

Volunteer Engagement, Indirect Compensation and Youth Experience

Alan chan¹, Shu-Kam Lee², Edith Samuel³

¹Department of Business Administration Crandall University Moncton, NB

²Department of Economics and Finance Shue Yan University Hong Kong

³Department of Psychology Crandall University Moncton, NB

Abstract: *This study applies the Order Tobit Regression approach to estimate volunteer engagement and retention. Using a sample of 14, 059 participants, this inquiry draws on the 2010 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP) and ascertains that compensation (both direct and indirect) can have a significant impact on volunteerism. The findings indicate that direct (honorariums and payments) and indirect compensations (opportunity to network and develop skills) empower volunteers in engagement and retention. Youth experience aids in volunteer engagement, but not in retention. Youth experience and religiosity foster volunteering in later life. The analysis concludes that effective training, family support, and recognition play strategic roles in promoting volunteerism.*

Keywords: *Volunteerism, Ordered Tobit Regression, Canada*

Introduction

Volunteering is an integral part of Canadian culture. The time and effort contributed through volunteer work results in the successful functioning of a great number of organizations. This is not only true of not-for-profit organizations, but also for most businesses and institutions in general. According to the Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP)¹, 13.3 million Canadians over the age of 15 volunteered in 2010. This number exceeds 71%² of the entire Canadian labour force. The estimated total volunteer hours are about 2.1 billion and it is equivalent to more than 1 million full-time jobs. It has been reported that the number of volunteers in Canada grows at a faster rate than the nation's population (Vezina & Crompton, 2012)

Volunteer engagement is an altruistic, humane, and philanthropic involvement usually in corporate organizations and businesses (Haski-Levinthal, 2009; Ellis & Jackson, 2013). Altruistic activities enable volunteers to gratify themselves by seeing others better off through their benevolent acts. Most volunteers continue to help when such experiences are in some way lucrative, profitable, or rewarding. Individuals engage in volunteerism to develop their levels of self-efficacy by helping others (Lindenmeier, 2008). The practice enhances an individual's self-esteem and self-worth (Mellor, Hayashi, Firth & Stokes, 2008). Many full-time workers use their leisure time to lend others a helping hand even though the exercise involves time opportunity costs (Chinman & Wandersman, 1999). Students and retired people who volunteer do so with relatively low time opportunity costs (Kahana, Bhatta, Lovegreen, Kahana & Midlarsky, 2013).

¹ See: <http://volunteer.ca/content/nearly-one-million-more-volunteers-2007>, accessed June 17, 2014

² According to CANSIM, table 282-0002, the total labor force in Canada in 2010 is estimated to be 18.525 million.

Positive outcomes that are rewarding motivate individuals to explore the determinants that affect volunteer engagement and turnovers. Vezina and Crompton's (2012) descriptive study arrive at results that may not necessarily be decisive and conclusive due to the statistical method used to analyze the data from the 2010 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP). Given the complexity of the survey, several variables are interdependent of each other. Since a descriptive analysis is inadequate, it is requisite to perform an empirical analysis using econometrical techniques to provide further deterministic findings (Phillips & Phillips, 2010).

According to the CSGVP over the years³, Volunteer Canada has recommended different approaches to engage volunteers already on board, such as training, skills, recognition, group work, and employer-support. In this inquiry, we empirically examine the potential factors such as number of hours volunteered and degree of engagement affecting levels of engagement using the CSGVP 2010 Publicly available microdata file.

Volunteer Engagement

John Wilson (2000) defined volunteerism as "any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group or cause. Volunteering is part of a cluster of helping behaviors, entailing more commitment than spontaneous assistance but narrower in scope than the care provided to family and friends" (p. 215). He also examined different theories on volunteerism: motivation, rationale choice, exchange, and social resources. *Motivational theory* attributes volunteer engagement as being inculcated in and passed down to children by parents. "Parents teach their children volunteer motivations when they teach them about social responsibility, reciprocity, and justice" (Wilson, 2000, p. 218; Amato & Booth,

³ CSGVP (or formerly the National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating) was carried out in 1997, 2001, 2004, 2007, and 2010. At the time of authorship, the 2010 survey is the latest publicly available micro data file.

1997). *Rational choice theory* (Rastoff & Sundeen, 1995; Segal, 1993) posits that volunteer engagement is a productive activity based on levels of education, type of work, and income. *Exchange theory* (Wuthnow, 1991) exemplifies the give-and-take process focusing on the benefits that individuals accrue from volunteer work. *Social resources theory* (Roshon, 1998) stresses the importance of communal solidarity and interaction among members of society while engaging in volunteer work.

Who volunteers and why

Volunteer work usually begins during adolescence and transitions into adulthood, reaching its peak in middle age, and increases again during retirement (Tang, Choi, and Morrow-Howell, 2010). Females, particularly the affluent, are more likely to volunteer than males (Arora & Saad, 2005). Among racial groups, in the US, Whites volunteer more than Blacks due to differences in levels of education, income, and occupational status (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). Individuals in the higher echelons of education, income, and job positions are in strategic places to contribute more.

Individuals and organizations may volunteer for reasons other than purely altruistic motives. Bussell and Forbes (2002) provide a theoretical framework for empirical testing. They identify the four W elements of 'what, where, who, and why' of volunteering. Specifically, the basis for volunteering include age, gender, educational attainment, income level, socio-economic status, employment status, lifestyle, stages in the life cycle, and family background.

