

The Satisfaction of Volunteers. Some empirical evidence

Abstract

Results of a research project on volunteer work are presented. The features of volunteers are described, and compared with the ones of paid workers. A logit analysis is performed, in order to detect the determinants of the satisfaction that volunteers and paid workers derive from their activity, whether they are paid or not. The conclusions are mixed, in the sense that, across the two groups of paid workers and volunteers, the determinants of satisfaction are neither exactly the same, nor completely opposite or different.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Non Profit Institutions

JEL Classification numbers: J28, L31, D64

Introduction

Do volunteers consider their activity, i.e. their direct participation in providing a service, satisfying? If so, why? In this paper, results of a survey on organizations providing social services will be presented, describing the features of the volunteers, in order to understand the factors determining the degree of satisfaction of volunteers from their own activity.

In Economics literature, volunteering is considered a donation of time, and the supply of volunteers' services is explained in the general framework of consumer equilibrium. Models of time allocation are employed to determine if donations of time and money are complements or substitutes, and if public funding crowds out volunteering. Generally, in these models, individuals maximize utility depending on private goods, leisure, and voluntary work; in equilibrium, the marginal utility they get from volunteering is equal to the utility derived from wage or leisure. In order to explain the utility deriving from volunteering, Schiff and Weisbrod (1993) distinguish four models of volunteer labor supply: demand for charitable output (the "collective goods model"), looking for a return (the "private goods model"), looking for information and influence (the "influence and search model"), acquiring skills (the "job skills model"). The last two categories provide—as pointed out by Govekar and Govekar (2002)—further specification of the "private good model".

The utility deriving from volunteering can be explained also from the point of view of the goals that the volunteers

try to attain. Two types of goals have been identified, “investment” and “consumption”. According to the consumption model, time giving is a normal utility-bearing good. In the investment model, instead, volunteers try to improve their earning opportunities (Menchik and Weisbrod, 1987). Both models appear to receive empirical support, and money and time donations appear to be complements. The results are rather mixed as far as the relation between wage and government expenditure is concerned. Volunteers tend to be better educated and have higher wages, but the higher the wage the less they tend to work; crowding out seems to exist, but only in some kinds of services (Menchik and Weisbrod, 1987; Day and Devlin, 1996; Freeman, 1997). More recently, Gomez and Gunderson (2003) explain volunteer labor supply in the framework of the household production function, where households produce a charitable activity out of monetary contributions and volunteer time. The empirical results, obtained from Canadian data, indicate that volunteering is positively correlated with income, but higher wages have no significant impact on volunteering, and people of higher status are less likely to volunteer. Moreover, this study underlines the positive correlation of volunteering with religious activity and “the social nature of many family activities” (p. 585).

Standard labor supply models seem able to explain only a minor part of volunteer behavior (Freeman 1997), leaving two basic and strictly related questions unresolved: 1) what rewards induce volunteers to work without pay? and 2) what are the determinants of volunteer satisfaction. In other words, if satisfaction is the only reward for volunteers, the goals of the latter can be derived from its determinants (Woolley, 2003; Tschirhart et al., 2001).

Satisfaction is indeed the best proxy measure we have for utility, especially as far as work is concerned (Clark, 1997). However, it must be remembered that the determinants of satisfaction are related with, but different from, the ones of labor supply decision. Satisfaction is rather a determinant of subsequent behavior. In the case of paid work, job satisfaction does not coincide with the decision of supplying hours of work, or with the decision of staying in one’s current position (Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette, 2004). Instead, when workers are asked *ex post* to report upon their level of satisfaction with the job, they are expected to answer to the question, “given what you know about your job outcomes, would you choose the same job again?” (Lydon and Chevalier, 2002, p. 15). More generally, you can be happy of the choice you have made, for reasons that are different from the ones which have motivated the decision itself.

