FORUM

FORMAL AND INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING IN HUNGARY. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES[1]

Éva Perpék[2]

Abstract There are several studies on volunteerism in Hungary but its formal (organizational) and informal (non-organizational) statistical differentiation has still not been in focus yet. Two comprehensive questions of my article are the following: is there a real, "qualitative" difference between Hungarian formal and informal volunteers. If yes, which is the more up-to-date form contributing to community development and local development? My general hypothesis is that the group of organizational and non-organizational volunteers significantly differs from each other, and formal volunteerism is the frame which rather corresponds to current needs. This means that: (1) formal volunteerism is the type which strengthens frequency of activity more effectively; (2) it is preferred by higher social status holders; (3) and it is moved by "modern" motivations. These expectations are tested on databases recorded on voluntary work and donation in 1994 and 2005. The hypotheses are essentially confirmed, the contradictions are discussed in more detail below.

Keywords formal and informal volunteerism, community development, human, cultural and social capital, motivation

2 PhD candidate, Corvinus University of Budapest, Institute of Sociology and Social Policy; e-mail: eva.perpek@uni-corvinus.hu

INTRODUCTION

The paper focuses on formal (organizational) and informal (non-organizational) voluntary work from a comparative aspect. Relevance of the topic comes from the evidence that the year of 2011 has been proclaimed as the European Year of Volunteering by the European Commission and the Council. The timing is not accidental. Ten years have past after the United Nations announced the International Year of Volunteers in 2001[3]. More evidence to highlight the importance of the present research is that in Hungary there is a scarcity of representative statistical analysis documented on formal and informal voluntary work.

EXPLANATIONS OF VOLUNTEERING: PREVIOUS RESEARCH OUTCOMES IN A NUTSHELL

The key explanatory variables of my research on formal and informal voluntarism are human, cultural, social capital; traditional (old or rather altruistic) and new (modern or rather instrumental) motivation. Within this present research, voluntary work is defined as non-paid voluntary activity doing for or in favor of non-family members or social groups, while intending to strengthen a community (Czike - Kuti 2006:13). This description first calls our attention to the fact that voluntary activity – no matter formal or informal – as a way of individual community participation per definitionem, contributes to meso level community development. Secondly, contradicting many definitions emphasizing organizational outlines, this one widens the frames with extra-organizational helping. Moreover, sharing Wilson and Musick's (1997:694) opinion, volunteer work is a productive and collective work that requires human, cultural and social capital at the micro level. The majority of international research studies focus on formal voluntarism, therefore most findings below refer to organizational helping.

---

3 *http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/news/news820_en.htm,*
  http:/www.eyv2011.eu,
  http://europa.eu/volunteering/en/home2

HUMAN CAPITAL

Education is commonly applied to measure human capital. The positive impact of education on voluntary participation has been confirmed in many previous studies (Smith 1994:248). The evidences provided by a study coming from the US National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (Caputo 2009) highlight that the probability of activist and non-activist (mixed) voluntarism increases alongside educational level. Multinominal logistic regression is chosen to examine determinants of civic engagement activities. Wilson and Musick (1997) conducted research based on two-wave (1986 and 1989) data of Americans' Changing Lives panel. They also confirm that education has a positive effect on helping others.

At the same time Smith (2006) revealed a very weak correlation between education and volunteerism in the 2002 and 2004 data of the American General Social Survey. Similarly, results of Van Ingen and Dekker (2011) indicate almost disappearing differences between voluntary participation of lower and higher educated people in the Netherlands.

It is generally accepted that volunteerism is more common among the economically active citizens. This fact is confirmed by the Eurobarometre (2010): based on a frequency table- three-fourth of helpers are employed. Nearly half of them are in the public sector and more than one-third are in business or private sector. Approximately, every fifth volunteer belongs to homemakers or unemployed. A recent study underlines that voluntary work became more widespread among the economically inactive inhabitants (pensioners or homemakers) in the Netherlands (Van Ingen - Dekker 2011) from 1997 to 2005. Similarly, an American longitudinal data analysis (1978-1991) on young women's cohorts underlines that "…*homemakers are more likely to volunteer than are full-time workers, followed by part-time workers."* (Rotolo - Wilson 2007:487). Within the present research, education and economic activity are also used as human capital indicators.

A positive relationship has been found by numerous researchers between income and helping others (Clary - Snyder 1991; Hayghe 1991; Hodgkinson - Weitzman 1992; Pearce 1993; Smith 1994). Poor people are three times less likely to be asked to volunteer than wealthy people (Hodgkinson 1995; Wilson - Musick 1997). Reverse impact was also measured: based on a Canadian study, volunteers earn 7% more than those who have never participated in such activity (Day - Devlin 1998). Smith (2006) found only a weak correlation between income and volunteerism. Education and income as indicators of human capital feature the so called dominant status of an

individual, which empowers stakeholders for volunteer work (Smith 1994; Wilson - Musick 1997). In 2004 a Hungarian questionnaire did not contain any data on personal or family income, thus instead of this, an occupational group was used as the third human capital indicator.

