WORK IN THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR: FORMS, PATTERNS AND METHODOLOGIES

Helmut K. Anheier
Eva Hollerweger
Christoph Badelt
Jeremy Kendall

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE • GENEVA

Cataloguing-in-publication data is available on request from INFORM, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, email INFORM@ilo.org

Anheier, H.K, Hollerwerger, E., Badelt, C. and Kendall, J.
Work in the non-profit sector: Forms, patterns and methodologies
Geneva, International Labour Office, 2003

Employment, unpaid work, voluntary service, non-profit organization, voluntary organization, developed country, developing country. 13.01.3

ISBN: 92–2–114272–8

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH–1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address. Further information is available on the ILO website: www.ilo.org/INFORM

Printed by the International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Not all work deserves to be called "labour", and much of the best forms of work go unrecorded and unrewarded in terms of the income that would be attached to them if they were "labour". It was a peculiar aspect of the 20th century that much of the most useful work done by millions of people all over the world were systematically and deliberately ignored in official social statistics and in social protection and regulation policy.

This must not continue in the 21st century. Work such as that involved in the many forms of caring for others, be they family members or neighbours or others, should be properly recognized and protected. Within the ILO's Socio-Economic Security Programme, *care work* is being assessed in these terms (see, for instance Daly, 2002). Those providing care, those receiving care and the intermediaries all deserve basic security in their work and social relationships.

The same should be the case for all those who do *voluntary work*, whether individually or in some not-for-profit venture. Much of this work is part of the glue of society, essential, very useful, part "gift" to communities or to wider social interests. Yet it is mostly invisible in official statistics and in social and economic policy.

The ILO emerged into the 21st century committed to the promotion of *decent work*, and in the main there is no more decent work than that which is provided voluntarily or for non-commercial reasons. Those who do it deserve to be protected against all the insecurities that beset other forms of work and labour, and in particular they should be enabled to have collective and individual Voice to protect and enhance their rights. Yet paradoxically those who do voluntary work of various kinds are often among the most vulnerable to several forms of exploitation and oppression, precisely because they are doing it out of personal or group commitment. Someone doing voluntary work trying to assist the hungry or the sick to live better is prone to "self-exploitation", giving more time and effort than they can safely provide.

Not all voluntary work is like that, which is one reason for being cautious about policy recommendations. One of the virtues of the project underlying this book is the recognition that we need to conceptualise voluntary work very carefully to take account of the several types of work involved and the several types of social relationship that underlie them.

The book has surely fulfilled a valuable function, that of bringing together a vast body of anecdotal and more systematic data in an attempt to give a global picture of the extent of voluntary work, the various forms it takes and the changing patterns of such work. Helmut Anheier and his co-authors have been working on these issues for many years and are well qualified to do this task, and we very much hope that readers will appreciate their achievements.

Guy Standing
Director

BACKGROUND 1

Non-profit organizations account for a significant proportion of paid employment in some industries, particularly human or welfare service fields, and utilize the majority of volunteer labour (Salamon et al., 1999; Ruhm and Borkoski, 2000). Although people volunteer for other organizations such as government agencies and even businesses, the great majority of formal voluntary work takes place in non-profit organizations. Of course, this does not cover what is referred to as "informal" volunteering and helping behaviour in families, among friends and within local communities.

Non-profit organizations are variously referred to as voluntary associations, charities, or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) [1]. The United Nations System of National Accounts recognizes these organizations as non-profit institutions, defined as "entities created for the purpose of producing goods and services whose status does not permit them to be a source of income, profit, or other financial gain for the units that establish, control or finance them" (United Nations, 1993, pp. 4–54).

Economists have identified several supply and demand conditions that favour the establishment of non-profit organizations relative to that of public agencies and for-profit firms (see Rose-Ackerman, 1996, for overview). Demand heterogeneity for public and quasi-public goods, combined with scarcity of public funds, lead to the creation of non-profit rather than government organization as service providers, whereas the presence of significant information asymmetries between supply and demand to the potential detriment of consumers discourages for-profit operations, and offer competitive advantages to non-profit organizations. For example, low levels of government expenditure on primary school education would lead to the establishment of private rather than public schools, and the difficulty of parents to monitor the actual relationship between the quality of education and expenditure levels would favour non-profit over for-profit schools.

However, supply and demand conditions change over time, allowing the establishment of other organizational forms (Anheier and Ben Ner, 1997). As a result, non-profit organizations often co-exist with governmental (or public) agencies and for-profit firms in the same field or industry. For example, non-profit or charitable hospitals operate alongside hospitals run by local

[1] Non-profit, voluntary and third sector are used interchangeably in this report.

municipalities or some other government entity, and for-profit hospitals. Likewise, kindergartens, schools, theatres, recreation facilities or research institutions can take different organizational forms. By implication, paid and unpaid work opportunities in non-profit organizations vary as well.

In recent years, the non-profit sector has experienced a significant economic expansion, with rates of employment generation well above that of the economy as a whole (Salamon et al., 1999). Growth in full-time equivalent paid employment averaged 24 per cent between 1990 and 1995 in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, France, Israel, and Japan. As we will show in more detail below, in OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) economies, the non-profit sector typically accounts for nearly 7 per cent of total full-time equivalent employment; with figures for transition economies (2.2 per cent) and developing countries (1.1 per cent for Latin America) are substantially lower (Salamon et al., 1999).

Anheier and Ben Ner (1997) attribute much of the expansion of the non-profit sector to increased demand for human services, heath care and education, i.e., fields with inherent information asymmetries, strained public finances in most OECD countries, and an ideological preference for privatization and "small government". At the same time, the non-profit sector should not be regarded as a panacea for reducing unemployment levels and for solving major social policy problems in both developed and developing countries. While the sector makes many important contributions, as Perotin argues (2001), its relatively small size is disproportionate to the scale of unemployment and social security problems most OECD and transition countries face.

The above employment figures and growth rates estimated by Salamon et al. (1999) do neither include unpaid and minimally paid work, nor any form of volunteering generally. Estimates of volunteer input based on population surveys suggest that the inclusion of volunteer time in terms of full-time equivalent jobs would increase total employment in the non-profit sector to about 10 per cent in OECD countries, 3 per cent in developing countries, and about 2 per cent in Central and Eastern Europe (Salamon et al., 1999). At the same time, population surveys suggest that volunteering has not expanded to the same degree as paid employment in non-profit organizations. To the contrary, volunteering levels have been fairly stable over the last few years, even though it has undergone profound changes in terms its social characteristics, motivations and political importance (see below).

The methodology, data coverage and data quality for volunteering is much less developed than that for the measurement of paid work in non-profit organizations. In this context, it becomes necessary to explore methodological aspects and examine available information that allows a comparative point of view to see how statistical coverage of volunteering could be improved in the future. Ultimately, the goal is to make it possible to analyse, contrast and compare work within the non-profit sector with work in other areas, showing

differences with and similarities to the public and private sectors, instead of focusing on non-profit institutions in isolation (Almond and Kendall, 2000a, pp. 205–210, for a review of the development of the body of such comparative evidence as already exists in Europe and the United States, and how it can provide "added value" compared to sectoral data taken out of such a comparative context).

While in the past, research on volunteer activity has focused primarily on delivery of service and economic aspects of unpaid work, recent work emphasis the wider social context of voluntary activity. This new emphasis owes much of its prominence to the notion of social capital, and fears that the social cohesion of modern societies is decreasing, leading to greater social exclusion and isolation in particular among population groups already (or at least potentially) marginalized (Putnam, 2000). A recent report, Household Satellite Account — Volunteering, by the Office of National Statistics (2002) in the United Kingdom points out that despite significant differences in definitions, a consensus seems to emerge among scholars in the field that relates the concept of social capital to social networks and civic norms. The key indicators of social capital include membership in formal and informal groups, trust, social participation and civic engagement, including most prominently, volunteering. The definition and indicators of social capital directly point to the role of the voluntary and community sectors, and the way in which social capital generated through membership, participation and volunteering. Specifically, volunteering is viewed as a way to generate social capital by:

- enhancing the social status and life chances of members, directly or indirectly (including the relationship with economic and cultural capital);
- bonding, bridging and linking members and the community at large, i.e., in its aggregate effects;
- creating positive spill-over effects into the local community, in particular the local economy; and
- being sensitive to policy interventions, either explicitly or implicitly.

Thus, a better understanding of volunteering is not only important for labour market research and the economics of service delivery; but it also has significant implications on the social fabric of society.

FORMS OF WORK IN THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR 2

Introduction

The non-profit sector includes numerous different forms of paid and unpaid and typical and atypical work. These forms depend heavily on factors including not only the type of economy (developed, transition, developing), industry or field (health and social services, culture, education, political advocacy, international humanitarian assistance), and geographical situation (urban, suburban, rural), but also on the size and the age of the non-profit organization in question. For example, non-profit organizations may rely exclusively on volunteer work at the beginning of their organizational life cycle, and begin to incorporate paid staff positions as the organization grows. Typically, non-profit organizations have paid and unpaid staff in both service delivery functions (e.g., counselling, befriending, giving care, fund-raising, advising) and governance (board membership, trustees).

While there exist a variety of mixed forms of work in the non-profit sector, the differentiation between paid and unpaid work is one of the most crucial distinctions in the structure and employment profile of non-profit organizations. At the same time, the distinction is less clear-cut than it first appears. For one, frequently volunteers are compensated for expenses that help offset some opportunity costs, and in some countries, trustees and board members receive honoraria or similar payments in cash or in kind in recognition of their services rendered. Indeed, as we see below, the "pecuniary" aspects of volunteering are receiving more attention by representatives of voluntary organizations to in their bid to increase the number of volunteers.

Conversely, any work performed below the market wage in a given labour market would involve some "voluntary", i.e. non-remunerated, elements regardless of its classification as paid or unpaid labour. Specifically, from an economic perspective, the theoretical reference point is the equilibrium wage rate. Thus, volunteering and mixed forms of paid and unpaid work are basically work supplied at wages lower than the equilibrium wage rate. In most cases, and primarily for practical reasons, the existence of a labour contract between employer and employee serves as a reference point to determine the form of work, since the equilibrium wage rate is often difficult to determine, particularly in the non-profit and public sectors.

There is, however, one additional difference involved. Whereas paid work is typically settled in a labour contract (in terms of wage rate, working time and other conditions such as fringe benefits), unpaid work is often not covered by a contract. Thus, volunteering is not only work either unpaid or paid below the equilibrium wage rate, it is also frequently informal work in the sense that it is not governed by a contract between "employer" and "employee".

Mixed forms of paid and unpaid work occur in many forms and with increasing flexibility and frequency as labour markets in developed, developing and transition economies seem to become more creative (and less restricted by labour laws and union influence) in finding new combinations between the two types of work. Hence the demarcation line between paid and unpaid is less clear-cut today than it was two or three decades ago. In the following pages, paid and unpaid work will be discussed separately although too strict a division can no longer be upheld due to the increasing importance of grey areas between "pure" paid work and "pure" volunteering.

Since volunteering is predominately in and for non-profit organizations, the issue of a blurring between paid and unpaid work is most relevant in the non-profit sector. Since the non-profit sector is in most countries typically the least unionized part of the labour market, volunteering takes place in a work environment in which organized labour is less present than in other parts of the economy. If unions come into play, they are generally related to, or extensions of, public sector unions, and dominated by the concerns of career civil servants. Therefore, even in the developed market economies, both paid and unpaid work in the non-profit sector is generally not well represented in terms of unionization and collective bargaining.

One reason for the low unionization rate of paid and unpaid work is an implicit assumption about the distinct characteristics of the non-profit sector. It assumes that the willingness to work for no monetary compensation or for monetary compensation below the equilibrium rate is based on some kind of special motivation and devotion to the causes, missions and aims of the organization. In this line of reasoning, volunteering becomes an expression of underlying values, attitudes and convictions, and social scientists have examined the extent to which such non-monetary incentives are basically altruistic, or if they indeed involve some form of calculus that is ultimately selfish in nature, at least in part.

In this context, scholars interested in volunteering have developed theoretical lines of argument within disciplinary frames of reference. For example, economists have understood volunteering based on rational decisions-making involving consumption, investment and search components (Freeman, 1997). Sociologists, for their part, have also considered the human investment aspect, but understood in terms of "productive work requiring human capital, collective behaviour requiring social capital, and ethically guided behaviour requiring cultural capital" (Wilson and Musick, 1997). Sokolowski (1996) links

volunteering to social movement activism on the one hand (e.g. environmentalism), and the interest of professional status politics and ethics (e.g. medical practitioners volunteering on community health boards or lawyers providing *pro bono* work) on the other hand.

The key question that follows from that research is the potential implication or policy use of volunteering. If, as research suggests, the supply of volunteering is sensitive to certain incentive structures, and the impact of volunteering judged positive for both service provision and wider social aspects, the question arises to what extent incentives can be changed for the achievement of specific policy issues. Examples include the "insertion policies" of the French Government during the 1990s to reduce youth unemployment through volunteering schemes, or the various initiatives of the Clinton and Bush Administrations in the United States to employ volunteers as policy tool in the re-organization of the countries welfare system.

Furthermore, researchers focusing on sectoral wage differentials in the paid labour market have argued that other, more structural or institutional factors, *de jure* or *de facto*, may also be relevant in explaining distinctiveness. Some lines of argument suggest higher pay and better conditions in the non-profit sector, and others suggesting lower rates of pay and poorer conditions may be prevalent there. This phenomenon can also be observed in the profit sector. After reviewing the literature on pay and some aspects of other indicators of quality of work, Almond and Kendall (2000d) summarize the situation as follows:

> "The size and direction of (any sectoral differential in pay and work quality will be) linked to a combination of self-selection of disproportionately "committed" workers into the third sector; contrasting mixes of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation by sector; different balances of wage and non-wage benefits; contrasting career structures; and different arrangements for bargaining, particularly in relation to pay" (p. 17).

Those authors find some evidence to support the existence of a distinctive bundle of quality of work attributes in the non-profit sector (having examined United Kingdom evidence at a number of levels, including economy-wide, third sector-relevant industries, and particular categories of third sector-relevant employees).

However, in general, empirical evidence as to whether pay and conditions systematically differ by sector is rare, particularly information that controls for differences in organizational size, kind of industry or field, and the types of occupations and professions involved (see also Leete, 2003). This is partly because available labour statistics lack appropriate differentiation between certain forms of work and compensation (e.g. wage, fringe benefits) as far as the paid labour force is concerned. However, based on an analysis of the 1990 US census, Leete (2001) suggests that wage differentials between the for-profit and the non-profit sector are likely to persist. What is more, Emanuele and Simmons (2002) found that non-profit organizations spend less on fringe benefits than

business as well. They argue employees of non-profit firms are willing to accept both lower wages and lower fringe benefits because they elect to support the cause of the organization—a cause in which they believe and decide to donate some of their time at levels below market rate relative to the skills they have.

Paid work

Typical forms

Typical work is usually defined as full-time work with an open-ended contract between employer and employee, regulated working hours, continuous wages or salary and some kind of job protection (Tálos, 1999, p. 417). The term "permanent jobs" also applies to what is covered by typical work. Most countries use this kind of full-time, permanent wage work as a point of reference or framework for social security arrangements, including as a basis for social security entitlements. Important features of typical forms of paid work in the non-profit sector include:

- a certain level of wage or salary, linked to country-specific notions of a "living wage";
- at least a minimum of social security associated with employment status; and
- some kind of fringe benefits that are additional to wage and salaries.

