0.371	***	1.449
Incomes	0.370	***	1.448				0.222	**	1.249
Population size	-0.143	n.s.	0.867				---		
Cultural context (*)									
<i>Protestant Europe</i>	0.986	***	2.68				0.861	***	2.366
<i>Catholic Europe</i>	0.650	***	1.916				0.528	***	1.696
<i>English Speaking</i>	1.201	***	3.323				0.779	**	2.179
Cultural values									
God importance				0.140	**	1.151	0.228	***	1.256
Children education				-0.037	n.s.	0.964	---		
Abortion approval				0.023	n.s.	1.023	---		
National pride				0.310	*	1.364	0.281	***	1.324
Respect for authority				0.085	n.s.	1.089	---		
Materialism-postmaterialism				0.122	n.s.	1.130	---		
Happiness feeling				0.492	***	1.635	0.347	***	1.414
Trust in people				0.454	**	1.575	0.282	**	1.326
Predisposition to political action				0.966	***	2.628	0.403	***	1.496
Tolerance of homosexuality				0.209	n.s.	0.099	---		
χ² Test Efficiency- Global Model	369.46			95.94			357.25		
Liberty levels	9			10			12		
Level of significance	0.000			0.000			0.000		
Correct% prediction:									
Global	65.5%			66.7%			65.7%		
Volunteers	61.4%			57.1%			64.9%		
No volunteers	69.3%			74.9%			66.5%		

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$; n.s. = not significant.

(*) The cultural context of reference is the Orthodox context

Model 2 illustrates the influence of the cultural values variables without the influence of the socio-demographic (hygiene) forces. Five of ten cultural values reveal statistically significant relationships with the likelihood of elder volunteering. Most significant by order of importance are predisposition to political action, happiness feeling, trust in people, national pride and God importance.

Model 3 presents a final model that includes only those socio-demographic (Model 1) and values variables (Model 2) that effectively predict the likelihood (log-odds) of volunteering. The differences between Models 1 and 2 compared with Model 3 illustrate the complex interaction between socio-demographic (hygiene) forces in conditioning how cultural values influence the propensity to volunteer among elder people. The impact of each of the relevant variables on the probability of dedicating time to volunteering substantially differs from one to others, as indicated by the analysis of the confidence intervals obtained for the corresponding odds ratios. The variables that contribute in a decisive way to predict volunteering activities are age in a negative sense (OR: 0.968), education level (OR: 1.449), income level (OR: 1.249), protestant context (OR: 2.366), catholic context (OR: 1.696), English speaking context (OR: 2.179), God importance (OR: 1,256), national pride (OR: 1.324), happiness feelings (OR: 1.414), trust in others (OR: 1.326), and predisposition to political actin (OR: 1.496). The statistic study of contrast used to assess the validity of Model 3 as a whole indicates sufficient reason to accept its validity. The omnibus test of the model used for this purpose generates a chi-square of 357.25, significant at $p < 0.000$. That is to say that the fact that whether a senior dedicates personal time to volunteering activities can be satisfactorily explained by these two inter-related sets of variables. The results clearly confirm Hypothesis 1, which suggested that elder volunteer profile in Europe is determined by socio-demographic factors as well as an array of cultural values.

In any case, although the model capability is acceptable, it is limited due to the fact that only 65.7% of elder people were correctly classified by these

twelve variables included in Model 3. We observe very minor differences between the percentages for volunteers (64.9%) and non-volunteers (66.5%) correctly classified by the Model 3. The results broadly suggest that other factors, apart from those culminating in Model 3, contribute to understand the reasons why elder people participate in volunteering activities. This circumstance may be explained by the heterogeneity in the types of volunteering included in the EVS, which likely disguises very different realities. For example, the personal profile of a senior volunteer who willingly works in a professional association can be very different from those who throw themselves into the human rights defense, devotion to pacifism, or enthusiasm for safeguarding the environment.