In the next sections, volunteer work will be defined, and the survey will be described together with some descriptive results. Some analyses on the determinants of volunteers’ satisfaction will be presented and compared with the satisfaction of paid workers.

1. Definitions

Before proceeding with empirical analysis, it is necessary to provide a definition of volunteer work, that goes beyond the mere absence of compensation. This problem is, as a matter of fact, not a trivial one, as often the gratuitous nature of volunteer activities has been interpreted as the mere absence of pay. However volunteers can retrieve other advantages from their activity, such as “psychic income”, i.e. the prestige and the joy of altruism, the possibility of influencing the composition and allocation of charitable transfers, to promote their own welfare, of gathering information on the way their money contributions are employed, of enhancing their job opportunities and their future income, of encouraging other people to give time and money to services they are interested in (Steinberg, 1990). Tschirhart et al. (2001) consider five kinds of volunteer “functions”, i.e. multiple possible outcomes of volunteer activity: altruistic (help

others), instrumental (help yourself), social (enhance friendship and positive regard by others), self-esteem (feel better about yourself), avoidance (escape alienation, boredom, personal problems)

Since some volunteers expect to have a tangible reward, included an increase in their future monetary wage, a problem arises. Are they to be considered “true” volunteers, or are they improperly defined as such? Frequent misunderstandings also come from the military origin of the term (Cnaan and Amrofel, 1994).

Neither the requisite of voluntary-ness is problem-free. The absence of compensation does not suffice in order to define an activity as voluntary. Otherwise, for instance, all domestic work, pure self-reproduction included, should have to be considered as volunteer work. Even if the family is the primary place where interpersonal relations are characterized by their gratuity, the activities carried out in this area do not seem to have the nature of volunteer work, mainly because family relations presuppose the existence of binding social norms. Therefore, volunteer activity is not only without pay, but also not imposed by binding social norms (Woolley, 2003). In Freeman’s (1997) terminology, it is a “conscience good or activity”, i.e. “something that people feel morally obligated to do when asked, but they would just as soon let someone else to do” (p. S140).

Another problem stems from the “work” nature of volunteer activity. According to the standard economic model of Labor Supply, a necessary (and maybe sufficient) condition for any use of one’s time to qualify as “work” is that it has to be “painful”. In that case, the only reason to rationally accept to perform a painful activity is its exchange for a salary. Since volunteering is unpaid, it cannot be painful, so it cannot be defined as work. It has instead to be considered consumption good. However, if work bears some utility, e.g. it is also the consumption of relational goods (Gui, 2000), and indeed an activity from which one can receive satisfaction (Lane, 1992), on the top of money and other monetary rewards, volunteering is just unpaid work. Additionally, if volunteers and paid employees have similar job attitudes as far as several aspects are concerned (Liao-Troth, 2001), one can hypothesize that the determinants of volunteers’ satisfaction should not be too far from those of paid workers (Mosca and Musella, 2003).

2. The dataset

The data on which this research is based were gathered in a survey carried out in 1998, and concern social services organizations active in Italy. Empirical information was collected on the types and characteristics of the organizations supplying various social services and their work force. The research focus was the satisfaction of the people working within these organizations, along with their personal features, working conditions and motivation.

The types of services within each province and the provinces themselves were chosen in the attempt of selecting a sufficiently representative sample of the organizations’ universe. For each type of service, the universe of production units operating in each province was censused, and the chosen organizations were selected among the ones with continuous service provision, that were established from at least 4 years, and that were employing at least three workers. In addition, the sample was drawn ensuring an adequate representation of each type of organization, i.e. public, private for profit, religious non-profit, and non-religious non-profit.

Inside each organization, if the staff exceeded 20 units, a sample of 10 paid workers and 10 volunteers was selected; otherwise, they were all included in the sample. In the former case, quotas were formed considering the

professional field of activity, working role and gender. Volunteers were selected also taking into account if the relation with the organization was continuous or occasional.