In contrast, most atypical forms of paid work and almost all forms of unpaid work lack one or more of these characteristics. However, there are significant differences across countries to which the standard version of typical work is found, applied and enforced.

Atypical forms

Typical or regular work is also the starting point for conception of work in the non-profit sector. The cultural imprint of the "breadwinner model" that dominated the industrial work force for many decades has left its mark in the non-profit sector. In France, Germany, the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries, but less so in the United States and the United Kingdom, the notion of the regular work with high levels of job security as the standard were for a long time re-enforced by the closeness of the non-profit sector to the state, in particular in the health and social service fields. Nonetheless, over the last decade or two, there has been increasing awareness of the persistence and often growth of "atypical" [2] or "non-standard" forms of work.

[2] "Atypical work" has also become generally known as "atypical employment", "non-standard work/employment" or "contingent employment." As Grunewald suggests "the term contingent employment is a term coined (...) to describe the range of employment relationships that had developed to meet the employer's need for flexible work arrangements to control labour costs in

Atypical work is more easily defined by what it is not rather than by what it is; it covers numerous forms of work which deviate from the "classical" Western European and American "full employment" standard and the "breadwinner model" of the post war period. Atypical work includes temporary work, part-time work, job creation and related training schemes, second and multiple jobs, combining employment and self-employment, sheltered employment, "cash in hand" and informal arrangements, including jobs on the borderline with the "black economy" with dubious or ambiguous legality, and numerous other forms. This heterogeneity makes generalizations difficult; and when it comes to atypical work in the non-profit sector, which itself is a perfect example of a highly diverse and heterogeneous sector, generalizations are even more risky given the limited research that has been carried out on this topic to date.

However, "atypical" work forms are apparently becoming more and more widespread - not only in the non-profit sector but also in the for profit sector (Delsen, 1995, p. 54). At the same time analysts like Delsen (1995) suggest that the amount of atypical forms in the non-profit sector seems to increase more rapidly and sharply than in other parts of the economy. One reason, as mentioned above, is the traditionally lower degree of unionization in non-profit organizations (see Anheier and Seibel, 2001, ch. 4). Another reason is due to the greater share of newly created positions relative to the existing pool of jobs, as non-profit organizations have grown disproportionately in recent years (Salamon et al., 1999). These newly created jobs are likely less tied to long-established payment and social security schemes.

Some analysts have tended to equate atypical work with precarious work. Rodgers (1989), for example, regards as secure primarily regular, permanent wage work, whereas other forms of work become precarious to the extent to which they deviate from this established norm. He differentiates between several dimensions of precariousness such as the degree of certainty of continuing work, control over work, extent of social security entitlements and legal protection, and regularity of wage income. For Rodgers "the concept of precariousness involves instability, lack of protection, insecurity and social or economic vulnerability" (1989, p. 3). It is the combination of these factors which identifies the degree to which jobs are precarious; consequently jobs vary not only by the extent but also by the particular nature of precariousness, depending on the specific factors involved.

While many atypical work positions are indeed precarious either in one or even several of the dimensions suggested by Rogers, it is not necessarily the case for all. In OECD countries, part-time work beyond a certain threshold, for example, is often stable and includes fringe benefits, as is the case in Germany where in 1999, the Schroeder government introduced basic social security

global economy. The term is generally understood to include part-time, temporary, on-call and leased employees" (1995, p. 725).

entitlements for minimal forms of employment. More generally, employment relations reflect changing social and economic needs, but the changes that can be observed across countries appear diverse, fragmentary and responsive to partial interests. However, a large number of these changes seem to create new vulnerabilities or to renew old ones (Rodgers, 1989, p. 1).

Some atypical work is concentrated overwhelmingly in or around for the profit sector, including most informal and "black economy" jobs, and the bulk of casual, seasonal, temporary, agency and seasonal work (Almond and Kendall 2000b). Prominent examples are migrant workers in agriculture, seasonal jobs in the retail industry, but also phenomena such as "temping" and "moon-shining". The most common forms of atypical work that seem to be disproportionately found in the non-profit sector are part-time work, second and third jobs, temporary work, jobs involving significant unpaid overtime and sheltered employment (evidence is primarily from the United States and the United Kingdom; see Almond and Kendall, 2000b and references therein).

We will examine different types of atypical jobs, including part-time work, temporary work, self-employment, sheltered employment, and second or multiple jobs. There is, of course, some overlap among these categories, as they involve variations in terms of time, control, and job security.

Part-time work

The concept of part-time work can be defined in different ways. It might involve all workers whose agreed normal working time lies on average below legal, collectively agreed or customary norms. These norms vary across countries but in most cases the borderline lies somewhere between 30 and 40 hours per week. Part-time does not necessarily imply information about the regularity and frequency of work or the duration of contract.

In most OECD countries, the non-profit sector has a higher proportion of part-time work than the public sector and for profit sector, a phenomenon closely related to the above average share of female employment in non-profit organizations. Anheier and Seibel (2001), for example, report that the German non-profit sector ranks very high in its share of part-time jobs and has a higher proportion of female employees than any other sector. In the somewhat rigid German labour market, the non-profit sector seems to have reacted the most to changes in labour demand over the last two decades.

In the 1990s, part-time work in the German non-profit sector was 30 per cent compared to 16 per cent for economy as a whole. When compared over time, part-time employment increased substantially in both absolute and in relative terms in the non-profit sector. Together, the commercial service sector and the non-profit sector show the highest growth rates in the number of part-time jobs added to the West German economy between 1970 and 1990. However, while the non-profit sector used to have the highest proportion of part-time jobs in the late 1980s, it has

been surpassed by the commercial service sector. In both sectors, however, three out of ten jobs are part-time, as compared to 1.5 of 10 for the economy as a whole. Furthermore, women represent 69 per cent of the labour force in the German non-profit sector, compared to 39 per cent for the economy as a whole. In recent years, female employment increased in the economy overall; in the non-profit sector, however, this increase came in addition to an already relatively high ratio of female employment.

The prominent position of part-time employment in the non-profit sector is also born out in relation to job qualification. The last three decades witnessed significant changes in the educational background and skill level of the German labour force, with a general decrease of unskilled and skilled blue-collar jobs in the traditional industrial sectors. The non-profit sector, which increased employment by almost 100 per cent, shows disproportionate increases in the number of white-collar jobs and apprentices (defined as people undergoing vocational training and qualifications). In 1990, two out of three jobs in the non-profit sector were white collar, a proportion higher only in the banking/insurance sector. Similarly, the relative share of apprentices and trainees among the total labour force was higher only in the construction industry, suggesting the significant contribution of non-profit organization to skill training and formation in the social services and health care fields in particular.

Indeed, we can suspect that some of the work classified as apprenticeship and trainees hide a special form of part-time work that exists in several countries: so-called “marginal” work. This is work defined as such either by certain time thresholds or wage limits. In OECD countries, these limits are usually between 12 and 19 hours per week or around €250 in monthly wages. These workers are often by-passed by most forms of social protection, because they tend to legally require minimum commitments of time or resources. European Union (EU) laws for member states now set some thresholds, but others are at the discretion of individual countries, with wide variation according to national traditions, ideologies and cultures. To put it differently, a large number of them shoulder their own risks, without intervention from the State. As suggested above, many “marginal” jobs seem to be concentrated in the for profit sector, but there are also cases in the non-profit sector, particularly in the health care and social service fields. Specifically, efforts by EU member states to reduce youth unemployment and improve skill levels have resulted in the creation of many marginal jobs in non-profit organizations.

Temporary work

Temporary work is difficult to define, as it exists in various forms (e.g. direct fixed-term, occasional or seasonal contracts, temporary employment through specialized agencies, etc.). Although most authors agree that temporary work involves fixed-term working contracts, the conceptual basis for statistics is

still not uniform. For instance, if formal apprenticeship contracts are included, the figures rise. In terms of labour market functioning, it is important at the margin, disproportionately affecting new labour market entrants and those re-entering work after unemployment (Marshall, 1989, p. 30). People working part-time are also more likely to be in jobs with fixed-term contracts than those working full-time (Employment and European Social Fund, 1999, p. 41).

Reasons for concluding temporary contracts can be in the interest of employees (Casey, 1988). However, Delsen and Huijgen (1994) insist that the demand for temporary work is rather determined by employers, who want to match their labour input closely to seasonal and cyclical fluctuations in demand. Thus, demand-side factors (e.g. economic situation, importance of the service sector) seem to be more influential in determining the extent of temporary employment than supply-side factors (e.g. preferences of employees, female participation rates).

In contrast to the German data reported above, evidence from the United Kingdom suggests that temporary work is actually more prevalent in the public sector than the non-profit sector. This is largely the result of quasi-market style reforms in the public sector that have perhaps been deeper and broader than in other European countries. Where it does occur, temporary employment in the non-profit sector reflects the standard labour market input factors referred to above, but may also *de facto* be related to the typically smaller size of non-profit organizations. The latter limits their capacity to offer secure jobs, as Almond and Kendall (2000a) have found for the United Kingdom. Moreover, sector-specific institutional or politico-economic factors may be behind some of these patterns, as with the German case, where trade union influences, which have often been important drivers in increasing job security, have been curtailed.

Self-employment

Self-employment is different from entrepreneurship [3] as such. The status of being self-employed is primarily a function of the legislative and fiscal systems in operation and the scope or incentive they imply for adopting this status rather than that of an employee (Employment and European Social Fund, 1999, p. 44). The “new” self-employed in transition economies (but also in OECD countries), no matter if working for profit or a non-profit organization, are frequently atypical employees with less or no social security at all (e.g. teachers working for institutions of further education are often self-employed, but their actual status comes closer to an atypical employee than to an entrepreneur). In countries like Poland, actual employment in the non-profit sector is higher than the number of employees found in official statistics, as many who work in non-

[3] Entrepreneurship, which is a quite common form of work in certain branches, is frequently associated with starting a business on one’s own. Entrepreneurs are not employees but employers, so this form of work is not dealt with in detail in this paper.

profit organizations have the status of "consultant" or self-employee to reduce costs associated with social security etc.

"Sheltered employment"

A relatively uncommon form of work is "sheltered employment". People who find it difficult to secure work in the labour market — because of various reasons, e.g. disabilities or long-term unemployment — work in special organizations that were established for the very purpose of providing sheltered job opportunities. In many countries, the non-profit sector primarily, but also the public sector and business run enterprises, provide opportunities for people with physical, sensory and other disabilities. These enterprises operate very much like a business, and but include job creation and employment training schemes that are typically sponsored by governments in response to unemployment problems for people from the mainstream workforce at times of economic depression and structural adjustment. The employees in question often have a slightly ambiguous status. In the United Kingdom, one of the few countries where systematic evidence is available, lower absolute numbers, but a higher proportion of all workers eligible for sheltered employment, are accounted for by such schemes in the non-profit sector. Thus, the non-profit sector in the United Kingdom is more responsive to create sheltered employment opportunities than both government and businesses.

"Second and multiple jobs"

European data have shown that multiple job holding is increasingly common in some contexts, and the United Kingdom is a country, which has a particularly high proportion of jobs of this kind. Initial evidence in this case suggests that a disproportionate number of people who have a subsidiary job have their main job in the non-profit sector (Almond and Kendall, 2000a, pp.217–218). The practice of multiple job holding is most pronounced in transition economies and developing countries, involving complex interactions and cross-subsidizations among job held in terms of wages, social security, and career patterns. In OECD countries, there is patchy evidence that job holders in the 55–65 age cohort with secure retirement packages, are increasingly reducing time spent on their "regular", long-term work typically linked to a career or profession, and seek opportunities in other ventures, including the non-profit sector. Similarly, there is a growing trend in the United States and the United Kingdom that retirees with low pensions seek part-time jobs to top up their retirement income. In both cases, the once relatively strict dividing line between "active work life" and retirement is being blurred.

Unpaid work and volunteering

Volunteering is the most common form of unpaid work within the non-profit sector. At its most general, volunteering means the giving time to help others for no monetary pay. This basic definition is used in the United States for the "*Giving and Volunteering Surveys*" carried out by Independent Sector, a Washington-based interest group and think tank (see Hodgkinson, 1996; see www.independentsector.org for later editions of the survey). A definition used for the first comparative study of volunteering in Europe (Gaskin and Smith, 1997, p.27) identifies volunteering as time, given freely and without pay to any organization, which has the aim of benefiting people or a particular cause.

The way in which "volunteering" is defined has massive implications for the apparent scope and scale of this work form [4]. In the following discussion, voluntary work is defined as work without monetary pay or legal obligation provided for persons living outside the volunteer's own household (Badelt, 1999). The definition refers to a four-fold distinction:

- first, it draws a demarcation line between paid and volunteer work. Actually, in several cases volunteers receive some kind of remuneration, which may be monetary. The borderline between paid work and voluntary work may therefore overlap.
- second, the definition provides a distinction between household work and volunteering. Household and family work is a form of unpaid work that relates to issues distinctive from those regarded concerning volunteers and should therefore be treated separately. Still there remain borderline cases such as services provided for relatives living close to the volunteer's own household.
- third, according to the definition, other people have to benefit from the result of voluntary work. Hence it excludes sole consumptive activities such as certain forms of hobbies like wine tasting or walking. Since activities may contain consumptive aspects as well as productive ones the decisive factor usually is the "third person". If another person could carry out the respective activity, it is considered productive. For instance practicing a musical instrument is not a voluntary service in terms of the definition, whereas playing in an orchestra can be regarded as a productive activity.
- fourth, persons who are legally obliged to provide "voluntary" services — like civil servants as part of their job description — are not considered volunteers, even if they do not receive adequate compensation.

Volunteering takes place in different forms across many fields and areas. The following exposition describes volunteer work in terms of various dimensions. Not surprisingly, the notion of what is volunteering and what is a volunteer varies across countries and is closely related to aspects of culture and

[4] In particular see the meta-analytic comparisons of existing surveys in the United Kingdom by Lynn (1997); see also the opening paragraph in the "methodology" section below for the German and Austrian case.

history. Before turning to more economic aspects, it is useful to take a brief look at some of the sociological factors that shape the meaning, form and pattern of volunteering. For sure, the British and American concept of volunteering, the French *voluntariat*, the Italian *voluntariato*, the Swedish *frivillig verksamhet* or the German *Ehrenamt* have different histories, and carry different cultural and political connotations (see Anheier and Salamon, 1999).

In Australia or United Kingdom, volunteering is closely related to the concept of a voluntary sector - a part of society seen as separate from both the business sector and the statutory sector of government and public administration. This notion of voluntarism has its roots in Lockeian concepts of a self-organizing society outside the confine of the state. Civil society and voluntary action also resonate in the thinking of Scottish enlightenment philosophy, yet find their most eloquent expression in the work of Alexis de Tocqueville's Democracy in America. For Tocqueville, voluntary action and voluntary association become cornerstones of a functioning democratic polity, in which a voluntary sector shields society from the tyranny of the majority. The link between voluntarism and democracy became deeply imprinted in American culture and the country's political self-understanding.

In other countries, however, the notion of volunteering is different in that it puts emphasis on communal service to the public good rather than social inclusion and democracy. The German term *Ehrenamt* (or honorary office) comes closest to this tradition. In the 19th century, the modernization of public administration and the development of an efficient, professional civil service within an autocratic state under the reformer Lorenz von Stein allocated a specific role to voluntarism. Voluntary office in the sense of trusteeship of associations and foundations became the domain of the growing urban middle class (Pankoke, 1994; Anheier and Seibel, 2001). A vast network of associations and foundations emerged in the middle and late 19th century, frequently involving paid staff, but run and managed by volunteers. But unlike in the United States, the German notion of voluntarism as a system of "honorary officers" took place in a still basically autocratic society where local and national democratic institutions remained underdeveloped. This trusteeship aspect of voluntarism began to be seen separately from other voluntary service activities such as caring for the poor, visiting the sick or assisting at school. These latter volunteer activities remained the domain of the church and, increasingly, also became part of the emerging workers' movement during the industrialization period.