This reality justifies exploration of our second research question, regarding differences in religious versus secular motivations for volunteerism. We estimate three additional regression models that include more homogeneity intra-groups and, a priori, more heterogeneity intergroup. In particular, we extracted two subsamples of elder people dedicated to volunteering in religious or church organizations, on the one hand, and trade unions, on the other hand. We pursue a double objective. First, to understand the motivations of religious (Model 4) and secular (Model 5) volunteering in comparison to elder people who do not volunteer. Second, to contrast the profile of religious volunteers with that of secular volunteers (Model 6). The final aim is to determine the individual profiles of the two groups to discuss possible similarities or differences that exist between them. The results of the logistic regression models are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

The Influence of Sociodemographic and Cultural Values on the Log-Odds of Religious and Union Volunteering

Variables	Model 4 Religious model			Model 5. Union model			Model 6. Religious model versus Union model		
	B	p-value.	OR	B	p-value.	OR	B	p-value.	OR
Sociodemographic factors									
Gender	0.099	n.s.	1.104	-1.281	**	0.278	2.298	***	9.953
Age	-0.033	n.s.	0.968	-0.031	n.s.	0.969	-0.006	n.s.	0.994
Education	0.296	*	1.345	-0.076	n.s.	0.927	-0.114	n.s.	0.892
Incomes	0.355	**	1.427	-0.661	n.s.	0.516	1.575	***	4.832
Cultural context (*)									
<i>Protestant Europe</i>	0.608	n.s.	1.837	-2.495	***	0.082	0.638	n.s.	1.893
<i>Catholic Europe</i>	0.249	n.s.	1.283	-1.494	*	0.225	1.011	n.s.	2.749
<i>English Speaking</i>	0.794	n.s.	2.212	-3.284	**	0.037	1.831	n.s.	6.238
Cultural values									
God importance	1.094	***	2.987	-1.776	***	0.169	1.727	***	5.621
National pride	0.419	**	1.521	0.822	**	2.274	-0.340	n.s.	0.712
Happiness feeling	0.392	**	1.480	-0.428	n.s.	0.652	-0.057	n.s.	0.944
Trust in people	0.489	*	1.630	-0.254	n.s.	0.776	0.282	n.s.	1.326
Predisposition to political action	0.320	n.s.	1.377	0.139	n.s.	1.149	-1.605	***	0.201
χ^2 Test Efficiency- Global Model	118.28			64.82			74.89		
Liberty levels	6			6			4		
Level of significance	0.000			0.000			0.000		
Correct% prediction:									
Global	68.4%			80.3%			72.9%		
Volunteers	71.4%			79.1%			74.2%		
No volunteers	65.2%			81.3%			71.6%		

* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; .n.s. = not significant.

(*) The cultural context of reference is the Orthodox context

Comparing them side by side in Table 2 (Model 4 and Model 5), we observe that religious volunteering is more likely in seniors with a higher educational level and higher incomes (see Model 4). As could not be otherwise, the most important variable in the explanation of this kind of volunteering is the importance that elder people give to God, followed by other cultural values as national pride, happiness feelings and trust in people.

Regarding union volunteering (see Model 5), a hygiene (socio-demographic) variable appears because we observe that this type of volunteering is more likely among elder male than elder female. Likewise, the results obtained show that union volunteering is more frequent in the

Orthodox context than in the other cultural contexts: protestant Europe, catholic Europe and English speaking. Finally, two cultural values stimulate the practice of union volunteering: national pride in a positive sense and the importance of God in a negative sense.

These results confirm the approach of hypothesis 2 and 3, that is, the differences between the values that sustain religious and union volunteering. We assert that religious volunteering will be associated with traditional values (H2), and union volunteering with secular values (H3). With the aim to deepen into this approach, Model 6 faced both types of senior volunteers. As indicated in Table 2, religious volunteerism is more feminized and increases among elder people with higher incomes. In addition, the main cultural value that characterizes religious volunteers is the value they place on God in their lives, whereas, on the contrary, union volunteers are more predisposed to political action. These profiles provide at least general qualified support for Hypotheses 2 and 3. In sum, the results demonstrate that cultural values (secular or traditional) affect the types of religious or union volunteering.