CULTURAL CAPITAL

In "volunteer" studies religiosity is the most frequently mentioned indicator of cultural capital. Taniguchi (2010) found out that religiosity was one of the most significant variables influencing voluntarism in the Japanese General Social Survey (2002). Various dimensions of religiosity are connoted with volunteering (e.g. individual belief, prayer, affiliation, church attendance). The impact of church attendance on volunteering increased by time (1975-2005) in the Netherlands, *"...churchgoers increase their volunteering for religious organizations on average."* (Van Ingen - Dekker 2011:682). Wilson and Musick's (1997) regression and correlation results revealed a significant relationship between church attendance, and both formal and informal voluntarism. According to the research findings of the US National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (Caputo 2009) there is a significant relationship between religious participation and activist, non-activist (mixed), and exclusive voluntarism. Wilson and Musick (1997) indicate that prayer as a private form of religious practice has a negative effect on informal voluntary activity. In some concepts of helping, religious participation represents not cultural rather social capital (e.g. Paik - Navarre-Jackson 2011). Regarding religious values, Jendrisak et al. (2006) observed that kidney and liver segment living donors do not own traditional religious values. Religious belief and theological thoughts seem not to be the best predictors for the quantity of voluntary work (Cnaan et al. 1993). Nonetheless, religious behavior is considered to be a better predictor for volunteering (Wilson - Musick 1997), but there are no data on public religiosity in available Hungarian data sets. Therefore, subjective religiosity is used as a cultural capital indicator within this study.

Ruiter and De Graaf's (2006) comparative research in 53 countries monitored both individual religiosity, national religious context and their interaction on volunteering. By their findings regular churchgoers do voluntary work more frequently. If only devout countries are observed, church attendance is hardly a relevant factor for volunteering, and there is only a little difference between religious and secular people. They reported a spillover effect of religious voluntarism, *"…implying that religious citizens also volunteer more for secular organizations. This spillover effect is stronger for Catholics than*

for Protestants, non-Christians and nonreligious individuals." (Ruiter - De Graaf 2006:191).

Parental patterns as a possible way of incorporated or embodied social capital [Bourdieu 2006 (1983)] may also contribute to volunteering. Fitzsimmons (1986) concludes that parents affect their children's future voluntary activity differently. Whilst the father's involvement has a positive impact, mother's participation has a negative effect on it. The analysis was conducted by multiple regression (N=424 baccalaureate graduates). Outcomes of Caputo (2009) expose that parental religious affiliation, fundamentalism and socialization influence American exclusive voluntarism. Besides, parental voluntarism and socialization have an impact on mixed (activist and non-activist) voluntary activities, and parental devotion affects activist voluntarism. In my research, family tradition is used as one item of the traditional motivation for volunteerism.

Wilson and Musick (1997) apply the variable 'how much the respondent values helping others' to measure one aspect of social capital. Their results delineate that this value-oriented item has a positive effect on both formal and informal voluntary activity. In Hungarian database a similar question is recorded, and included in analysis: it is a moral obligation to help people in need (1993) or poor people (2004).

SOCIAL CAPITAL

Among others, Taniguchi (2010) underlines that social capital variables are stronger predictors of how much work is done than demographic or socioeconomic ones (Japanese General Social Survey 2002). One of the influential variables, having a positive effect on voluntarism is the frequent face-to-face contact with friends; especially people, in contact with foreigners, volunteer more than those who do not exercise such activities. Likewise, Wilson and Musick (1997) also found that informal social interaction has a positive effect on both formal volunteering and informal helping. On the basis of the 'contact frequency' hypothesis (McPherson et al. 1992) people who interact more with friends and acquaintances, are more likely to become volunteers.

The number of children in the household is used as a familial social capital indicator in Coleman's (1998) well-known study on role of social capital in the creation of human capital. Smith (1994) found a positive relationship between the presence of children and volunteering. Wilson and Musick (1997) indicate that the number of children determines the formal type of voluntarism. Rotolo

and Wilson states the following: *"Mothers of school-age children are the most likely to volunteer, followed by childless women and mothers of young children. Mothers of school-age children are even more likely to volunteer if they are homemakers, and mothers of pre-school children are even less likely to volunteer if they work full-time."* (Rotolo -Wilson 2007:191; American database on Young Women's Cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey 1978-1991). The presence of children in a household is a key variable in the analysis of the US National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (Caputo 2009) too: this variable affects the likelihood of all types of voluntary activities: exclusive activism, exclusive voluntarism and mixed motivation voluntarism.

In Paik and Navarre-Jackson's model (2011) social and associational ties, religious involvement, and recruitment contacts represent a diversity of social networks (US Giving and Volunteering Survey 1999). In their estimated probit model, recruitment is a significant factor of voluntarism. Recruitment itself is linked with social contact diversity, the number of organizational ties and religious participation. Concerning single variables: "*Religious involvement is associated with higher probabilities of volunteering conditional on being asked, whereas social tie diversity and the number of associational ties increase volunteering among those not asked.*" (Paik - Navarre-Jackson 2011:476).

Brown and Ferris (2007) select two measures of social capital – individuals' associational networks and trust in others and in their community – when analyzing the US Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey's data (2000). They highlight that social capital explains the philanthropy of individuals very well. In addition, social capital decreases the direct influence of education (human capital) and religiosity (cultural capital) on giving and volunteering. From the measures listed above, the number of children in the household and organizational membership is included in my analysis.

In Hungary there is a scarcity of casual models on voluntary work. Concerning descriptive statistics, average volunteers – no matter formal or informal – completed secondary education, and work as employed manual workers (human capital). They are privately religious, and agree with the principle that 'it is (a) moral obligation to help people in need' (cultural capital). They live in a childless household, and are not affiliated with any social organization (social capital). However, members of organizations help others more than those not belonging to any social institution. (Czakó et al. 1995; Czike, Kuti 2006).

