

First international conference of ERNOP

Vienna, 7 June 2011

***European volunteering: comparisons, individual
and country determinants***

**Lionel PROUTEAU, LEMNA (Laboratoire d'économie et de management de Nantes-
Atlantique), University of Nantes, France**

E-mail : lionel.prouteau@univ-nantes.fr

Boguslawa SARDINHA,

Department of Management and Economics

Polytechnic Institute of Setubal, Portugal

E-mail : boguslawa.sardinha@esce.ips.pt

1. Introduction

The cross national approach to volunteering is a relevant issue on volunteering studies. Smith (1994, p. 257), in conclusion of his survey on the determinants of voluntary participation and volunteering, wrote that “more international cross-fertilization is [...] needed”. Wilson (2000, p. 229) noted that “the impact of context on individual volunteering is one of the least understood issues in the field”. Amongst the contextual factor, the ones which originate in the country characteristics might play an important role. Today, the remarks of these authors have not lost their pertinence. Nevertheless, in the last decade, several works have endeavored to study volunteering or voluntary association participation in a cross-national perspective and these studies have touched on the influence of some political, cultural, economic or religious country contextual variables on such behaviors (see for instance: Schofer and Fourcade-Gourinchas, 2001; Salamon and Sokolowski, 2001 and 2003; Halman, 2003; Hodgkinson, 2004; Parboteeah et al., 2004; Hank and Erlinghagen, 2005; Ruiters and De Graaf, 2006; Hank and Stuck, 2007; Hackl et al., 2009; Pires et al., 2010, Van Ingen and Van der Meer, 2011).

One of main problems faced by searchers is, when they want to carry out such approaches, the difficulty to get appropriate data. In order to solve this problem, the 18th Conference of Labor Statisticians recommended in December 2008 to add a module on volunteering to national survey on Labor force. For this purpose and to make data comparable, International Labor Organization (ILO), in cooperation with the Center for Civil Society Studies, has developed a manual to measure volunteering. This manual was formally accepted at the beginning of 2011¹. Up until now, the comparative investigations on volunteering have mainly drawn on data set from waves of the European Value Survey and World Value Survey, from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) or from the surveys carried out as part of Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector. These surveys will still be privileged sources to study such behaviors at a cross-national level until the recommendations of ILO have been implemented in a sufficient number of countries.

The present paper is aimed at giving preliminary results of a work in progress on volunteering in the countries of the European Union. It deals with variables which may influence the propensity to volunteer. To that purpose, it distinguishes micro (or individual level) variables and macro (country level) ones. The individual level variables do not only concern socio-

¹ The final approved pre-publication version of the Manual on the measurement of volunteer work can be downloaded from the Website of the Center for Civil Society Studies, <http://www.ccss.jhu.edu/index.php?section=content&view=9&sub=12>.

demographic characteristics but they also pertain to attitudes and values. The macro-level variables relate to economic, political and religious contexts. The next section presents the data we use and some descriptive statistics about the participation in volunteering in the different countries. Section 3 examines the individual determinants of the volunteer participation and the country fixed effects. Section 4 studies the relationship between some macro-variables and volunteering. Section 5 concludes this study.

2. The data and some descriptive statistics about volunteering

For our work, we use data from the most recent wave (the fourth one) of the European Value Survey, carried out in 2008 and, for some countries, in 2009. An advantage of this survey is that respondents are asked the same questions in all countries even if country-specific variables may be included in the questionnaire. Regarding volunteer work, respondents are presented with a list of voluntary organizations and they are required to say if they belong to one or several of them, and then if they do unpaid voluntary work for such organizations. Unfortunately, no questions are asked about the amount of time dedicated to these voluntary activities so that we are obliged to restrict our work to the study of the only participation without possibilities to investigate its intensity.

This type of cross-national survey raises the question of the possible discrepancies in the comprehension of questions by respondent. Are we sure that respondents from different countries have the same perception of volunteering? Does the expression “unpaid voluntary work” have the same meaning everywhere? This important question is handled by Meijs et al. (2003) when they analyze cross-cultural differences in public perception of volunteering across eight countries (Belgium, Canada, Germany, India, Israel, Italy, Netherlands and USA). Though these authors conclude that “a broad consensus exists regarding who is definitely a volunteer” (p. 32) they add that “on the level of concrete situations of unpaid work the differences in perception can be large” (p. 33). We cannot affirm that the answers obtained from the European Value Survey are completely protected against this problem. However, we have some reasons to consider that volunteer work mentioned in this questionnaire is mainly the formal one since the questions used to construct the volunteering variable refer to voluntary organizations.

In addition to the aggregate volunteering, we consider in our research different disaggregated types of volunteering according to the kind of organizations’ activities. To that effect, we group several types of organizations together to form six activity areas. The first area is

dedicated to education, arts, music, cultural activities, sports or recreation and to youth work (scouts, guides, youth clubs and so on). This area is termed as “Leisure activities” even if it includes education. A second area is made up by the following type of activities: “social welfare services for elderly, handicapped or deprived people”, “local community action on issue like poverty, employment, and housing, racial equity” and “health”. This area is termed as “social activities”. The third area refers to the organizations the purposes of which are: “Third world development or human rights”, “conservation, the environment or human right”, “women’s groups” and “peace movement”. We add “political parties or groups” and we named this area the “defense of causes” one. A fourth category of activities is termed as “occupational area” and includes “trades unions” as well as “professional associations”. The fifth area concerns religious activities and the last one (“other”) groups the activities which have not been included elsewhere.

Of course, this classification may be questioned because, in the world of voluntary associations, typologies are uneasy. The boundaries between categories are unclear. For instance, a sport association for young people in depressed areas might be classified in the leisure area or in the social one. We are conscious of this problem which is inherent in all classifications of voluntary associations.

The fourth wave of EVS collects data from 47 participating countries but this paper studies the only countries which are members of the European Union because some macro-structural characteristics cannot be obtained for some other countries. It is specially the case for information about expenditure on social protection and expenditure of general government, two variables that play an important role in section 4. In addition, in order to avoid possible biases, we think that it is more careful to delete Ireland from the sample because there are too many missing answers to the questions used to construct the variable concerning the volunteer participation. The same reason leads us to delete Northern Ireland. In short, our study is about 26 countries. In our econometric investigation (Sections 3 and 4), after deleting incomplete observations concerning dependent and independent variables, there remained 37,830 individuals in our sample.

Tables 1 present the rates of participation in aggregate volunteering for the 26 European countries. These rates have been weighted. It turns out that they are rather different from a country to another since they vary from a minimum of 9 per cent in Poland to a maximum of 47.3 per cent in Netherlands. Globally, three groups of countries can be distinguished. The first group is characterized by high rates of participation and it is made up of Scandinavian

members of EU (Sweden, Finland and Denmark) as well as Benelux countries (Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg). This first group also includes two PECO countries that are Czech Republic and Slovenia. At the bottom of the distribution of participation rates, the majority of PECO countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic and Lithuania) and several Mediterranean countries (Cyprus, Greece, Malta, Portugal, Spain) form a second group. Between these two previous groups, a third one is composed of other EU countries (Austria, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia and Great-Britain) which are in an intermediary position (considering participation in volunteering).

Insert Table 1 here

Considering volunteering at a disaggregated level, we can observe from table 2 that the “leisure” area is the dominant beneficiary of formal unpaid work since it often mobilizes close to or more than 50 percent of the volunteers. However, though still in first place, this area is less dominant in Greece and Spain. In addition, Cyprus, Malta, Romania and, to a certain extent, Poland are exceptions. In the first three countries this activity area takes only the second place and in Poland it is equal with the religious domain of volunteering.

The social area rallies at least one quarter of the volunteers and sometimes one third of them in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic and Great-Britain. There is less voluntary engagement in these activities in Bulgaria, Germany, Latvia and Poland. The occupational area of volunteering is in first place in Cyprus and Romania. It is also important in Bulgaria, Romania, Portugal and Greece whereas it is much lower in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Great-Britain, Italy, Malta and Spain.

Insert Table 2 here.

The organizations oriented towards “Defense of causes” recruit numerous volunteers in Cyprus, Romania, Bulgaria, Portugal and Greece. This area is even in majority in the first two countries and, in the last three, it attracts more than one unpaid worker out of three. Volunteering for religious organizations is the dominant type in Malta and Romania. In Poland it shares the first place with volunteer work for leisure organizations. It is also important in Italy, Austria, Great-Britain and Spain where more than one quarter of the volunteers are involved in this area.

