Giving Time and/or Money: Trade-off or Spill-over?

René Bekkers[1]

Suggested running head: Giving time and money

This article builds on a chapter in a research report for the Dutch government and fundraising organizations (Bekkers, R.H.F.P (2001) "Geven van geld en tijd: en-en of of-of?" In: Th.N.M. Schuyt (Ed). Geven in Nederland 2001: 106-118. Houten/Dieghem: Bohn Stafleu van Loghum). The present article extends the research report with more theory and numerous improvements in the analyses.

Abstract

The relation of giving money to charitable causes and volunteering for an association is examined in a sample of 612 respondents living in The Netherlands. In contrast to the expectation that check writing activism is used as a compensation for a lack of active involvement in civil society, volunteers were more likely to give to charitable causes than non-volunteers were. Volunteers also donated more money than non-volunteers did. Volunteers contributed mainly to charities in the sector in which they volunteered, but also some *spill over* - effects were found: volunteers in the health sector, in religious organisations and in sports clubs were more likely to donate to charities outside their 'own' sector. However, multivariate analyses, controlling for the main determinants of volunteering and giving to charitable causes, did not reveal any effects of volunteering on charitable donations. Giving and volunteering are complementary behaviors, arising from roughly the same social factors.

Keywords:
Philanthropy, volunteering, civil society, giving to charitable causes

[1] Center for the Study of Philanthropy and Volunteering
Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences
Free University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
De Boelelaan 859
1081 HV Amsterdam
+31 204446906 or +31 204446805
rhfp.bekkers@scw.vu.nl

Giving Time and Money: Trade-off or Spill-over?

1. Introduction

What is the relation between giving money to charitable causes and giving time to voluntary associations? Do people who are active as a volunteer for an association give money to charitable causes more or less often than people who are not active as a volunteer? Do monetary gifts compensate for a lack of active involv1ement, or do contributions to public goods – whether in terms of money or time - inevitably come from the same persons? In short: giving time and giving money: compensation or multiplication?

Research in the UK (CAF, 1993), the USA (Freeman, 1997) and Canada (Reed & Selbee, 2001) indicates that there is an overlap between giving and volunteering. In the UK, 93% of all households with at least one volunteer compared with 73% of all households without volunteers contributed to charitable causes in 1993 (CAF, 1993, p. 44). In the USA, the differences are even larger, with 90% of all households with at least one volunteer reporting donations versus 55% of all non-volunteering households (Independent Sector, 1996, p. 5). Putnam (2000) also reported a positive relation between giving money and time in the USA. Recently, Reed & Selbee (2001) showed that a 'civic core', consisting of only 6% of all Canadians, accounts for 42% of all volunteer hours and 35% of the total amount of philanthropic donations.

These results echo complaints by volunteers and people who contribute to charitable causes that "Always the same persons have to do it". When volunteers are needed for a certain task, people tend to look for a suitable person in a small circle of candidates. People who give to charitable causes receive an increasing number of letters asking for contributions, also from other charities. And volunteers seem to face even more of these requests than others. Once you've been identified as a part of the philanthropic sector, more and more requests for donations come into your mailbox. The alternative opinion is popular among culture pessimists: people give money to charitable causes because they want to get rid of a bad conscience. People recognize the problems of unfortunate others, but 'cannot afford' to do something about it, and fulfil their moral duties by giving money. This 'check writing activism' is often considered a cheap form of social involvement, which compensates for a lack of 'real action'.

Although both of these extreme opinions are often advocated in public debates, there is no research available on the relations among giving time and money in the Netherlands. There are several reasons why this relation may be different in the Netherlands than in other countries. Compared to other western countries, the Netherlands has a strong and sizeable voluntary sector, with a high proportion of volunteers (Curtis, Grabb & Baer, 1992; Burger, Dekker, Toepler, Anheier & Salamon, 1999). However, the third sector in the Netherlands differs from the UK and USA in a number of respects (for a comparative review of the whole non-profit sector, including government spending, see Burger, Dekker, Toepler, Anheier & Salamon, 1999). Due to massive secularization since the 1960s, the Netherlands have fewer volunteers working for religious groups than the USA, and charitable contributions often go to 'checkwriting organizations' that rely on donors and passive members but do not have many volunteers. There are also two methodological reasons to study the relation of giving time and money more closely. Most of the results reported earlier are based on bivariate analyses at the household level, and do not control for the determinants of volunteering. The economic analysis by Freeman (1997) is one of the few multivariate analyses, but did not control for the effect of religious involvement, for instance. Furthermore, previous research investigated only the proportion of donors among an undifferentiated group of volunteers, and the type of charities supported was not identified. In sum, it is not clear to what extent the individual volunteering experience contributes to charitable giving and which types of charities are supported by which types of volunteers. Finally, there is also a theoretical reason to study the relationship between giving and volunteering. We may be familiar with the overlap between volunteers and donors empirically, but theoretically it is not clear why this overlap exists. From a theoretical point of view, one could also imagine a substitution between giving and volunteering. Theories on this topic are lacking. In this paper, the two alternative theoretical ideas on the relation between giving and volunteering that were sketched briefly above will be worked out in more detail, and tested using data from a survey on volunteering and giving to charitable causes from 1997 ('Giving in The Netherlands', Schuyt, 1999).

2. Theory

a. Giving time and money: multiplicative behaviours?