According to Hustinx and Lammertyn (2003), the nature of volunteering is complex and multifaceted and may be structural-behavioral or motivational-attitudinal. Six dimensions are outlined to define volunteerism, namely, the biographical frame of reference, the motivational structure, the course and intensity of commitment,

the organizational environment, the choice/field of activity, and the affiliation to paid work.

Measuring volunteer engagement

The construct of volunteer engagement is multifarious as there is no single agreeable measurement. It may further include the duration of service, volunteer time per week, and organizational commitment. In this paper, for simplicity, we use the total hours of volunteering over the past 52 weeks as a measure of volunteer engagement⁴ and this dimension will be treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables used in this analysis are religiosity, youth experience, indirect compensation, life-cycle, and personal attitude (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; CSGVP, 2010).

In their study, Vecina, Chacon, Sueiro, and Barron (2011) employ the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale developed by Schafeli, Bakker, Salanova (2006) to measure volunteer engagement. A further extension of their parameters is used in the Three-Stage Model of Volunteers' Duration of Service proposed by Chacon, Vecina, & Davlia (2007). This paradigm focuses on volunteer engagement, volunteer satisfaction, and group affiliation. Vecina et al.'s (2011) results indicate that, initially, engagement is critical while later on volunteer satisfaction is crucial to continuing and persisting in the activity. Further analysis in their study indicates that participants' commitment is also decisive to activate interest while organizational commitment reinforces the intention to continue.

From a behavioral perspective, Omoto et al. (2010) endorsed personality factors as the bases for

⁴ Duration or length of time spent with the organization may be biased because it is age-dependent. A person who has been with an organization for 20 years may not essentially be more committed than one who has been there for less than a year. At the same time, having an official organization position as a volunteer does not necessarily mean that he/she is committed than any other individual who has no specific position in the organization.

measuring volunteer engagement. Linking political activity and activism to engagement, the researchers highlighted motivation, interpersonal orientation, and personality traits. Self-focused motivation, communal orientation, and the trait of extraversion were related to the findings. Other-focused motivations were activism and civic engagement. The Volunteer Process Model (Snyder & Omoto, 1992) specifying antecedents, experiences, and consequences of volunteerism was used to quantify political activism, and volunteer engagement. Kahana et al. (2013) utilized independent variables such as life satisfaction, depressive symptomatology, positive effects, and negative effects to estimate the level of volunteer engagement⁵.

Religious involvement and volunteering

Volunteer engagement is significant to both religions and secular organizations. However, engagement in religious organizations is one of the most pertinent types of volunteering. Becker and Dhingra (2001) focus on the correlation between religious involvement and volunteering. An interesting ruling is that there is no liberal/conservative difference either in the likelihood of volunteering or in choosing between secular, and religious volunteer opportunities.

Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) performed a multinational study using data from 53 countries and examined the relationship between religiosity

⁵ Life satisfaction comprises a cognitive element leading to the fulfillment of goals and thereby psychological well-being. Using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), life satisfaction was measured. The 5-point Likert-type scale spotlighted whether volunteers' lives were close to experiencing perfect lives. Depressive symptomatology was measured using a 10-item version of the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (Andresen, Algren, Carter, & Patrick, 1994). Specific emotions such as being sad and dejected were the foci of the analysis. The PANAS Scale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) measured both positive and negative emotions. Five words (e.g. happy, glad, alert, afraid, and nervous) describing both positive and negative effects were used on a 5-point scale. The summed up scores were divided by 5 with a higher score suggesting better affect levels.

and volunteerism. There is evidence that frequent churchgoers are more active in volunteer work and that possessing a devout and spiritual outlook has an additional positive effect. In contrast, Ruiter et al. (2006) reveal that church attendance is barely relevant for volunteering in even spiritual-minded countries. Additional research studies consider the concept of volunteer motivation among older adults. These studies indicate that religiosity and spirituality are important predictors of motivation and volunteering (Okun, O'Rourke, Keller, Johnson & Enders, 2014). Forbes and Zampelli (2012) survey the impact of human capital on volunteerism. Their research has ascertained that the 2006 Social Capital Community Survey in the United States was tested for the impact of social capital, religious capital, human capital and attitudes. It was concluded that religiosity increased the level of volunteering. This finding is also consistent with Nesbit's (2012b) research on the 2005 Current Population Survey's Volunteering supplement in the United States.

Indirect compensation and volunteering

Even though volunteerism is generally defined as unpaid help, some form of indirect compensation could be an option. Some volunteers are reimbursed by allowances and gifts whereas others are rewarded indirectly through personal gratification and fulfillment. In any case, it is expected that volunteer compensation will have a significant impact on the practice. In their field study, Millette and Gagne (2008) examine the impact of job satisfaction and performance on volunteer engagement. In a survey of 124 volunteers, they used the job characteristic model and recognize that job satisfaction is key to volunteer engagement. Tang, Choi and Morrow-Howell (2010) empirically analyze volunteer benefits among older adults using a two-wave study of 253 seniors in 10 volunteer programs from 2005 to 2006. They contend that organizational support (measured by choice of

volunteer activity, training and ongoing support) has direct association with perceived contribution and personal benefits. This implies that receiving personal benefits increases the likelihood of volunteering. The indirect benefits of volunteering have been documented in various studies: well-being (Morrow-Howell, Hinterlong, Rozario & Tang, 2003), mortality (Musick and Herzog, 1999), mental health (Musick & Wilson, 2003) and happiness (Borgonoiv, 2008)).