Systematic information and knowledge about volunteering in non-western countries is still sketchy, although it seems clear that the liberal, individualistic concept of voluntary, un-coerced action for the public good is historically bound to a very few countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Scandinavia or the Netherlands. Even though, western notions of volunteering are gaining currency in countries as diverse as South Korea, Armenia and Brazil,

and at the international level as well. For South Korea, Chang-Ho (2002) reports that despite the long-standing historical roots of traditions related to voluntarism, the concept became a fixture in the country's social and political scene only after the Asian Games of 1986, the introduction of corporate volunteer programmes, and the expectation for volunteering among the growing student population. For Armenia, Grigoryan (2002) suggests that while volunteering remains uncommon as a formal activity, spontaneous volunteer efforts appear more frequent. In the case of Brazil, DeLaMar (2000) shows the success of the *Programa Voluntarios*, created in 1995 as part of a larger effort to establish local councils that enlist different stakeholders from civil rights activists to business leaders to look after community affairs. Finally, with the proclamation of the year 2001 as the International Year of the Volunteer, the United Nations lend additional political weight the increasingly global spread of voluntarism in a western sense (Rule, 2001).

It is, however, important to emphasize that at least in their cultural and historical development, notions of volunteering are typically not related to labour markets and paid work. Instead, volunteering is seen in relation to the public good, social participation, political mobilization, and service to the community. The connection between volunteering and paid work is of fairly recent origin, and most pronounced in countries faced with high unemployment rates, particularly youth unemployment - such as France, Italy and Spain — or general problems of social exclusion of lower income groups, as is the case in many developing countries like Brazil.

In addition to different national traditions, voluntarism is also closely linked to the self-understanding of larger non-profit organizations like the Red Cross. Voluntary service is regarded next to the notions of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, independence, unity and universality — the seven fundamental principles of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (IFRC, 1993 and 1999). It defines volunteers as "individuals who reach out beyond the confines of paid employment and normal responsibilities to contribute in different ways without expectation of profit or reward in the belief that their activities are beneficial to the community as well as satisfying to themselves" (IFRC, 1993).

The UN offers a broader definition of volunteering as "contributions that individuals make as non-profit, non-wage, and non-career action for the well-being of their neighbours, and society at large" (UN, 1999) — a definition that is rather broad and includes mutual self-help and many forms of collective action. The UN sees volunteering primarily in its service function: "voluntary service is called for more than ever before to tackle areas of priority concern in the social, economic, cultural, humanitarian and peacekeeping fields" (1999, p. 2).

How do the social sciences in particular economics approach volunteering? In economics, volunteer work is a somewhat problematic concept because no market price exists to establish its value relative to changes in supply and

demand. The United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA) is a case in point (UN, 1993). The system treats volunteer work as a non-market activity just like housework or leisure activities such as gardening.

As a result, we have little systematic information on volunteering at the international level. Virtually no statistical office collects data on volunteering as part of its regular, ongoing reporting. Recognizing that the SNA treatment may be somewhat simplistic, Chadeau and Roy (1986) suggest breaking down economic activities into five categories:

- activities that are remunerated, reported, and typically included in official statistics, e.g. fulltime and part-time work covered by a formal contract;
- activities that are unpaid and intended for parties outside households, e.g. volunteering;
- unpaid activities within households, e.g. household chores such as cooking and ironing; and
- other activities.

The third category mentioned by Chadeau and Roy (1986) is of special interest and includes all unpaid activities carried out for the benefit of an economic unit other than the household itself. These non-market activities are set apart from both mutual aid and forms of barter. Volunteering work is work in the sense that it is different from leisure; and it is voluntary and therefore distinct from paid work. The objective distinction between volunteer work and leisure is based on the third-party criterion, i.e. the fact that some activities are non-marketable (Hawrylyshyn, 1977), since "it is impossible for one person to obtain another person to perform instead" (UN, 1993, pp. 6–16). For example, a sports club can either hire a paid coach or opt for asking someone to volunteer. Yet if members choose to play some sport like tennis or soccer, they cannot pay a third party to play for them without losing the benefits of playing (pleasure, fitness). Thus, membership participation is leisure, coaching is work. Likewise, attending an environmentalist rally involves participation and is therefore leisure, while organizing the rally without pay is voluntary work.

From the subjective point of view, however, this distinction is not always clear (Archambault et al., 1998). One source of confusion is tied to personal motivations and dispositions, especially when volunteering is mixed with advocacy functions: can I pay somebody to visit the sick or the handicapped instead of me? Another is the mix of membership and volunteering. For example, some national Red Cross societies traditionally make little distinction between members and volunteers, as do many political parties, unions and social movement organizations.

The distinction between voluntary and paid work is easier to make, and there is a clear difference in the status of volunteers as opposed to employees, even though the differences in atypical forms of work are increasingly becoming blurred. As a result, intermediate positions exist between totally unpaid work and work paid at labour market price. For example, as mentioned above, volunteers, in particular when serving on boards, are frequently reimbursed for

related expenses, and some receive in-kind compensation. Similarly, larger non-profit organizations in Germany provide benefits like health and accident insurance to volunteers, and some charities cover the pension payments for those working as volunteers overseas.

By contrast, some paid employees work for wages that are below market value. There are a variety of reasons for this. For one, employees may be sympathetic to the aim of the non-profit organization (e.g. humanitarian assistance, environmental protection, peace movement) and not demand wages at the market rate. What is more, they may see volunteering as an investment for gaining skills and experience, which is typically the case for apprentices in many European countries, the German trainee and apprentice example discussed above. Or they may be required to take on lower wages because of labour market imperfections. Such is the case in countries with structural unemployment problems such as Spain or France, but also in virtually all developing countries where large portions of the population work in a "gray zone" of paid and unpaid labour. Certainly, these examples go beyond the narrower meaning of volunteering.

Typical forms of volunteering

Informal and formal volunteering

Volunteering can take place in highly formal types of organizations such as the Red Cross, with formal job descriptions for volunteers but also outside organizational settings. Informal volunteering is defined as giving a certain amount of time without working in or through a formal organization (Hodgkinson, 1996; Davis Smith, 1998). Informal volunteering either takes place in smaller associations or groups without formally recognized roles for volunteers, or assumes the form of more infrequent and *ad hoc* participation on an "as-need-basis", for example in case of emergencies or for special events like community fairs and sport events. By contrast, formal volunteering occurs if a person contributes time to an organization, such as hospitals, welfare associations, or schools. The statistical accounting of informal volunteering is more difficult than that of formal volunteering.

Type of work done

Regardless of the field in which voluntary work is carried out, there exist a wide range of different activities, such as, raising money, committee work, personal care, and office work. Different patterns of volunteering pertain to individual countries and various types of organizations. Within organizations volunteering occurs on different levels of hierarchy. Volunteers can be found in leading positions such as on the boards of non-profit organizations, as well as, in positions where they fulfil mainly implementing activities such as clerical tasks,

cleaning facilities, greeting and looking after visitors, distributing leaflets, or helping with fund collection.

Working hours and frequency

Volunteers usually spend less time on their activities than typical paid workers. The volume of work done by volunteers varies tremendously concerning frequency, regularity and the amount of time spent for volunteering. Whereas in some cases the work of volunteers even exceeds "normal" working time, other volunteer activities are carried out only occasionally. This can be seen as a matter of personal preference and time restrictions or as a result of different requirements of various activities.

Qualification

The qualification required from volunteers is closely related to the type of work done. Whereas voluntary work often is considered as work that needs no certain qualification, this is not true for all activities. Volunteers may receive a specific training for their unpaid work. In some cases volunteers provide their working capacity as part of their profession, for example, medical practitioners, lawyers and other highly qualified professionals.

Atypical and mixed forms

Unpaid overtime

Unpaid overtime is usually not considered as volunteering. It often lacks recognition and visibility and is tied to a paid job. There is hardly any systematic empirical evidence whether unpaid overtime occurs more frequently in the non-profit than in the for profit sector (for exceptions, see Almond and Kendall, 2000b and 2000c).

Corporate volunteering

Corporate volunteering is a specific form of work that predominantly occurs in the non-profit sector. In some countries like the United States, it becomes increasingly common that profit-oriented companies allow their personnel to work for other — mostly non-profit -organizations within their paid working time. From the perspective of the person providing the work it is therefore not volunteer work, according to the applied definition. The non-profit organizations on the other hand may consider the work as volunteering since they need not pay for it. Conceivably the work done by someone for the non-profit organization might exceed the working time paid by the (profit) organization and therefore be partly volunteering.

Forms of volunteering and relative benefit

A continued problem in research on volunteering is the multi-dimensionality of the term, involving aspects of choice, remuneration, structure and impact of the activity in question. Cnaan et al. (1996, p. 371) examined a wide range of definitions and forms of volunteering and used the following classification.

These dimensions also involve different net costs to the volunteer irrespective of the benefits contributed to particular groups or society at large. Cnaan et al. (1996, pp. 374–6) suggest that the greater the net cost to the individual relative to the generalized benefit created through voluntary activities, the more altruistic volunteering becomes. Conversely, the less the net cost, and the more personal the benefits, the less the activity can be classified as volunteering and the more it resembles selfish, pecuniary action. For example, a highly paid manager working for an AIDS charity in her spare time would have higher net costs relative the benefit generated than a college students doing community service as part of graduation requirements.

Table 1. Aspects of volunteering

Dimension	Characteristics
Free choice	1. Free will
	2. Relatively un-coerced
	3. Obligation to volunteer
Remuneration	1. None at all
	2. None expected
	3. Expenses reimbursed
	4. Stipend/low pay
Structure	1. Formal
	2. Informal
Intended beneficiaries	1. Strangers
	2. Friends, relatives
	3. Oneself

The concept of net cost is considered important for understanding the complex nature and various facets of volunteering. Cnaan et al. (1996) developed a Guttmann scale approach to classify different types of volunteering, and tested in the US context. Unfortunately, this approach has not been replicated in other countries and cultures, and we will suggest below, closing this gap in empirical research on volunteering is one of the most significant items on the research agenda.

PATTERNS 3

Profile

Socio-economic profile of paid employment

Systematic data on the socio-economic profile of paid employment in the non-profit sector is lacking for most countries. For the few countries for which information is available, two results emerge when compared to both public sector and for-profit employment: Women fill most of the paid jobs in the non-profit sector, and a disproportionate number of non-profit jobs are part-time (Almond and Kendall, 2000b and 2000d, p. 7; Anheier and Seibel, 2001; Bachstein, 2000). In general, the percentage of women is highest in the health, education, and social services fields [5].

Demographic and socio-economic profile of unpaid employment [6]

As we have seen above, volunteering is structured by different traditions in different countries, depending, *inter alia*, on the social and welfare system in place (Anheier and Salamon, 1999). The Appendix offers information on volunteering in the countries covered by the 1999/2000 European Values Survey and the latest data available from the World Values Survey (1995, 2000 and 2001). These data reveals significant variations in the level of volunteering and correspond with the results of a similar study in Europe (Gaskin and Smith 1997,

[5] In the United Kingdom and United States researchers have begun to map systematically the comparative character of non-profit sector employment (Almond and Kendall, 2000a and 2000d; Leete, 2003). Similar research is required in other countries to draw a comprehensive picture of the significant differences and distinctions of employees of non-profit organizations as compared to employees of profit or public organizations. Some potential starting points for further investigation might be the following indicators: age, gender, educational qualifications, employment type (employee, self-employed, etc.), occupation and industry composition, employment status (part-time/full-time, permanent/temporary, types of temporary work, the extent of overtime and whether paid or unpaid), marital status, size of household, religion, urban/rural area, size of employer (measured by number of employees in workplace), etc.

[6] This section draws in part on Anheier and Salamon (1999).

p.30). However, additional research is needed from both a methodological and conceptual perspective to identify patterns across countries.

The Gaskin and Smith study of volunteering in Europe, conducted in 1995, found that 27 per cent of the adult population in the eight countries studied volunteered in the previous year (Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Netherlands, Slovakia and Sweden) [7]. As table 2 shows, the level of volunteering among the adult population in the nine countries varies significantly from a low of 12 per cent in Slovenia to a high 43 per cent in the Netherlands [8]. Two-third of those reporting voluntary activity did so at least once a month, with 5–10 hours per month the most frequent category in terms of time given (Gaskin and Smith, 1997, pp. 28–31). The ten most frequent areas for volunteering are:

- sports and recreation (28 per cent of all reporting to have volunteered during the last year);
- social services (17 per cent);
- kindergarten and child care (13 per cent);
- community development (13 per cent);
- religion (13 per cent);
- health (8 per cent);
- culture and arts (7 per cent); and
- advocacy (7 per cent).

Cross-national differences by gender are particularly pronounced in Europe as far as overall levels of volunteering are concerned (table 2). In most other areas of typical volunteering activities refer to office work, fund-raising, advocacy, teaching, personal care etc. Gaskin and Smith (1997, p. 37) found no major gender differences in the ten countries studied. In general men participate at a higher rate than women in most countries, although certain fields such as sport show a converse picture. Women volunteer more within social services, children's education, and religion whereas men dominate recreation and politics. Men are more likely to be involved in committee work (30 per cent versus 22 per cent for women), and less likely to be engaged in befriending and visiting activities (17 per cent versus 25 per cent). In most countries married people

[7] Reported percentages are weighted averages based on the response distribution in each country. The study was co-ordinated by the National Centre for Volunteering in Britain and involved population surveys as part a larger omnibus questionnaire survey, based on either telephone or face-to-face interviews. Each national team used a standard set of questions but somewhat different sampling approaches. This includes quota sampling (Belgium, Republic of Ireland), random location (Netherlands), random location combined with quota controls (Britain), multi-stage cluster sampling (Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Slovakia, and Sweden). Sample sizes are Belgium (870, French speaking population only) Bulgaria (1'073) Denmark (1'843), Germany (1'717), Great Britain (1'054), Ireland (1'404), Netherlands (1'020), Slovakia (1'015) and Sweden (1'000) (Gaskin and Smith, 1997: 115–117).

[8] In the section "Cross-national patterns", we will explore some of the reasons why volunteering levels vary across different countries.

volunteer more than singles. According to a German study people with children participate at a higher rate but invest less time than the average volunteer (Ehling and Schmidt, 1999, p. 418).

Table 2. Volunteers as percentage of adult population in Europe, by sex, 1995

Country	Percent of male population reported volunteering	Percent of female population reported volunteering	Percent of total population reported volunteering
Belgium	27	35	32
Bulgaria	21	18	19
Denmark	29	27	28
Germany	18	17	18
Great Britain	31	36	34
Ireland	28	24	25
Netherlands	43	34	38
Slovenia	12	12	12
Sweden	38	32	36
Total	27	26	27

Source: Based on information reported in Gaskin and Smith (1997, pp.28-29); see also the Appendix for a more detailed look at the various organizations in which people volunteer.