As for the “other” area, it is difficult to comment the results since we have no idea about the activities which are concerned. However, the not negligible percentage of volunteers involved

in this “residual” area in some countries (Finland, France, Portugal, Sweden and Great-Britain) suggests that the questionnaire of EVS would have to reexamine the list of organizations and activities which is showed to respondents to better document it in order to minimize the number of answers which are assigned to this opaque category.

In several countries, the current rates of participation in aggregate volunteering are very close to the ones obtained from the third wave of EVS conducted in 1999 and 2000 (Pires et al., 2010). These countries are Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands and Portugal (with respectively rates of 35.7%, 37.2%, 38.4%, 26.1%, 14.8%, 22.4%, 13.5%, 49.8% and 13.8% from the third wave of EVS). The differences between the two waves are a bit more perceptible but they are still limited in magnitude for Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Estonia (with respectively 30.5%, 16.5%, 32.5%, 21.3%, 26.1%, 13.7%, 28.5%, 17.6% and 17.8% from the third wave of EVS). For the rest of the EU countries they are much more important. For instance the participation rates of Greece, Malta, Sweden, Great-Britain and Slovak Republic are now markedly lower than they were from the third wave (39.8%, 28.4%, 56.4%, 43.1% and 51.2%). Quite the reverse, Luxembourg has a higher rate than it had from the third wave (30.6%). Are such discrepancies the consequence of dramatic change in voluntary behavior in these countries or are they the effect of sampling problems? This question cannot be answered but it leads us to show some caution when commenting our results.

3. The individual determinants of volunteering

In this section we look at the characteristics which are more likely to influence the propensity to volunteer. We are interested in variables at the individual level and the country effects are taken into account only through dummies. Among these individual-level variables, we incorporate, of course, the usual socio-demographic factors about which much is now known due to numerous previous works on this subject (Smith, 1994; Wilson, 2000). Therefore, we include gender, age, matrimonial status, presence of children in the household, income, having or not a job and the size of towns where respondents live. With respect to children, we know that their presence at home is expected to play a contradictory role. On one hand, such a presence restricts the spare time the parents can dedicate to volunteering and consequently their participation might decrease. On the other hand, having children at home may promote the participation of parents in voluntary associations oriented towards activities for teenagers (education, sport, leisure and so one). The former (negative) effect surely dominates when

children are very young but the importance of the latter rises when children are school-aged (Rotolo and Wilson, 2007). Unfortunately, the questionnaire of the fourth wave of EVS does not allow us to ascertain the age of children living in the household. Thereby we only mention the number of children.

In addition to these variables, we include a variable related to the religious attitude which is increasingly taken into consideration in studies on volunteering (Wilson and Janoski, 1995). To this end, we distinguish people without religious denomination from those with a denomination and we differentiate the latter according to the intensity of church attendance².

In this investigation, we are also interested in several attitudinal variables. Indeed we suggest that these variables might help us to better understand some values of volunteers and perhaps, though indirectly, their motivations. For this reason, we put a particular accent on the respondent attitudes towards work and leisure. Stebbins (1996), after Parker (1992), considers volunteering as a serious leisure which he distinguishes from casual or unserious leisure “exemplified in taking a nap or strolling in the park or in watching television [...]” (p. 215). This approach conducts him to think that volunteering proceeds from both altruism and self-interest, two motivations which are in a profoundly intricate relation one with another. In a same vein, Pearce (1993, p. 179) claims that volunteering is “both leisure and work”. As for them, Wilson and Musick (1997, p. 696) write that volunteering “is a leisure as work; it is work as leisure”.

Therefore, we have introduced several variables related to feelings and attitudes towards work and leisure. Concerning the former, we use the answers to questions (asked to all respondents, whether they have a job or not) about the aspects of job considered as important, namely:

- i) a good pay;
- ii) an opportunity to use initiative;
- iii) a useful job for society;
- iv) meeting people;
- v) a job in which one can achieve something;
- vi) a responsible job;
- vii) a job which is interesting
- viii) a job that meets one’s capabilities;

² We distinguish three categories of church members: those without attendance, those with irregular attendance and church members with regular attendance. Regular attendance concerns people who attend religious service at least once a week.

- ix) learning new skills;
- x) having a say in important decisions.

In addition, we also use answers about the degree of agreement (ranked to strong agreement to strong disagreement) given to following statements;

- xi) work is very or quite important in the respondent's life;
- xii) to fully develop your talents, you need to have a job;
- xiii) work is a duty towards society;
- xiv) work should away come first, even if it means less spare time.

We may think that, if respondents regard volunteering as work, they will be disposed to agree more easily with xi) but not necessarily with xiv) because if work would have come first, the volunteer would not have time to involve himself (or herself) in unpaid activities. Volunteers may be expected to be less sensitive to the opportunity cost of their unpaid activity (i.e. wage which they could receive if they dedicated their time to professional activities rather than to volunteer work) than non volunteers. Consequently, all things being equal, a negative correlation is predicted between i) and the propensity to volunteer. Concerning the other questions, we think that if paid work and the unpaid kind are perceived by respondents according to the same inclinations and values, their answers may give us some information about their propensity to volunteer and their motivations for doing such activities. For example, an individual giving a great importance to the social utility of his (her) job might be expected to be more prone to do volunteer work. In the same vein, we can hypothesize that the respondents who express a great interest for a job in which one can achieve something or for a job that meets one's abilities will be more inclined to do unpaid work if they are stimulated by motivations which proceed from needs of personal development or achievement. We also know that volunteering has a relational dimension (Prouteau and Wolff, 2004a and 2008), so we can conjecture that people who see the fact of "meeting people" as an important aspect of job might also be more likely to do unpaid voluntary work.

Concerning the questions about leisure, we suppose that the propensity to do volunteer work is positively correlated with the fact of considering that leisure time is very or quite important in one's life. Relational motive for volunteering work leads us to anticipate a same positive correlation with the importance given to meetings with nice people within the framework of leisure. On the opposite, because volunteering is a serious leisure, we hypothesize a negative correlation between such an involvement and the two other aspects of leisure ("relaxing" and "doing as one wants"). The relational dimension of volunteer work might also appear through

a positive correlation between this type of activity and the expressed feeling that friends and acquaintances are important in one's life.

We have added a variable pertaining to the importance given to one's family but in this case the nature of the relation with volunteering is uncertain. On one hand, respondents who give a great importance to their family might give time to voluntary organizations in order to help parents or children and the correlation would be positive in this case. On the other hand, these individuals might be lead to prefer to spend their spare time inside a domestic space to the detriment of voluntary activities done outside, leading to an opposite result.

In addition to the attitudes towards work and leisure, we take also account of some feelings and attitude towards politics. Firstly, we consider the respondents' interest in politics. Because some areas of volunteering (for instance volunteering for promoting causes) are oriented towards the public sphere, we hypothesize that an individual more interested in politics has also a higher probability of being a volunteer. Bekkers (2005) finds that in Netherlands, citizens with a greater interest in politics are more likely to volunteer for an association. Secondly, we include the political orientations of respondents. Respondents were asked to rank themselves on a scale from 1 (left) to 10 (right). We have made up four categories: left oriented respondents (ranked from 1 to 4), right oriented respondents (ranked from 7 to 10), middle-ground oriented ones (5 ranked 5 or 6) and a fourth category for the individuals who have not given a response, either because they do not want or because they refuse this left-right categorization.

Regarding the influence of the political orientation on volunteering, the results from previous studies are mitigated. For instance, Bekkers (2005) concludes that Dutch non-voters were less inclined to volunteer than left oriented people or voters for the Christian political party. Using a cross-national date set from 24 OECD countries, Hackl et al (2009) found that non-voters have a lower probability of volunteering and that right-wing people show a higher propensity to volunteer than their left-wing counterparts. These differences disappear, however, when controlling for religiosity. From the third wave of EVS, Pires et al (2010) observed no statistically significant difference between left-oriented respondents and left-right ones with respect to the propensity to volunteer but middle-ground oriented respondents and those who refuse to rank themselves on the left-right scale have a lower probability of doing such unpaid activities.

Thirdly, we consider another political variable obtained from a question about the system of governing in the country. Respondents were asked to rank how well things were going, on a

scale from 1 (very bad) to 10 (very good). Three categories of opinions have been distinguished: very satisfied (from 8 to 10), mitigated opinion (from 4 to 7) and very unsatisfied (from 1 to 3). We have added a fourth category for unknown responses. The predicted effect of this variable is unclear. On one hand, a low degree of satisfaction may stimulate voluntary participation in order to alleviate the consequences of this (subjectively-judged) bad situation. On the other hand, such feelings may lead people to growing apathy.