Discussion and Conclusions

The socio-demographic variables, or hygiene forces, that shape the profile of the volunteer are often analyzed in isolation. For this multidimensional phenomenon, too few studies jointly consider the interplay between those hygiene forces and cultural values on the characterization of volunteerism. In this paper, we show that volunteering by elders depends on a combination of variables that might be grouped conceptually into at least two categories: socio-demographic and cultural values. The demonstration of this dependence confirms the approach proposed in the first of the hypotheses about the multidimensional model. Variables that contribute in a more decisive way to predict the profile of the senior volunteers are age, level of incomes and education, importance of God, national pride, happiness feeling, trusting in others and predisposition for political action. Some cultural contexts are also an important factor. So, people belonging to English speaking, protestant and catholic European contexts have a higher

likelihood of volunteering in comparison with those who belong to an orthodox cultural context.

We should wonder if the identification of determined causes with the creed of the promoting institution joins wills; or on the contrary, they remain the support due to the fact that some people could associate the mission to the religious character of the supporting organization. This reflection could be used by managers of nonprofit entities to decide what to emphasize during recruitment campaigns: either in the nature of projects or in the nature of the institution.

Everything that has been here exposed is consistent with those previous studies that have analyzed the issue of volunteering as a unique undifferentiated phenomenon. However, we are aware that it is not a reality that can be easily studied from a global point of view. This study has analyzed the profile of senior volunteers according to the purpose of the activity to which they selflessly devote their time. A global study could be masking very diverse and heterogeneous realities.

For this reason, two types of volunteering have been chosen, each different in their orientation, where the incidence of secular and traditional values seems quite clear: volunteering with a religious background and union volunteering. This approach improves the global efficiency of classification of both models (68.4% in the case of religious volunteering and 80.3% in the union one), demonstrating that the effect of the cultural values influences the choice. This fact highlights our understanding of the second and third hypotheses. Particularly, the analysis reveals that the factors that explain religious volunteering are different from those that determine union volunteering -in some cases, because the explanatory variables are different, and in others, because the influence of the variables act in the opposite direction-

On the one hand, religious volunteering is conditioned by six variables that are particularly presented in this group: education and incomes between sociodemographic variables and, importance of God, national pride, happiness feeling and trust in people values among its members. This is a reflection of the presupposed social commitment. On the other hand, the idiosyncratic variables of the union model are gender (male), national pride and the importance of God in a negative sense, which responds to the

utilitarian nature of this type of volunteering, possibly exerted in a less selfless way.

Additionally, there is a group of socio-demographic and cultural values that, being part of both models, mark the difference between them because they influence the propensity to volunteer in the opposite direction. From the point of view of the values that characterize both groups, religious volunteers give great importance to God and little importance to political predisposition, just the opposite of what we find among union volunteers.

Following the classification of secular and traditional values of Inglehart and Welzel (2005), we can say that traditional values are more common among the religious volunteers, confirming in this sense the statement of the second hypothesis. At the same time, the increased presence of secular values among union volunteers corroborates the statements of the third hypothesis.

All these results have different implications. First, the analysis of the socio-demographic variables shows the existence of different aspects of elder volunteers' profile that should be taken into account in the recruitment campaigns and retention policies. If, in fact, volunteering is conditioned by a series of personal values, the affinity with these values will affect the satisfaction, well-being and permanence of elder volunteers. Second, cultural context influences volunteer engagement, and should guide promotion policies of volunteering according to environment features. Finally, the religious or secular character of the values would serve to reinforce the identity of the senior volunteers with the institution in which they collaborate. These characteristics should be clearly defined in the mission in disc strategies of the entity they collaborate with, avoiding contradictions.