How does volunteering vary across countries, and what is the contribution of volunteers to the size of the non-profit sector overall [9]. As part of the John Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project, Salamon and Anheier (1999) collected basic information on volunteering in over twenty countries worldwide. Table 3 shows the relative size of the non-profit sector for each country included in the study grouped by geographic regions. Generally speaking, as mentioned above, the non-profit sector is larger in the more developed countries and much less in evidence in Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe. Thus, compared to an average of 5 per cent for all the countries, non-profit organizations account for close to 7 per cent of the non-agricultural labour force in Western Europe and in the other developed countries we examined, but only 2.1 per cent in Latin America and 1.3 per cent in Central and Eastern Europe. How does this picture change when we include volunteers? Table 3 shows that the percentage of volunteers in the adult population ranges from a high of nearly 50 per cent in the United States to a low of less than 10 per cent in Hungary, with a mean of 27.7 per cent. For the countries studied, this translates into

[9] Most studies assume that volunteering takes places in non-profit or voluntary organizations, and neglect volunteering for public organizations and businesses. For example, Gaskin and Smith (1997, p. 33) report that in the countries they studied, one in ten volunteers did do with state or public organizations. The share of public sector volunteers was highest in Slovakia (23 per cent), Belgium (20 per cent) and Germany (14 per cent), whereas in other countries like Ireland or Sweden, the percentage was very low.

another 10.4 million full-time equivalent employees, which boosts the total number of full-time equivalent employees of the non-profit organizations to 29.3 million [10]. With volunteers included, the non-profit sector thus represents, on average, 7.1 per cent of the total non-agricultural employment in these countries, 13 per cent of the service employment, and 43 per cent of the public sector employment.

In general, adding volunteers (table 3) thus widens the range in non-profit sector size among the countries, from two thirds of a percent in Mexico to nearly 19 per cent in the Netherlands. Thus volunteer input contributes much more in both relative and absolute terms in the developed countries than it does in the rest of the world. Table 3 confirms this observation, showing the number of volunteers converted to full-time equivalent jobs. The level of volunteering in the developed countries surpasses that of Central and Eastern Europe by a ratio of 5:1, and Latin America by the ratio of 4:1. However when we consider only the percent of population volunteering, (table 3) the sharp differences among the countries are less pronounced. The difference between these two measures of volunteering thus suggests that volunteers in developed countries put in more hours on average than their counterparts in the developing world or in transition economies.

Gaskin and Smith (1997) and Barker (1993) looked into reasons why people decide for and against volunteering. In the Gaskin and Smith study (1997, p. 50), 51 per cent volunteered because they enjoyed doing so; 36 per cent as a means to make new friends; 34 per cent liked the satisfaction of seeing the results of their work; 29 per cent as way to stay active; 24 per cent volunteered for the experience gained; 18 per cent for the social recognition they gain in the community, and 18 per cent because volunteering helped them to uphold their basic religious or political values. The basic reasons for not volunteering are: no spare time left (41 per cent), never having been asked (28 per cent), and never thought about it (18 per cent) (Gaskin and Smith, 1997, p. 54) [11].

[10] The conversion of volunteering into full-time equivalent jobs is done in a number of steps. The data from the various population surveys provide the two key items: the number of volunteers in the sample, and the number of hours volunteered per volunteer. The proportionate share of volunteers is estimated to the whole adult population to yield the total number of volunteers, which, in turn, is multiplied by the average number of hours volunteered. Finally, the total number of hours volunteered is then divided by a average number of full-time equivalent hours per job for each country.

[11] Multiple answers possible for reasons given for and against volunteering.

Table 3. Relative size of non-profit sector; with and without volunteering, by country, 1995–97

Region/Country	Size indicators			
	Total paid non-profit employment (%)	Population volunteering (%)	FIE volunteers in 1'000	Total paid and unpaid employment (%)
European Union				
Austria	4.5	n.a	41.0	5.7
Belgium	10.5	30.0	99.0	13.0
Finland	3.0	33.0	75.0	6.3
France	4.9	23.0	1022.0	9.6
Germany	4.9	26.0	979.0	8.0
Ireland	11.5	20.0	32.0	14.2
Netherlands	12.5	46.0	678.0	18.7
Sweden	2.5	51.0	229.0	8.3
Spain	4.5	12.0	254.0	6.8
United Kingdom	6.2	48.0	1120.0	10.5
European Union average	6.9	32.1	452.9	10.3
Other developed countries				
Australia	7.2	19.0	177.0	10.1
Israel	9.2	12.0	32.0	11.0
Japan	3.5	Very low	695.0	4.6
United States	7.8	26.7	4995.0	11.9
Other developed countries' average	6.9	26.7	1474.8	9.4
Central and Eastern Europe				
Czech Republic	1.7	n.a	94.0	207.0
Hungary	1.3	7.0	10.0	1.6
Romania	0.6	34.0	91.0	1.3
Slovakia	0.9	n.a	7.0	1.2
Central and Eastern Europe average	1.1	20.5	50.5	1.7
Latin America				
Argentina	3.7	20.0	64.0	6.0
Brazil	2.3	12.0	139.0	2.5
Colombia	2.4	48.0	111.0	3.1
Mexico	0.4	n.a	47.0	0.7
Peru	2.4	31.0	26.0	2.9
Latin America average	2.2	27.8	77.4	3.0
Grand average	4.8	26.8	193.6	6.9

*) Wages + imputed value of voluntary labour, imputed value of voluntary labour also added to GDP.

Source: (Anheier and Salamon, 1999; Salamon et al., 1999).

Table 4. Volunteering, social class and educational background in Europe, 1990(a)

	Socio-economic class				Terminal age of education					
	Upper/ upper middle	Middle	Lower middle	Lower	16	17	18	19	20	21+
% volunteering	34	27	21	16	18	29	29	31	30	37
Not volunteering	66	73	79	84	82	71	71	69	70	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Weighted average percentages for response distributions from Belgium, Denmark, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Iceland, Northern Ireland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Sweden.

Source: ased on information presented in Barker (1993, pp.12, 23-24).

The reasons for becoming a volunteer underscore the importance of social networks in the recruitment of volunteers. Gaskin and Smith (1997) report that 44 per cent of all respondents in their multi-country study found out about volunteering through family and friends; 27 per cent through membership of an organization, and 13 per cent through the church, congregation or some other form of religious affiliation. In other words, social capital, i.e., the sum of connections individuals have to social institutions, serves as a social inclusion mechanism by making people more likely to volunteer. Indeed, Gaskin and Smith found a strong relationship between membership and volunteering, 60 per cent of all volunteers are members of the organizations in which volunteering take place. By implication, in communities where such social inclusion mechanisms (like the family, friendship networks, community groups, membership organizations etc) are less strong, volunteering tends to be less frequent and less developed as a social institution as well.

The willingness to volunteer and the frequency and pattern of volunteering are not constants over time. Over the last few decades, volunteering has undergone significant changes. The exact nature and end product of these changes is not well understood in their full complexity and implications. What seems clear, however, is that volunteering is subject to the greater individualization and secularization in most industrial countries. Both forces lead away from traditional forms of volunteering: lifetime volunteering becomes less frequent; many more voluntary activities are short term; and volunteering is less seen as service to others a more often tied to qualification and self-interest. Volunteers have become more output oriented in the sense that they would like to see a link between contributions and efforts on the one hand, and their results on the other. As a consequence volunteers are more interested in shorter-term assignments with tangible pay-offs (Barker, 1993, pp. 25–28).

Following Barker (1993, p. 28) we can identify three basic motivational factors to explain why people volunteer: altruistic, instrumental, and obligatory. He suggests a close connection between the rise of instrumental motives and a change in volunteering toward greater output orientation. Specifically:

- Altruistic motives include notions of:
  - solidarity for the poor;
  - compassion for those in need;
  - identification with suffering people; and
  - hope and dignity to the disadvantaged.
- Instrumental motives are:
  - to gain new experience and new skills;
  - something worthwhile to do in spare time;
  - to meet people; and
  - personal satisfaction.
- Finally, obligation motives are:
  - moral, religious duty;
  - contribution to local community;
  - repayment of debt to society; and
  - political duty to bring about change.

Of course, these motivations do rarely occur in isolation of each other. In reality, we find different combinations among them. The factor that bound these motivations in the past was frequently religion or more specifically, religiosity. In fact, many studies (e.g., Wuthnow and Hodgkinson, 1990; Sokolowski, 1996) suggest that the degree of religiosity is one of the most important factor explaining variations in volunteering both within countries and cross nationally [12]. It is also the factor that seems to be declining in its importance, particularly in Europe, Australia and other parts of the developed world with pronounced secularization trends. In these countries, instrumental orientations seem to have gained in relative weight since the 1980s, while religious values and selfless motivations appear to have lost ground (Inglehart, 1990). Moreover, as Barker (1993) suggests, younger cohorts in particular reveal more instrumental and less religious-moralistic attitudes toward volunteering compared to those over the age of 55. Volunteering, it seems, is finding a new motivational bases, perhaps signalling a continuing shift in overall levels and types of voluntary activities over the next decades.

Trends

Paid employment

The non-profit sector is obviously highly labour intensive, as almost all non-profit organizations operate in the labour-intensive services sector. Even with plenty of unpaid working hours completed, salaries and wages are often the

[12] In population surveys, religiosity is typically measured by the frequency of religious attendance in church, synagogue, mosque etc. This is a better predictor of volunteering than religious affiliation or denomination, i.e., Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Islam etc.

largest expense factor in non-profit organizations (Anheier and Salamon, 1998). Average salaries and wages in the United States non-profit sector may tend to be lower than in other sectors of the economy (Hodgkinson, 1992, p. 114). However, some studies claim the contrary, or at least that a more contingent picture needs to be painted taking into account or controlling for variation in composition by industry, occupation, size and other factors (Ruhm and Borkoski, 2000; Almond and Kendal, 2000b; Leete, 2003; Anheier and Seibel 2001). Lower than average working hours in the non-profit sector are apparently a reason for lower wages (Ruhm and Borkoski, 2000). However, one has to be cautious of making generalizations because some studies do not differentiate properly between part-time and full-time employment when comparing the level of wages.

The non-profit sector is often regarded as a "labour market of the future" as many new job opportunities were created within this sector during the last few years (see Salamon and Anheier, 1996; Salamon et al., 1999). However, the non-profit sector cannot serve as the main responsible actor for reducing mass unemployment (Bauer and Betzelt, 1999, p. 3), even though it has contributed disproportionately to employment growth in many OECD countries in recent years (Salamon et al., 1999; Anheier and Seibel, 2001). Although the net contribution of the non-profit sector to the expansion of the paid labour force is relatively modest in absolute terms, headcount growth in the non-profit sector is proportionally far stronger than the growth in the profit sector as a whole, according to a study in the United Kingdom.

There has been a widespread and substantial growth in part-time work in the third sector in recent years, particularly for women (Almond and Kendall, 2000d, p. 5ff; see also reference to German non-profit sector above in Anheier and Seibel 2001). Another preliminary study shows that the number of employees in the non-profit sector increased faster than employee compensation (Hodgkinson, 1992, p. 114), which might be an indication of an increase in part-time jobs.

Some studies state that part-time work is increasing dramatically in all sectors of the economy (see Gobin, 1997 and Almond and Kendall, 2000b). Many of the part-time jobs created in the last few years have been in the unskilled and poorly paid sector of women's work. While part-time work can be voluntary, a relatively small but growing number of workers work part-time because they cannot find a full-time job (Employment and European Social Fund, 1999, p.38). Almond and Kendall (2000d, pp. 32–33, and footnote 7) found that the aggregate concentration of part-time employment in the United Kingdom non-profit sector was largely a compositional effect, reflecting those organizations' disproportionate presence in industries in which part-time work was relatively common. At the same time, they note that on a number of different instances, there was a higher proportion of "involuntary" work amongst part-timers in the non-profit sector than in the public or for profit sectors in the

sense that a greater proportion of those were part-time because they could not find a full-time job.

On the other hand, some authors doubt that atypical work will substitute typical work forms one day, at least when it comes to the work of men. They do agree that there has always been a "female trend" towards part-time or other atypical forms of work (e.g. Sacher, 1999).

Volunteering

Volunteering is not a new phenomenon but still the empirical evidence of the extent and nature of volunteering continues to be inadequate (see appendices 1–5: for most countries, this is the extent of information available on volunteering; exceptions are the United States, United Kingdom, and to some extent Italy and Germany). Hardly any country collects data on volunteering at a regular and consistent basis. In most cases there exists a body of different studies that focus on specific aspects of volunteering within different industries. Since the various national surveys often use different definitions and methods of measuring volunteering, this limits the possibility of comparison. Therefore, propositions about trends in volunteering differ and sometimes are even contradictory.

Research on the voluntary sector has grown significantly over the last few years and is most advanced in the United States and the United Kingdom. A survey carried out in the United Kingdom shows a slight decline in formal and informal volunteering between 1991 and 1997 in terms of head counts (Smith, 1998). Existing volunteers on the other hand invested more time for their activities up from an average of 2.7 hours per week in 1991 to 4.05 hours in 1997. This generally results in an overall increase in the number of hours volunteered.

Unemployed people tend to volunteer less in 1997 than in 1991, whereas participation among retired people has increased in the same time. People volunteer for a mixture of self-interested, altruistic and functional reasons, with skill development becoming increasingly important especially among young people.

Issues

Most organizations in the non-profit sector depend on both paid and volunteer work. The co-operation between the two forms of work may become a crucial issue for various reasons. Volunteers on average invest less time in their work and are not bound by contractual obligations. Information and communication problems might occur if the work performed by paid and unpaid personnel depends strongly on each other. This often results in volunteers being regarded as not reliable.

Another problem might also occur if there is no clear demarcation between the respective duties and work plan of paid employees and volunteers. The more similar the assignments of paid and unpaid workers, the bigger and more probable is the risk of paid workers being substituted by volunteers. Above all this risk might emerge if the paid work mainly involves tasks that solely require low qualifications. However, as suggested above, volunteering is more and more seen as a good opportunity to gain professional experience as well. This might especially induce highly qualified people to volunteer in certain areas.

Financing of non-profit organizations also plays a decisive role. Small organizations in particular are often unable to embark on a long-term strategy due to their limited financial structure, which might influence recruitment of paid personnel. If financial shortages occur, the layoff of paid employees is a likely remedy to save expenses. This puts pressure on the paid employees who might hence come into conflict with the volunteers. Also the willingness of paid employees to work overtime without receiving any additional payment might be seen from this angle.

A closer look at the ratio of paid to unpaid work in non-profit organizations shows a strong relationship between budget size and the number of paid staff. Higher the budget of a non-profit organization, the higher is the number of paid workers. In Germany, organizations with very low budgets scarcely employ paid personnel (Bauer and Betzelt, 1999, p. 116). Similarly, research undertaken on registered charities in England has shown that paid employment is heavily skewed towards a small number of financially large organizations. Ninety-four per cent of all full time paid employees, and just under three-quarters of all part-time paid employees are found in organizations with annual incomes of over GB£100'000, which make up less than 10 per cent of all organizations (Passey et al., 2000, pp. 41, 92). The links between unpaid staffing and organizational size are more varied: direct service and administrative volunteers are concentrated in small (less than GB100,000 annual income) organizations, but fundraising volunteers are concentrated in a combination of these small organizations, and in very large organizations (annual income over GB£10 million, Passey et al., 2000, p.'101).

As already suggested above, some researchers like Hodgkinson (1992) argue that there might be a tendency toward lower paying jobs in the non-profit sector (see also Almond and Kendall, 2000b, for Britain). Another concern is that non-profit workers often receive lower than average earnings compared to those working in similar positions for profit companies. According to a study of Ruhm and Borkoski (2000). However, it is difficult to determine whether the wage disparities reflect some type of compensating factors that are non wage related such a value orientation or similar preferences in job allocation (Ruhm and Borkoski, 2000, p. 1). They state that compensation in non-profit organizations in some cases might even exceed that in profit-seeking companies, due to the non-distribution constraint. First of all, managers might have little

incentive to hold down wages since they do not gain from the resulting cost-reductions. Feldstein has termed this as "philanthropic wage-setting" (1971). A second reason might be the fact that non-profits have less incentive to shirk on quality and therefore are likely to employ better-qualified workers.