The research has involved 228 organizations operating in 15 Northern and Southern Italian provinces. Of these organizations, 157 were non-profit organizations, 54 were public agencies and 17 were for-profit companies. The services provided by them were, in the order of importance emerging from the sample, the following: assistance and help to physical handicap, elderly people, mental handicap, educational services, health care and work insertion for disadvantaged people.

Different questionnaires were provided to volunteers, paid workers and managers, as well as a questionnaire for each organization. All the questionnaires had been self-completed at the working place, whenever possible, and in any case in the presence of a trained interviewer.

724 interviews were made to volunteers, which are the focus of the present paper's analysis. The vast majority of them (68,7%) were working in non-profit organizations, while no case of volunteer work was found in for-profit organizations.

3. The features of volunteer and paid workers.

Volunteers were present in 65.5% of the organizations that were included in the research. On average, 74,5% of those interviewed volunteered on a regular basis.

The 78.4% of volunteers worked in non-profit organizations; the remaining worked in the public sector. Paid workers in non-profit organizations were instead less than two thirds of the total, and—like volunteers—were mainly distributed among non-religious entities. Even if the average age was around 40, young (under 30), followed by older (over 50) people were the two largest groups. On average, paid workers were only slightly younger (the average age was 37), while the presence of young people (under 25) and of people about to retire was limited. Women made a slight majority among paid workers. More often than paid workers, volunteers were single, and with a high level of education. More than 58% of the interviewees declared that they belonged to categories outside of the work force, and only 30% said that they were employed. In Northern and Central Italy students, retired and employed people prevailed, mainly among white-collar professions (but only 21.5% in the social service sector), while in the South the percentage of unemployed people was higher.

The interviewees said they carried out their activities on average for 10 hours per week, on a regular basis, half of which in direct contact with the people they assisted. In some organizations they held managerial positions, and many of the managers interviewed had previously been volunteers.

Their service is highly valued by managers, above all because they help lowering costs, improve the quality of the services, and better understand the needs of consumers. The other workers and the volunteers themselves hold the same opinions. In particular, due to their activity, the overall motivation of workers is increased, and it is possible to introduce new services and to innovate, thanks to the cost reduction brought by their presence.

The survey of these organizations allows further investigation on some peculiarities of volunteer work. It should be noted that the total number of hours reported by the organizations is noticeably inferior to that indicated by the

volunteers themselves. The volunteers donated on average 15 hours of work per month, except in the public sector where they worked on average almost twice as much, i.e., 24 hours.

It is interesting to remark that even paid workers donate work without pay, in the form of hours of overtime that were not compensated or recovered. This practice is most frequent among non-profit religious organizations (31.7% of workers) and in social cooperatives (19.3% of workers). These two organizational types are also those that make the greatest use of overtime work. On average almost 2 hours per week in the first case, and little more than an hour and a half for the second.

4. Motivation and Attitude of volunteers

The interviewees chose the organization they volunteered for the following reasons, in decreasing order of importance: (i) agreement with the way of interacting with users (5.43 points in a range of 1, not important, to 7, very important); (ii) the sector in which the organization operates (5.32); (iii) the capacity of the organization to meet the needs of the volunteer (4.58). Paid workers have also valued the coherence between their studies and their job, otherwise their motivations are about the same.

Neither the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic attitudes towards work shows differences between volunteer and paid workers. Thompson and Bono (1992), starting from a Marxist perspective on paid labor as “alienation, self-estrangement, result[ing] from individuals engaging in activities for extrinsic rather than intrinsic rewards” (p. 121), found that volunteer fire-fighters were motivated by the need to struggle against alienated social relations. Among the attitudes towards volunteer and paid work, we found instead that both intrinsic and extrinsic attitudes are equally important. Volunteering is considered, above all, an enriching experience on a human level (6.58), an opportunity for helping others (6.45), an occasion for establishing new and deeper human relationships (5.89), a chance to act coherently with ones’ values (5.88), and a moral duty (4.64); while it is not considered a way to improve one’s work skills (2.26), nor a way to fill free time (2.63).