Recent research has been directed toward corporate-sponsored volunteering. There are beliefs that having inspiration and support from employers are effective ways to promote volunteerism. Pajo and Lee (2011) argue that when there is corporate support, individuals are more likely to engage.

Youth experience and volunteering

Oesterle, Johnson, and Mortimer (2004) look at the role of education, work and family in promoting volunteerism during late adolescence and early adulthood. Oesterle et al. (2004) maintain that there is substantial continuity in volunteering motivation that shifts from adolescence to adulthood. The impact is significant during both early and late adulthood. Marta and Pozzi's (2008) longitudinal study deals with the impact of volunteerism on youth and long-term volunteerism using a dataset with 158 volunteers. Together with other studies (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Strage, 2004; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001), they also find a positive relationship between childhood and adulthood volunteering.

This is significant as it differs with Uggen and Janikula's (1999) study, which examines the impact of volunteerism among youth and the likelihood of arrest or detention. One of the findings relates to a robust negative relationship between volunteer work during adolescence, and arrest during adulthood.

Other determinants of volunteerism

Nesbit (2012a) claims that the influence of major life-cycle events and the impact on volunteering. In her study, the presence of children decreases the likelihood and time spent on volunteering. Divorced males are more likely to volunteer than divorced females. Divorced individuals with children are more likely to volunteer whereas the widowed are less likely to volunteer. In another review, Rebecca Nesbit (2012b) examines the impact of family and household members on individual volunteer choice. Living with other volunteers increases the likelihood of volunteering, especially in religious volunteering and engagement.

Surveying the motivation of volunteering among Swiss youth, Rehberg (2005) classifies motivations into three categories: “Achieve something positive for others”; “Quest for the new”; “Quest for oneself”. He reasons that the positive nature and the new experiences that go with volunteering, provide the most important motivation. Personal attitude can play an important role in volunteer engagement on specific issues (Measham & Barnet, 2008). Holdsworth (2010) asserts that student motives can change over time and are therefore life-stage dependent.

2. Methodology

Forbes and Zampelli (2014) examine the impact of human capital on volunteerism. They use the 2006 Social Capital Community Survey in the United States to test the impact of social capital, religious capital, human capital and attitudes. Most empirical studies on religious involvements (Lincoln, Morrissey & Munday 2008; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011) are theoretically based on the rational choice model of church attendance (Azzi & Ehrenberg, 1975).

However, this study uses the following unique model to derive volunteering involvement of an individual by solving the following constrained utility maximization problem:

Max $U(V, G; Z)$ subjected to $P_v V + G = I$, where

- $U(V, G; Z)$ = the utility function of an individual,
- V = the volunteering involvement,
- P_v = the price of volunteering involvement
- G = the goods other than volunteering involvement,
- I = Income
- Z = the vector of Characteristics of an individual.

As volunteering involvement cannot be negative, its values are centered at 0. The optimal volunteering involvement for an individual i is written as $V^* = \max [0, (V, G; Z)]$, which is an unobservable latent variable. The structural form of V^* for an individual i can be expressed as

$$V_i^* = \varphi + \beta X_i + u_i, \quad u_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $X = [P_v, I, Z]$.

An observable variable V_i is introduced as

$$V_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V_i^* < 0 \\ V_i^* & \text{if } V_i^* \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

This study focuses on Retention (years within organization) and Engagement (total Hours of Volunteering in last year). Volunteer involvement j for the individual i is expressed as the following equation:

$$V_i^{j*} = \varphi + \beta_1 Econ_i + \beta_2 Demo_i + \beta_3 Region_i + \beta_4 Why_i + \beta_5 exper_i + \beta_6 Support_i + u_i$$

(See Table 1).

Table 1 Definitions of the variables

| Variable | Definition |
|----------|---|
| j | Retention (years within organization) or Engagement (total Hours of Volunteering in last year) |
| Econ | set of economic variables such as Household Income and Give Price in terms of (1-tax rate) |
| Demo | set of demographic variables such Marital Status, Gender, Respondents' Age, Spouses' Age, Children under 5 |
| Why | set of variables on reasons of Volunteer Engagement such as Invited to be a volunteer, Required to be a volunteer, Receiving payment to cover out of pocket expenses. Receiving monetary reimbursement for time, ... |
| Exper | set of variables on respondent's experience such as Participating in Volunteering group when young, Did Volunteer work when young, Going door to door to raise money when young, Active in church when young, ... |
| Support | set of variables on employers' support such as Self-employed, Employer support program, Employer donating according to hours volunteered, Employer gives use of equipment/facility, Employer gives paid time off, Employer gives reduced/flexible work hours and Employer gives recognition letter, ... |

The vector of parameters ϕ and β cannot be estimated by ordinary least squares, or else, its estimators will be inconsistent. It will yield an upward-biased estimate of the intercept, ϕ and a downwards-biased estimates of the slope coefficients β . Instead, the Tobin estimators are consistent and unbiased ⁶ (Tobin, 1958; Amemiya, 1973).