First, the possibility that giving to charitable causes and volunteering for an association are complements is examined. Several theories support this argument: the classical theory of Durkheim on social cohesion and suicide, psychological theories on personality, and the more recent theory of Putnam and others on trust and social capital. The first two theories predict that giving and volunteering are both determined by the same set of factors. According to this line of reasoning, volunteering in itself does not increase giving. The theory on trust and social capital predicts that the volunteering experience in itself increases the propensity to donate to charitable causes, controlling for their joint determinants.

(1) It is possible that voluntary work and donations to charitable causes are concentrated among the same persons, because both are determined by the same set of factors. After all, both are forms of collective action that produce collective benefits but require an individual to give up some of his or her resources. Previous research indicates that volunteering and giving to charitable causes are both related to educational level, religious involvement and community size (for the Netherlands, see Schuyt, 2001, Bekkers, 2000, 2001; for the USA, see Putnam, 2000, pp. 118-122). These results are consistent with Durkheim's classical theory of norm-conform behaviour (1896): in more cohesive communities, such as religious groups and smaller villages, norm-conform behaviour is more common. In this view, giving and volunteering are merely two forms of norm-conform behaviour that are both the product of integration in cohesive social groups. Or in other words: giving and volunteering are two indicators of cohesion. In the analyses presented below, social integration will be measured using information on religious involvement and community size, assuming that religious persons and persons living in smaller communities are more strongly integrated. Of course, some differences may be expected between the factors that determine voluntary work and charitable giving, because they require different sets of resources. The level of education and the amount of leisure time available will be more important for participation in voluntary work (Wilson, 2000), while the available income will be more important for giving to charitable causes. But according to the logic that giving time and giving money are two forms of prosocial behaviour that are generated by similar factors, voluntary work in itself does not increase the chance to donate to charitable causes.

Alternatively, giving and volunteering may be seen as the result of an individual preference for the well being of others reflecting individual differences in personality that are independent of social structure. This assumption underlies psychological research on the prosocial personality (Penner, Fritsche, Craiger & Freifeld, 1995). Persons who feel more concerned about the wellbeing of others will be more likely to volunteer time as well as give money for the benefit of society. There is some evidence that prosocial personality traits such as empathy and agreeableness are indeed related to both giving money as well as volunteering time (Penner et al., 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Elshaug & Metzer, 2001; Carlo, Allen & Buhman, 1999). In the analyses presented below, a measure of the concern for the wellbeing of others known as the social value orientation (Van Lange, 2000) will be used. This procedure has been validated in social psychological research on cooperation in social dilemmas, in which it was shown to have considerable predictive value (Van Lange, 2000). Social value orientations are a more reasonable choice to study the effect of personality on giving time and money than a general social trait such as agreeableness because social value orientations reflect a specifically prosocial motivation structure in social dilemma situations where individual and collective interests diverge. However, individual differences in cooperative intentions are not very stable (Bekkers, 2002). In spite of the low test-retest reliability, social value orientations did predict various forms of prosocial behavior in 'the real life', such as charitable giving (Van Lange, 1997).

(2) A more complex assumption is that apart from the social or psychological factors that lead to participation in voluntary work, volunteering activity itself increases the chance to give to charitable causes. This could be due to two reasons. The first reason is that donations come from the people who are part of social networks, in which societal activism and solidarity are a dominant social norm. People who are embedded in such a network, have a higher chance to be active as a volunteer, and if they are, they will be more likely to be asked to donate to charitable causes: "Once on the list of usual suspects, I'm likely to stay there" (Putnam, 2000, p. 121). Within organisations that depend on the efforts of volunteers, this social norm will be even more dominant, and more initiatives will be taken to live up to expectations. In this way, a *multiplier-effect* originates. A second reason why participation

in voluntary work increases the chance to give to charitable causes is that active participation in voluntary associations may increase trust in fellow citizens and institutions like the state and the civil society. This is an important idea in recent debates about social capital, and is based on the assumption that participation in civil society has a positive socialisation effect (Putnam, 2000). Putnam argued that there is a virtuous circle of participation increasing trust, increasing giving and participation, increasing trust, and so on. This idea may be a little too optimistic. Research in The Netherlands (SCP, 1999) and in other European countries (Dekker, 2002) shows that participation in civil society does not contribute very much to trust in fellow citizens. A more realistic version of the same idea is that giving time only increases giving money to the same type of organisation. In other words: there is no general increase of trust in institutions and fellow citizens, but only an increase of trust in the 'own' sector in which people volunteer. This weak version of the *multiplier*- hypothesis implies that volunteers in a given sector contribute more often to charitable causes in their 'own' sector, but not to causes in other sectors. The strong version implies that volunteers in a given sector are more likely to donate to charities in all sectors alike.

b. Time or money: compensatory behaviours?

Although giving money and time are two forms of prosocial behaviour, both to the benefit of society as a whole, it is possible that in fact they are competitive behaviours. This line of reasoning follows from a 'rational choice' perspective, relying on assumptions from neo-classical micro-economic theory (Lindenberg, 2001). However, 'rational choice theory' as it is used in sociology extends narrow economic perspectives and does not necessarily assume self-interest: people may also satisfy their needs for social approval (Lindenberg, 2001) or their concern for the wellbeing of others, such as family members (Becker, 1981). Rational choice theory does require that people choose between behavioral options in a completely rational manner. Confronted with two options, the relative costs and benefits (material, social or otherwise) associated with these should determine the choice made.