Intrinsic motivations towards work, and above all the desire for self-realization (5.54 points) achieved the higher consensus. Extrinsic attitudes immediately followed in order of importance, and are those related to primary socio-economic needs (work was felt as a mean to sustain oneself and his or her family). The relational goal received a considerable score (4.87).

As far as their role within the organizations is concerned, it appears that volunteers believe that the development of volunteering is something positive (6.56); they consider their own activity important for temporarily filling a lack of resources in the organization (5.3); they perceive their activity as support to workers (5.12); a good mean for networking between users and the local community (5); and a source of innovation in the provision of services (4.84).

According to the interviewees, the working environment in which they operated was characterized fundamentally by good communication of the tasks to carry out (5.5); good capacity to offer opportunities to better oneself and to recognize one’s merits (5.1); a good degree of openness towards new ideas and suggestions coming from volunteers (5); a fair capacity to offer opportunities for professional growth (4.57); a reduced level of stress (2.5).

Notwithstanding general satisfaction for the capacity of the working environment to recognize one’s own merits,

on average the interviewees would have worked harder if they only had received more recognition for the work done (3.21 was the average score).

For the volunteers it is of primary importance that users get the maximum benefit from the services provided (6.52), are directly involved in their work (5.46), and in the activity of the organization (4.55). They do not maintain, however, that the needs of users should be cared for to the detriment of their own needs and rights (1.86), nor do they consider the users only customers requesting a certain service (1.79).

The volunteers agreed on the following features of the relation they maintained with paid workers: full respect and acceptance (5.7), the recognition of the work done by volunteers as a support activity for workers (5.54); the easing of relations between the two categories (5.35); the parity of treatment within the organization (4.92); the complementarity of the tasks of volunteers and the workers (4.8).

The volunteers felt that their work was done fundamentally in the interest of users (6.45), of the local community (5.27), of society at large (5.1), and also of other volunteers (4).

All scores related to the involvement of the interviewees in various aspects of control are lower than 5. Among these, the highest score is given to the quality of relations with users (4.87), followed by the control on the quality of services (4.87), and on the quality of relations among people in the organization (4.28).

5. Volunteers' satisfaction and its determinants.

Volunteers generally felt more than satisfied with the activity they performed (5.66), above all for the following factors: the relations with other volunteers (6.14), with managers (5.72), and with their paid colleagues (5.49); the coherence with their own ideals (6.12); the usefulness of their contribution to users (5.49); the recognition for the activity carried out (5.25).

The satisfaction of volunteers is generally higher than that of paid workers, both in general and for each single item. Volunteers are not satisfied as far as the prospects of being hired by the organization are concerned (2.91). Similarly, paid workers are not satisfied with their own career opportunities (2.93). It could, in fact, be concluded that volunteers, instead of being dissatisfied, are simply not interested in the prospect of enrollment, as well as paid workers are not interested in career advancement, as is evident from the answers to the relevant abovementioned questions on motivation.

The satisfaction of volunteers does not seem to vary according to the type of organization. Loyalty towards volunteering and the organization is very high, even if slightly lower among non-profit religious groups.

In order to examine the satisfaction that volunteers get from their work and its determinants, some "ordered probit" analyses have been performed, taking the overall satisfaction of paid workers and volunteers as dependent variable. In table 2, the results of two models are presented. In the first model, attitudes towards work, and in the second model reasons for choosing the organization have been used as explanations, together with a set of other common variables. As far as the latter variables are concerned, the results of the two models are rather similar.

As for personal features, it appears that age bears negative effects on the satisfaction of paid workers, but a positive one on the satisfaction of volunteers. More educated paid workers are less satisfied. However, education level does not have

a significant effect on satisfaction of volunteers.

