

Bojana Radovanović¹

Univerzitet u Beogradu

Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju,

Ivana Simeunović²

Univerzitet Union

Beogradska bankarska akademija – fakultet

za bankarstvo, osiguranje i finansije

Originalni naučni članak

UDK 005.966.2:316.627/.628(497.11)

005.966.2:17.026(497.11)

316.752.01

Submitted: 3.10.2019.

Accepted: 13. 5. 2020.



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC2002269R>

WHO VOLUNTEERS IN SERBIA? MOTIVES AND VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF SERBIAN VOLUNTEERS

Ko volontira u Srbiji?

Motivacija i vrednosne orijentacije volontera u Srbiji

ABSTRACT: *In this paper, we focus on individual factors that influence on people to engage in formal volunteering, providing empirical evidence from Serbia. We discussed Batson's four-motive theory of communal actions. The majority of Serbian volunteers reportedly dedicated their time in order to contribute to the community and to help people in need. Thus, they were driven by collectivism and altruism. The lack of time, lack of solicitation for volunteering and being unable to make long-term commitments were reported as the main barriers to volunteering. Serbian volunteers rarely obtain material and non-material benefits from volunteering, and they do not perceive volunteering as a valuable tool for job success. Then, we focused on Schwartz value theory and its potential to explain pro-social behaviour. Our findings based on descriptive statistics and the independent samples t test show that self-transcendence values are more important for Serbian volunteers than self-enhancement values, and that self-transcendence values are more emphasized among volunteers than among non-volunteers. However, we also found that on average volunteers score higher on self-enhancement value orientation than non-volunteers. Our findings, based on multiple regression models, cannot confirm that, controlled for other factors, volunteers and non-volunteers have different value orientations. Finally, according to the logistic regression models, Serbian volunteers are more likely to be found among younger, better-educated population, with higher scores on the scale of self-transcendence value orientations.*

KEYWORDS: *volunteering, formal volunteering, motives, Schwartz value theory, Serbia.*

1 radovanovic@instifdt.bg.ac.rs

2 ivana.simeunovic@bba.edu.rs

APSTRAKT: U okviru ovog rada analizirali smo individualne faktore koji utiču na pojedince da se uključe u formalno volontiranje, kroz empirijsku analizu podataka iz Srbije. U radu smo razmotrili Bejtonovu (Batson) teoriju četiri motiva koji pokreću delovanje usmereno ka opštem dobru. Najveći broj volontera u Srbiji, prema njihovim odgovorima, pokreće želja da doprinesu zajednici i želja da pomognu onima kojima je pomoć potrebna, te možemo reći da ih pokreću kolektivizam i altruizam. Nedostatak vremena, odsustvo poziva da se priključe volonterskim akcijama i nemogućnost da se dugoročno obavežu, najčešće su barijere volontiranja u Srbiji. Volonteri retko ostvaruju materijalne i nematerijalne koristi od volontiranja, a volontiranje ne doživljavaju kao sredstvo za ostvarenje uspeha u poslu. Zatim smo se fokusirali na Švarcovu (Schwartz) teoriju vrednosti i njen potencijal da objasni prosocijalno ponašanje. Na osnovu deskriptivne statističke analize i t testa možemo da zaključimo da su vrednosti samo-transcedencije važnije za volontere od vrednosti samo-poboljšanja, kao i da su vrednosti samo-transcedencije više naglašene među volonterima nego među onima koji ne volontiraju. Međutim, i vrednosti samo-poboljšanja su takođe izraženije među volonterima nego među građanima koji se ne uključuju u volonterske akcije. Rezultati naše analize zasnovani na višestrukoj regresiji, ne mogu potvrditi da volonteri i oni koji ne volontiraju imaju drugačije vrednosne orijentacije, u smislu samo-transcedencije i samo-poboljšanja. Na kraju, na osnovu logističke regresije, možemo da zaključimo da se volonteri češće nalaze među mlađom populacijom, obrazovnijom populacijom i onom sa izraženijom vrednosnom orijentacijom samo-transcedencije.

KLJUČNE REČI: volontiranje, formalno volontiranje, motivi, Švarcova teorija vrednosti, Srbija.

1. Introduction

Volunteering is an activity when time, labour and expertise are given freely in order to benefit another person, group or cause (Cnaan and Amroffell 1994, Cnaan, Handy, and Wadsworth 1996). Voluntarily dedicating one's time, labour and expertise can be done through formal organisations and or through loosely organised groups or the initiatives of individuals, thus volunteering can be formal and informal (Leigh et al. 2011).

Being a voluntary action means that people do not volunteer out of coercion, nor is volunteering financially remunerated. Unlike market exchange, a return favour does not follow volunteering, though organisations sometimes cover some of the costs related to volunteering. Thus, there can be a material payback for volunteering, but it is not equivalent to the service provided (Smith and Van Puyvelde 2016).