From a rational choice perspective, people have two alternative options to fulfil their duties as good citizens: by giving money or time. They will decide between these two options in a rational manner. Active involvement costs a certain amount of leisure time, but persons who do not have so much of this scarce good in stock will give money instead. Money and time can be exchanged for each other: if a person does not contribute to collective goods by giving time, he or she will have to contribute by giving money. In other words: there is a *trade-off* between giving money and time (Freeman, 1997). One could also say that people may contract out their social activism to professionals, by paying money to organizations whose aims they support (Maloney, 1999). This *trade-off* hypothesis implies that persons with more leisure time will have a higher chance to be active as a volunteer, but a lower chance to give money. Conversely, persons with higher incomes will have a higher chance to donate money, but a lower chance to be active as a volunteer. The empirical evidence for the theoretical arguments from a rational choice perspective are mixed. In the USA, income and hours worked for pay are positively related with volunteering, which is in contrast with predictions (Menchik & Weisbrod, 1987; Freeman, 1997). Among the subgroup of donors, however, there is some evidence of substitution: high-income persons give more money and less time. Previous research on volunteering in the Netherlands actually found a negative relationship between hours worked and volunteering (Lindeman, 1996; Kraaykamp, 1996). Controlling for education, income does not seem to be related to volunteering (Bekkers, 2001; Bekkers & De Graaf, 2002).

Data and methods

The analyses in this article make use of data combined from the 'Giving in the Netherlands' (GIN) survey from 1997. The originally separate data files on voluntary work and on giving to charitable causes contain information about 1277 respondents (Schuyt, 1999). Matching these data files revealed a number of respondents missing in one or the other file, leaving 612 respondents suitable for cross tabulation purposes. Missing data are mainly due to the fact that the questions on voluntary work were sometimes answered by different members of the same household, next to some missing values on several variables. Fortunately, there was no bias in missing data with respect to region, gender, marital status, religious involvement, and giving to charitable causes. To investigate the overlap between giving and volunteering in The Netherlands, a simple cross tabulation of the

number of volunteers and non-volunteers contributing to charitable causes will be reported. After that, the giving behaviour of volunteers and non-volunteers will be compared for a number of different types of charitable causes. To test the trade-off and the multiplier-hypothesis, the determinants of participation in voluntary work and donations to charitable causes will be analysed using multivariate regression analysis. The regression analyses proceed in five steps, each introducing a number of individual characteristics that are related to prosocial behaviour. The following variables were entered in the regression:

a) Basic demographic characteristics: gender (0: female, 1: male), age (in years), marital status (dummies for never married, married, widowed and divorced), community size (0: < 5000 inhabitants, 1: 5000-10000, 2: 10000-20000, 3: 20000-50000; 4: 50000-100000, 5: 100000-400000, 6: >400.000 inhabitants).
b) An indicator for human capital: the highest level of education reached (in 7 categories, from primary education to university degree).
c) Three indicators for time and money restrictions: the amount of leisure time is represented by the size of the household (in number of persons), and the number of working hours per week. As an indicator of the available monetary resources the gross household income in guilders per month is used (1000 NLG = € 454 = US$ 400, exchange rate January 2002).
d) Measures of religious affiliation: the frequency of attending church (0: never, 1: less than once a month, 2: once or twice a month, 3: more than twice a month) and dummy variables for religious denominations (Roman Catholic, Dutch Reformed, Orthodox Calvinist, other religion; no affiliation served as a reference category) are added.
e) Individual differences in value orientations: postmaterialism (Inglehart, 1996) and the social value orientation (Van Lange, 1997). With regard to political values, participants were classified in three categories (materialists, postmaterialists, and mixed values). Social value orientations were measured with a series of 6 decomposed games (Messick & McClintock, 1968), in which people allocate points of hypothetical value to themselves or an 'unknown other'. The more points allocated to the 'unknown other', the more altruistic the respondent. In the games used in this survey, respondents could allocate a maximum of 50% to the unknown other, and a minimum of 16%. This measure has proved to be highly predictive of cooperation in social dilemma situations in the psychological laboratory (Van Lange, 2000) and has high internal validity (Bekkers, 2002). Evidence on the external validity is scarce, but promising (Van Lange, Agnew, Harinck & Steemers, 1997).

Due to missing data on several independent variables, 546 respondents were left for the regression analyses. Descriptive information on all variables can be found in table 1. All monetary data were originally measured in Dutch guilders, and have been converted to 1000 Euros (€1000 is about $900) to facilitate reading and interpreting the data. If the determinants of charitable donations and participation in voluntary work are known, they can be compared to one another. Do people make a choice between giving money or time, depending on the circumstances? Or are factors that make for giving to charitable causes also the factors that make for participation in voluntary work? Or does voluntary work provide an extra chance to give to money?

Results

a. Contributions of volunteers to charitable causes

According to the GIN-survey, volunteers contribute more often to charitable causes than non-volunteers: 56.1% of the respondents in the survey who reported volunteering activities also contributed money to charitable causes, as opposed to 45.8% of the non-volunteers (see table 2). This difference is significant (Chi^2=6.08, p<.014), but smaller than in research on the UK and the USA. One reason for the difference with other research may be that our data are on the individual level, not the household level. Of course, the difference could also reflect cultural differences. In any case, volunteers still contribute more often to charitable causes than non-volunteers. This result is in contrast with the *trade off*-hypothesis.