Finally, we have included three last attitudinal variables. The first one is constructed from a question which requires that respondents place on a scale from 1 to 10 their view on the following issue: “individuals should take more responsibility for providing for themselves” (rank 1) versus “the state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for” (rank 10). We defined a dummy which takes value 1 if people rank their view from 8 to 10, expressing an opinion in favor of a strong state interventionism. Once again, the predicted effect of this variable on the participation in volunteering is uncertain. When engaging in unpaid voluntary activities, people show that they do not rely entirely on the State. Thereby we can presume a negative correlation between our dummy and volunteer work. However, people might consider that efficient volunteering requires that the state should provide society with a sufficient amount of basic services and in this case the above mentioned correlation might be positive.

The second variable relates to the trust given to others and it differentiates those who think that most individuals can be trusted from the other respondents. When studying the influence of social capital on giving and volunteering, Brown and Ferris (2009) study draw on the regular distinction between network-based social capital and norm-based one. They use the individual’s trust and faith in others and civic institution to measure the latter and they show that this type of social capital enhances volunteering. Consequently, we expect a positive correlation between our indicator of social trust and volunteer participation.

The last variable refers to the possible intergenerational transmission of attitudes. There are some evidences of a positive relation between current volunteering of adults and parental volunteering in the past (Prouteau and Wolff, 2004b; Bekkers, 2007). Unfortunately, from the fourth wave of EVS, we cannot know if respondents’ parents volunteered in the past. However, we can assume that the intergenerational transmission of this behavior work through different channels and particularly by a process of socialization which progressively infuses habits and attitudes favorable to volunteering. For instance, parents may pass a sense of interest for the public sphere on their children. In the fourth wave of EVS, respondents

were asked if, when they were about 14 years old, their parents liked to follow the news. Because such an attention for the news may be communicated to children and because it may contribute to stimulate empathy feelings as well as an interest in the public sphere and consequently a certain degree of extraversion, we expect a positive correlation between current volunteering and this variable³.

For the purpose of our econometric investigation, we use a Logit model. Results are shown in Table 3. For each variable, category of reference is given in appendix 1. At the aggregate level, men appear more inclined to volunteer than women are. This result corroborates the one obtained by Pires et al. (2010) from the third wave of EVS but it attests that there are differences in gender behavior regarding volunteer work between the United States and Europe since in the US, women appear more likely to take part in these unpaid activities (Pho, 2008). The rate of participation drops between 25 and 35 years of age, then it increases with a peak between 55 and 75 years and drops again after this age, confirming that old people are markedly less inclined to volunteer. Single (never married) people have the highest probability of volunteering and the widowed individuals have the lowest. Having one child at home penalizes the participation of members of the household but such an effect is absent when there are two or more children. Perhaps larger families are more sensitive to the previously mentioned incitements to do unpaid tasks in voluntary associations whose activities are oriented towards children.

Insert Table 3 here.

Individuals who have paid jobs volunteer more than non-employed ones. As expected, the higher the education level is, the higher the individual probability of volunteering. An increasing in domestic income has a positive effect on the participation. Inhabitants in large towns are less inclined to do volunteering than those who live in small towns and above all in rural areas. One of the reasons is probably that in the areas where the density of population is low voluntary organizations and their volunteers have to make up for a deficiency in the supply of public or marketable services (Prouteau and Wolff, 2004a). Another reason is suggested by Wilson (2000, p. 230): inhabitants in small towns “emphasize solidarity benefits and norms of reciprocity while suburbanites emphasize self-development”.

Now, if we consider the areas of volunteering, we can observe some differences in the influence of these socio-demographic variables. For instance, men volunteer less than women

³ Extraversion has been shown to encourage to volunteer (see for instance: Bekkers, 2005; Okun et al., 2007).

in social, defenses of causes and religion areas whereas the opposite is true in the other areas. Having a paid job plays a role only in leisure and, of course, in occupational areas. Age profile of volunteers is decreasing in leisure area whereas it is increasing until 75 years in the social area. Occupational volunteering has a peak at middle-ages but, curiously, it does not severely drop after 65 years of age though many people are retired. Domestic income strengthens the probability of volunteering only in the leisure area. On the other hand, the influence of the educational level is systematic as is the impact of residence town, even if the importance of such effects varies from a volunteering area to another. For instance, the educational level is a bit less discriminating in religious volunteering than it is in other areas and the size of residence town plays a less important role in occupational volunteering.

The presence of two or more children in the household plays an incentive effect on volunteering in leisure and religion areas but not in the other ones. This result is consistent with the activities which are oriented towards children in these areas⁴.

Religiosity is an important variable to take into consideration as determinant of volunteering. Several previous researches have concluded that it is not the fact of belonging to a religious denomination which matters but instead the degree of church attendance (Wilson and Musick, 1997). Table 3 confirms such a conclusion since individuals who do not have a religious denomination do not volunteer less than those who are church members but do not attend religious service, whereas people who regularly attend these service have a markedly higher volunteer participation. One can also note that this religious factor plays the same role in all types of volunteering and not only in the religion area, though the importance of its influence varies (it is lower in occupational area). This result is in line with the one of Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) since these authors find that people doing religious volunteering are also more likely to volunteer for secular organizations.

Regarding the attitudinal variables, we can see that the coefficients of several of them have the expected sign. So, trusting in others increases the probability of participating in all types of volunteering except in the “other” area, which confirms the importance of this factor. Respondents having had parents who liked to follow the news are more inclined to volunteer at the aggregate level as well as in social, leisure and other areas. Individuals who consider that work and leisure are important in their life have a tendency to volunteer more than others. As predicted in a “serious leisure” perspective of volunteering, respondents who consider “relaxing” and “doing as one wants” as important aspects of leisure are less prone to volunteer

⁴ For instance, in the religion area, such activities may be catechism.

whereas those who emphasize the usefulness of job for society are more inclined to participate, though these results do not hold in all areas of volunteering. Taking into account aspects of job considered as important, we observe that “an opportunity to use initiative”, “a job in which one can achieve something” and “opportunity to have a say in important decisions” are positively correlated with volunteering even if it is not systematic. These results suggest that the hope of achievement and the need of initiative may lead to volunteer work. Curiously and contrary to our prediction, “a job that meets one’s abilities” is an aspiration negatively correlated with the volunteer participation whereas the same type of correlation with the “good pay” aspect was more expected. Respondents who attach importance to relational dimension of job (“meeting people”) are not more inclined to volunteer (except in social area) but the stress put on this relational aspect in the domain of leisure is more positively related to voluntary participation and principally in the leisure area of volunteering. In addition, we can observe that individuals who consider friends and acquaintances as important in their life have a higher probability of participating but, once again, only in the leisure area of volunteering, which suggest that this type of volunteering is more motivated than the others by the relational motive. The importance given to family in one’s life does not have an influence on the propensity to do volunteer work.

With respect to the political variable, we find that interest in politics is systematically and positively correlated with the participation in volunteering and this correlation is particularly high in occupational and defense-of-causes areas. At the aggregate level of volunteering, people who have no political orientation (or who do not declare this orientation) as well as those who are middle-oriented or (though to a lesser extent) right-oriented, volunteer less than those who are left-oriented. Such a result was not observed from the third wave of EVS (Pires et al., 2010). However, the effect of the political orientation is not homogeneous in all areas of volunteering. In the religion area, rightists are more inclined to volunteer than leftist are.

The more people judge that the system for governing the country is good, the more they volunteer, but this result is found only at the aggregate level of volunteering and in the leisure area. Finally, as expected, respondents who consider that the state should take more responsibilities to ensure that everyone is provided for are less inclined to participate in volunteer work but this result holds only at the aggregate level of volunteering and in the leisure area.

The coefficients of country dummies allow us to classify the EU countries in a decreasing order of importance with regard to the propensity to volunteer once the composition effects

are controlled (i.e. once we have taken account of the differences in characteristics of national samples). At the aggregate level of volunteering, the observed results are globally in line with the ones which are presented in table 1. Compared to France which is the reference category, Netherlands, Finland, Luxembourg, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark and Sweden have a higher participation whereas numerous countries from Eastern and Mediterranean Europe have a lower rate. But this classification may change from an area to another. For instance, France has a high level of participation in the social area (it is the fourth country in a decreasing ranking order) whereas it has a very low rate in the defense-of-causes area⁵. Now let us turn to the possible explanations or these country effects.