Volunteer Retention (years within an organization) in our survey data set is an ordered variable, and so we cannot treat it as an interval variable using OLS because (i) the error terms are heteroskedastic and (ii) unless the thresholds are all about the same distance apart, the OLS estimation will render misleading results. Instead, we employ the Ordered Logit method to assess the determinants affecting volunteer retention (years within organization)⁷ (Long, 1997, p. 118).

3. Data and Variables

This study uses the Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participation public use micro-data file in 2010. This survey contains 14,059 respondents residing across Canada in the year 2010. Listed below are the variables used in this study. (See Tables 2 & 3).

Table 2 Dependent Variables

⁶ However, the β coefficients should not be interpreted as the marginal effect of X_i on V_i , as defined in a linear regression model. It should be interpreted as a combination of (1) an effect on the mean of V_i , given that it is observed; and (2) an effect on the probability of V being observed. For details, see McDonald and Moffit (1980).

⁷ The positive coefficient for X_i means that the likelihood of Retention increases with X_i , and *vice versa*.

| Variable | Name of Variable | Details |
|---|------------------|---|
| Years within organization (Retention) | RETENT | 0: Valid Skip (Not a volunteer) 1: Less than 1 year 2: 1-3 years 3: 3- 5 years 4: 5-10 years 5: 10 or more years |
| Total Hours of Volunteering in last year (Engagement) | ENGAGE | Total number of hours volunteered in the last 12 months |

Table 3 Independent Variables

| Variable | Name of Variable | Variable Type | Details |
|-----------------------|--|---------------|---|
| Region ⁸ | Maritimes (including the province of New Brunswick(NB), Nova Scotia (NS), Prince Edward Island (PE), Newfoundland and Labrador(NL) | Dummy | “1” if the respondent is living in Maritimes and “0” otherwise. “1” if the respondent is living in British Columbia and “0” otherwise. |
| | Quebec | Dummy | “1” if the respondent is living in Quebec and “0” otherwise. |
| | Prairies (including the province of Manitoba (MB), Saskatchewan (SK) and Alberta (AB) | Dummy | “1” if the respondent is living in Prairies and “0” otherwise |
| | British Columbia | Dummy | “1” if the respondent is living in British Columbia and “0” otherwise. |
| Age Group | AGE | Ordinal | 1:15-24 2:25-34 3:35-44 4:45-54 5:55-64 6: 65 and UP |
| Respondent’s Sex | GENDER | Dummy | “1” if male and “0” otherwise. |
| Marital Status | MARRY | Dummy | “1” if Married/Common Law and “0” otherwise.0 |
| Household Size | HHSIZE | Interval | number of persons in the household 5: 5 or more |
| Children under 5 | C_under5 | Dummy | “1” if the respondent has children and “0” otherwise. |
| Children between 6-17 | C_above5 | Dummy | “1” if the respondent has children above 6-17 and “0” otherwise. |

⁸ Ontario is preferred as benchmark (also transformed). None of the respondents live in the three territories in Canada.