VOLUNTEER MOTIVATION

Main groupings of volunteer motivations include rather altruistic and rather egoistic or instrumental driving forces (Smith 1981; Frisch - Gererd 1981; Gillespie - King 1985), however, primacy of altruism is observed in reality. After creating and testing the Motivation to Volunteer Scale – composed of 28 reasons –, Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) feature that mixed motivations describe better human service agency volunteers than egoistic or altruistic ones (N=258). Besides Motivation to Volunteer Scale, two more meaningful scales have been introduced: Volunteer Functions Inventory (35 statements, 6 factors) (Clary et al. 1992) and Volunteer Motivation Inventory (40 statements, 8 factors) (McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy 2002). The latter scale was improved and tested on large sample data by Esmond and Dunlop (2004), thus motivation dimensions increased to ten. The most important motivation elements of Australian volunteers would be: values, career development, personal growth, self-esteem and social interaction. The improved Volunteer Motivation Inventory was implemented into Hungarian situation by Bartal and Kmetty (2010) (N=2319). According to previous research outcomes (Czakó et al. 1995; Czike - Kuti 2006), the authors conclude that Hungarian volunteerism is altruistic value-oriented. Moreover, organizational recognition, social interaction and environment factors occur to be influential.

In case of Israeli National Service volunteers, primarily parents and friends affect decision making. This fact indicates the importance of strong and weak ties. The three strongest motivations are: altruism, environmental pressure and idealism (Sherer 2004) (N=40). Turkish community volunteers are also moved by altruism; furthermore, by affiliation and personal improvement (Boz - Palaz 2007) (N=175). An American-Canadian comparative representative research (Hwang et al. 2005) differentiates collective and self-oriented causes. "*Findings show that Americans are more likely than Canadians to mention altruistic rather than personal reasons for joining voluntary organizations, and Canadians are slightly more likely than Americans to emphasize personal reasons for their volunteer work, but this difference is not significant after controls." (*Hwang et al. 2005:387). Hustinx et al. (2010) compares 5794 students in six countries. They argue that while volunteering is a personal decision at the individual level, it is partly influenced by macro-social factors too.

From the motivations cited above, altruistic values (the good feeling of helping others), strong and weak ties, social interaction and community are labeled as old or traditional motivation. In addition, career development and personal growth are implemented as new or modern variables in present

research (Czike - Bartal 2005; Czike, Kuti 2006).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS, HYPOTHESES, METHODOLOGY

First, in order to understand the research questions more deeply, data sources should be outlined. Empirical evidence of the study comes from secondary analysis of two Hungarian representative surveys' data conducted in 1994 and 2005. In 1994 nearly 15 thousand adult respondents were interviewed on individual giving and volunteering. The 2005 data collection referred to a Hungarian population above 14 years. This sample contained nearly 5 thousand people. The base period of the questionnaire was the previous year in both cases: 1993 in the first and 2004 in the second wave.

Some researchers argue that formal and informal volunteering is strongly and positively correlated (Smith 1994; Gallagher 1994; Wilson - Musick 1997). The general question to answer within this paper is whether *qualitative* differences – in activity, composition, motivation – can be observed between Hungarian formal and informal volunteers or not. Using the word "qualitative" is reasonable because the proportion of formal and informal volunteers is more balanced in Northern and Western Europe than in Hungary and Central and Eastern European countries in general. For instance, whilst 10% (900 thousand people) of the population above 14 years were registered as a formal volunteer, the proportion of non-organizational volunteers reached 30% (2.6. million people) in Hungary in 2004 (Czike - Kuti 2006:33-34.). This means that a *quantitative* inequity already exists between the two groups. The second comprehensive question would be the following: if such qualitative difference exists, which is the more up-to-date form contributing to community development and local development.

The *first* concrete research question would be that, does the way of volunteerism (formal or informal) have an effect on frequency of activity (1.a). If yes, is there any change by time in this regard (1.b)? I expect that form of helping does affect regularity: formal or organizational volunteers work more frequently than informal ones in both period of time ($H_{1.a}$). Moreover, I assume that the role of organizations strengthens by time ($H_{1.b}$). The dependent variable of this hypothesis is the frequency of helping, independent variable is the formal and informal volunteering dummy. The explanandum is actually measured on an ordinal scale starting with one extraordinary case, and ending with every day basis. Measurement level of this variable originally would not allow using linear regression, but this 7 point scale offers the possibility to "overestimate" it, and handle it as a numeric variable. In order to compensate

this statistically imperfect procedure, I do introduce a dummy variable – where 0 represents 'volunteers rarely', and 1 means 'volunteers frequently' – thus logistic regression is applied as a complementary method. Formal volunteers' stronger activity ($H_{1.a}$) requires positive b_1 coefficient and Exp (b) coefficient above 1 in hypothesis testing either in 1994 or 2004. The increasing role of organizations ($H_{1.b}$) implies higher b_1 and Exp (b) coefficients in 2004.

The *second* research question concerns the respondent's social status and form of volunteering. Namely, which way of voluntary activity is chosen by those with higher social status (2.)? I suppose that high-status people prefer organizational helping (H_2). Verification of this hypothesis would mean that formal volunteers are recruited from more prestigious members of the Hungarian society than the informal ones. The dependent variable of the second hypothesis is the formal and informal volunteering dummy.

Higher social status is conceptualized by human, cultural and social capital, each of them measured with a composite index. These independent variables are inspired by Wilson and Musick (1997). According to the Hungarian questionnaires' features, there are three items indicating human capital, and four-four variables referring to cultural and social capital. The second hypothesis is tested by the statistical method of logistic regression. If the hypothesis is verified, Exp (b) coefficients above 1 should be observed in both years.