Wage (only up to a certain threshold) has a positive influence on paid workers' satisfaction, and work time has a negative influence on volunteers' satisfaction. The type of organization has no influence, both on paid workers and volunteers' satisfaction.

Concerning the kind of activity performed, being a manager has a positive effect on the satisfaction of paid workers, while being engaged in support activities, with no contact with users, has a negative one. The most satisfied volunteers are instead the ones both working in contact with users, and engaged in support activities.

Some attitudes towards work seem to have the same positive influence on paid workers and volunteers' satisfaction, while some others seem to have a different influence.

The former believe that work is self-fulfillment and contributes to improve society.

As far as the latter are concerned, believing that work is an occasion for external relations has a positive influence on the satisfaction of workers, and a negative influence on the satisfaction of volunteers. Moreover, thinking that work is a mean to earn a living has a negative impact on paid workers' satisfaction, and is not significant for volunteers' satisfaction.

Having chosen the organization they work for on the basis of interest in a particular sector has a positive influence on the satisfaction of both paid and volunteer workers. Those among paid workers, whose choice was influenced by the fact that they knew a customer of the organization, have higher chance of being disappointed, but the same is not true for volunteers. The expectation of being hired by the organization seems to have a strong negative influence on volunteers' satisfaction.

Volunteers and paid workers have different levels of satisfaction, but it is unclear whether the determinants of satisfaction of the former are different from the ones of the latter. More research is needed to answer this question.

Volunteers seem to be particularly interested in personally donating their service, together with the importance given to the users' needs, which they share with paid workers. Previous research (Borzaga et al., 1995) had also hypothesized that volunteers have a special taste for working with the disabled or with people in need.

It is illuminating also to consider that the most frequent motivations indicated by paid workers and volunteers are the interest for the sector of activity in which the organization operates and the agreement with the work modalities in favor of users.

Therefore, volunteers can be described as individuals who do an activity, which gives them satisfaction, for a number of different reasons. Some determinants are the same for paid and volunteer workers, some are not, but what all especially appreciate is mainly connected with their relations with the users.

Satisfaction (1. unsatisfied – 7. very satisfied)						
	Workers			Volunteers		
	Ord.	Mean	Variance	Ord.	Mean	Variance
Relation with paid workers colleagues	1	5.51	2.1385	6	5.49	2.4354
Recognition of the help given to the recipients	2	5.31	2.2234	5	5.50	1.7634
Job satisfaction	3	5.27	2.0318	4	5.66	1.3096
Relation with the managers	4	5.17	2.9627	3	5.72	2.0870

Work time (paid workers only)	5	4.81	3.0594			
Job security (paid workers only)	6	4.70	3.6858			
Activity's variety and creativity.	7	4.63	3.1493	9	4.88	2.1759
Activity recognition.	8	4.54	3.1286	7	5.25	2.3074
Professional enrichment.	9	4.50	3.3120	10	4.85	2.3700
Physical working environment.	10	4.48	3.4395	8	5.00	2.5106
Decisional autonomy.	11	4.36	3.2718	11	4.66	2.8506
Wage (paid workers only)	12	4.07	3.3120			
Career advancement (paid workers only)	13	3.10	3.7357			
Chances of future career advancement (paid workers) / enrolment (volunteers).	14	2.93	3.4011	12	2.91	3.3440
Coherence between his/her activity and ideals (volunteers only).				1	6.13	1.2275
Relation with volunteers colleagues (volunteers only)				2	6.15	1.2792