Volunteers do not only contribute more often, but also more money: volunteers contributed a mean amount of € 100 ($90) to charitable causes, opposed to a mean amount of €39 ($35) by non-volunteers (see table 3). This difference is significant (t-value = 3.19, p<.002). Volunteers also

contribute more money as a fraction of their income than non-volunteers: 0.30% versus 0.14%. This difference is also significant (t-value = 3.09, p<.002). Again, this result is in contrast with the *trade off*-hypothesis.

Which charities profit from the donations of volunteers? According to table 4, mainly churches and charities in the sectors of international solidarity, the environment, nature conservation, research and education, and public and social benefit receive donations from volunteers. For charities in the health sector, and charities supporting arts and culture and sports and recreation there are no differences between volunteers and non-volunteers in donations. With regard to the amount of money donated, the picture looks different. Table 5 shows that volunteers only tend to support organisations in the area of religion, health, and environment with more money than non-volunteers. For charitable causes in other sectors, differences were not significant.

In the next analyses, a closer look is taken at the relation between donations to charitable causes and participation in voluntary work and the kind of organisation in which the respondents are active as volunteers. Table 6 shows that volunteers mainly contribute to charities in the sector in which they are active as volunteers. Still, there are some *spillover-effects*: when voluntary work in one sector is related to monetary donations to charities in other sectors. Especially volunteers who are active in the health sector contribute more often to charities in six other sectors. Volunteers working for religious organisations contribute more often to four kinds of charities outside the religious sector. Looking at the receiving parties, it can be seen that mainly environmental organisations and charities supporting research and education profit from these *spillover-effects*. These kinds of charities are widely supported among volunteers. In spite of these *spillover*-effects, the results from table 6 support the weak version of the multiplier-hypothesis: volunteers contribute mainly to charities that are active in the same, 'own' sector. The strong version of the multiplier-hypothesis must be rejected.

The results from table 7, examining the amounts given by volunteers in different sectors, indicate that higher rates of giving do not necessarily imply that higher amounts are given. In fact, none of the *spillover*-effects from table 6 are significant in table 7. Volunteers for religious organisations report higher donations in their own sector (€ 103 or $92 versus € 23 or $20 by people who are not volunteering for religious organisations). Volunteers in the health sector report higher overall donations than other respondents (€186 or $167 versus €56 or $51), also as a fraction of income (0.53% versus 0.19%).

b. Determinants of participation in voluntary work

What accounts for the overlap between participation in voluntary work and giving to charitable causes? Are giving and volunteering related to the same set of determinants or does volunteering contribute something extra to the odds to give? In the following two sections, regression-analyses are presented to answer these questions. In this section, participation in voluntary work is analyzed, in the next section giving to charitable causes is considered.

In line with previous research, volunteering activity is positively related to being male and church attendance, while negative relations are observed with community size and working hours (see table 8). The relation with social value orientation is marginally significant and positive, indicating that persons with more altruistic value orientations are more likely to volunteer. The level of education is not related to volunteering activity. This result seems to contradict previous research, but it is in line with the trend in The Netherlands that educational attainment is becoming less important for volunteering (Kraaykamp, 1996). Also the large effect of church attendance is in line with previous research on volunteering in The Netherlands, which showed that frequency of church attendance is the most important predictor of volunteering activity (Kraaykamp, 1996; Bekkers, 2000). People who frequently attend church, are much more likely to volunteer than the non-religious. Additional stepwise analyses (not shown in the table) revealed that religious involvement mediated urban-rural differences. The marginally significant positive relation with income is in contrast with the idea that people trade-off time for money. However, the relatively strong negative relation with the number of working hours is consistent with the idea of a trade-off, if it can be shown that persons with more working hours are more likely to donate money to charitable causes. This analysis will be reported later (see table 10).

The regression analysis of the number of hours volunteered (see table 9) reveals some interesting differences with the previous analysis. Next to the familiar relations with being male, the

number of hours worked for pay, and church attendance, significantly positive relations are observed for household income, postmaterialist value orientation and social value orientation. The result for income is consistent with previous research in the USA (Menchik & Weisbrod, 1987; Freeman, 1997), but has not been found in The Netherlands before. The relation with postmaterialism was not found in a recent analysis (Bekkers & De Graaf, 2002), but this may be due to a difference in the question about volunteering. The relation with social value orientation is also a new revelation, which is consistent with psychological theories of prosocial behavior (Van Lange, 2000). If social value orientations are also an important predictor of philanthropic donations, the reason for the overlap between giving and volunteering may be rooted in personality. With regard to our main hypotheses, the result for income is in contrast to the trade-off hypothesis, but the result for working hours may support another variant of the same idea.

c. Determinants of giving to charitable causes

The logistic regression analysis of giving to charitable causes is similar to the previous analysis of voluntary work, but with one difference: volunteering activity is now introduced as an independent variable which may contribute to the prediction of charitable giving. A brief reminder of our expectations: according to the *trade-off* hypothesis, a higher household income, a tight leisure time budget and a lack of volunteering activity work will make people give to charitable causes. According to the multiplier hypothesis, involvement in voluntary work will increase the chance to give to charitable causes.

The results of the regression analysis reported in table 10 fail to support the multiplier-hypotheses. Controlling for the determinants of volunteering, volunteering activity itself is unrelated to the chance to give to charitable causes. The negative relation with working hours is in clear contrast to the trade-off hypothesis. Besides the positive relation with household income, significant relations were found with marital status, the level of education, household size, and being a Roman Catholic. Widowed and divorced persons were less likely to donate than unmarried persons, while married persons were most likely to donate to charitable causes. The lower educated were more likely to give. Roman Catholics and persons with smaller families were also more likely to donate. Social value orientations are not a significant predictor of the likelihood of philanthropic donation. This result is in contrast to the significant relation of social value orientation with volunteering reported in table 9 above, which implies that individual differences in personality are not the cause of the overlap between giving and volunteering.