| | | | |
|--|------------|-------|---|
| Formal Volunteer | FVOL | Dummy | “1” if the person is a formal volunteer and “0” otherwise. |
| Number of Organization volunteered in the last 12 months | NUMVORG | Ratio | |
| Invited to be a volunteer | INVITED | Dummy | “1” if the person is invited to be a volunteer and “0” otherwise. |
| Required to be a volunteer? | REQUIRE | Dummy | “1” if the person is required to be a volunteer and “0” otherwise. |
| Receive payment to cover out of pocket expenses? | R_EXPENSE | Dummy | “1” if the person receives payments and “0” otherwise. |
| Receive monetary compensation for time? | R_HONRM | Dummy | “1” if the person receives money and “0” otherwise. |
| Personally affected by the cause supported | RN_CAUSE | Dummy | “1” if the person is affected and “0” otherwise. |
| Your friend also volunteers | RN_FRIEND | Dummy | “1” if the person has friends who also volunteers and “0” otherwise. |
| Networking Opportunity | RN_NTWK | Dummy | “1” if the person believes there is networking opportunity and “0” otherwise. |
| Improve job opportunity | RN_JBOPP | Dummy | “1” if the person believes there are improvements and “0” otherwise. |
| Fulfill religious obligation | RN_RELIG | Dummy | “1” if the person thinks he/she has religious obligation and “0” otherwise. |
| Explore one’s own strength | RN_SLFSTG | Dummy | “1” if the person believes it can enhance one’s own strength and “0” otherwise. |
| Contribute back to society | RN_GVBACK | Dummy | “1” if the person believes he/she can contribute back and “0” otherwise. |
| Use one’s skill and experience | RN_USESKLL | Dummy | “1” if the person believes he/she can use his/her own skill and experience and “0” otherwise. |
| Volunteer with family | V_FAMILY | Dummy | “1” if the person does so and “0” otherwise. |
| Volunteer with Friend | V_FRIEND | Dummy | “1” if the person does and “0” otherwise. |
| Use internet to search for volunteer opportunities | INTRNTUSE | Dummy | “1” if the person searched and “0” otherwise. |
| Do you have a paid job? | PAIDJOB | Dummy | “1” if the person has and “0” otherwise. |
| Self-employed? | SLFEMP | Dummy | “1” if the person is and “0” otherwise. |
| Employer encouragement program | E_PROGRM | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|--|
| Employer donate according to your hours volunteered | E_MATCH | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |
| Employer gives you use of equipment/facility | E_EQUIP | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |
| Employer give paid time off | E_PDTIME | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |
| Employer gives reduced/flexible work hours | E_RDWORK | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise.. |
| Employer gives recognition letter | E_RECOG | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |
| Employer gives other support | E_OTHER | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |
| Any skill gained from volunteer work | SKILL | Dummy | “1” if it is true and “0” otherwise. |
| number of skills gained from volunteer work | SKSUM | Ordinal | |
| Any business benefits gained from volunteer work | BUSGAIN | Dummy | 1: Some benefits 0: No benefits |
| Participate in youth sports team | Y_SPORTS | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Seen someone you admire volunteer | Y_ADMIRE | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Participate in volunteering group when young | Y_GROUP | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Did volunteering work when young | Y_VOLUN | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Did you go door to door to raise money when young | Y_DRTODR | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Were you active in student government | Y_STDGOVT | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Active in church when young | Y_CHURCH | Dummy | “1” if the person did and “0” otherwise. |
| Parent volunteers | Y_PARENT | Dummy | “1” if his/her parents also volunteered and “0” otherwise. |
| Self-assessed Health | HEALTH | Ordinal | 1: Excellent 5: Poor |
| Self-assessed satisfaction with life | SATISFY | Ordinal | 1: Very Satisfied 4: Very dissatisfied |
| Highest education completed | EDU | Ordinal | 1: Less than high school 5: University |
| Employed | LF_EMP | Dummy | “1” if the person is and “0” otherwise. |
| Unemployed | LF_UEMP | Dummy | “1” if the person is and “0” otherwise. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---------|---|
| Not in labor force | LF_NOT | Dummy | “1” if the person is and “0” otherwise. |
| Hours of Work/Week for regular job | HRWK | Ordinal | 1: less than 30 hours 2: 30-40 hours 3: 40-50 hours 4: 50 or more |
| Current Job | J_MANAGE J_BUS J_NATURAL J_HEALTH J_EDU J_SPORTS J_SALES J_TRADE J_PRIMARY J_MANUF | DUMMY | Details: P. 126 |
| Religion Affiliation | REL_NO REL_CATH REL_PROT REL_OTHER | DUMMY | No religion Catholics Protestants Other |
| Frequency in attending church | FQCHURCH | Ordinal | 1: At least once per week 2: At least once per month 3: At least 3 or 4 times a year 4: 1 or two times a year 5: Not at all |
| Born in Canada? | CANBORN | Dummy | |
| Length of stay in the current community | LGSTAY | Ordinal | 1: Less than 3 years 2: 3-5 years 3: 5-10 years 4: 10 or more years |
| Language spoken most often at home | LANG_EN LANG_FR LANG_OTH | Dummy | |
| Household income | INCOME | Ordinal | 1: less than 20k 2:20-40k 3:40-60k 4:60-100k 5:100k+ |

4. Descriptive Statistics and Regression Results

According to the data, in terms of volunteering hours, the distribution is truncated. The overall average is 98.2 hours per year (about 1.89 hours per week). The results are tabulated in Table 4.

Table 4 Descriptive Summary on Volunteer engagement and retention

| Descriptive Summary | Volunteer Engagement | Volunteer Retention |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Mean | 98.20065 | 1.778377 |
| Standard Deviation | 271.6039 | 1.905549 |
| N | 109.6563 | 1.769704 |

Geographically, British Columbians and the Maritimers volunteer more hours than those living in Quebec and the Prairies. It may be argued that those in British Columbia and the Maritime provinces volunteer for a longer period of time in the same organization. The descriptive summary is tabulated in table 5.

Table 5 Descriptive summary by region

| Descriptive Summary | | Maritimes | Quebec | Ontario | Prairies | British Columbia | Canada |
|----------------------|------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|------------------|---------|
| Volunteer Engagement | Mean | 100.577 | 81.556 | 106.779 | 87.892 | 117.852 | 98.201 |
| | S.D. | 296.824 | 276.142 | 268.785 | 214.9968 | 297.009 | 271.604 |
| | Rank | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | --- |
| Volunteer Retention | Mean | 3.846 | 5.320 | 3.743 | 3.54832 | 3.583 | 3.578 |
| | S.D. | 5.589 | 4.770 | 5.314 | 5.320 | 5.237 | 5.312 |
| | Rank | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | --- |

In this study, the ordered Tobit regression has been employed using the general to specific approach to generate the sufficiently parsimonious final preferred model⁹. The result is tabulated in Table 6.