On the other hand, some people may be willing to "donate" a portion of their paid labour to "socially responsible" non-profit employers by working at reduced wages performing "socially desirable" activities. The resulting non-profit wage penalty will be reinforced if these enterprises attract persons placing relatively high value on institution-specific fringe benefits (such as shorter working hours, better working conditions, or other non-monetary factors) and a low value attributed to monetary returns (Ruhm and Borkoski, 2000, p. 3). Rose-Ackerman for instance stressed that "ideologues" may accept lower wages for non-profit work to receive greater certainty that their efforts achieve altruistic goals, rather than benefit stockholders (Rose-Ackerman, 1996).

Non-profit organizations might also be concentrated in more competitive and less profitable sectors of the economy, where the benefits of choosing the non-profit form exceed the costs imposed by the non-distribution constraint and other limitations of non-profit status. The increased competitiveness implies downward pressure on wages (Ruhm and Borkoski, 2000). The low average non-profit wages might reflect the concentration of these jobs in low-paying industries. This could take place because disadvantaged groups (e.g. women seeking part-time work) or low-skill workers are selected for these sectors such as day care or social work. So far it has not been possible to provide appropriate answers to the range of possible factors accounting for lower or higher wages in non-profit sector.

Employers argue that atypical jobs provide the flexibility needed to be competitive. But those in atypical jobs, on average, are paid less, are less likely to receive health insurance or a pension, and have less job security than workers in regular full-time jobs. The disparities between non-standard and regular full-time jobs (e.g. wages, health insurance and pension, job security, etc.) persist even when comparing workers with similar personal, educational, and job characteristics. Some types of atypical work indeed pay high wages, but even these arrangements are usually deficient with respect to fringe benefits and job security. The most common types of atypical work arrangements are apparently, on average, inferior in all respects to regular full-time jobs. Atypical workers may depend on several of these contracts, often hoping to switch to a regular job in one of the organizations some day.

METHODOLOGY 4

Measuring paid and unpaid work in the non-profit sector

The methodology to collect systematic information on paid, unpaid and atypical forms of work in the non-profit sector is still in its infancy. As a result, quantitative information to describe the volume and type of non-profit work remains incomplete. Ideally, the following information should be gathered on a regular basis:

- quantitative aspects: How much time is invested for volunteering and by how many people? Different methods of measuring are more or less capable of providing the required information. Unfortunately, the methods differ in terms of definitions involved, in sample frames and sizes, and in the actual wording and coding of the questions asked. As a result, much work remains to be done to assess the reliability and validity of the various approaches that have been developed. For example, a comparison of different studies on volunteering in Germany shows that estimates of the adult German population volunteering range from between 13 per cent to 38 per cent of the German population volunteers (Anheier and Seibel, 2001, and Von Rosenbladt, 1999, p. 399)
- qualitative aspects: How does the meaning of volunteering vary across different fields and types of work? And how do key aspects such as motivation, job performance, work satisfaction or career planning differ across sectors? With such data at hand, it would be possible to have 'demarcation lines' drawn between the non-profit sector and other sectors, paid and unpaid work, productive activities and consumption activities.

Tools for collecting information on volunteering

Population surveys

Different methods for obtaining information have been discussed in the literature (Dingle et al., 2001, p. 15). These include prominently population surveys:

- targeted surveys (typically medium-sized survey that target a number of specific areas of voluntary activity or geographical localities);

- omnibus surveys (government statistical agencies and commercial research firms sometimes offer to add a series of questions to an existing questionnaire. This allows for larger and usually well-controlled population samples, but the number of questions and hence the amount of detail that can be obtained is limited); and
- full-scale surveys (representative sample of the population being studied, which is sufficiently large to minimize sampling error and to assure representativeness at more refined levels. Such surveys require substantial resources and time. For example, the 1999 volunteer survey in Germany worked with a sample size of over 30'000 to achieve representativeness for the various *Länder* (states or regions) and areas of volunteer activity (*Bundesministerium*, 2000). The scale of this survey, which now serves as the baseline for future efforts in this field, contrast with the sample size of 1 to 2'000 for most omnibus surveys. It is important to keep in mind that virtually all the information on volunteering, including the figures presented in table 3, are based on omnibus surveys rather than full-scale efforts. The data presented in the Appendix are based on population surveys, too, but were part of a larger, integrated survey instrument developed and perfected over three waves (applications) between 1981 and 2000. Sample sizes for the World Value Surveys and the European Value Surveys range between 800 and 2'500.

To minimize the effect of subjective interpretation, population surveys typically use some general description of volunteer work and use examples to illustrate salient aspects of volunteering. In a French population survey carried out by Archambault (1996), the questionnaire used a very specific definition of volunteer work to separate it from related aspects like membership, informal helping behaviour and the like (box 1).

Box 1. Volunteering question in French population survey

"We will now ask you about volunteer work (or volunteering). By this, we mean unpaid work and time spent to offer a service to groups or non-profit organizations, outside your family, your neighbours and your friends. For example:

- doing clerical work for an association or union;
- running a youth organization·
- coaching at sports clubs.

Distributing food, clothes or helping with other relief activities:

- volunteering as a fire-fighter or in emergency rescue programs;
- cleaning open spaces or helping preserve wildlife; or
- working on committees or serving on boards."

Box 2. The European Value Survey uses the following questions

"Please look carefully at the following list of voluntary organizations and activities and say *(a)* which, if any, do you belong to? or *(b)* which, if any are you currently doing unpaid voluntary work for?

- social welfare services for elderly, handicapped or deprived people;
- eligious or church organizations;
- education, arts, music or cultural activities;
- trade unions;
- political parties or groups;
- local community action on issues like poverty, employment, housing, racial equality;
- third world development or human rights;
- conservation, the environment, ecology, animal rights;
- professional associations;
- youth work (e.g., scouts, guides, youth clubs etc.);
- sports or recreation;
- women's groups;
- peace movements;
- voluntary organizations covered with health;
- other groups."

Box 3. Volunteering questioning the World Values Survey

"Now I am going to read off a list of voluntary organizations; for each one, could you tell me whether you are an active member, an inactive member or not a member of that type of organization?

- church or religious organization;
- sport or recreation organization;
- art, music or educational organization;
- labour union;
- political party;
- environmental organization;
- professional association;
- charitable organization;
- any other voluntary organization."

The Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project (Salamon et al., 1999; Salamon and Anheier, 1996) used a more elaborate sequence of questions in a broad cross-section of countries (boxes 4 and 5), although unlike Cnaan et al. (1996) but in line with the approach taken by the World Value Survey, the comparability of the term volunteer was not systematically tested:

Box 4. Volunteering questions in Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project (JHCNSP)

"First, we would like to ask you about volunteer work, volunteering, and [list other commonly used terms for volunteering in your country, if any]. By this we mean that you work in some way to help others outside your own family and friends for no monetary pay.

For example, some people may work in a hospital for two hours a week to help patients cope with their illnesses; others may help the handicapped, clean up parks and playgrounds, or volunteer for the local fire department or the Red Cross.

Here is a list of areas and fields in which people typically volunteer."

INTERVIEWER: Hand LIST A to respondent. LIST A: AREAS AND FIELDS

Note: this list needs to be adjusted to fit the context of specific countries; the list must fit on one page.

Culture, Arts and Recreation includes theatres, museums, zoos, aquariums, performing arts, historical and cultural societies, sports clubs, social clubs, service clubs like the Lions, Rotary etc.

- Education and Research includes primary, elementary and secondary schools, higher education, vocational schools, adult and continuing education, research institutes.
- Health includes hospitals, rehabilitation, nursing homes, mental health institutions, preventive health care, emergency medical services, and volunteer ambulances.
- Social services include child welfare services, day care, youth welfare, family welfare, services for the handicapped, services for elderly, assistance to refugees and homeless people, shelters and food distribution.
- Environment includes environmental protection, conservation, cleanup and beautification, animal and wildlife protection, and veterinary services.
- Development and housing includes community and neighbourhood organizations, domestic economic and social development activities, housing associations and housing assistance.
- Civil and advocacy organizations includes civic associations, civil liberty groups, advocacy organizations, legal services, crime prevention and rehabilitation of offenders, consumer protection.
- Philanthropy and voluntarism promotion includes foundations, volunteer bureaus, and fund-raising organizations.
- Religion includes churches, synagogues, mosques and other places of warship.
- International activities include exchange, friendship and cultural programs, international disaster and relief, international human rights and peace promotion, development assistance and aid.
- Business and professional associations and unions includes associations among businesses, business men, professionals, and unions.

Others [please specify] ……

In which, if any, of these areas listed, have you, yourself, done volunteer work **in the past month, that is in the month of** _____ [insert month prior to survey month]?

During the last year, that is 200_, are there any other areas in which you volunteered? [refer back to LIST A]

Now, I would like you to estimate the total number of hours you spent on average per month on each of the areas in which you have been a volunteer.

3a. First, how many hours did you spend working for [list first activity mentioned by respondent in Question 1] in the last month?

3b. And how many hours did you spend working for [list second activity mentioned by respondent in Question I] in the last month?

[Record for each activity mentioned to the nearest hour]

RECORDING SHEET: VOLUNTEERING

Area	Last Month	Hours Last Month	Last Year	Hours Last Year
Arts and Recreation	yes/no		yes/no	
Education/ Research	yes/no		yes/no	
Health	yes/no		yes/no	
Social Services	yes/no		yes/no	
Environment	yes/no		yes/no	
Development/Housing	yes/no		yes/no	
Civic/Advocacy	yes/no		yes/no	
Philanthropy	yes/no		yes/no	
Religion	yes/no		yes/no	
International	yes/no		yes/no	
Business, Professional	yes/no		yes/no	
Other	yes/no		yes/no	

For each of the areas you have mentioned so far [in Questions 1 and 2 on Volunteering in Key Module], which one number on this card best describes the type of organization you volunteered for?

The Johns Hopkins module also includes a question at the type of organization in which people volunteer:

Box 5. JHCNSP list B types of organizations

Non-profit

1. [Use most common term for non-profit organization in country]
   - Church-related associations
   - Church or religious association
   - Union-related association
   - Political party related association

Public

- Municipal organization
- Local state or public organization
- Other public organization

For profit

- Commercial association or business
- Others (please specify)

As part of a developing a satellite account for the household sector, the Office of National Statistics (ONS) in the United Kingdom built an inventory of past surveys of volunteering based on Lynn's (1997) previous work (table 5). The ONS found significant discrepancies across the surveys in terms of definition, methodology and coverage. To a large extent, these discrepancies are responsible for the significant variation in the estimates based on survey data. As table 6 shows, the proportion of the population volunteering ranges from 23 per cent to 55 per cent in surveys conducted in 1987, 24 per cent to 51 per cent for surveys from the early 1990s, and 32 per cent to 48 per cent for the late 1990s and 2000/1. Applied to the actual number of people volunteering, ONS concludes that estimates range from 10.8 million (for 1992) through 14.8 million (2001–08) to 21.8 million (for 1997), and attributes these differences in survey methodologies, whereas actual changes in the level of volunteering may be much less significant (ONS, 2001–08, pp. 6).

Therefore, depending on the source used, a wide range of estimates on volunteering can be found. Table 6 demonstrates that there is lack of consistency in data on volunteering. Thus we can conclude that current survey methods are not sufficient to measure volunteering over-time.

Table 5. Survey definitions of voluntary activity

Survey	Year	Payments allowed	Beneficiaries excluded	Informal?	Questioning method
General Household Survey (GHS)	1981	Expenses	Household, family friends, animal charity	Yes	Presented definition
National Survey of Volunteering (NSV)	1981	Expenses, nominal fees	Immediate family	Yes	Range of direct questions
General Household Survey (GHS)	1987	Expenses	Family, personal friends	No	Presented definition and examples
Charities Aid Foundation (CAF)	1987–1993	Not specified	All individuals, organizations that are not charities	No	Presented list of examples only
National Surey of Volunteering (NSV)	1991	Expenses, nominal fees	Close relatives	Yes	Range of direct questions and examples
General Household Survey (NHS)	1992	Expenses	Trade unions, political parties	No	Presented definition and examples
National Survey of Volunteering (NSV)	1997	Expenses	Close relatives	Yes	Extended range of questions and examples
National Statistics (United Kingdom) Omnibus	2001	Expenses	Trade unions, political parties, families, friends	No	Presented definition and examples

Source: National Statistics, household Satellite Account - Volunteering, HHP8–2001–09, Appendix B [Amended and updated from Lynn, 1997].

Table 6. Number of people who volunteer (millions)

Year	General Household Survey		Charities Aid Foundation		National Survey on Volunteering		National Statistics Omnibus module	
	No.	Proportion (%)	No.	Proportion (%)	No.	Proportion (%)	No.	Proportion (%)
1981	9.8	23.0						
1982								
1983								
1984								
1985								
1986								
1987	10.2	23.0	23.4	55.0				
1988			12.8	30.0				
1989			12.5	29.0				
1990			14.7	34.0				
1991					22.8	51.0		
1992	10.8	24.0	11.3	26.0				
1993			9.2	21.0				
1994								
1995								
1996								
1997					21.8	48.0		
1998								
1999								
2000								
2001							14.8	32.0

Source: National Statistics, household Satellite Account — Volunteering, HHP8–2001–08, Appendix A.

Based on an assessment of the surveys listed in table 5, the ONS developed and tested module for volunteering-related questions in population surveys that seek to collect data for three basic estimates:

- the number of volunteers in the population;
- the total number of hours volunteered (for persons 16 and older); and
- the total number of hours volunteered by activity.

This approach is similar the one developed by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project (Salamon and Anheier, 1996). Table 7 offers the NSO module used for the 2001 omnibus survey on volunteering in Britain.

Table 7. The National Statistics Omnibus Survey (Module 275 — Volunteering)

Ask always:
Intro
We are interested in any voluntary activity that you may do through a group or organization.
By volunteering we mean any activity that helps other people or the environment but which is UNPAID, except for expenses.
Please do NOT include any kind of informal caring such as shopping for an elderly relative or friend.
(1) PRESS ENTER TO CONTINUE
Ask always:
M275_1
SHOW CARD C275.1

Please look at this card which lists the kinds of voluntary activity that people might do.
During the last 12 months, have you done any voluntary activity?
Yes No
Ask if: Has done voluntary activity in the last 12 months
M275_2
SHOW CARD C275.1
What kinds of voluntary activity have you done in the last 12 months?
Please choose your answers from this card.
CODE ALL THAT APPLY — SET[8] OF
Personally raising or collecting money
Serving on committees
Organizing or helping a club or group
Giving professional advice, talks, coaching or training
Giving non-professional advice, talks, coaching or training
Providing administrative, clerical or secretarial help
Giving other kinds of practical help not already mentioned
Any other type of voluntary activity
M275_3
Now thinking about the last 4 weeks, that is since (correct date), have you done any voluntary activity in that time?
Yes No
Ask if: Has done voluntary activity in the last 12 months and: Has done voluntary activity in the last 4 weeks.
M275_4
SHOW CARD C275.1
(Thinking about the last 4 weeks, that is since (date)), what kinds of voluntary activity have you done in that time?
Please choose your answers from this card.
CODE ALL THAT APPLY — SET [8] OF
Personally raising or collecting money
Serving on committees
Organizing or helping a club or group
Giving professional advice, talks, coaching or training
Giving non-professional advice, talks, coaching or training
Providing administrative, clerical or secretarial help
Giving other kinds of practical help not already mentioned
Any other type of voluntary activity
Ask if: Has done voluntary activity in the last 12 months and: Has done voluntary activity in the last 4 weeks and: Has done any other voluntary activity in last 4 weeks
M275_4a
PLEASE SPECIFY OTHER TYPE OF VOLUNTAYR ACTIVITY THAT YOU HAVE DONE STRING [200]
Ask if: Has done voluntary activity in the last 12 months and: Has done voluntary activity in the last 4 weeks
M275_5
How many hours do you think you have spent (doing each activity mentioned at M275_4) in the last 4 weeks
0.672
Ask if: Has done voluntary activity in the last 12 months and: Has done voluntary activity in the last 4 weeks
M275_6
More time than usual
Less time than usual
About the same amount of time as usual

Source: National Statistics, Household Satellite Account — Volunteering, HHP8–2001–09, Appendix C.