References

- Ariza-Montes, A., Tirado-Valencia, P., Fernández-Rodríguez, V. & Leal-Rodríguez, A. (2017) Volunteering by elders: a question of values? *The service industries journal*, 3(11-12), 685-702. doi: [10.1080/02642069.2017.1298095](https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2017.1298095)
- Bradshaw, Y.W. & Wallace, M. (1996). *Global inequalities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Brady, H., Schlozman, K.L., & Verba, S. (1999). Prospecting for participants: rational expectations and the recruitment of political activists. *American Political Science Review*, 93, 153–169. doi: [10.2307/2585767](https://doi.org/10.2307/2585767)
- Brady, H., Verba, S. & Schlozman, K.L. (1995). Beyond SES: A resource model of political participation. *American Political Science Review*, 89, 269–295. doi: [10.2307/2082425](https://doi.org/10.2307/2082425)
- Brehm, J. & Rahn, W. (1997). Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3), 999-1023. doi: [10.2307/2111684](https://doi.org/10.2307/2111684)
- Brown, E. & Ferris, J.M. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: An analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 85-99. doi [10.1177/0899764006293178](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764006293178)
- Cappellari, L. & Turati, G. (2004). Volunteer labour supply: The role of workers' motivations. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 75(4), 619-643. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00265.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00265.x)
- Carstensen, L. L. (1993). Motivation for social contact across the life span: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. In J. E. Jacobs (Ed.), *Current theory and research in motivation*, Vol. 40. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1992: Developmental perspectives on motivation (pp. 209-254). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Choi, N.G. & DiNitto, D.M. (2012). Predictors of time volunteering, religious giving, and secular giving: Implications for nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 39(2), 93-120. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol39/iss2/6/>
- Cnaan, R.A., Handy, F., & Wadsworth, M. (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3), 364-383. doi: [10.1177/0899764096253006](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764096253006)
- Curtis, J. E., Baer, D. E., & Grabb, E. G. (2001). Nations of joiners: notions of voluntary association membership in democratic societies. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 783-805. doi: [10.2307/3088873](https://doi.org/10.2307/3088873)

- Day, K.M. & Devlin, R.A. (1996). Volunteerism and crowding out: Canadian econometric evidence. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 29(1), 37-53. doi: [10.2307/136150](https://doi.org/10.2307/136150)
- DiMaggio, P. (1994). Culture and economy. In N. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social foundations of post-industrial society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forbes, K.F. & Zampelli, E.M. (2014). Volunteerism: The influences of social, religious, and human capital. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2), 227-253. doi: [10.1177/0899764012458542](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012458542)
- Gallagher, S. (1994). Doing their share: Comparing patterns of help given by older and younger adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 56, 567-578. doi: [10.2307/352868](https://doi.org/10.2307/352868)
- García, I. & Marcuello, C. (2007). Social capital and participation in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 100-120. doi: [10.1177/0899764009333956](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009333956)
- Georgellis, Y. & Lange, T. (2012). Traditional versus secular values and the job-life satisfaction relationship across Europe. *British Journal of Management*, 23, 437-454. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00753.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00753.x)
- Gesthuizen, M. & Scheepers, P. (2012). Educational differences in volunteering in cross-national perspective: Individual and contextual explanations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(1), 58-81. doi: [10.1177/0899764010394203](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010394203)
- Gil-Lacruz, A. I., Marcuello-Servós, C., & Saz-Gil, M. I. (2016). Youth Volunteering in Countries in the European Union Approximation to Differences. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(5), 971-991. doi: [10.1177/0899764015609731](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015609731)
- Gomez, R. & Gunderson, M. (2003). Volunteer activity and the demands of work and family. *Industrial Relations*, 58(4), 573-589. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23078013>
- Grizzle, C. (2015). The determinants of volunteering in Nordic countries: Evidence from the European Values Survey. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 38(5), 364-370. doi: [10.1080/01900692.2014.938820](https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2014.938820)