Table 6 Tobit Regression Results

| Construct | Variable Name | Volunteer Engagement ¹⁰ (Pseudo R ² = 0.126) | | Volunteer Retention (Pseudo R ² = 0.090) | |
|------------|------------------|---|--------|--|--------|
| | | Coefficient | p | Coefficient | p |
| | Intercept | 1.866 | 0.0000 | | |
| Econ | INCOME | | | 0.090348 | 0.0153 |
| Demo | AGE | 0.097 | 0.0000 | 0.425293 | 0.0000 |
| | GENDER | 0.155 | 0.0004 | | |
| | C_UNDER5 | -0.179 | 0.0035 | | |
| Region | Prairies | -0.121 | 0.0177 | | |
| | British Columbia | 0.138 | 0.0511 | | |
| Why | NUMVORG | 0.348 | 0.0000 | 0.082810 | 0.0027 |
| | INVITED | | | -0.710225 | 0.0000 |
| | R_HONRM | 0.409 | 0.0001 | 0.978072 | 0.0000 |
| | RN_FRIEND | -0.127 | 0.0039 | | |
| | RN_SLFSTG | 0.134 | 0.0053 | | |
| | RN_USESKLL | 0.498 | 0.0000 | 0.363599 | 0.0002 |
| | RN_NTWK | 0.106 | 0.0220 | 0.290974 | 0.0007 |
| | RN_JBOPP | | | -0.297921 | 0.0158 |
| | RN_RELIG | | | 0.443514 | 0.0000 |
| Experience | V_FAMILY | 0.195 | 0.0001 | 0.258128 | 0.0051 |
| Support | SLFEMP | 0.105 | 0.0470 | | |
| Other | FQCHURCH | -0.085 | 0.0000 | -0.150866 | 0.0000 |
| | LGSTAY | 0.036 | 0.0975 | 0.388466 | 0.0000 |
| | Y_GROUP | 0.090 | 0.0562 | | |
| | Y_CHURCH | 0.106 | 0.0240 | | |
| | HRWK | | | 0.092101 | 0.0204 |

⁹ For details, see Hendry, Adrain, Pagan and Sagan (1984)

¹⁰ the natural logarithm of Volunteer Engagement

5. Findings

This study has revealed that age, gender, income and employment, family structure and community, religiosity, corporate constitution, compensation, happiness and well-being, personal skills, networking, and regional differences are statistically significant predictors of volunteer engagement.

Age and gender

In this study, volunteer engagement and retention levels with age as older people (around 65 years and older; see Table 3) volunteered more and longer. Likewise, Tang et al.'s study (2010) discovered that older volunteers pledged more hours deriving greater personal satisfaction. The young (around 15 -64 years; see Table 3) volunteered more with no difference in terms of duration. However, Law and Shek's (2009) study reports that adolescents volunteered more with the influence and support of their families. Young people usually volunteer until they get paid employment.

In this study, males were more inclined to engage in volunteerism than females, but there was no difference with females' engagement in terms of retention. Li, Chi & Zu's (2010) also found that "female older adults were 20% less likely to volunteer than their male counterparts" (p. 70). The reason for this trend could be that males used volunteer work to network and acquire paid work.

Income and employment

It was found that income levels played little or no role in volunteer engagement. This finding is consistent with a study in Botswana, Africa, where most volunteers were unemployed and had no income (Rankopo, Osei-Hwedie and Moroka, 2006). The rewards they received were no doubt intangible and were aimed at societal exposure and national recognition. This study also concluded that those in the higher socio-economic

groups were more inclined to volunteer in the same organization for a longer period of time. The reasons could be that volunteers were recognized and appreciated more in their activities coupled with the satisfaction and fulfillment derived. This finding is consistent with the study by Arora and Saad (2005) where affluent women gave more of their time and money to charitable causes. Again, in this study, the self-employed and those who worked more hours were likely to volunteer longer in the same organization.

Family structure and community

Those who had children under five years old were less likely to engage in volunteerism but the results made no difference in terms of retention. This is consistent with other research studies where parents with young children were inclined to volunteer less (Nesbit, 2012(a); Damico et al, 1998; Scholzman et al; 1994). Both engagement and retention levels were not significantly different among those who had children over 5 years old. Volunteering along with family members increased both engagement and retention levels. Long time residents in the same community were more inclined to volunteer in the same organization. In Williams et al.'s (2008) study, residential longevity in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan had a strong effect on volunteerism.

Corporate constitution

In this study it was found that the more number of organizations volunteers were involved in, the more engaged they were with higher retention levels. A rather important finding in this study was that those who were *invited* to volunteer were less likely to be volunteers in the same organization for a longer period of time. This may imply that solicited volunteerism is, by and large, ineffective. The other possibility could be that younger volunteers found a paying job.

Compensation

In this study, if compensations or reimbursements were given, it was more likely that volunteers engaged with higher retention levels. It was further found that volunteers were less likely to engage if they had friends volunteering in the same organization.

Happiness and well-being

In this study, volunteers engaged more and for a longer period of time if they were able to enhance their subjective well-being. This finding is consistent with earlier studies that drew out the notion that volunteers' self-reported health and happiness yielded mental health benefits by doing good (Morrow-Howell, Hinterlong, Rozario & Tang, 2003; Borgonovi, 2008; Musick & Wilson, 2003; Morrow-Howell et al., 2003).

Personal skills

Volunteers engaged more if they could use and develop their own personal skills. The more skills volunteers developed and cultivated, the more likely they engaged and stayed longer in volunteer positions. Leadership spots with value-expressive motivation, aims, and goals have been found in other studies (Okun et al., 2014; Omoto et al., 2010; Millette & Gagne, 2008; Kloseck et al., 2006). Volunteer training is indispensably related to the development of personal skills.