Taking a more detailed view, the number of charitable causes supported in different sectors was investigated in table 11. In contrast to the previous analysis, this table does support the multiplier-hypothesis. Volunteers support a higher number of charities than non-volunteers. Other relevant factors were marital status, income, working hours and church attendance. Married persons support more charities than unmarried persons, while widowed persons support fewer organizations. Persons with higher incomes, persons working fewer hours and persons who go to church more frequently support a higher number of different charities.

The results of the analysis for the amount of money donated (see table 12) reveal only three important factors: age, income, and church attendance. Older persons, people with higher incomes and persons who frequently go to church give more money to charitable causes. The relation with income is in line with the trade-off hypothesis, but no relation with the number of working hours was found. Volunteers did not differ from non-volunteers in the amount of money donated.

Conclusions and discussion

This study investigated the contributions to charitable causes of volunteers and non-volunteers in The Netherlands. The main results can be summarized as follows (see figure 2). In simple cross-tabulations, volunteers in The Netherlands donate more often to charitable causes than non-volunteers, and volunteers also donate more money. In contrast with the strong version of the multiplier-hypothesis, volunteers mainly supported charities in their own sector. Volunteers in the health sector and volunteers for churches and sports clubs were exceptions to this rule. Volunteers in these sectors do contribute more often to charities outside their 'own' sector. Environmental organisations and charities supporting research and education profit from their donations.

Multivariate analyses, controlling for the main determinants of giving and volunteering, revealed an additional effect of volunteering on the number of charities supported in different sectors, but no additional effect of volunteering on the chance to give to charitable donations at all. Apparently, non-volunteers are not less supportive of charity in general, but they support a lower number of different charities. Comparing the determinants of giving and volunteering, consistently positive and often strong relations with household income and church attendance were found. Individual differences in social value orientations, which are supposed to indicate a prosocial personality, were related to the number of hours volunteered, but not to the likelihood of donation or the amount donated. This result indicates that the overlap between giving and volunteering is not due to personality factors. More working hours diminished the chance to give and volunteer, and also diminished the number of hours volunteered, but not the amount of money donated. The negative relation of working hours with the chance to donate is in contrast with the trade-off hypothesis. It may be the result of the fact that persons working longer hours are less likely to be at home for door to door collections, and not so much the result of a lower willingness to donate. After all, working hours were not related to the amount donated. Apparently, fewer donations were compensated by higher amounts per donation. However, persons with more working hours did not compensate their lower rate of volunteering by higher donations. In sum, only the weak version of the multiplier-hypothesis withstood the empirical tests, and only with regard to the chance to give, not with regard to the amount donated. Neither version of the trade-off hypothesis was supported by the data. In general, the results of this article support the view that giving and volunteering are two complementary forms of prosocial behavior, but not substitutes. There is an overlap between giving and volunteering because both forms of prosocial behavior arise from roughly the same set of social factors, not because they are a reflection of a 'generous personality' or because volunteering reinforces giving.

A better test of the trade-off hypothesis would involve tracking changes in giving behaviour of individuals through time, using panel-data. It is possible that people invest less time in voluntary work and give more money to charitable causes when they enter new stages of life, cutting money and time budgets. Having children and an increase in working hours after getting a more prestigious job may be breaking points in charitable careers: people may stop doing voluntary work and compensate for this inactivity with an increase of charitable donations. However, the relation of household size with charitable giving is inconsistent with this idea: people with larger families were less likely to contribute to charitable causes. Research using a dynamic model of voluntary association membership in the USA (Rotolo, 2000) suggests that this argument does not hold either with regard to participation in associations. Still, it would be worth while to investigate the interrelation of charitable, occupational and relational careers.

References

Becker, Gary S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bekkers, René H.F.P. (2000). Religieuze betrokkenheid en vrijwilligerswerk: een kwestie van psychologische dispositie of sociale organisatie? ["Religious involvement and voluntary work: a question of psychological disposition or social organization?"] *Sociologische Gids* (47): 268-292.

Bekkers, René H.F.P. (2001). Participation in Voluntary Associations: Resources, Personality, or Both? Paper prepared for the 5th Conference of the European Sociological Association, August 2001, Helsinki.

Bekkers, René H.F.P. (2002a). Reliability and Construct Validity of Social Value Orientations. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Bekkers, René H.F.P. (2002b). Personality Correlates of Social Value Orientations. Working paper, Utrecht University.

Bekkers, René H.F.P. & De Graaf, Nan Dirk (2002). Verschuivende achtergronden van verenigingsparticipatie ["Shifting backgrounds of participation in voluntary associations"]. *Mens & Maatschappij, 77 (4)*, forthcoming.

Burger, Ary, Dekker, Paul, Toepler, Stefan, Anheier, Helmut K. & Salamon, Lester M. (1999). In Salamon, Lester M., Anheier, Helmut K., List, Regina, Toepler, Stefan, Sokolowski, S. Wojciech & Associates (Ed.). *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Carlo, Gustavo, Allen, James B. & Buhmann, Dion C. (1999). Facilitating and Disinhibiting Prosocial Behaviors: The Nonlinear Interaction of Trait Perspective Taking and Trait Personal Distress on Volunteering. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 21 (3)*: 189-197.