4. The influence of some country-level variables on volunteering

In previous works about the impact of country-level variables on volunteering, the attention of the researchers has mainly focused on the economic, political and religious context. From the economic approach, one may hypothesize that the more affluent a society is, the more inclined to volunteer people are. Two arguments are put forward. The first one considers that economic development provides people with more resources and consequently allows individuals to meet the expenses related to volunteer involvement. The second argument sees economic development as a specialization process which increases the number of interest groups and fosters participation (Curtis et al, 2001, Ruiter and De Graaf, 2006). A third reason might be suggested since in most these works it is the unpaid work in organizations which is generally concerned. With economic development, the nature of volunteering changes: formal volunteering substitutes for informal one (Davis Smith, 1999). Economic development is often measured by GDP (or GNP) per capita. Schofer and Fourcad-Gourinchas (2001) find no effect of GDP per capita on association membership. Curtis et al (2001) observes a positive correlation between the natural logarithm of GDP per capita and the total memberships, but this relation is no longer valid for working memberships which can be considered, at least partially, as volunteering. Similarly, Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) as well as Hackl et al (2009) found no effect of such a variable on the participation in volunteering. Halman (2003) observed a bivariate correlation between GDP per capita and volunteer work but it disappears when the author controls for other contextual factors. Pires et al. (2010) found a positive relation between GDP per capita (and GNI per capita) and the propensity to volunteer but, once again, this relation disappears when introducing other country-level variables.

⁵ Of course, if we do not control for religiosity at the individual level in the equation related to religion area (column 6) the coefficients of country dummies may be very different.

Nevertheless, Parboteeah et al. (2004) concluded that a significantly positive relation exists between formal volunteering and the per capita purchasing power parity estimation GNP. Van Ingen and Van der Meer (2011) obtained a similar result concerning voluntary association participation.

Some authors have taken a more particular interest in the impact of public social expenses on volunteering. In this case, the underlying concern refers to the so-called “crowding effect”. Do these public expenses substitute for volunteer effort or, quite the reverse as claimed by Salamon and Sokolowski (2003), do they stimulate this effort because the public and the nonprofit sectors are interdependent, the former supporting the latter? Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) concluded that there is no significant relation between welfare expenditures (as percentage of GDP) and volunteering whereas Hackl et al (2009) displayed a negative and significant relation. Salamon and Sokolowski (2003) found a positive correlation between national rates of volunteer participation and government social spending as percentage of GDP but, as Ruiter and De graaf (2008) say, they do not take into account the compositional differences between the countries. Controlling for such differences, Pires et al (2010) showed that volunteer participation is rather enhanced by social expenses (as percentage of GDP). Though they are only interested in the effect of welfare state expenses on inequalities in voluntary association participation, Van Ingen and Van der Meer (2011) are lead to model the overall influence of such expenses which turns out to be positively correlated with participation.

Regarding the political context, several types of variables have been used. Curtis et al (2001) firstly chose the political type (distinguishing between liberal democracies, social democracies, former eastern bloc state socialist countries and a fourth group compounded of other democracies) and secondly the number of years of continuous democracy between 1920 and 1990. Total working membership appears to be influenced by both variables. Halman (2003) finds a slight positive relation between the number of volunteers and adherence to democratic attitude but the author stresses that “the pattern is less clear than expected” (p. 190). Hackl et al (2009) found a negative impact of the degree of political consensus (between voters and ideological orientation of government) on volunteering and a similar effect of an index of democratization, explaining such results in terms of “consensual” and “participatory” crowding out. The more voters agree with the ideological orientation of government or the more democratized the country is, the less people are encouraged to volunteer to change things. Contrary to their theoretical hypothesis, Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) concluded that the level of democracy is negatively related to volunteering. However, Parboteeah et al. (2004)

inferred from their investigation that societal collectivism and an increasing degree of liberal democracy are statistically significant factors favorable to volunteer work⁶. Finally, some authors conjecture that the religion context is an important aspect for explaining the national difference in propensities to volunteer. The reasoning can be summarized as follows (see Ruiter and De Graff, 2006):

- i) church attendance enhances the probability of volunteering because of a network effect. Individuals which regularly attend to church services are strongly integrated within religious networks. They are more subjected to be asked to volunteer;
- ii) in more devout societies, individuals, whether belonging to a religious denomination or not, are more subjected to contact with involved church members and consequently have a higher probability to volunteer.

In this line of reasoning, Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) assumed that “the chance to volunteer increases with the devoutness of the society” (p. 195). In addition, they expect that the religiosity variable at the individual level is less discriminating in more devout societies with respect to the propensity to volunteer. Using the 1981-1984, 1990-1993 and 199-2001 waves of EVS-WVS, they average church attendance to measure the degree of devoutness of the society. Their results validate their hypotheses and lead the author to see in secularization of societies a danger for future volunteering. The European Volunteer Center (2007) echoes this fear when it writes about the Netherlands (p. 21): “Secularization implies disappearance of important recruitment and mobilizing setting therefore it has a negative impact on volunteering”.

Parbooteeah et al. (2001) found a statistically significant positive relation between the percentage of people attending religious services in different countries and volunteerism. Curtis et al. (2001) used a different variable which refers to religious composition of nations distinguished according to the dominant religious domination: Protestant-dominant countries, mainly Roman Catholic countries, mixed Catholic and Protestant countries and other ones. Religious composition is markedly associated with total membership, mixed Christian as well as Protestant dominant ones being more favorable to total memberships. However, this influence is more tenuous on working memberships (i.e. volunteering). Halman (2003) did not observe a positive relation between country-level religiosity and the involvement in voluntary activities.

⁶ Drawing on the definition of House et al. (2004) the authors define societal collectivism as “degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distributive of resources and collective action” (p. 436). The degree of liberal democracy is measured from different elements such as freedom of group opposition, political rights and effectiveness of the legislative body.

Stimulating as they are, the above-mentioned works do not give unambiguous conclusions. Consequently the effects of contextual variables on volunteering deserve a sustained effort of research. In the present paper, this question is approached principally by using a multilevel model which allows us to study the influence of country-level variables whereas the compositional differences between national samples are taken into account⁷. In our model, individual variables (level 1) are the same than in table 1.

At the country level (level 2) we consider three types of variables. The first type relates to the economic context. Under this aspect, we choose an indicator of wealth which is the PPP (purchasing power parity) estimation of GNI (Gross National Income) per capita obtained from United Statistics Division in 2008 (the year of the survey for most countries). We also consider two variables which refer, more particularly, to the importance of the state's economic role in the country. These variables are total social protection expenses per capita and final consumption expenditure of general government (per capita). The last economic variable is an income inequality index which is defined as the income quintile share ratio that is the ratio of total income received by the 20% of the population with the highest income (top quintile) to that received by the 20% of the population with the lowest income (lowest quintile). By introducing this variable, our aim is to reconsider the result of Hackl et al. (2009). Indeed, these authors find that the higher the income inequality is, the higher is the propensity to volunteer. They interpret this result as a form of crowding out of volunteering by a more equal income distribution. From the third wave of EVS, Pires et al. (2010) does not confirm this positive relation between the degree of inequality and volunteering. These last three economic variables are obtained from Eurostat.

The second type of variables concern the political dimension. We use two indicators which are computed from each national sample. The first political variable is a proxy for the adherence to democratic values and regime. It consists of the (weighted) percentage of respondents who think that having democratic political system is a *very* good way of governing the country. The second variable is obtained by computing the (still weighted) percentage of respondents who are very critical towards the system for governing the country and more precisely those who ranked themselves very low (1, 2 or 3) on a scale from 1 (very bad) to 10 (very good) when they were asked their opinion about how well things were going. We have seen (table 3) that the individuals who express their satisfaction in this respect have

⁷ About multilevel models see, for instance, Hox (2002)

a tendency to volunteer more. But, from this result obtained at the individual level, we cannot a priori infer a similar influence at the country level unless to make the *atomistic fallacy*.

The third dimension we retain is the religious one. The variable that we choose represents an indicator of secularization. It is the percentage of the national population who does not belong to a religious denomination.

Let us notice that our contextual variables are often correlated between them, the degree of inter-correlation being higher for the economic variables. Such a situation makes it uneasy to estimate the effect of each country variable when we introduce several of them in the model. Consequently we have to be careful when commenting our results.

These results are shown in table 4 and refer only to aggregate volunteering⁸. We can see that the estimations related to level-1 variables are very similar to those obtained in the previous stage of our study (see Table 3). Consequently, we only pay attention to country-level variables. When they are introduced as sole contextual variables in the model (columns I to VII), all of them have a significant effect with the exception of the political variable concerning the adherence to democracy. Regarding the economic indicators, the GNI per capita as well as the final consumption expenditure of general government per capita and the total social expenses per capita are positively correlated to volunteering. It is not possible to rigorously test the crowding out effect hypothesis versus the interdependence hypothesis in the scope of this study, especially because we have no information from EVS on the hours given by volunteers. However, we can at least say that in no way the crowding out hypothesis is strengthened by our investigation. Quite the reverse, at least in the European Union countries, the interdependence hypothesis seems more plausible.