- Grønbjerg, K.A. & Never, B. (2004). The role of religious networks and other factors in types of volunteer work. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 14(3), 263-289. doi: [10.1002/nml.34](https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.34)
- Grönlund, H., Holmes, K., Kang, C., Cnaan, R.A., Handy, F., Brudney, J.L., & Zrinščak, S. (2011). Cultural values and volunteering: A cross-cultural comparison of students' motivation to volunteer in 13 countries. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2, 87-106. doi: [10.1007/s10805-011-9131-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9131-6)
- Grönlund, H. (2012). Religiousness and volunteering: Searching for connections in late modernity. *Nordic Journal of Religion & Society*, 25(1), 47-66. Retrieved from <http://tapir.pdc.no/pdf/NJRS/2012/2012-01-3.pdf>
- Guterbock, T.M. & Fries, J.C. (1997). *Maintaining America's social fabric: The AARP survey of civic involvement*. Washington D.C.: American Association of Retired Persons.
- Hager, M.A. & Brudney, J.L. (2013). Sustaining volunteer involvement. In K. Seel (Ed.), *Volunteer Administration: Professional Practice, Second Edition*. Ontario, Canada: LexisNexis Canada.
- Hall, M., Knighton, T., Reed, P., Bussiere, P., Macrae, D., & Bowen, P. (1998). *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hall, M., McKeown, L., & Roberts, K. (2001). *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Halman, L. (2003). Volunteering, democracy and democratic attitudes. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 179-198). New York: Kluwer.
- Herzberg, F. (1964). The motivation-hygiene concept and problems of manpower. *Personnel Administrator*, 27, 3-7. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1964-09377-001>
- Herzog, A. & Morgan, J. (1993). Formal volunteer work among older Americans. In S. Bass, F. Caro, Y. Chen (Eds.), *Achieving a Productive Aging Society*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.

- Hodgkinson, V., Weitzman, M., Abrahams, J.A., Crutchfield, E.A., & Stevenson, D. (1996). The nonprofit almanac 1996-1997: Dimensions of the independent sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hong, S. & Morrow-Howell, N. (2013). Increasing older adults' benefits from institutional capacity of volunteer programs. *Social Work Research, 37*(2), 99-109. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svs028>
- Hong, S., Morrow-Howell, N., Tang, F., & Hinterlong, J., (2009). Engaging older adults in volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38*(2), 200-219. doi: 10.1177/0899764008317207
- Hofstede, G. H. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Inglehart, R. & Baker, W.E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values. *American Sociological Review, 65*, 19-51. Retrieved from <http://my.fit.edu/~gabrenya/cultural/readings/Inglehart-Baker-2000.pdf>
- Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2005). Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (Ed.). (2003). *Human values and social change: Findings from the values surveys*. Boston, MA: Brill Academic Pub.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2010). Changing mass priorities: The link between modernization and democracy. *Perspectives on Politics, 8*(2), 551-567. doi: 10.1017/S1537592710001258
- Jackson, E.F., Bachmeier, M.D., Wood, J.R., & Craft, E.A. (1995). Volunteering and charitable giving: Do religious and associational ties promote helping behavior? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 24*(1), 59-78. doi: 10.1177/089976409502400108
- Jones, K.S. (2006). Giving and volunteering as distinct forms of civic engagement: The role of community integration and personal

- resources in formal helping. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 249-266. doi: [10.1177/0899764006287464](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764006287464)
- Lim, C. & MacGregor, C.A. (2012). Religion and volunteering in context: Disentangling the contextual effects of religion on voluntary behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 747-779. doi: [10.1177/0003122412457875](https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412457875)
- Maki, A. & Snyder, M. (2017). Investigating similarities and differences between volunteer behaviors: Development of a volunteer interest typology. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(1), 5-28. doi: [10.1177/0899764015619703](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015619703)
- Mannino, C.A., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A.M. (2011). Why do people get involved? Motivations for volunteerism and other forms of social action. In D. Dunning (Ed.), *Social Motivation*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Menchik, P.L. & Weisbrod, B.A. (1987). Volunteer labor supply. *Journal of Public Economics*, 32(2), 159-183.
- Mesch, D.J., Rooney, P.M., Chin, W., & Steinberg, K.S. (2002). Race and gender differences in philanthropy: Indiana as a test case. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 37, 65-77. doi: [10.1002/pf.7](https://doi.org/10.1002/pf.7)
- Musick, M.A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Indiana University Press. Bloomington, IN: Indiana.
- Musick, M.A., Wilson, J., & Bynum, W.B. (2000). Race and formal volunteering: The differential effects of class and religion. *Social Forces*, 78(4), 1539-1570. doi: [10.2307/3006184](https://doi.org/10.2307/3006184)
- Nesbit, R. (2012). The influence of major life cycle events on volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1153-1174. doi: [10.1177/0899764011429181](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011429181)
- O'Neill, M. & Roberts, W. (1999). *Giving and volunteering in California. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action*. November, Washington, D.C.
- Parboteeah, K. P., Cullen, J. B., & Lim, L. (2004). Formal volunteering: A cross-national test. *Journal of World Business*, 39(4), 431-441.