Charities Aid Foundation (1993). *Individual Giving and Volunteering in Britain. Who gives what…and why?* 6th Edition. Tonbridge: CAF.

Curtis, James E., Grabb, Edward G. & Baer, Douglas E. (1992). Voluntary Association Membership in Fifteen Coutries: A Comparative Analysis. *American Sociological Review, 57*: 139-152.

Dekker, P. (2002). *De oplossing van de civil society*. ["The solution of the civil society"]. Inauguration speech delivered at the University of Tilburg, June 28, 2002.

Durkheim, Emile (1896). *Le Suicide*. Paris: PUF.

Elshaug, Carol, & Metzer, Jacques (2001). Personality Attributes of Volunteers and Paid Workers Engaged in Similar Occupational Tasks. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141* (6): 752-763.

Freeman, Richard B. (1997). Working for Nothing : The Supply of Volunteer Labor. *Journal of Labor Economics, 15*(1), S140-S166.

Marc Hooghe (2002), Value Congruence within Voluntary Associations. A Social Psychological Extension of Social Capital Theory, pp. 56-82 in Eric Uslaner, Dietlind Stolle, Bo Rothstein & Marc Hooghe, *Social Capital as Trust.* Exeter: University of Exeter (Civic Series 2).

Independent Sector (1996). *Giving and volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Inglehart, Ronald (1996). *Modernization and Postmodernization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kraaijkamp, Gerbert (1996). Ontwikkelingen in de sociale segmentering van vrijetijdsbesteding; toenemende exclusiviteit of evenredige participatie? ["Developments in social segmentation of leisure time allocation: increasing exclusivity or equal participation?"]. In Harry B.G. Ganzeboom and Wout Ultee (eds.). *De sociale segmentatie van Nederland in 2015*: 171-203. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers.

Lindeman, Ellen (1996). Participatie in vrijwilligerswerk ["Participation in voluntary work"]. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.

Lindenberg, Siegwart (2001). Social Rationality versus Rational Egoism. In Turner, Jonathan H. (Ed.). *Handbook of Sociological Theory*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 635-668.

Maloney, William A. (1999). Contracting out the participation function: social capital and cheque-book participation. In Jan W. Van Deth (ed.). *Social Capital and European Democracy*: 108-119. London/New York: Routledge.

Messick, D.M. & McClintock, C.G. (1968). Motivational Basis of Choice in Experimental Games. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3*: 85-101.

Penner, Louis A. & Finkelstein, Marcia A. (1998). Dispositional and Structural Determinants of Volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*: 525-537.

Penner, Louis A., Fritzsche, Barbara A., Craiger, J. Philip & Freifeld, Tamara S. (1995). Measuring the Prosocial Personality. In Spielberger, Charles D. & Butcher (Eds.). *Advances in Personality Assessment, vol. 10*, ch. 7, pp. 147-163.

Putnam, Robert D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rotolo, Thomas (2000). A Time to Join, A Time to Quit: The Influence of Life Cycle Transitions on Voluntary Association Membership. *Social Forces, 78* (3): 1133-1152.

Schuyt, Th.N.M. (1999). *Geven in Nederland 1999* ["Giving in The Netherlands"]. Houten/Diegem: Bohn Stafleu van Loghum.

SCP (1999). *Sociale en Culturele Verkenning 1999*, Cahier 157. Den Haag: SCP (Social and Cultural Planning Office).

Van Lange, Paul A.M. (1997). De rol van sociale waarde-oriëntaties in het 'echte leven'. ["The Role of Social Value Orientations in Real Life"]. In Th.N.M. Schuyt and S.J.M. Hoff (eds). *Filantropie & Sponsoring*: 18-38. Amsterdam: VU-uitgeverij.

Van Lange, Paul A.M. (2000). Beyond Self-Interest: A Set of Propositions Relevant to Interpersonal Orientations. In Stroebe, W. & Hewstone, M. (Eds). *European Review of Social Psychology, 11*. London: Wiley.

Van Lange, Paul A.M., Agnew, Christopher R., Harinck, Fieke & Steemers, Gemma E.M. (1997). From Game Theory to Real Life: How Social Value Orientation Affects Willingness to Sacrifice in Ongoing Close Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*: 1330-1345.

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

Figure 1. Summary of hypotheses

	Multiplier hypothesis		Trade-off hypothesis	
	Strong	Weak	Leisure time	Income
For the odds to give	Volunteers contribute more often to all kinds of charitable causes	Volunteers in a given sector contribute more often to charitable causes in the 'own' sector only	Persons with more leisure time are more likely to volunteer and less likely to donate to charitable causes	Persons with higher incomes are less likely to volunteer and more likely to donate to charity
For the amount given	Volunteers contribute more money to all kinds of charitable causes	Volunteers in a given sector contribute more money to charitable causes in the 'own' sector only	Persons with more leisure time volunteer more hours and donate less money to charitable causes	Persons with higher incomes volunteer less hours and donate more money to charitable causes