Insert Table 4 here

Unlike Ackl et al. (2009) but like Pires et al. (2010) we find a negative relation between the income inequality variable and volunteering, with a statistical significance at 10 per cent level. This result holds even if we use the Gini coefficient as an indicator of inequality instead of our index.

With respect to the political variables, the degree of national adherence to democracy such as measured by our indicator has no effect on the propensity to volunteer. On the other hand, the more important the dissatisfaction (at the national-level) with the way of governing the country is, the less is the likelihood to volunteer.

⁸ For the purpose of estimating our multilevel model, we use the GLIMMIX procedure from SAS software.

Lastly, volunteering seems to be enhanced by an increasing degree of secularization. Such a result is rather new and is at variance with the ones obtained by Riter and De Graaf (2006) as well as by Parboteeah et al. (2004). To check the robustness of this result, we have replaced our variable with another which consists of the percentage of respondents who regularly attend to church services in each national sample. Of course, to confirm our previous investigation, we expect a negative and significant sign associated to this new variable. This is what we obtain and consequently secularization seems to strengthen volunteering instead of discouraging it⁹.

When we simultaneously include these different country-level variables in the model (except those which are the most highly inter-correlated) several effects disappear (column VIII of table 4). However, the “final consumption expenditure of general government” variable and the index of secularization keep their significant positive correlation with volunteering whereas the indicator of dissatisfaction with the way the country is governed keeps its negative sign (with a 10 percent significance level)¹⁰.

When we consider the area of volunteering, we can see that the results change from an area to another (Table 5)¹¹. The “final consumption expenditure of general government” variable and the index of secularization are positively related to all the areas of volunteering except the occupations and defences-of-causes ones which are not influenced by any contextual variables we consider. The indicator of dissatisfaction about the system for governing the country is only negatively significant (at the 10 percent level) related to volunteer work in the religion area.

Insert Table 5 here

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated the effects of individual variables and the ones of macro-contextual ones. Regarding the former, in addition to the now well-known influence of socio-demographic variables, we scrutinize the impact of several attitudinal variables on aggregate volunteering and our results tend to strengthen the idea that volunteering is a serious leisure. People who think that both work and leisure are important in their life are more inclined to do such unpaid activities and the same is true for individuals who emphasize the usefulness of a

⁹ The results of this investigation are not reported here but they are available upon request to the authors.

¹⁰ The same result holds if we replace the final consumption expenditure of general government with the total social protection expenses per capita.

¹¹ We do not present the coefficients of level-1 variables because, once again, they are very similar to the ones shown in Table 3.

job as well as some of its aspects. People who are inclined to sociability (they appreciate the relationships with friends or other persons) have also a higher probability of volunteering and the same is true for those who are interested in politics.

At the country level, two variables appear to be robustly and positively related to volunteering except in occupational and defence-of-causes areas: the expenses of government per capita (or the social protection expenses per capita) and the degree of secularization of society (the higher it is, the higher the probability of volunteer). The latter result is particularly important because it is at variance with the conclusion of previous researches that find that devout societies are more favourable to volunteering. The former result leads us to a great scepticism towards the crowding out hypothesis. A third country variable, concerning the degree of dissatisfaction with the way the system for governing the country is working, is found to have a negative correlation with the probability of doing volunteer work but its impact is less frequent and robust and deserves to be more documented.

However, we have to stress that these results have a restricted geographical area of validity since they concern only European Union countries. It is not impossible that we obtain different conclusions from other regions of world or from a larger group of countries. Nevertheless, an exploratory broadening of our analysis to other European countries does not seem to invalidate our results but such a question calls for further researches. We have also to underline that our investigation is a cross-sectional one and, if we want to be rigorous, it cannot be used for dynamic inferences. The impossibility to study the hours given by volunteers represents another limit of this work.

Last but not least, in this analysis we have hypothesized that coefficients related to individual-level variables are the same across the different countries but they might be different (see Van Ingen and Vand der Meer, 2011). This question as well as one concerning the possible influence of the country variable on the coefficient of individual variables is the next stage of our work.

Bibliography

- Bekkers R. (2005), "Participation in voluntary associations, relations with resources, personality, and political values", *Political Psychology*, 26, pp. 439–454.
- Bekkers R. (2007), "Intergenerational Transmission of Volunteering", *Acta Sociologica*, 50 (2), pp. 99-114.
- 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, pp. 85-99.
- Curtis J. E., Baer D. E. and E. G. Grabb E. G. (2001), "Nations of Joiners : Explaining Voluntary Association Membership in Democratic Societies", *American Sociological Review*, 66, pp. 783-805.
- Davis Smith J. (1999), *Volunteering and Social Development*, A Background Paper for Discussion at an Expert Group Meeting, New York, United Nations. Available from: <http://mirror.undp.org/capacity/cases/insights/volunteering.pdf>
- European Volunteer Center (2007), *Volunteering in the Netherlands. Facts and Figures Report*, Brussels.
- Hackl F., Halla M. and G. J. Pruckner (2009), *Volunteering and the State*, IZA Discussion Paper series n° 4016.
- Halman L. (2003), "Volunteering, Democracy, and Democratic Attitudes", in P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds), *The Values of Volunteering. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, New York, Luwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, pp. 179-198.
- Hank K., Erlinghagen M. (2005), "Volunteer Work", in Börsch-Supan A., Brugiavini A., Jürges H., Mackenbach J., Siegrist J. and G. Weber (eds), *Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe*, Mannheim Research Institute for the Economics of Aging, pp. 259-264.
- Hank K., Stuck S. (2007), *Volunteer Work, Informal Help, and Care among the 50+ in Europe: Further Evidence for 'Linked' Productive Activities at Older Ages*, Discussion Papers 733, DIW Berlin.
- Hodgkinson V. A. (2003), "Volunteering in Global Perspective", in P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds), *The Values of Volunteering. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, New York, Luwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, pp. 35-53.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. and V. Gupta, (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations*, The GLOBE study of 62 cultures. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Hox J. (2002), *Multilevel Analysis. Techniques and Applications*, Mahwah, London: Lawrence Elbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Meijs L. C. P. M., Handy F., Cnaan R. A., Brudney J. L., Ascoli U., Ranade S., Hustinx L., Weber S. and I. Weiss (2003), "All in the Eyes of the Beholder?". Perceptions of Volunteering Across Eight Countries", in P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds), *The Values of Volunteering. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, New York, Luwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, pp. 19-34.

- Okun M. A., Pugliese J. and K. S. Rook (2007), "Unpacking the relation between extraversion and volunteering in later life: The role of social capital", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, pp. 1467-1477.
- Parboteeah K. P., Cullen J. B. And L. Lim (2004), "Formal Volunteering: a Cross-National Test", *Journal of World Business*, 39, pp. 431-441.
- Parker S. R. (1992), "Volunteering as serious leisure", *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 17, pp. 1-11.
- Pearce J. L. (1993), *The organizational behavior of unpaid workers*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Pho Y. H. (2008), "The value of volunteer labor and the factors influencing participation: Evidence for the United States from 2002 through 2055", *Review of Income and Wealth*, 54, pp. 220-236.
- Pires C., Prouteau L. and Sardinha B. (2010), *Rates of Participation in Volunteering and Characteristics of Volunteers: European Comparisons*, paper presented at the 9th International Conference of the International Society for Third sector Research, Istanbul, July 7-10. Available in the volume 5 of the Conference Working papers Series of ISTR, <http://www.istr.org/conference/istanbul/WorkingPapers/index1118.htm>
- Prouteau L., Wolff F.-C. (2004a), « Relational Goods and Associational Participation », *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 75, pp. 431-463.
- Prouteau L., F.-C. Wolff (2004b), "Donner son temps : les bénévoles dans la vie associative", *Économie et Statistique*, n° 372, pp. 3-39.
- Prouteau L, Wolff F.C. (2008), « On the relational motive for volunteer work », *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29, pp. 314-335.
- Rotolo T., Wilson J. (2007), "The Effects of Children and Employment Status on the Volunteer Work of American Women", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36, pp. 487-503.
- Ruiter S., De Graaf N. D. (2006), "National Context, Religiosity and Volunteering: Results from 53 Countries", *American Sociological Review*, 71, pp. 191-210.
- Salamon L. M., Sokolwski W. (2001), *Volunteering in Cross-national Perspective: Evidence From 24 Countries*, Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project.
- Salamon L. M., Sokolwski W. (2003), "Institutional Roots of Volunteering: Toward a Macro-Structural Theory of Individual Voluntary Action", in P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds), *The Values of Volunteering. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, New York, Luwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, pp. 71-90.
- Schofer E., Fourcade-Gourinchas M. (2001), "The Structural Contexts of Civic Engagement: Voluntary Association Membership in Comparative Perspective", *American Sociological Review*, 66, pp. 806-828.
- Smith D. (1994), "Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23, pp.243-263.
- Stebbins R. A. (1996), "Volunteering: A Serious Leisure Perspective", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25, pp.211-224.