Motivations for choosing the organization (1. not important – 7. very important)						
	Workers			Volunteers		
	Ord.	Mean	Variance	Ord.	Mean	Variance
Interest in the org.'s activity	1	5.39	4.0413	2	5.33	3.6757
Org. capacity to meet the workers'/volunteers' needs	2	4.52	4.9348	3	4.59	4.5922
Coherence between the job and educational attainment (paid workers only)	3	4.50	5.5349			
The worker/volunteer approves the org. behaviour towards recipients	4	4.41	5.1082	1	5.43	3.6346
Job security (paid workers only)	5	4.20	5.6283			
This org. was almost the only one which offered me a job (paid workers only) / the opportunity to volunteer (volunteers)	6	3.60	5.8760	7	2.65	4.3946
Paid workers and volunteers are deeply involved in internal decisions	7	3.54	4.7206	5	4.16	4.6667
Knowledge of people involved in the org.	8	3.22	5.2225	4	4.36	5.1257
Wage and career (paid workers) / enrolment (volunteers) opportunity	9	2.33	3.1769	8	1.69	2.0982
Knowledge of org.'s recipients	10	2.23	3.4446	6	2.85	4.4374

Attitudes towards work (1. don't agree – 7. agree)						
	Workers			Volunteers		
	Ord.	Mean	Variance	Ord.	Mean	Variance
Work is a means to earn a living	1	5.71	2.7714	2	5.27	3.7084
Work is a duty	2	5.64	2.8258	4	5.18	3.5060
Work is self-fulfilment.	3	5.57	2.8986	1	5.53	2.9651
Work is a way to give financial help to the family.	4	5.38	3.6058	3	5.16	3.7804
Work is an occasion for external relations.	5	4.85	3.3836	5	4.87	2.6767
Work is a contribution to improve society.	6	4.34	4.0812	6	4.79	3.4450
Work is a means to earn as much as possible	7	2.97	4.2306	8	2.69	3.3096
Work is a way to be successful and renowned	8	2.65	3.6996	7	2.76	3.7839
Work is a pastime.	9	2.13	2.8257	9	2.27	2.7222

Ordered logit: impact of attitudes towards work on job satisfaction

Y: Job satisfaction (1. unsatisfied – 7. very satisfied)				
Variables	Workers^a		Volunteers^b	
	B	Sig.	B	Sig.
Female	-0,1051	-	0,1177	-
Age	-0,6385	***	0,1819	**
Age Squared	0,8569	***		
Marital Status				
Single	0,1277	-		
Separated/divorced	-0,2466	**		
Widow	0,3210	*		
Married (base-line)				
Educational Attainment				
Vocational Qualification	-0,1137	-	0,6522	-
High school	-0,1186	-	0,2488	-
Laurea breve (3 years)	-0,2311	*	-0,2178	-
Laurea (4/5 years)	-0,3392	**		
No title or primary school (base-line)				
Previous (paid workers) / actual (volunteers) condition				
Employed	0,9339	-	0,2996	*
Student	-0,9189	-	-0,4193	-
Housewife	0,6100	-	-0,4684	-
Compulsory military service			0,5689	-
Unemployed, retired (base-line)				
Wage and work time				
Log wage	0,3452	**		
Log wage squared	-0,1239			
Full time worker (paid worker) regular volunteer (volunteers)	-0,2196	-	-0,2794	**
Type of activity				
Manager	0,3558	***	0,4069	-
Provision of the service (in direct contact with recipients)	0,2553	-	0,3096	**
Administration/Accountancy (base-line: paid workers only)			0,1884	-
Personnel development & management (base-line: paid workers only)			0,6119	-
Support activity (not in direct contact with recipients)	-0,2717	-	0,4729	***
Other	-0,1034	-	0,6443	***
Attitudes towards work				
Work is self-fulfilment.	0,1612	***	0,9462	***
Work is an occasion for external relations.	0,5891	***	-0,7053	**
Work is a contribution to improve society.	0,4224	***	0,1246	***
Work is a means to earn a living	-0,5799	***	0,2724	-

^a Number of observations: 1560; Log likelihood function: -2471.696; Restricted log likelihood: -2596.584; Chi-squared: 274.0195; Degrees of freedom: 31; Significance level: .0000
Threshold parameters for index