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of variables

variable	minimum	maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Male	0	1	.49	.50
Age	18	88	46.54	16.51
Unmarried	0	1	.23	.42
Married	0	1	.64	.48
Widow	0	1	.07	.26
Divorced	0	1	.06	.24
Community Size	0	6	3.53	1.53
Household income (x € 1000)	2.04	64.89	27.76	14.10
Educational level	1	7	3.68	1.90
Household size	1	5	2.72	1.23
Working hours	0	80	19.22	19.10
Church attendance	0	3	.76	1.09
No religion	0	1	.48	.50
Roman Catholic	0	1	.27	.45
Dutch Reformed	0	1	.12	.32
Orthodox Calvinist	0	1	.07	.25
Other religion	0	1	.06	.23
Postmaterialism	1	3	1.87	.60
Social value orientation	.17	.50	.42	.10
Voluntary work	0	1	.37	.48
Hours volunteered	0	98	4.16	10.93
Donation	0	1	.47	.50
Amount donated (x € 1000)	0	2.53	.05	.18
Fraction of income donated	0	6.40	.17	.58

Table 2. Giving to charity by participation in voluntary work (n=612)

	Giving to charitable causes	
	Yes	No
Volunteers (n=228)	56.1	43.9
Non-volunteers (n=384)	45.8	54.2
All (n=612)	47.0	53.0

Table 3. Amount of money and fraction of income given to charitable causes by participation in voluntary work (n=612)

	Total mean amount in €	Fraction of income
Volunteers	100.29	.00307
Non-volunteers	39.22	.00144
T-value	**3.19	**3.09
All	51.74	.00175

Table 4. Giving to different types of charities by participation in voluntary work (n=612)

	At least one type of charity	Religion	Health	International solidarity	Environment	Nature conservation	Research and education	Arts and culture	Sports and recreation	Public and social benefit
volunteers (n=228)	56.1	32.9	37.3	27.6	18.0	27.6	8.8	5.7	14.5	27.2
non-volunteers (n=384)	45.8	16.4	31.0	18.5	7.3	16.9	3.1	2.9	11.5	15.6
Chi^2	*6.08	**22.27	2.55	**6.99	**16.34	**9.91	**9.21	3.06	1.18	**11.99

Note: ** = significant difference at p<.01; * = significant difference at p<.05

Table 5. Amount of money given to different types of charitable causes by participation in voluntary work (n=612)

	Religion	Health	International solidarity	Environment	Nature conservation	Research and education	Arts and culture	Sports and recreation	Public and social benefit
volunteers (n=228)	47.03	16.20	14.80	3.07	6.13	2.75	2.46	1.18	6.37
non-volunteers (n=384)	16.53	5.58	7.22	0.73	3.01	0.84	0.60	1.54	2.47
t-value	*2.50	*2.09	1.81	**2.62	1.20	1.33	1.59	-0.43	1.92

Note: ** = significant difference at p<.01; * = significant difference at p<.05

Table 6. Significant differences between volunteers and non-volunteers in different kinds of volunteer organizations giving to different types of charities (n=612)

Volunteer in	**Giving to**	**% volunteers giving**	**% non-volunteers giving**	**Chi²**
Health	Health	57.7	32.3	**7.25
	Environment	30.8	10.4	**10.32
	Nature conservation	50.0	19.6	**13.89
	Research and education	23.1	4.4	**17.46
	Arts and culture	11.5	3.6	*4.18
	Public and social benefit	50.0	18.6	***15.38
Religion	Religion	46.2	20.9	***13.29
	Environment	23.1	10.5	*5.80
	Research and education	12.8	4.7	*4.85
	Arts and culture	12.8	3.3	**8.76
Sportsclub	International solidarity	39.7	19.7	**14.19
	Environment	19.1	10.3	*4.70
	Sports en recreation	23.5	11.2	**8.34
School	Environment	34.6	10.2	***14.79
	Research and education	19.2	4.6	**10.74
Hulpverlening	Religion	48.5	21.1	***13.45
	Nature conservation	39.4	19.9	**7..20
Social work	Sports en recreation	34.8	11.7	**10.71
Arts and culture	Arts and culture	11.1	3.6	*3.88

Note: *** = significant difference at p<.001; ** = significant difference at p<.01; * = significant difference at p<.05

Table 7. Significant differences between volunteers and non-volunteers in different kinds of volunteer organizations giving to different types of charities (n=612)

Volunteer sector	**Giving to**	**Mean amount donated by volunteers**	**Mean amount donated by non-volunteers**	**T-value**
Sports	Religion	12.76	29.78	*-2.08
	Arts and culture	0.17	1.44	*-2.36
	Environment	6.27	1.02	*2.00
Health	Total amount	185.75	56.48	*2.17
	Fraction of income (in ‰)	53.40	18.99	*2.19
Religion	Religion	102.97	22.78	*2.07

Note: *** = significant difference at p<.001; ** = significant difference at p<.01; * = significant difference at p<.05

Table 8. Logistic regression analysis of participation in voluntary work (n=547)

Variabele	**B**	**Se**	**Wald**
Male	.4479	.2249	*3.97
Age	.0129	.0104	1.53
Marital status			4.55
Married	.0021	.3422	0.00
Widow	-.5654	.5720	0.98
Divorced	.7155	.4940	2.10
Community size	-.1229	.0676	~3.31
Level of education	.0307	.0622	0.24
Income (x € 1000)	.0154	.0087	~3.12
Household size	.1222	.1117	1.20
Working hours	-.0153	.0070	*4.72
Church attendance	.5403	.1197	***20.38
Roman Catholic	-.1508	.2744	0.30
Dutch Reformed	.1152	.3208	0.13
Orthodox Calvinist	-.3485	.4520	0.59
Other religion	.1151	.5210	0.05
Social value orientation	1.8228	1.0868	~2.81
Political value orientation			
Mixed	.3157	.2452	1.66
Postmaterialist	.2951	.3507	0.71
Constant			-3.0430
Nagelkerke R^2			.177
Chi^2 (df)			***75.54 (18)