The *third* research question is related to the motivation of volunteers: are there any differences in the motivations of formal and informal helpers (3.)? I assume that formal volunteers are stimulated by modern or new motivators ($H_{3.a}$), whereas informal volunteers are moved by traditional impulses ($H_{3.b}$). Similarly to the second hypothesis, explanandum would be the form of volunteering as a dummy variable. Regarding explanatory variables, the good feeling of helping, family tradition, community, acquaintances, and gratitude specifying old (Czike - Bartal 2005:94-95) or traditional (Czike - Kuti 2006) motivations. Goal achievement, useful leisure activity, experience, self-recognition, professional improvement, and new workplace are labeled as new or modern impulses (Czike, Kuti 2006). Motivations are measured on a 5 point Likert scale. In view of the fact that traditional and new motivations are not derived from multivariate statistical analysis, confirmatory factor analysis is used to oversee the relevance of these two types. Then the factors are incorporated into the logistic regression as independent variables to explain informal and formal volunteerism. Only the 2004 database is involved in analysis because it contains eighteen statements related to motivation. The 1993 questionnaire includes only nine such questions, but not all of them have their equivalent in 2004.

If the expectations above are confirmed, we can state that formal volunteering is the more up-to-date form contributing to community development and local development.

MAIN FINDINGS

FIRST HYPOTHESIS ON FREQUENCY OF ACTIVITY AND FORM OF VOLUNTEERING

The first expectation's zero hypothesis (H_0) would be the following: formal or informal way of volunteerism has no effect on the frequency of activity. Observed significance level of t-quotient in both linear and logistic regression is under 5%, so that coincidence as an alternative explanation and H_0, are rejected (*Table 1*). This low significance level attests that relationship between frequency and way of voluntary work is valid to the whole population. The first part of the hypothesis ($H_{1.a}$) is confirmed either in 1993 or 2004: formal volunteers work more regularly than informal ones. At the same time the difference is not so large: in 1993 the estimated value of the dependent variable is by 10%, in 2004 by 4% higher among formal volunteers in linear regression model. The latter outcomes point out that the second part of the first hypothesis ($H_{1.b}$) is rejected: intermediary role of organizations does not increase by time[4]. The reason of this phenomenon could be that along with increasing publicity, prestige of volunteering, and strengthening of civil society in Hungary, people do not need organizations as intermediary tools to volunteer. This possible "explanation" is supported by the fact that in 2004 informal volunteers worked more intensively than eleven years before (b_0=2.74 in 1993, b_0=3.86 in 2004). A more persuasive answer requires further statistical analysis.

---

4 Standard error of the estimate is low enough (1993: 1.625; 2004: 1.232) that means that accuracy of the estimate is satisfactory, and regression linear fits well. Standard error of regression coefficients is even smaller (1993: 0.035 and 0.054; 2004: 0.033 and 0.063). Adjusted coefficient of determination (adjusted R^2) is unfortunately low in both cases (1993: 0.7%, 2004: 0.2%) such as explanatory force of independent variable is quite modest. This shows that informal or formal way of volunteerism by itself is not able to predict frequency of activity. In further analysis other explanatory variables need to be involved.

Table 1 H_1: *Results of linear and logistic regression on frequency and way of voluntary work in volunteer subsample in 1993 and 2004*

		Frequency of voluntary work	
		Linear regression 0-7	Logistic regression 0-1 Exp (B)
1993 N=3719	b_0 Informal	2.74***	
	b_1 Formal	0.28***	1.28**
2004 N=1646	b_0 Informal	3.86***	
	b_1 Formal	0.14*	1.36**

Source: Database on donation and voluntary work 1994 (KSH) and 2005 (National Volunteer Centre, Non-profit Research Group Association), own calculation.
p* < 0.05 < p** < 0.01 p*** < 0.001.

Regarding frequency and form of volunteerism, the logistic regression model provides similar results: the likelihood of regular voluntary work is a bit bigger among formal volunteers than among informal ones either in 1993 or 2004. Thus, the first part of the first hypothesis ($H_{1.a}$) is verified by logistic regression model too. Since coefficients are not far from 1, meaning no effect, in this case, also, only a weak probability is observed. From another aspect, logistic regression coefficients contradict linear regression model results: the difference between informal and formal volunteers' work intensity slightly strengthens by time. Transferring this into hypothesis testing, $H_{1.a}$ hypothesis is verified. Due to contradictory findings, $H_{1.a}$ cannot be convincingly confirmed.

SECOND HYPOTHESIS ON FORM OF VOLUNTEERING AND HUMAN, CULTURAL, SOCIAL CAPITAL

In the second hypothesis, capital indices as independent variables are simple sums of item scores. The human capital index (HCI, 0-9) is represented by recoded education (0-2), economic activity (0-3) and occupation (0-4). The lowest score (0) goes to those who own basic educational background, are dependants (students, homemakers) and – logically – do not work (*Table 2*). This group represents the reference category in the analysis. Respondents completing higher education, being active workers and independents, get the highest score (9). The index elements are correlated with each other (correlation coefficients range between 0.27-0.69).

Table 2 *H_2: composition and distribution of human capital index in volunteer subsample, in 1993 and 2004*

Human capital index	Recoded response categories	Coding, score	1993 % N=3799	2004 % N=1646
HC$_1$ Education	Low: primary school or less	0	29.4	24.4
	Medium: vocational or secondary school	1	51.2	58.4
	High: college, university	2	19.4	17.3
HC$_2$ Economic activity	Dependant: student, homemaker	0	2.7	13.6
	Unemployed	1	6.9	6.7
	Pensioner, person on child-care leave	2	35.3	31.5
	Employed	3	55.1	48.2
HC$_3$ Occupation	Does not work	0	44.4	51.8
	Employed manual worker	1	22.3	20.8
	Employed non-manual worker, no diploma	2	12.0	11.1
	Employed non-manual worker with diploma	3	15.7	8.9
	Runs his/her own business	4	5.6	7.4

Source: Database on donation and voluntary work 1994 (KSH) and 2005 (National Volunteer Centre, Non-profit Research Group Association), own calculation.
Human capital index is derived from a simple sum of items above: HCI=HC$_1$+HC$_2$+HC$_3$.