- Petrova, T. & Tarrow, S. (2007). Transactional and participatory activism in the emerging European polity: The puzzle of East-Central Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(1), 74-94. doi: [10.1177/0010414006291189](https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414006291189)
- Plagnol, A.C. & Huppert, F.A. (2010). Happy to help? Exploring the factors associated with variations in rates of volunteering across Europe. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 157-176. doi: [10.1007/s11205-009-9494-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9494-x)
- Prouteau, L. & Sardinha, B. (2015). Volunteering and country-level religiosity: Evidence from the European Union. *Voluntas*, 26(1), 242-266. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00258.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00258.x)
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rosenthal, S., Feiring, C., & Lewis, M. (1998). Political volunteering from late adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 477-493. doi: [10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01231.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01231.x)
- Salamon, L. M., & Sokolowski, W. (2001). Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Evidence from 24 countries. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lester_Salamon/publication/237649701_Volunteering_in_Cross-National_Perspective_Evidence_From_24_Countries/links/550214040cf231de076da259.pdf
- Snyder, M. & Omoto, A.M. (2008). Volunteerism: Social issues perspectives and social policy implications. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 2(1), 1-36. doi: [10.1111/j.1751-2409.2008.00009.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2008.00009.x)
- Studer, S. (2016). Volunteer management: Responding to the uniqueness of volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(4), 688-714. doi: [10.1177/0899764015597786](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015597786)
- Stukas, A. A., Hoyer, R., Nicholson, M., Brown, K. M., & Aisbett, L. (2016). Motivations to volunteer and their associations with volunteers' well-being. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(1), 112-132. doi: [10.1177/0899764014561122](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764014561122)
- Vaillancourt, F. (1994). To volunteer or not: Canada 1987. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 27(4), 813-826. doi: [10.2307/136185](https://doi.org/10.2307/136185)

- Van Ingen, E., & Wilson, J. (2017). I volunteer, Therefore I am? Factors affectinf Volunteer Role Identity, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, in press. doi: [10.1177/0899764016659765](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764016659765)
- Voicu, B. & Voicu, M. (2009). Volunteers and volunteering in Central and Eastern Europe. *Sociología*, *41*(6), 539-563. Retrieved from <https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/07211230Voicu2%20AF%200K.pdf>
- Wang, L. & Graddy, E. (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas*, *19*(1), 23-42. doi: [10.1007/s11266-008-9055-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-008-9055-y)
- Wei, Y., Donthu, N., & Bernhardt, L., (2012). Volunteerism of older adults in the United States. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, *9*, 1-18. doi: [10.1007/s12208-011-0069-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-011-0069-6)
- Wilson, J. & Musick, M.A. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, *62*, 694-713. doi: [10.2307/2657355](https://doi.org/10.2307/2657355)
- Winniford, J.C., Carpenter, D.S., & Grider, C. (1997). Motivations of college student volunteers: A review. *NASPA Journal*, *34*(2), 134-146. Doi: [10.2202/1949-6605.1015](https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1015)
- Wolff, N., Weisbrod, B., & Bird, E. (1993). The supply of volunteer labor: the case of hospitals. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *4*, 23-45. doi: [10.1002/nml.4130040104](https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.4130040104)

Antonio Ariza-Montes. Titular professor. Department of Business Management. Universidad de Loyola Andalucía.

Pilar Tirado-Valencia. Titular profesor. Department of Accounting and Finance. Universidad de Loyola Andalucía.

Vicente Fernández-Rodríguez. Titular professor. Department of Business Management. Universidad de Loyola Andalucía.

Mark A. Hager. Associate Professor. School of Community Resources and Development. Arizona State University.

Contact Address:

C/ Escritor Castilla Aguayo, 4. 14004 Cordoba (Spain).

ptirado@uloyola.es