Clearly, cross-national methodologies to measuring volunteering with the help of population surveys can benefit from the experience gained at the national level, be it the German volunteer survey or the volunteer module as part of the household satellite in the United Kingdom. At present, however, regardless of sampling frame and actual sample size, national surveys vary significantly in their methods of data collection, be it by telephone, mail, or face to face. Largely in response to the weak comparability of data on volunteering, a debate on the use of population surveys has developed among researchers in the field in recent years. The main issue is the appropriateness of survey instruments such as telephone interviews and postal questionnaires to measure a phenomenon as multi-faceted as volunteering. While some suggest stability of resulting population estimates using different methods of data collection (Kirsch et al., 2001), others are more cautionary (Hall, 2001; O'Neill, 2001), while some others question the reliability of the survey data to make generalizations (Havens and Schervish, 2001; Rooney et al., 2001).

Specifically, Havens and Schervish refer to their earlier work on charitable giving and suggest that the amount and range of volunteer activity reported in directly related to the degree to which "the more carefully a survey samples the full range of households by income, interviews the knowledgeable decision-makers in an household, furthers respondent recall, contracts trained interviewers who ask complex questions patiently and accurately, and otherwise uses rigorous field practices" (2001, p. 548). In other words, population surveys most likely underreport the scale and diversity of volunteering, a problem that is compounded in cross-national research by the absence of basic methodological groundwork examining the validity of the concept of voluntary activity in the first place.

Employment-based surveys and censuses

Employment-based surveys and censuses are a second cluster of tools to collect information on unpaid work, as part of regular reporting on all kinds of paid employment in non-profit organizations. The advantages of such an approach are the regularity and long-term perspective with which such surveys are carried out. The disadvantage is that most standard employment surveys do not include any questions on unpaid and many forms of atypical work.

Organizational surveys

Organizational surveys are a third way to gather information on volunteering. They can offer detailed information on characteristics of work for both paid and unpaid work, allow for comparisons between paid and unpaid work within organizations, and make it possible to the output produced by paid and unpaid work in non-profit organizations. Specifically, this covers information on the type of work done in the organization, the way in which tasks of paid and unpaid workers relate to each other, and the extent to which

volunteers complement or substitute paid staff. While these data items go beyond what can be collected through population surveys, and add usefully to our understanding of work in the non-profit sector, organizational surveys, have also potential disadvantages. For one, they tend to exclude informal volunteering, because the universe of non-profit organizations might be rather difficult to identify. What is more, many non-profit organizations do not keep precise records on volunteers and their activities.

Time-use studies

Time-use studies are normally based on written diaries, which picture a complete, randomly selected 24-hour day among a sample population (see Haven and Schervish, 2001 for a Boston-based study). A person writes down all the activities performed within 24 hours, subdivided into time slices of a certain length (the length of the time slices may vary from survey to survey, e.g. five, 10 or 15 minutes). The results provide an overview of a person's entire time budget for the day selected (Bühlmann and Schmid, 1999, p. 62). Mostly the persons are asked to use their own wording, and also to provide additional information like eventual parallel activities and with whom or for whom they carried them out.

Recorded activities are then assigned to different categories. The three main categories into which human activities can be grouped are

- personal activities (non-economic or non-market);
- productive non-market activities (mostly for own-consumption); and
- productive market-oriented activities.

The "third-person criterion" demarcates personal activities from productive non-market activities. The basic question here is if it is possible for one person to obtain another person to perform instead (UN, 1993, pp. 6–16). If it is impossible, then the activity classifies as a personal, non-market activity.

The "production boundary" defined in the United Nations System of National Accounts demarcates productive non-market activities from market-oriented activities (UN, 1993; Goldschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis, 1995). Diverse categories have been adopted for non-SNA activities in different national studies, which complicate the assessment of common orders of magnitude. There exist various classification schemes for activities in time use studies, of which the European Time-Use Survey (ETUS) and the UN Trial International Classification of Activities For Time-use Statistics (ICATUS) are perhaps the most widely used:

- The ETUS classification system differentiates between SNA activities based on or closely related to employment, and non-SNA activities. The latter includes personal care, studying, household and family care, volunteer work, attending social meetings, social life and entertainment, sports and outdoor activities, hobbies and games, and leisure travel (Eurostat, 2000, p. 17ff).
- The ICATUS classification differentiates ten main groups that include employment activities in establishments, primary production activities

outside establishments, services for income and other production of goods outside establishments, household maintenance, management and shopping for own household, care for children, the sick, elderly and disabled for own household, community services and help to other households, learning, social and cultural activities, mass media use, and personal care and self-maintenance) (Bediako and Vanek, 1998, p. 5).

Time-use studies offer significant advantages. They provide very detailed information on persons providing work and different time use behaviour can be obtained, and they are more reliable than population surveys for collecting data about frequent and common activities (Goldschmidt-Clermont, 1995).

A potential disadvantage of time use surveys lies in the fact that unpaid work is carried out infrequently, often on weekends. The time of questioning will have an impact on estimated working time provided by volunteers (in most cases underestimated). Moreover, establishing a strong differentiation between certain forms of volunteering becomes easily labourious and costly (especially if other activities are recorded as well).

However, many time-use studies fail to distinguish properly between volunteering and membership, i.e., the distinction between voluntary service provision and social participation. What is more, they frequently do not include a specification by type of voluntary work and the type of organization in which voluntary activities take place. Consequently, time-use studies show constraints for estimating the basic population parameters needed for calculating the replacement value of voluntary work (Archambault et al., 1998, p. 8).

Goldschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis (1995) point out the following challenges for comparing different national time-use surveys:

- data collection methods (keeping personal diary, reporting verbally to interviewer questions, frequency of recall etc);
- handling of seasonal variations and influence of holidays and vacation periods;
- degree of representativeness of the sample, including , handling of non-response;
- handling of transportation time;
- setting the right time units across a wide range of activities;
- age groups under observation;
- categorization of activities;
- time-use studies might probably sometimes be too costly to gather useful information about work in the non-profit sector;
- some people would not classify the organization they are working for as a non-profit organization; and
- if the results are viewed from a macro perspective they might occur rather vague, if they are viewed in perfect detail no universally valid statements are possible.

Evaluating unpaid work

At least as challenging as measuring is the evaluation of unpaid work. Different approaches of evaluation exist as presented in the following paragraphs. They involve different theoretical models and imply specific assumptions about the value of volunteer work relative to paid work. At present, no "right" valuation method exists among the different approaches that explain evaluation of unpaid work from various perspectives. Deciding which of the theories and their underlying assumptions are chosen ultimately points to normative questions. What is the intention of the evaluation and what kind of evaluation methods correspond best to the evaluation's aims (see Hollerweger, 2000, p. 52)?

From a practical point of view another aspect that affects evaluation, is the availability of information. On the one hand, as we have seen, the collection of information about unpaid work is far from being systematic and therefore the data are frequently not comparable. Different methods of measurement are more or less useful to provide the required information. On the other hand, the SNA currently lacks sufficient differentiation of reference values concerning remuneration, labour costs, structure of labour etc. (Franz, 1996, p. 142).

For valuation of unpaid work basically two approaches can be distinguished, output-based models and input-based methods. Both approaches imply the existence of comparable goods and services available on the market. Whereas output-based methods value the result of the production process, the income-based methods refer primarily to the labour force allocated to the volunteer activities.

Output-based valuations

Output-based methods refer to the output of the production process, namely to the goods and services produced by the private household or the non-profit organization, and value them with the market price of equivalent market products. Therefore goods and services produced have to be recorded in detail. Crucial for the evaluation is the definition of output units. The approach implies a clear illustration of all services produced within the non-profit sector. In order to assure comparability across countries consistent output units have to be defined.

Output-based valuations would be appropriate in order to guarantee compatibility with national account procedures since the system of national account proceeds from the result of the production as well. Still, due to their complexity and due to serious problems about the data the use of output-based valuations is not very common. They have only been performed occasionally and on a restricted number of activities (Goldschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis, 1995, p. 17).

Input-based valuations

Input-based methods determine the value of the labour factor by imputing a fictive wage to the working time invested in voluntary work. Concerning the input method, the approach implies that wage rates would remain unchanged if volunteers entered the labour market. As we have seen above, according to existing empirical studies volunteers represent a significant workforce, especially within certain fields (Salamon et al, 1999). The transfer of this workforce to the labour market would most likely affect the equilibrium wage rate and push it lower (Archambault et al., 1998, p. 13). Further, it seems reasonable that many people would not be able to claim services if they had to pay market prices. Thus, a hypothetical shift of volunteer services to the market would therefore affect the demand side as well. In the following paragraphs, two different approaches will be discussed: replacement costs and opportunity costs.

Valuation of volunteer time at replacement cost

The replacement cost approach refers to the costs that would arise if the work done voluntarily were to be bought in the labour market. The approach implies that wage earners could replace volunteers. Hence volunteers and wage earners are perfect substitutes in terms of skills and productivity. Paid and unpaid work may take place in different environment, such as market oriented and domestic work. Applying the same set of prices for valuation might not be appropriate. However, these critical issues of valuation of unpaid work seem to be less challenging for volunteering than for housework, since the activities carried out by volunteers are closer to the labour market. In most cases they are formalized and more part of production activities than household activities, as defined by the SNA (Archambault et al., 1998, p. 2).

Since the labour market is far from being homogenous, several wages can be considered. Different concepts exist about which kind of wage is to be chosen based on the qualification of volunteers. For example, the voluntary activity of persons working in a soup kitchen can be evaluated by considering the wage rate of a professional cook on one extreme or by imputing the wage rate of a kitchen helper on the other extreme. The specialist approach refers to the volunteers' work to be compared with the work of specialists. This might be appropriate in certain cases. Still the assignment of a certain profession is crucial since more than one profession could be feasible. For instance, garden work could be compared to the work of gardeners, florists or agriculturists. Some studies chose to form equivalence groups that contain all plausible professions and determine the average wage rate (Schmid et al., 1999, p.47).

The generalist approach on the other hand refers to volunteers as "polyvalents" who do different kinds of work. This is in most cases equated with less qualification and therefore results in a lower wage rate. Volunteering can include both, specific activities that require the work of a specialist, as well as,

jobs with little qualification requirements. Due to the heterogeneity of voluntary work the generalist method might give a low estimate, whereas the specialist method may give a high estimate (Hirway, 1999, p. 17).

Which of the approaches is more appropriate is also a matter of the level of aggregation and differentiation. Again the definition of input units is crucial. Whereas some studies differentiate clearly between various kinds of volunteer work, others are less precise. The comparison of single activities to the work of wage earners is not consistent since paid work is typically performed over forty relatively well-defined hours per week that involve a range of activities as defined in formal job descriptions. Even the jobs of specialists will include activities with different qualification requirements, which will be reflected in the wage rate according to economic theories. Since paid and unpaid work vary considerably with regard to the time spent the systematic comparison of different activities appears crucial for the validity of estimates.

To some extent, organizational surveys might allow a direct comparison of paid and unpaid work on relative low levels of aggregation, especially if the organizations keep adequate records. While the documentation of paid work is compulsory to a certain degree, and frequently required under labour laws or bargaining agreements, the collection of data concerning unpaid work is typically left up to the organizations' own interest. However, it is possible that with increasing consciousness of the economic value of volunteer work, organizations will be more likely to document the range of volunteer activities more fully.

In partnership with research institutions instruments such as the Volunteer Investment and Value Audit (VIVA) have been developed in recent years, to formalize the process of documentation and evaluation (Gaskin, 1999). The VIVA approach offers a menu of routes to calculating expenditure and value of volunteering in organizations. Replacement costs are applied for valuing the work of volunteers. Practical concepts are emphasized rather than methodological ones. The replacement costs refer either to the external labour market or to the internal pay structures of the respective organizations (Gaskin, 1999, p. iv). However, so far organizations rarely record the work done by volunteers and therefore will not be able to provide the necessary information. Since volunteer work is often carried out rather infrequently the documentation could become laborious and costly.

Valuation of volunteer time at opportunity cost

The opportunity cost refers to the wage unpaid workers would earn in the market if they decided to give up voluntary work and take up paid employment for the same kind of activity. The approach is based on the assumption that individuals can choose freely between paid and unpaid work. Determining the opportunity cost for persons participating in the labour market is relatively

simple since their actual wage rate can be applied. Imputing a monetary value to unpaid work of people who are not employed is more challenging. The evaluation of voluntary work by persons who have no or little choice, like the unemployed, is crucial for the validity of this approach. Conceptually, their work would have to be valued at zero opportunity costs. Similar questions are raised concerning the evaluation of work performed by retired people or youths below legal employment age.

The potential replacement wage for the non- and unemployed has to be estimated. According to the human capital theory, the wage rate is a function of the human capital usually described by educational level, skills and working experience. The decision regarding which variables are to be included affects the results and can result in distortions. The approximation of the potential wage rate is rather complicated. In many cases, the average wage is applied instead, which is not appropriate from a theoretical point of view (Schmid et al., 1999, p. 32).

Another critical point is that valuations based on opportunity cost will value the same activity differently depending on who performs it. For instance, the value of cooking is higher if the volunteer is a university graduate rather than a person who only finished primary school. Since people tend not to volunteer in the same field of activity than in their paid jobs it is questionable whether the use of this approach is justified (Archambault et al., 1998, p. 11). Personal characteristics, which are important for paid jobs like education and job experience might play a minor role for the requirements of the respective voluntary work.

For theoretical and practical reasons most studies opt against the valuation of unpaid work at opportunity cost. Since the approach evolves from the microeconomic theory the application for macroeconomic aims is crucial and therefore not recommended (Schmid et al., 1999, p. 32). The microeconomic approach derives from a number of assumptions that are rarely met in practice (Golschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis, 1995, p. 18).

Wage concepts

Net or gross wages

The choice between gross or net wages for the valuation of volunteer activities depends on the use and wider purpose of the obtained results. Net wages reflect the economic impact actually generated by non-SNA activities. Gross wages on the other hand reflect which changes would be generated and how SNA aggregates would be affected, if production were transferred from households or non-profit institutions to the market (Golschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis, 1995, p. 18). According to the concept of substitution, gross wages are therefore a more appropriate concept for the valuation of volunteer time (Schmid et al., 1999, p. 38). Even so Goldschmidt-Clermont and

Pagnossin-Aligisakis (1995, p. 18) opt for the use of net wages in respect of inclusion of unpaid work in the household sector satellite account. They do so from a practical perspective, as the use of gross wages might be more feasible since the national account item "compensation of employees" represents a convenient reference point for net wages (Goldschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis, 1995, p. 18).