Cultural capital index (CCI, 0-7) is composed of cultural events as information sources about social organizations (cultural information source, 0-1), sharing of the opinion that 'it is (a) moral obligation to help people in need' (0-3), subjective religiosity (0-2), and religious events as information sources about social organizations (religious information channel, 0-1) (*Table 3*). Reference group of cultural capital is represented by those rejecting cultural and religious events as information channel, not agreeing with the principle of helping the poor as moral obligation, and not being religious. Respondents sharing the opposite opinions, belong to the fraction having 7 points. Not surprisingly, the highest correlation (0.4) between subjective religiosity and religious event as an information source is measured.

Table 3 H_2: *Composition and distribution of cultural capital index in volunteer subsample, in 1993 and 2004*

Cultural capital index	Recoded response categories	Coding, score	1993 % N=3799	2004 % N=1646
CC_1 Cultural information source	No	0	82.3	85.3
	Yes	1	17.7	14.7
CC_2 It is a moral obligation to help people in need.	Does not agree (1-3)	0	2.1	18.8
	Partly agrees, partly disagrees (4-6)	1	30.6	25.4
	Rather agrees (7-9)	2	41.7	26.4
	Absolutely agrees (10)	3	25.6	29.3
CC_3 Subjective religiosity	Non-religious	0	27.6	28.4
	Privately religious	1	39.9	49.3
	Publicly religious	2	32.6	22.3
CC_4 Religious information channel	No	0	72.6	77.8
	Yes	1	27.4	22.2

Source: Database on donation and voluntary work 1994 (KSH) and 2005 (National Volunteer Centre, Non-profit Research Group Association), own calculation.
Cultural capital index is derived from a simple sum of items above: $CCI=CC_1+CC_2+CC_3+CC_4$.

Social capital index (SCI 0-6) contains the number of children in the household (0-2), organizational membership (0-1), interpersonal relations as information sources about social organizations (0-1), and acquaintances as motivators to volunteer (0-2). All who have no children, do not affiliate to any organization, are not informed by their personal relations, and are not motivated by acquaintances, get 0. The highest score goes to respondents having two or more children, belonging to an organization, motivated by acquaintances, and using personal connections to get informed. Social capital index constituents are the most independent ones, no substantial correlation is observed between them.

Table 4 H_2: *Composition and distribution of social capital index in volunteer subsample in 1993 and 2004*

Social capital index	Recoded response categories	Coding, score	1993 % N=3799	2004 % N=1646
SC$_1$ Number of children in the household	0	0	47.8	45.7
	1	1	22.9	25.3
	2 or more	2	29.3	29.0
SC$_2$ Organizational membership	No	0	62.2	71.7
	Yes	1	37.8	28.3
SC$_3$ Interpersonal relations as information sources	No	0	57.3	52.3
	Yes	1	42.7	47.7
SC$_4$ Acquaintances as motivators to volunteer	Does not agree (1-2)	0	63.4	47.1
	Partly agrees, partly disagrees (3)	1	12.2	20.9
	Agrees (4-5)	2	24.5	31.9

Source: Database on donation and voluntary work 1994 (KSH) and 2005 (National Volunteer Centre, Non-profit Research Group Association), own calculation.
Social capital index is derived from a simple sum of items above: $SCI = SC_1 + SC_2 + SC_3 + SC_4$.

In order to examine separate effects of index elements – e.g. education, occupation, religiosity or number of children – on formal or informal volunteering, all of them are included in the analysis. Index dummies seemed to be rational to introduce because increasing scores in one item are sometimes accompanied by rising scores in one or more items. This is particularly true in the case of human capital: higher level of education means a probably higher level in economic activity and/or occupation group. In index dummies, 0 stands for small amount of capital, whilst 1 replaces big amount of capital. Dummy variable recoding is determined by mean and standard deviation of every single capital index. Values ranging from 0 to 4 in case of human capital, and scores between 0-2 in case of cultural and social capital are defined as low level of capital. Respondents possessing more scores belong to high level capital holders.

Zero hypothesis (H_0) of the analysis would mean that human, cultural and social capital do not affect the probability of formal or informal volunteering. If capital indices are taken into account, H_0 is rejected: these three forms of capital have a significant positive effect on the way of volunteerism (*Table 5*). We can conclude that the more capital a respondent has, the higher probability of formal volunteerism exists either in 1993 or 2004. Therefore, the second hypothesis is verified in case of capital indices. The highest impact belongs to the social capital index dummy in 2004: a big amount of social capital (SC

dummy=1) represents 2.5 times higher probability of formal volunteerism. In 1993 social capital's effect was weaker, cultural capital was stronger than eleven years later. In 1993 odds of becoming

Table 5 H_2: *Results of logistic regression on form of volunteering and capital in volunteer subsample in 1993 and 2004*