Van Ingen E., Van Der Meer T. (2011), "*Welfare State Expenditure and Inequalities in Voluntary Association*", *Journal of European Social Policy*, forthcoming.

Wilson J. (2000), "Volunteering ", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, pp. 215-240.

Wilson J., Janoski T. (1995), "The Contribution of Religion to Volunteer Work", *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 56, pp. 137-152.

Wilson J., Musick M; (1997), "Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work", *American Sociological review*, 62, pp. 694-713.

Table 1. Rates of participation in aggregate volunteering (%)

Countries	Rates of participation
Austria	26.5
Belgium	33.9
Bulgaria	13.2
Cyprus	17.2
Czech Republic	28.8
Denmark	36.4
Estonia	22.9
Finland	38.2
France	25.8
Germany	26.5
Great Britain	21.3
Greece	16.6
Hungary	12.2
Italy	22.4
Latvia	23.3
Lithuania	16.0
Luxembourg	39.9
Malta	14.6
Netherlands	47.3
Poland	9.0
Portugal	14.3
Romania	13.2
Slovak Republik	13.6
Slovenia	32.4
Spain	13.2
Sweden	30.3

Source: Fourth wave of EVS - 2008

Note: Table 1 presents the weighted rates

Table 2. Distribution of the volunteers according to the activity area (%)

Countries	Leisure	Social	Occup.	Defense of causes	Religious	Other
Austria	45.7	26.9	10.4	30.7	28.7	15.4
Belgium	58.2	27.0	11.1	15.6	12.2	11.9
Bulgaria	52.5	15.5	34.7	39.9	7.8	7.6
Cyprus	35.0	23.4	19.5	40.1	19.8	12.8
Czech Republic	55.1	21.2	17.3	25.2	13.4	17.2
Denmark	61.8	28.5	14.2	19.3	10.8	14.4
Estonia	56.9	20.4	17.9	28.9	13.6	12.8
Finland	44.2	26.9	15.6	23.7	20.3	22.8
France	48.1	26.6	10.7	13.2	10.8	20.3
Germany	51.4	15.5	8.5	17.5	17.1	14.5
Great Britain	43.5	27.0	4.5	16.6	27.0	19.6
Greece	37.4	20.3	17.8	33.6	13.5	14.3
Hungary	47.0	17.1	12.5	13.6	18.0	14.7
Italy	47.8	27.1	10.6	23.4	32.2	14.3
Latvia	48.4	11.4	32.8	17.7	23.0	10.2
Lithuania	36.3	26.3	11.7	26.9	19.0	10.4
Luxembourg	66.3	32.3	22.1	29.3	13.0	9.8
Malta	35.0	17.2	7.2	14.4	48.8	8.9
Netherlands	59.7	35.6	11.7	22.2	26.1	15.0
Poland	28.1	11.1	19.2	11.6	28.1	16.4
Portugal	48.9	35.4	28.1	37.0	28.1	29.5
Romania	33.1	26.6	19.8	38.6	47.0	9.2
Slovak Republik	45.9	31.8	14.9	20.6	27.4	18.1
Slovenia	53.3	24.9	22.0	25.0	16.4	18.3
Spain	33.1	21.2	8.7	26.2	26.1	7.4
Sweden	55.5	22.1	11.8	21.8	17.2	26.3

Source: Fourth wave of EVS - 2008

Table 3: Determinants of volunteering – Logit model

Area of volunteering	(1) Aggregate	(2) Social	(3) Leisure	(4) Occupational	(5) Defense of causes	(6) Religion	(7) Other
Characteristics							
Constant	-2.091***	-4.188***	-2.911***	-5.963***	-4.923***	-6.255***	-3.702***
Gender							
Female	-0.166***	0.314***	-0.423***	-0.323***	0.150***	0.113**	-0.383***
Age							
25-34	-0.356***	0.014	-0.624***	0.246	0.114	-0.099	0.023
35-44	-0.181***	0.217*	-0.612***	0.415***	0.232**	-0.062	0.307**
45-54	-0.104*	0.341***	-0.646***	0.735***	0.340***	-0.061	0.249*
55-64	-0.103	0.514***	-0.814***	0.729***	0.379***	0.111	0.373**
65-74	-0.022	0.657***	-0.779***	0.663***	0.340***	0.145	0.528***
>74	-0.469***	0.147	-1.318***	0.598***	0.035	-0.201	0.426**
Marital status							
Divorced or separated	-0.116**	-0.001	-0.111	-0.094	-0.102	-0.129	0.026
Widowed	-0.147**	-0.044	-0.274***	-0.102	-0.214*	-0.178	-0.191
Married or registered partnership	-0.085*	0.034	-0.094*	0.090	-0.033	-0.078	0.016
Children aged under 18 at home							
One	-0.086**	-0.169**	0.050	-0.030	-0.121*	-0.106	-0.145
Two	-0.024	-0.291***	0.155***	-0.006	-0.158**	-0.004	0.062
Three and more	0.082	-0.144	0.257***	0.050	-0.020	0.261**	0.078
Unknown	0.036	0.115	0.034	-0.381*	-0.148	-0.005	0.053
Educational level							
Lower secondary or second stage of basic education	0.166***	0.358***	0.240***	0.201	0.093	0.123	0.240*
Upper secondary education	0.437***	0.554***	0.594***	0.452***	0.387***	0.184*	0.511***
First stage or second stage or tertiary education	0.751***	0.803***	0.888***	0.850***	0.712***	0.434***	0.666***
Domestic income							
Medium	0.114***	0.104	0.099*	0.095	0.032	0.035	0.153
High	0.224***	0.069	0.342***	0.226**	0.028	0.065	0.128
Unknown	0.006	-0.072	0.138**	-0.182*	-0.009	-0.138	0.091
Paid job	0.134***	-0.076	0.122***	0.828***	0.061	0.024	-0.054
Religiosity							
Belonging to religious denomination without attendance	-0.002	-0.013	-0.088	-0.010	-0.149*	0.793***	0.027
Belonging to religious denomination with irregular attendance	0.412***	0.367***	0.249***	0.170**	0.104	2.332***	0.258***
Belonging to religious denomination with regular attendance	1.109***	0.889***	0.465***	0.200*	0.493***	4.31***	0.491***
Size of residence town							
2,000-20,000 inhabitants	-0.167***	-0.125*	-0.169***	-0.034	-0.304***	-0.029	-0.128
20,000-100,000 inhabitants	-0.446***	-0.296***	-0.471***	-0.227**	-0.484***	-0.265***	-0.238***
More 100,000 inhabitants	-0.478***	-0.394***	-0.498***	-0.264***	-0.476***	-0.337***	-0.481***
Unknown	-0.241***	-0.096	-0.300**	-0.161	-0.648***	-0.081	-0.382*
Work is very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.127***	0.241***	0.118*	0.231*	0.244***	-0.038	-0.091
Strong agreement with the following opinions							
To fully develop one's talents, one needs to have a job	0.052	0.197***	0.024	0.174***	0.030	0.137**	-0.014
Work is a duty towards society	0.068**	0.029	0.097**	0.043	0.070	0.013	0.062
Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time	-0.073*	-0.027	-0.033	0.066	0.109	-0.171**	-0.106
Aspects of job considered as important:							
Good pay	-0.200***	-0.284***	-0.117***	-0.073	-0.184***	-0.170**	-0.115*
An opportunity to use initiative	0.143***	0.181***	0.094**	0.112**	0.227***	-0.040	0.153**
A useful job for society	0.212***	0.357***	0.063	0.178	0.372***	0.386***	0.203***
Meeting people	-0.034	0.105*	0.001	0.061	-0.030	0.018	-0.037
A job in which one can achieve something	0.069**	-0.006	0.166***	0.106	0.100*	0.106	0.012
A responsible job	0.004	-0.005	0.037	-0.029	-0.066	-0.108*	-0.044
A job that is interesting	-0.009	-0.082	0.019	-0.104	-0.075	0.043	-0.070
A job that meets one's abilities	-0.066**	-0.170***	-0.035	-0.136*	-0.153**	0.036	-0.016
Learning new skills	0.045	0.139**	0.091**	0.061	0.073	0.063	0.018
Have a say in important decisions	0.071**	0.101*	0.070*	0.386***	0.199***	0.079	0.095