Another challenge is the standardization of wage concepts in order to achieve cross-national comparison. Especially the definition of gross wages may vary across countries. Whereas income taxes are included in most countries, differences occur in the addition of social security contributions. According to the social security system of the respective countries, the social security contribution may be partly borne by the employer or by public sector funds.

Standard wage (union wage rate) or real wage

Real wages are determined by the actual remuneration for the performed work including special payments, social security contributions of employer and reimbursement for days off. Standard wages represent the lower limit of the actual remuneration. Real wages better reflect the actual circumstances on the market and should therefore be preferred (Franz, 1996, p. 143).

Contract hours and actually worked hours

For calculating the wage rate per hour the differentiation between actual and contractual hours has to be considered: public holidays, illness, industrial conflicts, vocational training, meal breaks, unpaid overtime have an impact on the actual working time and productivity; hence the real wage rate is affected. The standardization of data recording is necessary for cross-national comparison.

Valuation of unpaid work has been carried out by many countries mainly with the purpose of investigating and illustrating the work provided within households. Only few studies concentrate on volunteering, although some include a limited range of volunteer activities. Most studies are based on time use surveys. Schmid et al. (1999) summarize the recent experiences of different countries in this respect, and finds that most use replacement costs for the valuation of unpaid work, while a few, either solely or additionally, calculate on the basis of opportunity cost. Other countries still use highly local wage concepts and methods, which leads Schmid et al. (1999, p. 55) to conclude that available results are hardly comparable cross-nationally. Interestingly, some studies consider divers wage concepts and valuation methods and illustrate the resulting differences in the estimations obtained (see Franz, 1996).

Goldschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis (1995) examine the measures of unrecorded economic activities in fourteen countries, emphasizing the differences in wage determination and basic time-use data. The estimate of

the value of non-SNA labour based on gross or extra-gross wages range between 33 and 72 per cent of the GDP. Of course, such estimates can merely be used as rough markers or "measuring rod" since the value of non-labour cannot be compared to the value of GDP based on the SNA approach. In one country, compared to the SNA item "compensation of employees", the value of non-SNA labour inputs even exceeds the SNA labour input. Estimates of the value of non-SNA production at cost of inputs yield values of 50 to 85 per cent of GDP using extra-gross wages (available for four countries) and 32 or 47 per cent using net wages (available for two countries). Therefore, systematic and meaningful cross-national comparisons cannot be made at present, and Goldschmidt-Clermont and Pagnossin-Aligisakis (1995) suggest developing recommendations on definitions and methods at an international level, in order to achieve cross-national comparability

RECOMMENDATIONS 5

Several recommendations follow from this report, most of them centred on the improvement and further testing of current methodologies, and remedies to counteract the continued paucity of high-quality data paid work in the non-profit sector generally, and on volunteering specifically. We conclude this report with eight recommendations.

The first recommendation is to improve data coverage and understanding of how different paid employment in the non-profit sector is from other parts of the economy. This would go beyond the kind of cross-sector analyses of existing jobs reviewed above, but also extend to aspects of career patterns and the influence of professions (medical, social work, legal, educational) on work patterns. What is more, we need a better understanding of inter-sector dynamics, i.e., how job creation and termination in one sector, such as, government relate to employment growth or contraction in the non-profit sector or in the for-profit economy.

Second, in terms of unpaid work, it has become clear that population surveys on volunteering are clearly limited in their research and policy use, and are best carried out to track basic changes in a few select parameters such as the proportion of the population volunteering or the volume of hours volunteered. What is needed urgently are the basic methodological approaches suggested by Cnaan et al. (1996) who examine types of volunteering using the concepts of net cost and benefit to develop empirical categories of different forms and meanings attached to voluntary activity. Unfortunately, none of the population surveys examined here engaged in this basic task, and in particular comparative research in the field seems to gloss over many important conceptual issues.

Third, what is needed is a coordinated effort to "deconstruct" volunteering empirically, and to develop types that carry meaning cross-nationally. Once this improved terminology is in place, the next step is to conduct a micro-census of volunteering, which typically implies sample sizes of 30,000 and more in most OECD countries, and perhaps even higher in developing countries with heterogeneous populations. The lessons learned from the micro-census on volunteering in Germany should prove useful to other countries as well (*Bundesministerium*, 2000). As suggested above, conventional population surveys can then be used to update this baseline. The challenge to develop more culturally and economically sensitive definitions is most acute in the developing

world as well as in the transition economies of Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

Fourth, these surveys should be complemented by other approaches such as time-use surveys, diary studies and specifically by organizational studies that look at the role of volunteers in the work context. Too little is known about how volunteers relate to paid staff, the extent to which paid and unpaid positions are substitutable, complementary or parallel to each other. Moreover, the costs and benefits of volunteering are under-researched. Organizational surveys for non-profit organizations will provide the main source of information on the output of non-profit organizations. Therefore, output-based approaches need to be developed in order to value non-market production. Output-based surveys should be designed to deliver estimates of volumes of outputs, as well as, information about up to what extend the production was provided by unpaid and paid labour.

Fifth, for labour market policies, much more needs to be done in the areas of security around work provided by volunteers, both in terms of insurance coverage but also in the field of entitlements and other benefits. At present, no study is available that examines these issues from a cross-national perspective. For this reason, there is a need to carry out special programs of labour force surveys to investigate paid and unpaid work within non-profit organizations. It is therefore necessary to develop a questionnaire that provides a clear definition of non-profit organizations so that the respondents can easily classify the organization they work for as a NPO by themselves. As part of this effort, it is necessary to clearly differentiate between actual, usual, normal and legal hours of work. For economic analyses, the most suitable definition is actual hours of work in productive activities, whether paid or unpaid.

Sixth, a stronger differentiation of certain forms of unpaid work is needed within national time accounts. National time accounts represent a set of estimates of total income and expenditure of time in a country. They provide measures of how households allocate time between paid work, unpaid work and leisure (Ironmonger, 1999, p. 6). The development of such national time accounts is in different stages of progression within various countries. Mostly they are primarily based on time use studies. Existing diary-based surveys could be extended to better differentiate between certain forms of volunteering. It is also feasible to carry out specially designed time use studies to record paid and unpaid work within the third sector. Time use studies are expensive and their regular appliance is therefore limited. Further they suffer from certain biases hence surveys using stylized questions should be carried out additionally (for specific survey instruments see Dingle et al., 2001, p. 31). In order to ensure comparability these questions should be consistent throughout all countries. Still, differences in the forms of paid and unpaid work across countries should be taken into consideration.

Seventh, there is a need to expand the methodological testing of the various evaluation approaches in estimating the value of volunteer time. At present, for practical purposes, VIVA appears as the best approach but it further tests, particularly in developing countries and transition economies. In particular, to the extent that larger data sets on work in the non-profit sector become available, we should be in a better position to test alternative approaches.

Finally, the ultimate goal is to incorporate the notion of unpaid work fully into the work security and work place statistics and information systems maintained at relevant national and international organizations. To explore the objectives, contours, and uses of such a system represents the true challenge ahead. Fortunately, the United Nations Statistical Office has just issued a Handbook on Non-profit Institutions in relation to the 1993 System of National Accounts (see The Global Non-Profit Information System Project, 2000). Linking systematic and methodologically sound data on paid and unpaid work in the non-profit sector will be a welcome contribution to this important step forward.

REFERENCES

Almond, S. and Kendall. J. 2000a. "Taking the employees' perspective seriously: An initial United Kingdom cross-sectoral comparison", in *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 205–231.

_____. 2000b. "Low pay in the United Kingdom: The case for a three sector comparative approach", in *Annals of Public and Co-operative Economics* Vol. 72(1), pp. 45–76.

_____. 2000c. *Paid employment in the self-defined voluntary sector in the late 1990s: An initial description of patterns and trends*, Working Paper No. 7 (Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics).

_____. 2000d. *The quality of United Kingdom third sector employment in comparative perspective*, paper presented at the Conference of the Association for Research on Non-Profit Organizations and Voluntary Action, New Orleans.

Anheier, H.K. and Ben Ner, A. 1997. "The shifting boundaries: Long-terms changes in the size of the for-profit, non-profit, cooperative and Government sectors", in *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* Vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 335–354.

Anheier, H.K. and Salamon, L.M. (eds). 1998. *The non-profit sector in the developing world* (Manchester, Manchester University Press).

_____. 199. "Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Initial comparisons", in *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 43–66.

Anheier, H. A. and Seibel, W. 2001. *The Non-profit sector in Germany* (Manchester, Manchester University Press).

Archambault, E. 1996. *The non-profit sector in France* (Manchester, Manchester University Press).

Archambault, E. et al. 1998. *The monetary value of volunteer time: A comparative analysis of France, Germany and the United States*, paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Review of Income and Wealth, Lillehammer, Norway.

Bachstein, W. 2000. *Non-profit organisationen im Bereich sozialer Dienste: Beschäftigung und sozialpolitische Implikationen* (Vienna,Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration).

Badelt, C. 1999. "Ehrenamtliche Arbeit im Non-profit Sektor", in C. Badelt (ed.) *Handbuch der Non-profit Organisationen. Strukturen und Management* (Stuttgart, Schäffer-Poeschl), pp. 433–462.

Barker, D. G. 1993. "Values and volunteering", in J.D. Smith (ed.) *Volunteering in Europe*, Second Series No. 2 (London, Voluntary Action Research), pp. 10–31.

Bauer, R. and Betzelt, S. 1999. *NETS "New employment opportunities in the third sector: Final country report Germany*, www.lunaria.org/tertium/ricerca/conclusi/nets/germany_final.pdf, 15 January, 2001.

Bediako, G. and Vanek, J. 1998. *Trial international classification of activities for time-use statistics* (New York, United Nations Statistic Division), www.un.org/Depts/unsd/timeuse/icatus/expnote_1.pdf (20 February, 2001).

Bühlmann, J. and Schmid, B. 1999. *Unbezahlt — aber trotzdem Arbeit. Zeitaufwand für Haus- und Familienarbeit, Ehrenamt, Freiwilligenarbeit und Nachbarschaftshilfe* (Neuchâtel, Switzerland, Bundesamt für Statistik).

Bundesministerium für Familie. 2002. Senioren, Frauen und Jugend. Ehrenamtliches und bürgerschaftliches Engagement in unserer Gesellschaft (Berlin, Bundesministerium).

Casey, B. 1988. "Temporary employment: Practice and policy in Britain", cited in K. Heitzmann (1995) *European trends in contractual flexibility: A cure for unemployment?* (Bath, MESPA).

Chadeau, A and C. Roy. 1986. "Relating households final consumption to household activities: Subsidiarity or complementary between market and non-market production", in *The Review on Income and Wealth*, Series 32(4).

Chang-Ho, L. 2002. "Volunteerism in Korea", in *Journal of Volunteer Administration,* Vol. 20, No. 3, pp.10-11.

Cnaan, R. et al. 1996. "Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations", in *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 364–383.

Daly, M. (ed.). 2002. *Care Work: The Quest for Security* (Geneva, ILO)

Davis Smith, J. 1998. *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering* (London, Institute of Volunteering Research).

DeLaMar, R. 2000. "Volunteerism in Brazil: A society redefines its concept of service", in *Volunteer Leadership* (Spring), pp. 26–8.

Delsen, L. W. M. 1995. *Atypical employment: An international perspective* (Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff).

Delsen, L. W. M. and Huijgen, F. 1994. "Analysis of part-time and fixed-term employment in Europe using establishment data", Cited in K. Heitzmann (1995) *European trends in contractual flexibility: A cure for unemployment?* (Bath, MESPA).

Dingle, A. t al. (eds.). 2001. *Measuring volunteering: A practical toolkit* (Washington, D.C., Independent Sector and United Nations Volunteers), www.independentsector.org/programs/research/toolkit/IYVToolkit.PDF (15 February, 2001).

Ehling, M. and Schmidt, B. 1999. "Ehrenamtliches engagement. Erfassung in der zeitbudgeterhebung des statistischen bundesamtes und möglichkeiten der weiterentwicklung", in E. Kistler et al. (eds.). *Perspektiven gesellschaftlichen zusammenhalts. empirische befunde, praxiserfahrungen, meßkonzepte* (Berlin, Edition Sigma), pp. 411–433.

Emanuele, R. and W.O. Simmons. 2002. "More than altruism: What does the fringe benefit say about the increasing role of the non-profit sector?" in *Mid-American Journal of Business*, Vol. 17 (2).

Employment and European Social Fund. 1999. *Employment in Europe 1999* (European Commission, Employment and Social Affairs).

Eurostat. 2000. *Survey on time-use — Activity coding list, final draft*, http://www.un.org/Depts/unsd/timeuse/tusresource_manuals/eurostat_man.pdf (20th February, 2001).

Feldstein, M. S. 1971. *The rising cost of hospital care* (Washington D.C., Information Services Press).

Franz, A. (ed.). 1996. *Familienarbeit und Frauen-BIP* (Weien, Oesterreichisches Statistisches Zentralamt).

Freeman, R. 1997. "Working for nothing: The supply of volunteer labour", in *Journal of Labour Economics* Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. S140–S166.

Gaskin, K. 1999. *VIVA in Europe. A comparative study of the volunteer investment and value audit* (London, Institute for Volunteering Research).

Gaskin, K. and Smith, J. D. 1997. *A new civic Europe?* (London, The Volunteer Centre), 3rd Edition.

Gobin, C. 1997. "The mirage of a social Europe", in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November, www.monde-diplomatique.fr/en/1997/11/europe (15 January, 2001).

Goldschmidt-Clermont, L. and Pagnossin-Aligisakis, E. 1995. *Measures of unrecorded economic activities in fourteen Countries* (United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report Office), Occasional Paper 20, http://www.undp.org/hdro/oc20a.htm (20 February, 2001).

Grigoryan, S. 2002. "Volunteering and volunteer management in Armenia", in *Journal of Volunteer Administration*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 12–13.

Grunewald, M. H. 1995. "The regulatory future of contingent employment: An introduction", in *Washington and Lee Law Review*, Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 725–753, www.wlu.edu/~lawrev/abs/grunewald.htm (15 January 2001).

Hall, M. 2001. "Measurement issues in surveys of giving and volunteering and strategies applied in the design of Canada's National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participation", in *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 515–527.

Havens, J.J. and Schervish, P.G. 2001. "The methods and metrics of the Boston Area Diary Study", in *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 527–550.

Hawrylyshyn, O. 1977. "Towards a definition of non-market activities", in *The Review on Income and Wealth,* Series 23(1).

Hirway, I. 1999. *Time-use studies: Conceptual and methodological issues with reference to the Indian time-use survey paper*, http://www.unescap.org/stat/meet/timeuse/Conceptual_SesI.pdf, (20 February, 2001).

Hodgkinson, V. et al. 1992. *The non-profit almanac: Dimensions of the independent sector 1992–1993* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass).

_____. 1996. *Non-profit almanac: Dimensions of the independent sector 1996–1997* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass).

Hollerweger, E. 2000. "Oekonomische Bedeutung ehrenamtlicher Arbeit", in M. Roessler et al. (eds.) *Gemeinwesenarbeit und Bürgerschaftliches Engagement. Eine Abgrenzung* (Wien, OGB Verlag).

Inglehart, R. 1990. *Culture shift in advanced industrial society* (Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). 1993. *Code of ethics* (Geneva, IFRC).