Mu(1)	.2800548329	.51927051E-01	5.393	.0000
Mu(2)	.7884896933	.69028378E-01	11.423	.0000
Mu(3)	1.454878455	.76078983E-01	19.123	.0000
Mu(4)	2.252390668	.79763300E-01	28.238	.0000
Mu(5)	2.996372011	.82665682E-01	36.247	.0000

^b Number of observations: 466; Log likelihood function: -659.9784; Restricted log likelihood -684.3783; Chi-squared: 48.79990; Degrees of freedom 26; Significance level: .0043

Threshold parameters for index

Mu(1)	.1790337515	.16276635	1.100	.2714
Mu(2)	.7326076723	.30624402	2.392	.0167
Mu(3)	1.615963373	.34222798	4.722	.0000
Mu(4)	2.449113518	.35380059	6.922	.0000
Mu(5)	3.246982864	.35343152	9.187	.0000

Ordered logit: impact of motivations of choosing the org. on job satisfaction

Y: Job satisfaction (1. unsatisfied – 7. very satisfied)				
Variables	Workers^a		Volunteers^b	
	B	Sig.	B	Sig.
Female	-0,2670	-	0,1316	-
Age	-0,3960	*	0,1874	***
Age Squared	0,5786	**		
Marital Status				
Single	-0,1940	-		
Separated/divorced	-0,2543	**		
Widow	0,5182	**		
Married (base-line)				
Educational Attainment				
Vocational Qualification	-0,2493	***	0,1054	-
High school	-0,2999	***	0,4894	*
Laurea breve (3 years)	-0,2752	**	-0,9392	-
Laurea (4/5 years)	-0,5655	***		
No title or primary school (base-line)				
Previous (paid workers) / actual (volunteers) condition				
Employed	0,1574	-	0,2419	-
Student	-0,9908	-	-0,5112	*
Housewife	-0,4394	-	-0,3944	-
Compulsory military service			-0,4005	-
Unemployed, retired (base-line)				
Wage and work time				
Log wage	0,4275	***		
Log wage squared	-0,1909	**		
Full time worker (paid worker) regular volunteer (volunteers)	0,1838	-	-0,2435	*
Type of organization				
Public Org.	-0,1517	-		
Non-profit non-religious Org.	-0,9921	-	0,10522	-
Non-profit religious Org.	0,7497	-	0,6209	-
For profit Org. (base-line)				
Type of activity				
Manager	0,2572	**	0,1364	-
Provision of the service (in direct contact with recipients)	-0,9980	-	0,3843	***
Administration/Accountancy (base-line: paid workers only)			0,1083	-
Personnel development & management (base-line: paid workers only)			0,5072	-
Support activity (not in direct contact with recipients)	-0,2489	**	0,4311	***
Other	-0,2049	*	0,5149	***
Motivations for choosing the organization				
Interest in the org.'s activity	0,1130	***	0,1081	***
Knowledge of people involved in the org.	0,1818	-	-0,3916	-
Personal knowledge of org. recipients	-0,4219	**	0,2591	-
The worker/volunteer approves the org.'s behaviour towards recipients	0,7121	***	0,7066	**
Coherence between the job and his/her educational attainment (paid workers only)	0,5518	***		
Org. capacity to meet the workers'/volunteers' needs	0,3772	-	0,2767	-
This org. was almost the only one which offered me a job (paid workers only) / the opportunity to volunteer (volunteers)	-0,1182	-	-0,9876	-
Wage and career (paid workers) / enrolment (volunteers) opportunity	0,2649	-	-0,6868	**
Job security (paid workers only)	-0,1326	-		
Paid workers and volunteers are deeply involved to internal decisions	0,9368	***	0,4621	*

a
N
u
m
b
e
r
o
f
o
b
s
e
r
v
a
t
i
o
n
s
:
1
5
0
0
;
L
o
g
l
i
k
e
l
i
h
o
o
d
f
u
n
c
t
i
o
n
:
-
2
2
8
6
.
7
5
8
;
R
e
s
t
r
i
c
t
e

d log likelihood: -2475.780; Chi-squared: 378.0435; Degrees of freedom: 33; Significance level: .0000