Table 3 continued: Determinants of volunteering – Logit model

Area of volunteering	(1) Aggregate	(2) Social	(3) Leisure	(4) Occupational	(5) Defense of causes	(6) Religion	(7) Other
Characteristics							
Leisure Time is very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.143***	0.144*	0.244***	0.032	0.170**	0.075	0.119
Aspects of leisure time considered as very important ones							
Meeting nice people	0.146***	0.095*	0.196***	0.041	0.078	-0.006	0.088
Relaxing	-0.059*	-0.062	-0.057	0.049	-0.097*	-0.214***	-0.103
Doing as one wants	-0.074**	-0.209***	-0.072*	-0.038	-0.080	-0.041	0.048
Friends and acquaintances are very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.187***	0.004	0.283***	0.144	0.156	0.137	0.183
Family is very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.017	-0.046	0.089	-0.016	0.106	0.128	-0.099
Interested in politics	0.294***	0.250***	0.195***	0.524***	0.671***	0.188***	0.173***
Political orientation							
Middle ground	-0.125***	-0.025	-0.087*	-0.308***	-0.209***	0.083	0.055
Right	-0.078**	-0.001	-0.170***	-0.243***	-0.188***	0.204**	0.019
No orientation or unknown	-0.293***	-0.158*	-0.312***	-0.545***	-0.522***	0.030	-0.220**
Opinion about the system for governing the respondent's country							
Mitigated opinion	0.069**	-0.020	0.055	0.034	-0.050	0.087	-0.020
Things are going very good	0.087*	-0.044	0.115*	-0.003	0.013	0.157	-0.077
Unknown – no response	-0.016	-0.017	-0.031	0.038	-0.050	0.105	-0.184
The state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for	-0.077**	-0.039	-0.096**	-0.051	0.007	0.045	-0.037
Most people can be trusted	0.250***	0.213***	0.237***	0.173***	0.213***	0.254***	0.076
The respondent's father or mother liked to follow the news	0.160***	0.159***	0.183***	0.032	0.099	0.065	0.155**
Country							
Austria	-0.154*	-0.173	-0.154	-0.068	0.909***	0.233	-0.440**
Belgium	0.488***	0.341**	0.673***	0.517**	0.830***	0.087	-0.353*
Bulgaria	-0.868***	-1.397***	-0.632***	0.532**	0.468**	-1.535***	-2.037***
Cyprus	-0.758***	-0.734***	-0.954***	0.108	0.734***	-1.065***	-0.963***
Czech Republic	0.346***	0.004	0.470***	0.872***	1.023***	0.345	-0.087
Denmark	0.204**	0.170	0.478***	0.377*	0.503***	0.042	-0.296*
Estonia	0.040	-0.307*	0.287**	0.587***	0.843***	0.294	-0.449**
Finland	0.570***	0.236	0.485***	0.825***	1.111***	0.938***	0.434**
Germany	-0.181**	-0.788***	-0.062	-0.340	0.182	0.002	-0.440***
Great-Britain	-0.101	-0.153	-0.126	-0.782**	0.416*	0.433**	-0.144
Greece	-0.723***	-0.913***	-0.764***	0.182	0.544***	-1.287***	-0.924***
Hungary	-0.749***	-1.072***	-0.680***	-0.323	-0.470*	-0.485*	-1.091***
Italy	-0.315***	-0.231	-0.098	-0.128	0.481**	-0.290	-0.622***
Latvia	0.051	-0.922***	0.128	1.447***	0.407**	0.568***	-0.691***
Lithuania	-0.572***	-0.534***	-0.757***	-0.148	0.548***	-0.606***	-1.140***
Luxembourg	0.519***	0.493***	0.779***	1.086***	1.163***	-0.174	-0.554***
Malta	-1.205***	-1.402***	-1.163***	-0.856**	-0.520*	-1.008***	-1.536***
Netherlands	0.772***	0.883***	0.897***	0.474**	1.123***	0.938***	0.050
Poland	-1.739***	-2.225***	-1.925***	-0.316	-1.173***	-1.973***	-1.528***
Portugal	-0.937***	-0.386*	-0.648***	0.664***	0.473**	-0.908***	-0.294
Romania	-0.880***	-0.828***	-1.031***	0.338	0.659***	-0.358*	-1.457***
Slovakia	-1.038***	-0.838***	-0.957***	-0.061	-0.191	-1.051***	-0.909***
Slovenia	0.170*	0.048	0.261**	1.066***	0.871***	-0.209	-0.007
Spain	-0.558***	-0.626***	-0.805***	-0.384	0.496**	-0.226	-1.513***
Sweden	0.201**	-0.035	0.410***	-0.006	0.793***	0.753***	0.404**
Log Likelihood	-18189.499	-7656.325	-11700.513	-5098.762	-7345.534	-5599.106	-5462.350
Number of volunteers	8867	2274	4375	1344	2095	1841	1356
Number of observations				37830			

Significance levels: * = 10 percent; ** 5 percent; *** = 1 per cent.

Source: Fourth wave of the European Value Survey - 2008

Table 4: Multi-level analysis of EU volunteering

Characteristics	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Constant	-3.388***	-2.898***	-3.036***	-1.470***	-2.901***	-1.73***	-2.589	-3.412***
INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL VARIABLES								
Gender Female	-0.165***	-0.165***	-0.165***	-0.165***	-0.166***	-0.165***	-0.165***	-0.166***
Age 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65-74 >74	-0.356*** -0.180*** -0.104* -0.101 -0.018 -0.464***	-0.356*** -0.181*** -0.104* -0.102 -0.019 -0.465***	-0.356*** -0.181*** -0.104* -0.102 -0.019 -0.465***	-0.356*** -0.180*** -0.104* -0.102 -0.020 -0.466***	-0.356*** -0.181*** -0.104* -0.102 -0.021 -0.467***	-0.356*** -0.180*** -0.104* -0.102 -0.020 -0.465***	-0.356*** -0.180*** -0.104* -0.102 -0.019 -0.465***	-0.358*** -0.182*** -0.105* -0.104* -0.022 -0.469***
Marital status Divorced or separated Widowed Married or registered partnership	-0.115** -0.145** -0.084*	-0.115** -0.145** -0.084*	-0.114** -0.144** -0.084*	-0.115** -0.147** -0.084*	-0.116** -0.149** -0.084*	-0.115** -0.147** -0.085*	-0.115** -0.147** -0.085*	-0.116** -0.145** -0.083*
Children aged under 18 at home One Two Three and more Unknown	-0.086** -0.024 0.082 0.034	-0.086** -0.024 0.081 0.033	-0.086** -0.024 0.081 0.033	-0.087** -0.024 0.082 0.033	-0.087** -0.024 0.082 0.033	-0.086** -0.024 0.082 0.033	-0.087** -0.024 0.082 0.033	-0.086** -0.024 0.081 0.033
Educational level Lower secondary or second stage of basic education Upper secondary education First stage or second stage or tertiary education	0.171*** 0.441*** 0.756***	0.171*** 0.440*** 0.755***	0.171*** 0.441*** 0.756***	0.168*** 0.437*** 0.753***	0.166*** 0.435*** 0.752***	0.169*** 0.439*** 0.755***	0.169*** 0.438*** 0.754***	0.167*** 0.440*** 0.755***
Domestic income Medium High Unknown	0.113*** 0.223*** 0.004	0.114*** 0.224*** 0.004	0.114*** 0.224*** 0.004	0.113*** 0.223*** 0.004	0.112*** 0.221*** 0.004	0.113*** 0.223*** 0.003	0.113*** 0.223*** 0.004	0.112*** 0.222*** 0.003
Paid job	0.135***	0.135***	0.135***	0.135***	0.135***	0.135***	0.135***	0.135***
Religiosity Belonging to religious denomination without attendance Belonging to religious denomination with irregular attendance Belonging to religious denomination with regular attendance	-0.006 0.407*** 1.094***	-0.006 0.407*** 1.095***	-0.007 0.407*** 1.094***	-0.003 0.409*** 1.097***	0.000 0.412*** 1.101***	-0.004 0.408*** 1.094***	-0.004 0.408*** 1.097***	-0.002 0.414*** 1.101***
Size of residence town 2,000-20,000 inhabitants 20,000-100,000 inhabitants More 100,000 inhabitants Unknown	-0.167*** -0.444*** -0.477*** -0.251***	-0.167*** -0.444*** -0.477*** -0.249***	-0.168*** -0.445*** -0.477*** -0.252***	-0.165*** -0.443*** -0.477*** -0.246***	-0.163*** -0.441*** -0.476*** -0.244***	-0.166*** -0.443*** -0.477*** -0.251***	-0.165*** -0.443*** -0.477*** -0.246***	-0.167*** -0.446*** -0.477*** -0.260***
Work is very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.126***	0.126***	0.126***	0.126***	0.127***	0.126***	0.126***	0.127***
Strong agreement with the following opinions To fully develop one's talents, one needs to have a job Work is a duty towards society Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time	0.051 0.068** -0.073*	0.051 0.068** -0.073*	0.051 0.068** -0.073*	0.051 0.069** -0.074*	0.050 0.070** -0.074*	0.051 0.069** -0.073*	0.050 0.069** -0.074*	0.051 0.068** -0.072*
Aspects of job considered as important: Good pay An opportunity to use initiative A useful job for society Meeting people A job in which one can achieve something A responsible job A job that is interesting A job that meets one's abilities Learning new skills Have a say in important decisions	-0.202*** 0.143*** 0.211*** -0.033 0.068** 0.002 -0.008 -0.067** 0.046 0.070**	-0.201*** 0.143*** 0.212*** -0.033 0.068** 0.002 -0.008 -0.066** 0.046 0.070**	-0.201*** 0.143*** 0.212*** -0.033 0.068** 0.002 -0.008 -0.067** 0.046 0.070**	-0.203*** 0.144*** 0.212*** -0.033 0.068** 0.003 -0.009 -0.067** 0.046 0.070**	-0.205*** 0.145*** 0.211*** -0.033 0.068** 0.004 -0.009 -0.067** 0.046 0.071**	-0.203*** 0.143*** 0.211*** -0.033 0.068** 0.004 -0.009 -0.067** 0.046 0.070**	-0.203*** 0.144*** 0.211*** -0.033 0.068** 0.004 -0.009 -0.067** 0.046 0.070**	-0.202*** 0.142*** 0.212*** -0.033 0.068** 0.003 -0.008 -0.065** 0.046 0.070**