_____. 1999. *Strategy 2010: Learning from the Nineties and other supporting documents* (Geneva, IFRC).

Ironmonger, D. 1999. *An overview of time-use surveys*, Paper presented at the International Seminar on Time-Use Studies, Ahemedabad, India, http://www.unescap.org/stat/meet/timeuse/timeuse.htm.

Kirsch, A. et al. 2001. "Evaluation of differences in giving and volunteering data collected by in-home and telephone interviewing", in *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 495–504.

Leete, L. 2001. "Wage equity and employee motivation in non-profit and for-profit organizations", in *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization* Vol. 43 (4).

_____. 2003. "Paid employment in the non-profit sector", in W.W. Powell and R. Steinberg (eds.) *The Non-Profit Sector Research Handbook*, Forthcoming.

Lynn, P. 1997. "Measuring voluntary activity", in *Non-Profit Studies*, 2(1), pp. 1–11.

Marshall, A. 1989. "The sequel of unemployment: The changing role of part-time and temporary work in Western Europe", in G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers (eds.) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation: The growth of atypical employment in Western Europe* (Geneva and Brussels, International Institute for Labour Studies and Free University of Brussels), pp. 17–48.

Office of National Statistics (ONS). 2001. *Household satellite account — Volunteering* (London, Office of National Statistics), HHP8–2001–08, 09, 11.

_____. 2002. "Social analysis and reporting division", in *Social Capital: A Review of the Literature* (London).

O'Neill, M. 2001. "Research on giving and volunteering: Methodological considerations", in *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 505–514.

Pankoke, E. 1994. "Zwischen Enthusiasmus und Dilletantismus. Gesellschaftlicher Wandel freien Engagements", in L. Vogt and A. Zwingerle (eds.) *Ehre* (Frankfurt, Suhrkamp), pp. 151–171.

Passey, A. et al. 2000. *The United Kingdom Voluntary Sector Almanac* (London, NCVO Publications).

Perotin, V. 2001. "The voluntary sector, job creation and social policy: illusions and opportunities", in *International Labour Review* (Geneva).

Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling alone* (New York, Simon and Schuster).

Rodgers, G. 1989. "Precarious work in Western Europe: The state of the debate", in G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers (eds.) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation: The growth of atypical employment in Western Europe* (Geneva and Brussels, International Institute for Labour Studies and Free University of Brussels), pp. 1–16.

Rooney, P.M. et al. 2001. "A methodological comparison of giving surveys: Indiana as a test case", in *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 551–568.

Rose-Ackerman, S. 1996. "Altruism, non-profits and economic theory", in *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 701–728.

Ruhle, P. 2001. "Global celebration: countries gear up for the International Year of Volunteers", in *Volunteer Leadership* (Winter), pp. 26–7.

Ruhm, C. J. and Borkoski, C. 2000. *Compensation in the non-profit sector*, Working Paper Series No. 7562 (Cambridge, National Bureau of Economic Research),

Sacher, M. 1999. Das Ende des Normalarbeitsverhältnisses? Vortrag für das Internationale Bodenseesymposium "Mut zur Zukunft", Bregenz/Vorarlberg. July 1999. www.ba-wue.gruene.de/Partei/MatthiasSacher.htm (19 January, 2001).

Salamon, L.M., and Anheier, H.K. 1996. *The emerging non-profit sector* (Manchester, Manchester University Press).

Salamon. L. M. et al. 1999. *Global civil society: Dimensions of the non-profit sector* (Baltimore, Maryland, Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies).

Schmid, H. et al. 1999. *Monetäre Bewertung der unbezahlten Arbeit. Eine empirische Analyse für die Schweiz anhand der Schweizerischen Arbeitskäfteerhebung* (Neuchâtel, Switzerland, Bundesamt für Statistik).

Smith, J. D. 1998. The 1997 *National Survey of Volunteering* (London, The National Centre of Volunteering).

Sokolowski, W. 1996. "Show me the way to the next worthy deed: Toward a microstructural theory of volunteering and giving", in *Voluntas*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 259–278.

Tálos, E. 1999. "Atypische Beschäftigung: Verbreitung - Konsequenzen - sozialstaatliche Regelungen. Ein vergleichendes Resümee", in E. Tálos (ed.) *Atypische Beschäftigung: Internationale Trends und sozialstaatliche Regelungen* (Wien, Manz), pp. 417–468.

The Global Non-Profit Information System Project. 2000. *Glossary of System of National Accounts (SNA) Terms, Annex 4 to the Handbook on Non-Profit Institutions in the System of National Accounts (Draft) 04 Dec. 2000*, www.jhu.edu/~gnisp/docs/snaglsry.pdf (16 January, 2001).

United Nations (UN). 1993. *System of national accounts* (New York, United Nations), http://www.un.org/Depts/unsd/sna/sna1-en.htm.

Von Rosenbladt, B. 1999. "Zur Messung des ehrenamtlichen Engagements in Deutschland", in E. Kislter et al. (ed.) *Perspektiven gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalts. Empirische Befunden, Praxiserfahrungen, Messkonzepte* (Berlin, Edition Sigma).

Wilson, J. and Musick, M. 1997. "Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work", in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 62, pp. 694–713.

World Values Study Group. 1999. *World Values Survey 1981–1984, 1990–1993 and 1995–97 Cumulative file for the first 3 waves* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research), CD Rom.

Wuthnow, R. and Hodgkinson, V. A. (eds.). 1990. *Faith and philanthropy in America: Exploring the role of religion in America's voluntary sector* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass).

APPENDICES

1. Volunteering, by field of activity (Europe only, 2000), in percentages

Country	Percentage of respondents volunteering in each field												
	Welfare groups	Religious groups	Cultural activities	Trade unions	Political parties	Local community action	Third World development/ human rights	Environment	Professional associations	Youth work	Sports recreation	Women's groups	Peace movements
Austria	2	7	7	2	3	1	1	2	2	2	9	2	0
Belarus	3	4	2	5	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Belgium	6	6	9	2	3	3	5	3	3	4	8	3	1
Bulgaria	1	2	2	3	3	1	0	1	2	1	4	1	0
Croatia	1	6	4	4	2	1	0	2	2	2	7	1	1
Czech Republic	3	3	6	3	2	2	0	3	2	6	10	1	0
Denmark	4	3	5	4	3	3	1	2	4	5	14	1	0
Estonia	3	3	5	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	3	1	0
Finland	7	8	5	4	3	2	3	2	2	4	12	2	1
France	4	3	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	0	0
Germany	2	6	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	2	0
Great Britain	13	6	3	2	1	2	4	8	8	15	4	1	4
Greece	7	9	8	4	3	6	3	5	4	3	5	2	5
Hungary	2	5	3	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	0	0
Iceland	9	5	6	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	11	2	0
Ireland	4	8	4	2	2	4	2	1	3	5	13	3	1
Italy	5	7	6	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	6	0	1
Latvia	2	4	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	0	0

Country	Percentage of respondents volunteering in each field												
	Welfare groups	Religious groups	Cultural activities	Trade unions	Political parties	Local community action	Third World development/ human rights	Environment	Professional associations	Youth work	Sports recreation	Women's groups	Peace movements
Lithuania	1	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Luxembourg	7	6	8	3	3	3	5	4	1	6	9	2	1
Malta	5	13	4	2	4	4	2	2	2	3	5	2	0
Netherlands	9	12	17	2	3	4	4	2	3	5	16	2	1
Northern Ireland	3	9	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1
Poland	2	4	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0

Source: © European Values Survey, WORC, Tilburg University, Netherlands, 1999- 2000, by permission.

2. Volunteering, by field of activity (worldwide, 1995–97), in percentages

Country	Percentage of respondents volunteering in each field								
	Church	Trade unions	Political parties	Environment	Professional associations	Sports recreation	Arts	Charity	Other groups
Argentina	15	2	3	3	5	8	10	6	4
Australia	21	12	3	7	20	37	25	18	16
Brazil	31	10	7	6	10	13	11	15	8
Chile	29	5	3	4	7	17	13	8	6
China		6	6	2	2	10	6	3	2
India	14	7	9	5	7	10	12	8	4
Japan	5	3	2	1	7	12	6	1	5
Korea, Republic of	16	2	2	6	6	14	7	6	5
Mexico	39	10	9	9	11	24	21	9	8
Nigeria	68	11	6	12	16	21	20	14	4
Norway	8	16	3	1	9	23	15	9	15
South Africa	60	8	12	8	10	21	16	11	8
Switzerland	17	6	7	5	11	34	17	7	7
Turkey	1	3	5	1	5	4	3	2	2
United States	51	10	20	9	21	24	22	26	21
Average	27	7	7	5	10	18	14	10	8

Source:

3. Volunteering in one or more fields of work; percentages of total population, male and female populations, age groups, and religious/non-religious populations (1995–97 and 2000)

Country	Total population	Sex		Age group (adult population)				Religious self-assessment		
		Male	Female	Under 25 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–54 yrs	55+ yrs	Religious	Non religious	Convinced atheist
Argentina	34	34	34	34	35	35	32	36	27	45
Armenia	17	18	16	25	16	11	15	18	12	31
Australia	73	72	74	80	69	74	70	77	68	63
Austria	31	36	26	29	29	36	25	33	22	21
Azerbaijan	9	10	8	14	7	8	8	9	10	6
Bangladesh	51	65	33	45	53	50	59	53	44	100
Belarus	19	19	19	20	23	20	14	23	17	21
Belgium	36	39	33	31	34	37	37	38	30	39
Bosnia and Herzegovina	43	47	37	47	41	43	43	44	40	54
Brazil	54	56	52	51	48	56	66	57	36	17
Bulgaria	16	19	14	18	19	18	13	16	14	29
Chile	52	57	47	49	47	54	57	56	41	17
China	23	24	22	28	22	21	25			
Colombia	45	47	44	48	51	55	64	37	39	33
Croatia	24	31	18	24	24	28	14	23	26	21
Czech Republic	33	38	28	36	32	32	32	33	32	34
Denmark	37	42	33	33	34	44	32	39	34	35
Dominican Republic	71	76	68	72	64	80		74	63	71
Estonia	18	18	18	21	18	19	15	18	18	21
Finland	38	37	39	31	32	43	41	43	32	36

Country	Total population	Sex		Age group (adult population)				Religious self-assessment		
		Male	Female	Under 25 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–54 yrs	55+ yrs	Religious	Non religious	Convinced atheist
France	26	28	24	21	24	29	26	27	26	26
Georgia	8	8	8	11	7	9	5	8	8	13
Germany	21	22	21	10	22	23	22	30	11	15
Great Britain	43	44	43	35	42	47	41	55	34	36
Greece	33	32	34	27	31	43	26	36	19	53
Hungary	15	16	14	12	15	17	14	16	12	20
Iceland	33	35	30	17	32	39	33	34	30	30
India	35	42	26	40	36	33	33	37	24	62
Ireland	31	33	29	28	27	34	29	33	27	24
Italy	26	30	23	26	28	29	22	26	23	39
Japan	30	33	26	21	29	32	30	37	29	22
Korea, Republic of	39	44	35	38	39	40	35			
Latvia	22	23	22	41	23	20	19	24	21	12
Luxemburg	31	30	31	37	23	32	31	32	32	22
Macedonia	25	30	19	32	21	28	16	27	21	31
Malta	29	33	25	28	27	27	32	30	23	100
Mexico	65	66	63	64	68	65	62	65	65	70
Moldova, Republic of	25	25	25	28	23	27	23	27	17	17
Montenegro	18	18	17	17	17	20	13	22	15	25
Netherlands	50	53	46	71	39	53	49	53	44	42
New Zealand	68	68	69	68	67	70	67	75	63	46
Nigeria	72	76	68	71	70	75	80	73	60	76
Northern Ireland	22	24	21	19	16	23	25	28	12	18

Country	Total population	Sex		Age group (adult population)				Religious self-assessment		
		Male	Female	Under 25 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–54 yrs	55+ yrs	Religious	Non religious	Convinced atheist
Norway	58	57	60	57	65	58	52	63	54	59
Pakistan	18	22	12	100	100	100	100			
Peru	46	50	41	47	41	48	48	48	44	17
Philippines	32	34	31	30	32	32	40	33	29	
Poland	14	16	11	13	13	15	12	14	15	25
Portugal	14	18	10	19	11	21	8	14	14	13
Romania	16	18	13	16	17	20	10	15	25	22
Serbia	15	22	9	20	15	17	12	14	18	19
Slovakia	51	54	48	48	49	53	52	53	47	57
Slovenia	29	32	25	32	25	30	27	29	29	38
South Africa	77	76	77					81	56	64
Spain	18	20	16	25	19	17	14	19	13	27
Sweden	56	57	56	55	55	58	56	61	55	50
Switzerland	60	66	54	63	58	62	57	63	54	71
Turkey	17	27	8	19	15	19	18	15	24	48
Ukraine	13	14	13	17	11	15	10	15	8	20
United States	78	78	78	76	76	78	79	81	64	76
Uruguay	36	33	37	45	38	36	31	41	28	37
Venezuela	44	43	44	50	41	44	37	45	38	50
Average	34	37	32	36	34	37	34	37	30	37

Sources:

4. Volunteering in one or more fields of work, by socio-economic status (Europe only, 2000), in percentages

Country	Socio-economic group			
	AB volunteering	C1 volunteering	C2 volunteering	DE volunteering
France	28	26	23	27
Germany	33	23	16	6
Austria	43	34	21	18
Italy	37	29	21	16
Spain	27	22	15	12
Belgium	52	39	31	24
Sweden	61	55	56	51
Poland	24	19	12	9
Czech Republic	47	36	27	30
Slovakia	66	53	49	46
Hungary	42	17	17	8
Croatia	30	25	19	20
Malta	50	28	26	21
Luxembourg	47	39	32	19
Average	42	32	26	22

Source: © European Values Survey, WORC, Tilburg University, Netherlands, 1999- 2000, by permission.

5. Volunteering in one or more fields of work, by social class (world-wide, 1995–97), in percentages

Country	Subjective rating of social class				
	Upper volunteering	Upper-middle volunteering	Lower-middle volunteering	Working volunteering	Lower volunteering
Albania		45	32	22	22
Argentina	50	55	38	26	15
Armenia	48	26	14	12	11
Australia	92	80	75	67	54
Azerbaijan	25	12	8	3	8
Bangladesh	56	63	54	35	25
Bosnia and Herzegovina	60	54	39	39	42
Brazil	60	65	55	49	51
Chile	75	58	50	56	41
China 90	27	24	16	34	18
Colombia	49	51	46	46	39
Dominican Republic	63	72	73	68	83
Georgia	15	13	8	6	8
India	41	40	36	33	25
Japan	33	36	29	26	31
Korea, Republic	90	45	36	35	30
Macedonia	33	24	26	24	23
Mexico	79	71	64	59	63
Moldova	83	38	27	22	22
Montenegro	100	25	14	15	25
New Zealand	80	73	72	62	74
Nigeria	95	85	88	82	83
Norway	60	68	57	55	42
Peru	43	52	45	46	37
Philippines	46	26	34	36	28
Serbia	11	23	18	13	10
South Africa	89	85	78	77	69
Switzerland	73	66	57	50	36
Turkey	15	22	14	18	14
United States	87	85	79	71	52
Uruguay	40	44	38	33	17
Venezuela	60	61	54	41	36
Average	57	50	43	39	35

Source: © World Values Study Group, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1999, by permission.

INDEX

Note: page numbers in **bold** refer to major text sections, those in *italic* to boxes and figures. Subscript numbers appended to a page number indicate a footnote reference