Note: *** = p<.001, ** = p<.01, * = p<.05, ~=p<.10

Table 9. Linear regression analysis of hours volunteered (n=546)

Variabele	**b**	**se**	**Beta**
Male	2.623	.985	**.124
Age	-.0001	.045	-.001
Marital status			
Married	.137	1.484	.006
Widow	-1.739	2.463	-.039
Divorced	1.019	2.226	.021
Community size	-.059	.292	-.009
Educational level	-.044	.271	-.008
Income (x 1000)	.079	.038	*.105
Household size	-.015	.484	-.002
Working hours	-.109	.030	***-.198
Church attendance	1.096	.527	*.114
Roman Catholic	-.637	1.183	-.027
Dutch Reformed	-.170	1.452	-.005
Orthodox Calvinist	-1.949	2.038	-.046
Other religion	.588	2.192	.013
Social value orientation	10.104	4.684	*.088
Postmaterialism			
Mixed	.412	.963	.019
Postmaterialist	3.036	1.530	*.089
Constant	-2.409	3.609	
Adjusted R^2			.037
F-Value (df)			**2.303 (18)

Note: *** = p<.001, ** = p<.01, * = p<.05, ~=p<.10

Table 10. Logistic regression analysis of giving to charity (n=547)

Variabele	**B**	**Se**	**Wald**
Male	-.1087	.2213	0.24
Age	-.0115	.0103	1.24
Marital status			***31.93
Married	.7358	.3254	*5.12
Widow	-1.8603	.6328	**8.64
Divorced	-1.2184	.6217	*3.84
Community size	-.0595	.0659	0.82
Level of education	-.2127	.0623	***11.66
Income (x € 1000)	.0339	.0088	***14.76
Household size	-.2455	.1093	*5.04
Working hours	-.0173	.0068	*6.41
Church attendance	.1303	.1222	1.14
Roman Catholic	.5670	.2648	*4.58
Dutch Reformed	-.1888	.3187	0.35
Orthodox Calvinist	.3403	.4471	0.58
Other religion	.6518	.5277	1.53
Social value orientation	1.1139	1.0493	1.13
Political value orientation			0.05
Mixed	.0068	.2357	0.01
Postmaterialist	-.0617	.3457	0.03
Volunteering	.1583	.2102	0.57
Constant	.4156	.8063	0.27
Nagelkerke R^2			.232
Chi^2 (df)			***104.79 (19)

Note: *** = p<.001, ** = p<.01, * = p<.05, ~=p<.10

Table 11. Linear regression analysis of number of charitable causes supported (n=546)

Variabele	**B**	**se**	**Beta**
Male	-.319	.179	~-.078
Age	-.001	.008	-.008
Married	.508	.270	~.115
Widow	-1.027	.448	*-.119
Divorced	-.548	.405	-.059
Community size	-.065	.053	-.049
Educational level	-.057	.049	-.052
Income (x € 1000)	.029	.007	***.202
Household size	-.077	.088	-.046
Working hours	-.012	.005	*-.108
Church attendance	.182	.098	~.098
Roman Catholic	.267	.215	.059
Dutch Reformed	-.249	.264	-.041
Orthodox Calvinist	.486	.370	.060
Other religion	.021	.398	.002
Social value orientation	.910	.853	.041
Mixed	.037	.175	.009
Postmaterialist	.169	.278	.026
Volunteering	.444	.170	**.105
Constant	.672	.655	
Adjusted R^2			.142
F-Value (df)			***6.285 (19)

Note: *** = p<.001, ** = p<.01, * = p<.05, ~=p<.10

Table 12. Linear regression analysis of amount donated (n=546)

Variabele	**B**	**se**	**Beta**
Male	-.018	.019	-.043
Age	.002	.001	*.159
Married	.025	.028	.054
Widow	-.066	.047	-.074
Divorced	-.044	.043	-.046
Community size	-.000	.006	-.003
Educational level	.010	.005	~.086
Income (x € 1000)	.002	.001	**.144
Household size	-.007	.009	-.039
Working hours	.000	.001	.004
Church attendance	.033	.010	**.173
Roman Catholic	-.034	.023	-.072
Dutch Reformed	.015	.028	.023
Orthodox Calvinist	.065	.039	.078
Other religion	-.010	.042	-.011
Social value orientation	.014	.090	.006
Mixed	-.009	.018	-.032
Postmaterialist	.008	.029	.012
Volunteering	.019	.018	.047
Constant	-.151	.069	*
Adjusted R^2			.107
F-Value (df)			***4.822 (19)

Note: *** = p<.001, ** = p<.01, * = p<.05, ~=p<.10

Figure 2. Evaluation of hypotheses

	Multiplier hypothesis		Trade-off hypothesis	
	Strong	Weak	Leisure time	Income
For the odds to give	Volunteers contribute more often to all kinds of charitable causes	Volunteers in a given sector contribute more often to charitable causes in the 'own' sector only	Persons with more leisure time are more likely to volunteer and less likely to donate to charitable causes	Persons with higher incomes are less likely to volunteer and more likely to donate to charitable causes
For the amount given	Volunteers contribute more money to all kinds of charitable causes	Volunteers in a given sector contribute more money to charitable causes in the 'own' sector only	Persons with more leisure time volunteer more hours and donate less money to charitable causes	Persons with higher incomes volunteer less hours and donate more money to charitable causes

Not rejected
Rejected