Table 4 continued: Multi-level analysis of EU volunteering

Characteristics	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Leisure Time is very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.141***	0.142***	0.142***	0.142***	0.142***	0.142***	0.142***	0.143***
Aspects of leisure time considered as very important ones								
Meeting nice people	0.145***	0.145***	0.145***	0.145***	0.145***	0.145***	0.145***	0.145***
Relaxing	-0.058*	-0.058*	-0.058*	-0.058*	-0.058*	-0.058*	-0.058*	-0.058*
Doing as one wants	-0.075**	-0.076**	-0.076**	-0.075**	-0.075**	-0.076**	-0.076**	-0.075**
Friends and acquaintances are very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.186***	0.186***	0.185***	0.187***	0.188***	0.187***	0.187***	0.185***
Family is very or quite important in the respondent's life	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015
Interested in politics	0.293***	0.294***	0.294***	0.294***	0.294***	0.293***	0.294***	0.293***
Political orientation								
Middle ground	-0.124***	-0.124***	-0.123***	-0.124***	-0.126***	-0.124***	-0.125***	-0.125***
Right	-0.075*	-0.075*	-0.075*	-0.077**	-0.078**	-0.076*	-0.077*	-0.076*
No orientation or unknown	-0.292***	-0.292***	-0.291***	-0.293***	-0.294***	-0.294***	-0.294***	-0.290***
Opinion about the system for governing the respondent's country								
Mitigated opinion	0.069**	0.070**	0.069**	0.070**	0.072**	0.069**	0.071**	0.068**
Things are going very good	0.086*	0.086*	0.085*	0.088*	0.092*	0.085*	0.088*	0.086*
Unknown – no response	-0.016	-0.016	-0.016	-0.015	-0.014	-0.017	-0.015	-0.015
The state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for	-0.077**	-0.077**	-0.077**	-0.077**	-0.077**	-0.078**	-0.077**	-0.076**
Most people can be trusted	0.252***	0.252***	0.251***	0.253***	0.253***	0.253***	0.253***	0.250***
The respondent's father or mother liked to follow the news	0.160***	0.160***	0.160***	0.161***	0.163***	0.161***	0.162***	0.160***
COUNTRY-LEVEL VARIABLES								
Gross National Income (PPP) per capita	0.000036***							-0.000048
Total social protection expenses per capita		0.000111***						
Final consumption expenditure of general government (per capita)			0.000136***					0.000123**
Inequality index				-0.1906*				0.08561
Percentage of the national population without belonging to a religious denomination					0.01931***			0.01849***
Percentage of the national population very critical towards the system for governing the country						-0.02124***		-0.01112*
Percentage of the national population thinking that having a democratic political system is a very good way of governing the country							0.00533	
Variance of the country intercept								
Estimate	0.234	0.232	0.208	0.353	0.262	0.305	0.395	0.102
Estimated standard error	0.069	0.069	0.062	0.104	0.078	0.090	0.116	0.034
Number of volunteers	8867							
Number of observations	37830							

Significance levels: * = 10 percent; ** 5 percent; *** = 1 per cent.

Source: Fourth wave of the European Value Survey - 2008

Table 5: Country-Level variables and the areas of volunteering

Areas of volunteering	(1) Social	(2) Leisure	(3) Occupational	(4) Defense of causes	(5) Religion	(6) Other
Country-level variables						
Gross National Income (PPP) per capita	-0.0000025	-0.00000883	-0.00000886	-0.00000959	-0.00002	-0.00001
Final consumption expenditure of general government (per capita)	0.000129**	0.000153***	0.000037	0.000033	0.000173**	0.000128*
Inequality index	0.006842	0.08378	0.163	0.1309	0.157	-0.05784
Percentage of the national population without belonging to a religious denomination	0.01327***	0.0212***	0.01016	0.00822	0.02361***	0.0134***
Percentage of the national population very critical towards the system for governing the country	-0.00281	-0.0102	-0.0119	-0.00912	-0.01674*	-0.00597
Variance of the country intercept						
Estimate	0.140	0.114	0.299	0.221	0.215	0.169
Estimated standard error	0.052	0.040	0.106	0.079	0.076	0.063
Number of volunteers	2274	4375	1344	2095	1841	1356
Number of observations	37830					

Significance levels: * = 10 percent; ** 5 percent; *** = 1 per cent.

Source: Fourth wave of the European Value Survey - 2008

Appendix 1

Reference categories for variables used in regression

Variable	Reference group
Gender	<i>Male</i>
Age	<i>18-24 years.</i>
Marital status	<i>Never married and never registered partnership</i>
Education.	<i>None education or pre-primary education or primary education or first-stage of basic education.</i>
Domestic income	<i>Low income</i>
Religious denomination	<i>The respondent does not belong to a religious denomination</i>
Paid job	<i>No paid job</i>
Size of residence town	<i>Under 2,000 inhabitants</i>
Work is very or quite important in the respondent's life	<i>Not or not at all important or no answer</i>
Family is very or quite important in the respondent's life	<i>Not or not at all important or no answer</i>
Friends and acquaintances are very or quite important in the respondent's life	<i>Not or not at all important or no answer</i>
Leisure Time is very or quite important in the respondent's life	<i>Not or not at all important or no answer</i>
Most people can be trusted	<i>Most people cannot be trusted too careful or no answer</i>
Aspects of job considered as important: Good pay An opportunity to use initiative A useful job for society Meeting people A job in which one can achieve something A responsible job A job that is interesting A job that meets one's abilities Learning new skills Have a say in important decisions	<i>Not or not at all important or no answer</i>
Strong agreement with the following opinions To fully develop one's talents, one needs to have a job Work is a duty towards society Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time	<i>Agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, disagree strongly, no answer</i>
Aspects of leisure time considered as very important ones Meeting nice people Relaxing Doing as one wants	<i>Quite important, not or not at all important or no answer</i>
Interested in politics	<i>Not very or not at all interested or no answer</i>
Political orientation	<i>Left oriented</i>
The state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for	<i>Individuals should take more responsibility for providing for themselves</i>
Opinion about the system for governing the respondent's country	<i>Bad or very bad (the three lowest rating positions from a scale having ten positions)</i>
The respondent's father or mother liked to follow the news	<i>Only to some extent or a little bit or no or no answer.</i>
Country	<i>France</i>