Networking prospects

In this study, the opportunity to network with others increased both volunteer engagement and retention. This aspect of volunteer engagement is consistent with Hustinx and Lammertyn's (2003) study where volunteer work is discussed in relation to a "network society" extending beyond the framework of paid work. Volunteers who looked for potential job opportunities (mostly between 15-64 years; See Table 3) were liable to cut down their volunteer time once they were employed. This was particularly true of the working group.

Religiosity

A significant finding was that those who attended church often were prone to volunteer and engage less in the same organization for a shorter period of time. Those who attended church when they were young were more likely to volunteer, with little impact in duration. Religiosity as a predictor of volunteerism is consistent with studies by Becker and Dhingra's (2001) and Smith (1994). Specific to cultural capital, elites in prestigious positions in society have been required to contribute more.

Regional differences across Canada

In this study, those living in the Prairies were likely to engage less than those living in Ontario. People living in British Columbia were inclined to engage more than those living in Ontario. There was no significant difference on volunteer retention across Canada.

6. Implications and Conclusion

In this paper, the Order Tobit Regression approach has been used to estimate volunteer engagement and retention. This analysis has incorporated data from the 2010 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP). It has been validated that compensations (both direct and indirect) can have a significant impact on a person's decision to volunteer. Indirect compensation (networking and skill-development) helps volunteers to engage and remain in the same charity or foundation. Youth experience, however, can help engagement but not volunteer retention. However, youth involvement and religiosity do influence volunteerism in adulthood.

To increase volunteer engagement, consistent with the motivational, rational choice, social resource, and exchange theories, it is necessary to focus on effective training, and networking. All socio-economic groups, including elites, should be encouraged to volunteer. More importantly, volunteerism needs to be promoted within the family by instructing and educating children when they are young (Wilson, 2000). Parents should be

role-models in promoting household volunteerism. The activity can later be extended to community members. To retain volunteers some form of compensation/honorariums and certificates may be given to make the participants feel appreciated, valued, and respected.

References

- Amemiya, T. (1973). Regression Analysis when the Dependent Variable Is Truncated Normal, *Econometrica*, Vol. 41, No. 6 (Nov., 1973), pp. 997-1016
- Amato, P. & Booth, A. (1997). *A Generation at Risk: Growing up in an Era of Family Upheaval*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Andresen, E. M., Malmgren, J. A., Carter, W. B., & Patrick, D. L. (1994). Screening for depression in well older adults: Evaluation of a short form of the CES-D. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 10(2), 77-84.
- Arora, R. & Saad, L. (2005). Social issues activate affluent women. *The Gallup News Service*, Princeton, New Jersey
- Astin, A.W., Sax, L.J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(2), 187-202.
- Azzi, C., & Ehrenberg, R. G. (1975). Household allocation of time and church attendance. *Journal of Political Economy* 83(1), 27-56.
- Becker, P. E., & Dhingra, P. H. (2001). Religious involvement and volunteering: Implications for civil society. *Sociology of Religion*, 62(3), 315-335.
- Bekkers, R., & Weipking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies in philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 5, 924-973.
- Borgonovi, F. (2008). Doing well by doing good. The relationship between formal volunteering and self-reported health and happiness. *Social science & medicine*, 66(11), 2321-2334.
- Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2002). Understanding the volunteer market: The what, where, who and why of volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(3), 244-257.
- Chacon, F., Vecine, M.L., & Davila, M. C. (2007). The three-stage model of volunteers' duration of service. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 35(5), 627-642.
- Chinman, M. J. & Wandersman, A. (1999). The benefits and costs of volunteering in community organizations: Review and practical implications, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28, 1, 46-64,
- Damico, A., Damico, S., & Conway, M. (1998). The democratic education of women; high school and beyond. *Women Polit.* 19, 1031.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Ellis, S. J. & Jackson, R. (2013). Philanthropy and giving are not just about money. *Volunteerism*, 13, 2.
- 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
- Haski-Levinthal, D. (2009). Altruism and volunteerism: The perceptions of altruism in four disciplines and their impact on the study of volunteerism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 3, 271-299
- Holdsworth, C. (2010). Why volunteer? Understanding motivations for student volunteering. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58(4), 421-437.
- Hodgkinson, V. & Weitzman, M. (1996). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*, Washington D. C: Independent Sector.