	Informal and formal volunteering 0-1 Logistic regression, Exp(B)	
	1993 N=3799	2004, N=1379
Human capital (HC) index 0-9	1.04**	1.08***
Human capital index 0-1	1.20**	1.23*
HC$_1$ Education 0-2	(1.08$^{0.11}$)	1.42***
HC$_2$ Economic activity 0-3	(1.09$^{0.07}$)	1.15***
HC$_3$ Occupation 0-4	1.08**	1.12**
HC$_1$ + HC$_2$ + HC$_3$ at max. 5% sign. level	1.08	3.69
Cultural capital (CC) index 0-7	1.38***	1.31***
Cultural capital index 0-1	2.14***	1.80***
CC$_1$ Cultural information source 0-1	2.37***	5.45***
CC$_2$ Moral obligation to help people in need 0-3	(1.07$^{0.12}$)	(1.08$^{0.21}$)
CC$_3$ Subjective religiosity 0-2	1.63***	1.60***
CC$_4$ Church as information channel 0-1	2.78***	4.06***
CC$_1$ + CC$_2$ + CC$_3$ + CC$_4$ at max. 5% sign. level	6.78	10.03
Social capital (SC) index 0-6	1.29***	1.45***
Social capital index 0-1	1.93***	2.48***
SC$_1$ Number of children in the household 0-2	1.19***	1.19**
SC$_2$ Organizational membership 0-1	1.87***	3.62***
SC$_3$ Interpersonal relations as information sources 0-2	1.22***	1.42***
SC$_4$ Acquaintances as motivators to volunteer 0-1	1.47***	1.78***
SC$_1$ + SC$_2$ + SC$_3$ + SC$_4$	5.75	8.01

Source: Database on donation and voluntary work 1994 (KSH) and 2005 (National Volunteer Centre, Non-profit Research Group Association), own calculation.
p* < 0,05, p** < 0,01, p*** < 0,001. Values in brackets represent insignificant coefficients. Their upper indices show the significance level of the given variable.

a formal volunteer is more than two times larger among those who own „much" (CC dummy=1) cultural capital. The role of personal networks rises by time, whereas cultural capital slightly loses its importance. Human capital has only a weak positive effect on the form of voluntary work, and no considerable change is observed between the two periods of time.

Shifting to the index components, no significant effect can be found in case of education and economic activity (human capital) in 1993, and in case of obligation of helping poor people (cultural capital) in 1993 and 2004. Education's insignificant impact in 1993 supports Smith (2006) findings on 2002 and 2004 data of the American General Social Survey, and partly confirms Van Ingen and Dekker's conclusions (2011)[5]. Insignificant outcomes on economic activity in 1993 contradict previous expectations (Van Ingen - Dekker 2011; Rotolo - Wilson 2007). As we can see, human capital components delineate weak or insignificant probabilities. From this fact we can understand human capital index's low effect. A potential explanation of human capital's low effect could be that comparing the elements of the three different types of capital, human capital indicators are the most unchangeable, objective or tough ones.

The sum of significant coefficients[6] (6.78) underlines that cultural capital still has the strongest effect in 1993. From separate index constituents, religious information source (Exp (B) =2.78) is the most influential item, not only within cultural capital but among other types of capital too. Although this item does not describe religious practice very well, no better indicator is found in the questionnaires. Thus, to some degree we can state that religious behavior's anticipated positive effect is affirmed (Musick 1997; Caputo 2009; Paik - Navarre-Jackson 2011).

The religious information channel variable is followed by cultural information sources about social organizations (Exp (B) =2.37). The effect of subjective religiosity is the weakest one among significant cultural capital variables in 1993 and 2004. Based on Cnaan et al. (1993) and Wilson and Musick's (1997) findings, we could not suppose a high impact of religious belief. The altruistic value-oriented variable does not show a significant effect either in 1993 or 2004. This result contradicts Wilson and Musick's (1997) outcomes who indicate a positive effect of valuing help on both formal and informal voluntary activity.

After religious and cultural events the third important variable in 1993 was the membership in an organization (Exp (B) =1.87) as the social capital item. Organizational affiliation was assumed to be a reasonable item strengthening volunteering (Czakó et al. 1995; Czike - Kuti 2006). These three leading

---

5 Present and previous research outcomes only partly can be compared in the sense that numerous results featured before concern voluntary activity itself, not formal or informal type of it. Thus, comparison of research findings should be handled with this limitation.

6 Sum of Exp(B) coefficients is not really correct statistically; it is used only to illustrate weight of indices, summing up its elements.

factors' weight is even larger eleven years later. Contradicting capital index outcomes, not social, but cultural capital's impact is the highest in 2004 (sum of significant coefficients=10.03). Primacy of cultural capital is probably due to two pulling items, namely cultural (Exp (B) =5.45) and religious (Exp (B) =4.06) information sources. Another dominant variable, strengthening social capital would be organizational membership (Exp (B) =3.62) in 2004. In comparison with other social capital components, in this variable considerable growth is measured by time. This fact is particularly noticeable because organizational membership has been lower among volunteers than eleven years before (*Table 4*).

All in all, since human, cultural and social capital are defined by the capital indices and they have a significant positive effect on the probability of formal volunteering, the second hypothesis is confirmed. If capital components are taken into consideration, four insignificant coefficients are measured.

THIRD HYPOTHESIS ON FORM OF VOLUNTEERING AND MOTIVATIONS

In the third hypothesis, confidence of the Likert-scale is measured with Cronbach alpha. Its result above 0.8 suggests strong confidence in the scale. Originally all eleven items – supposed to be traditional and new – were included in the confirmatory factor analysis. Four variables had to be expelled because they belonged to both factors or had low extracted communalities. Finally seven variables remained in the factor structure satisfying all criteria.