Threshold parameters for index

Mu(1)	.2904163009	.56013718E-01	5.185	.0000
Mu(2)	.8074354809	.74562717E-01	10.829	.0000
Mu(3)	1.561625926	.82212789E-01	18.995	.0000
Mu(4)	2.400123725	.85427854E-01	28.095	.0000
Mu(5)	3.161329682	.87506245E-01	36.127	.0000

^b Number of observations: 466; Log likelihood function: -653.1463; Restricted log likelihood: -684.3783; Chi-squared: 62.46412; Degrees of freedom: 25; Significance level: .0000

Threshold parameters for index

Mu(1)	.1844780490	.17753060	1.039	.2987
Mu(2)	.7205635673	.31007216	2.324	.0201
Mu(3)	1.599676219	.34743688	4.604	.0000
Mu(4)	2.453744030	.35822974	6.850	.0000
Mu(5)	3.268217326	.35810323	9.126	.0000

References

Borzaga, C., Gui, B., and Schenkel, M. (1995) "Disoccupazione e bisogni insoddisfatti: il ruolo delle organizzazioni non-profit", *Quaderni di Economia del lavoro*, **50**, pp. 100-129.

Clark A. E. (1997) "Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work?", *Labour Economics*, **4**, pp. 341-372.

Cnaan, R.A., and Amroffell, L. (1994) "Mapping Volunteer Activity", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, **23**, pp. 335-351.

Day, K. M., and Devlin, R. A. (1996) "Volunteering and Crowding Out: Canadian Econometric Evidence", *Canadian Journal of Economics*, **XXXIX**, pp 37-53.

Freeman, R. (1997) "Working for Nothing: The Supply of Volunteer Labor", *Journal of Labor Economics*, **15**, pp. 140-166.

Gomez R., Gunderson M. (2003) "Volunteer Activity and the Demands of Work and Family", *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, **58**, pp. 573-589.

Govekar, P. L., and Govekar, M. A. (2002) "Using Economic Theory and Research to Better Understand Volunteer Behavior", *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, **13**, pp.33-48.

- Gui, B. (ed.) (2000) "Economics and Interpersonal Relation", *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, **71**.
- Lane, R. E. (1992) "Work as 'disutility' and money as 'happiness': Cultural origins of a basic market error", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, **21**, pp. 43-65.
- Lévy-Garboua, L., and Montmarquette, C. (2004) "Reported job satisfaction : what does it mean?", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, **33**, pp. 135-151.
- Liao-Troth, M. (2001) "Attitude Differences between Paid Workers and Volunteers", *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, **11**, pp. 423-442.
- Lydon, R., and Chevalier, A. (2002) "Estimates of the Effect of Wages on Job Satisfaction", Centre for Economic Performance, Discussion Paper 531.
- Menchik, P., and Weisbrod, B. A. (1987) "Volunteer Labor Supply", *Journal of Public Economics*, **32**, pp. 159-183.
- Schiff, J. and Weisbrod, B. (1993) "Competition between For-Profit and Non-profit Organizations". In Ben-Ner, A., and Gui, B. (ed) *The Non-profit sector in the Mixed Economy*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Steinberg, R. (1990) "Labor Economics and the Nonprofit Sector. A Literature Review", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, **19**, 2.
- Tschrhart, M., Mesch, D., Perry, J.L., Miller, T., and Lee, G. (2001) "Stipended Volunteers: Their Goals, Experiences, Satisfaction, and Likelihood of Future Service", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, **11**, pp. 422-443.
- Thompson Alexander, M. III, and Bono, B. A. (1992) "Alienation, Self-Actualization and the Motivation for Volunteer Labor", *Review of Radical Political Economics*, **24**, pp. 115-123.