- Hustinx, L., & Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A sociological modernization perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 14(2), 167-187.
- Kahana, E., Bhatta, T., Lovegreen, L. D., Kahana, B. & Midlarsky, E. (2013). Altruism, helping, and volunteering: pathways to well-being in late life. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 25(1), 159-187.
- Kloseck M, Crilly RG, Mannell RC. (2006). Involving the community elderly in the planning and provision of health services: predictors of volunteerism and leadership. *Canadian Journal on Aging* 25(1):77-92.
- Law, B. M. F. & Shek, D. T. L. (2009). Family influence on volunteering intention and behavior among Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Adolescence*, 44, 175, 665-683.
- Long, J. Scott (1997). Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables. London: Sage Publications.
- Li, H., Chi, & Zu (2010). Intergenerational support and self-rated health among Chinese older adults in one-child families. *Social Development Issue*, 32, 1, 62-75.
- Lincoln, R. L., Morrissey, A., & Munday, P. (2008). Religious giving: a comprehensive review Of literature. Report for the John Templeton Foundation Generosity Planning Project.
- Lindenmeier, J. (2008). Promoting volunteerism: Effects of self-efficacy, advertisement-induced emotional arousal, perceived costs of volunteering, and message-framing. *VOLUNTAS*, 19, 1, 43-65.
- Marta, E., & Pozzi, M. (2008). Young people and volunteerism: A model of sustained volunteerism during the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 15(1), 35-46.
- McDonald, J. F. & Moffit, R. A. (1980). The uses of Tobit analysis. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 62, 2, 318-321.
- Measham, T. G., & Barnett, G. B. (2008). Environmental volunteering: Motivations, modes and outcomes. *Australian geographer*, 39(4), 537-552.
- Mellor, D., Hyashi, Y., Firth, L., & Stokes, M. (2008). Volunteering and well-being: Do self-esteem, optimism and perceived control mediate the relationship? *Journal of Social Service Research*, 34, 4, 61-70.
- Millette, V., & Gagné, M. (2008). Designing volunteers' tasks to maximize motivation, satisfaction and performance: The impact of job characteristics on volunteer engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 32(1), 11-22.
- Morrow-Howell, N., Hinterlong, J., Rozario, P. A., & Tang, F. (2003). Effects of volunteering on the well-being of older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 58(3), S137-S145.
- Musick, M. A., Herzog, A. R., & House, J. S. (1999). Volunteering and mortality among older adults: Findings from a national sample. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 54(3), S173-S180
- Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2003). Volunteering and depression: The role of psychological and social resources in different age groups. *Social science & medicine*, 56(2), 259-269.
- Nesbit, R. (2012a). The influence of major life cycle events on volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1153-1174.
- Nesbit, R. (2012b). The Influence of Family and Household Members on Individual Volunteer Choices. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764012450365.
- Oesterle, S., Johnson, M. K., & Mortimer, J. T. (2004). Volunteerism during the transition to adulthood: A life course perspective. *Social Forces*, 82(3), 1123-1149.

- Okun, M. A., O'Rourke, H. P., Keller, B., Johnson, K. A., & Enders, C. (2014). Value-Expressive Volunteer Motivation and Volunteering by Older Adults: Relationships With Religiosity and Spirituality. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, gbu029.
- Omoto, A.M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J. D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality*, 78, 1703-1734.
- Pajo, K., & Lee, L. (2011). Corporate-sponsored volunteering: A work design perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(3), 467-482.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Siegl, E. (2007). Health benefits of volunteering in the Wisconsin longitudinal study. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 48, 450-464.
- Phillips, L. C. & Phillips, M. H. (2010). Volunteer motivation and reward preference: An empirical study of volunteerism in a large not-for-profit organization. *S. A. M. Advanced Management Journal*, 75, 4. 12-19.
- Rankopo, M. J., Osei-Hwedie, K. & Modie-Moroka, T. (2006). Issues in service and volunteerism in Botswana, *VOSESA*, 24-28.
- Rastoff S. & Sundeen, R. (1995). *Trends in volunteering: an analysis of a decade*. Paper presented at the annual meeting Association Res. On Non-Profit Organizations and Voluntary Association., Cleveland, Ohio.
- Rehberg, W. (2005). Altruistic individualists: Motivations for international volunteering among young adults in Switzerland. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 16(2), 109-122.
- Roshon, T. (1998). *Culture moves: Ideas, Activism, and Changing Values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ruiter, S., & De Graaf, N. D. (2006). National context, religiosity, and volunteering: Results from 53 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 71(2), 191-210.
- Schafeli, W.B., Bakker, A. B., Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: a cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66 (4), 701-716.
- Segal, L. (1993). *Four essays on the supply of volunteer labour and econometrics*. Unpublished document dissertation. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
- Schlozman, K., Burns, N., & Verba, S. (1994). Gender and the pathways to participation: the role of resources. *J. Polit.* 56, 963-990.
- Smith, D. H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: a literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23, 243-63.
- Snyder, M. & Omoto, A. M. (1992). Volunteerism and society's response to the HIV epidemic. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, 113-116.
- Strage, A. (2004). Long-term academic benefits of service-learning: When and where do they manifest themselves? *College Student Journal*, 38, 257-261.
- Tang, F., Choi, E., & Morrow-Howell, N. (2010). Organizational support and volunteering benefits for older adults. *The Gerontologist*, 50(5), 603-612.
- Thoits, P. A., & Hewitt, L. N. (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 42 (2), 115-131.
- Tobin, J. (1958). Estimation of relationships for limited dependent variables. *Econometrica*, 16, 1, 24-36.

Uggen, C., & Janikula, J. (1999). Volunteerism and arrest in the transition to adulthood. *Social Forces*, 78(1), 331-362.

Vecina, M. L., Chacon, F., Sueiro, M., & Barron (2011). Volunteer engagement: Does engagement predict the degree of satisfaction among new volunteers and the commitment of those who have been active longer? *Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 130-148. Doi/10.1111/apps.2012.61.issue-1/issuetoc)

Vezina, M. and Crompton, S. (2012). Volunteering in Canada, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/2012001/article/11638-eng.htm>, accessed March 11, 2015

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1-63.

Williams, A. M., Muhajarine, N., Randall, J., Labonte, R. & Kitchen, P. (2008). Volunteerism and residential longevity in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 85,97-110.

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

Wuthnow, (1991). *Acts of Compassion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.