According to expectations (Czike - Bartal 2005; Czike - Kuti 2006), factor analysis[7] indicates that the importance of self-recognition, experience, professional challenges, community and personal connections, and useful leisure activity are labeled as new or modern impulses. Community and personal connections originally were expected to belong to traditional motivation. I consider that this new classification is also acceptable because

---

7 Extraction method of the analysis is maximum likelihood; rotation method is Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (Kaiser 1958). Total variance explained exceeds 49%. Results of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO=0,823) and Bartlett-test (Sign=0,000) point out that there is a latent structure behind the set of variables and the items are not independent. Unfortunately, goodness-of-fit test's chi-square is quite high and its significance level does not move from 0. This means that factors do not replace the original variables in an adequate way. Two possibilities to overcome the problem: increasing the number of factors; running explorative factor analysis on eighteen traditional, modern and neutral motivation items. Within this short paper there is no opportunity to continue the analysis.

Table 6 H_3: *results of linear regression on form of volunteering and motivation in volunteer subsample in 2004*

	Logistic regression, Exp(B)	Significance
Modern motivation factor	Formal voluntary work	
	2.69	0.000
Traditional motivation factor	Informal voluntary work	
	1.01	0.923

Source: Database on donation and voluntary work 2005 (National Volunteer Centre, Non-profit Research Group Association), own calculation.

making friends or joining a community, and "using" them as personal resources, plays a crucial role, not only in a traditional but in a modern person's life too. All other new motivations are rather instrumental and related to gaining knowledge, experience and personal improvement. Standard deviation of this factor equals 0.91 which predicts satisfactory fit of the model. Skewness is 0.47 which means a relatively balanced distribution. Only two items belong to traditional motivation: the altruistic impulse, such as the good feeling of helping others, and family tradition. This altruistic motive is the most popular one among all volunteer respondents. Except for these, joining a community, getting acquaintances, and gratitude were supposed to belong to the traditional group. Goodness of fit in this factor is worse (0.78) than what we saw in the case of new motivation. This outcome is responsible for a weak fit of the entire model as well. The traditional factor is quite skewed (-1.59), the negative sign means that majority of respondents agree with the questions representing traditional items. As *Table 6* illustrates the first part of the third hypothesis ($H_{3.a}$) is confirmed: the likelihood of organizational volunteering is significantly and 2.7 times higher among new motivation holders. No significant relationship is found between traditional motivation and non-organizational volunteering: the second part of the third hypothesis ($H_{3.b}$) is refused. Not only the effect of independent variable is insignificant, but the entire informal model too. However, the good feeling of helping others (Czakó et al. 1995; Czike - Kuti 2006; Sherer 2004; Boz -Palaz 2007) and parental pattern (Fitzsimmons 1986, Caputo 2009 on father's volunteering) seem to be influential variables on volunteering they do not affect the probability of non-organizational helping together.

CONCLUSION

The main findings of this research are explained below. In the first hypothesis, way of volunteerism has a significantly positive effect on the frequency of work in both linear and logistic regression models. So the regularity part of the first expectation is verified: formal volunteers work more often than informal ones. Regarding the expanding role of organizations, results are ambiguous, as no convincing evidence is produced to accept hypothesis verification.

According to the results of the logistic regression in the second hypothesis, odds of formal volunteering as the dependent variable significantly increases alongside with human, cultural and social capital index scores. Consequently, the second hypothesis is confirmed. It is the cultural capital which has the strongest positive effect on the probability of formal volunteering. Outcomes of logistic regression in the third hypothesis point out that according to expectations, the likelihood of organizational volunteering is significantly higher among those respondents who vote for new motivations. Regarding informal helping and old motivations, there is no significant relationship between these two. This underlines that the first part of the third hypothesis is confirmed whilst the second one is rejected.

Summing up the findings, data analysis has confirmed that groups of formal and informal volunteers are significantly different in at least three fields, such as frequency of activity, prestige and motivations of participants. The main consequence being that within this present research framework, organizational volunteerism is a more modern and effective tool of community participation and local development for three reasons. First, it fosters better regularity of the activity. Second, organizations as intermediary tools to volunteer are chosen exactly by those with higher social status. Third, formal volunteers are moved by new or instrumental motivations which could activate masses of people not only in 2004 but presently as well.

REFERENCES

Bartal A. M., Kmetty Z. (2010): A magyar önkéntesek motivációinak vizsgálata és a magyar önkéntesmotivációs kérdőív (MÖMK) sztenderdizálásának eredményei. Kutatási jelentés. Budapest. *http://volunteermotivation.hu/downloads/onkmot.pdf.* Downloaded: 30 April 2009.

Borgonovei, F. (2008): Divided We Stand, United We Fall: Religious Pluralism, Giving, and Volunteering. *American Sociological Review 1,* 73: 105-128

Bourdieu, P. (2006) [1983]: Gazdasági tőke, kulturális tőke, társadalmi tőke. In:

Lengyel Gy., Szántó Z. (2006.) (eds): Gazdaságszociológia. Szöveggyűjtemény. Aula Kiadó, Budapest.

Boz, I., Palaz, S. (2007): Factors Influencing the Motivation of Turkey's Community Volunteers *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36:643-661.

Brown, E., Ferris, J. M. (2007): Social Capital and Philanthropy: An Analysis of the Impact of Social Capital on Individual Giving and Volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36:85-99.

Caputo, R. K. (2009): Religious Capital and Intergenerational Transmission of Volunteering as Correlates of Civic Engagement. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38:983-1002.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M. (1991): A Functional Analysis of Altruism and Prosocial Behavior: The Case of Volunteerism. In: Clark, M. (ed.): Prosocial Behavior. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Pp. 119–148.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. (1992): Volunteers' Motivations: a Functional Strategy for the Recruitment, Placement, and Retention of Volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 2:333-350.

Cnaan, R. A., Goldberg-Glen, R. S. (1991): Measuring Motivations to Volunteer in Human Services. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27:269-284.

Cnaan, R., Kasternakis, A., Wineberg, R. (1993): Religious People, Religious Congregations, and Vounteerism in Human Services: Is There a Link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 22:33–51.

Coleman, J.S. (1988): Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94:95-120.

Czakó Á., Harsányi L., Kuti É., Vajda Á. (1995): *Lakossági adományok és önkéntes munka*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Nonprofit Kutatócsoport. Budapest.

Czike K., Bartal A. M. (2005): Önkéntesek és nonprofit szervezetek – az önkéntes tevékenységet végzők motivációi és szervezeti típusok az önkéntesek foglalkoztatásában. Civitalis Egyesület, Budapest.

Czike K., Kuti É. (2006): Önkéntesség, jótékonyság, társadalmi integráció. Nonprofit Kutatócsoport és Önkéntes Központ Alapítvány, Budapest. *http://www. nonprofitkutatas.hu/letoltendo/NP_14_1.pdf*

Dailey, R. C. (1986): Understanding Organizational Commitment for Volunteers: Empirical and Managerial Implications. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 15:19-31.

Day, K. M., Devlin, R. A. (1998): The Payoff to Work without Pay: Volunteer Work as an Investment in Human Capital. *Canadian Journal of Economics* 31:1179–1191.

Eurobarometre 73 (2010): L'opinion publique dans l'Union Europeenne. Rapport. Volume 2. TNS Opinion & Social. Bruxelles.

Fitzsimmons, V. R. (1986): Socialization and Volunteer Work: The Role of Parents and College Volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 15:57-66.

Frisch, M. B., Gerrard, M. (1981): Natural Helping Systems: Red Cross Volunteers. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 9:567-579.

Gallagher, S. (1994): Doing Their Share: Comparing Patterns of Help Given by Older and Younger Adults. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56:567–78.

Gillespie, D. F., King, A. E. O. (1985): Demographic Understanding of Volunteerism. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 12:798-816.

Hayghe, H. (1991): Volunteers in the U.S.: Who Donates the Time? *Monthly Labor Review* 114:16–24.

Hodgkinson, V. (1995): Key Factors Influencing Caring, Involvement, and Community. Pp. 21–50. In: Schervish, P., Hodgkinson, V., Gates, M. and Associates (eds): Care and Community in Modern Society. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Hodgkinson, V., Weitzman. M. (1992): Giving and Volunteering in the United States. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hustinx, L., Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Brudney, J. L., Pessi, A. B., Yamauchi, N. (2010): Social and Cultural Origins of Motivations to Volunteer: A Comparison of University Students in Six Countries. *International Sociology* 25:349-382.

Hwang, M., Grabb, E., Curtis, J. (2005): Why Get Involved? Reasons for Voluntary-Association Activity Among Americans and Canadians. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 34:387-403.

Jendrisak, M.D., Hong, B., Shenoy, S., Lowell, J., Desai, N., Chapman, W., Vijayan, A. Wetzel, R.D., Smith, M., Wagner, J., Brennan, S., Brockmeier, D., Kappel, D. (2006): Altruistic Living Donors: Evaluation for Nondirected Kidney or Liver Donation. *American Journal of Transplantation* 6:115–120.

McEwin, M., Jacobsen-D'Arcy, L. (1992): Developing a Scale to Understand and Assess the Underlying Motivational Drives of Volunteers in Western Australia: Final report. Perth: Lotterywest & CLAN WA Inc.

McPherson, J. M., Popielarz, P., Drobnic, S. (1992): Social Networks and Organizational Dynamics. *American Sociological Review* 57:153–70.

Paik, A., Navarre-Jackson, L. (2011): Networks, Recruitment, and Volunteering: Are Social Capital Effects Conditional on Recruitment? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40:476-496.

Pearce, J. (1993): Volunteers: the Organizational Behavior of Unpaid Workers. New York. Routledge.

Rotolo, T., Wilson, J. (2007): The Effects of Children and Employment Status on the Volunteer Work of American Women. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 36:487-503.*

Ruiter, S., De Graaf, N. D. (2006): National Context, Religiosity, and Volunteering: Results from 53 Countries. *American Sociological Review* 71:191-210.

Sherer, M. (2004): National Service in Israel: Motivations, Volunteer Characteristics, and Levels of Content. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33:94-108.

Smith, D. H. (1981). Altruism, Volunteers, and Volunteerism. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 10:21-36.

Smith, D. H. (1994): Determinants of Voluntary Association Participation and Volunteering: A Literature Review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 23:243–63.

Smith, T. W. (2006): Altruism and Empathy in America: Trends and Correlates. National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

Sundeen, R. A. (1992): Differences in Personal Goals and Attitudes among Volunteers.

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 21:271-291.

Taniguchi, H. (2010): Who Are Volunteers in Japan? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39:161-179.

Van Ingen, E., Dekker, P. (2011): Changes in the Determinants of Volunteering: Participation and Time Investment Between 1975 and 2005 in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40:682-702.

Wilson, J., Musick, M. A. (1997): Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work. *American Sociological Review* 62:694–713.

Internet sources:

2011 be the European Year of Volunteering: *http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/news/ news820_en.htm.*

Website of the European Year of Volunteering: *http://www.eyv2011.eu*

Website of the International Year of Volunteers: *http://europa.eu/volunteering/en/ home2*