Pro-social actions – those that are beneficial to others while at the same time being costly for the actor, have puzzled evolutionary biologists and many social scientists (Bowles and Gintis 2011, Hodgson 2013, Richerson and Boyd 2005). Such behaviour is puzzling because of the expectation that people are selfish,

that they would rather have a free ride than dedicate their resources for the public good and that they would rather defeat than benefit others. Nevertheless, many people through the world give their time to organisations and directly to those in need to relieve their suffering (Butcher and Einolf 2017, Musick and Wilson 2008). Some people are even willing to place themselves in harm's way to save the life of a stranger, which is perhaps best illustrated by the rescuing of Jews during WWII (Monroe 1996, Oliner and Oliner 1988).

Understanding and explaining such behaviour has occupied scholars from different disciplines, including social psychology and sociology, economics, and political science. A range of individual and contextual factors influences one's decision to volunteer (Butcher and Einolf 2017, Musick and Wilson 2008, Radovanović 2019). Whether one will volunteer depends, in the first instance, on her awareness of the need for help (Musick and Wilson 2008, Schwartz 2010). Once the need for help is recognised, or the cause worth supporting detected, one must be motivated to do something about it (Musick and Wilson 2008, Batson et al. 2002). Various motives prompt one to dedicate our time to others or the common good. People volunteer out of both egoistic and altruistic motives, also to adhere to moral principles, or to reach collective aims (Batson et al. 2002). The norm of reciprocity, which has been found all over the world, impels us to dedicate our material and non-material resources to others, and makes it so that we are part of a chain of giving and receiving (Moody 2008, Putnam 2000). Moreover, self-transcendence values direct our attention to the needs of others and may induce pro-social behaviour (Schwartz 2010).

Our decision to volunteer does not only depend on subjective dispositions in terms of perception, motivation and internalised values and norm, but it also depends on personal, social and organisational resources we have at our command. Being educated, having free time, being healthy and having disposable income make us more capable of giving away our time (Musick and Wilson 2008, Wilson 2012). Also, having a greater network of friends, colleagues and acquaintances, which is both our source of information and which reinforces norms of reciprocity, makes us more likely to get engaged in volunteering (Putnam 2000). This may differ throughout the life cycle and depend on marital and employment status (Musick and Wilson 2008).

The way people give their time for the benefit of others is not the same everywhere. Differences in prosocial behaviour are attributed to history, culture, welfare systems, governmental support to the non-profit sector and the characteristics of the non-profit sector (Butcher and Einolf 2017, Salamon et al. 2017, Wiepking and Handy 2015). Volunteering cannot flourish in countries where the non-profit sector is underdeveloped, where the legislation related to giving time to non-profits is lacking. If the state takes full responsibility for the provision of social welfare, there might not be the need for non-profit organisations, operating in the field of social welfare. Options that are available for societies and individuals are to a great extent shaped by the history of welfare provision and the culture (Butcher and Einolf 2017). Finally, the existence of emergencies, such as natural disasters and wars are specific conditions, which may induce many to offer spontaneous assistance to victims (Musick and Wilson 2008).

In this paper, we focus on individual factors that influence on people to engage in formal volunteering, providing empirical evidence from Serbia. Firstly, we discuss factors that explain volunteering, including perceptions, motives and values. Then, we identify motives and values that drive Serbian volunteers. Data analysed in this paper are original data from the national survey on prosocial behaviour conducted in Serbia in 2014.

2. Individual Factors of Volunteering

In line with Sober and Wilson, we argue that volunteering, as a purposeful action is a result of a deliberative process, which can “occur in a flash, but it is thinking nonetheless” (Sober and Wilson 1998: 211). In other words, a volunteer goes through a decision-making process, though the process is not always a result of conscious reflection, which include:

- a) awareness of the need for help;
- b) perceiving oneself as able to help;
- c) sensing oneself as responsible;
- d) awareness of possible actions;
- e) choosing a kind of help to provide; and
- f) implementing the chosen course of action.³

Each of these steps in the decision-making process is shaped by individual and contextual factors that influence whether one will dedicate her or his non-material resources for the benefit of others. In this paper, we focus on individual factors of volunteering.

In explaining behaviour, psychologists look at situational factors and subjective dispositions (Staub 2003). Characteristics of the situation include the identity of the recipient, the anonymity of the helper, and the number and identity of observers (*ibid.*). The presence of other people influences the way we see our role in providing help. When there are many people around a person in need, then responsibility is diffused, and each person feels less responsible for the misfortunate (*ibid.*). In a series of experiments, Latane and Darley explored the influence of the presence of other bystanders on the likelihood that people will take action in emergencies and found that with an increase in the number of bystanders, there was a decrease in the subject's tendency to take an action, which became known as the bystander effect (*ibid.*).

The research on providing or refraining from providing help to someone in dire need emerged within psychology after the famous case of Kitty Genovese in the mid-1960s (Staub 2003). According to social psychology textbooks, Kitty Genovese was knifed to death outside her apartment in Queens, while 38 witnesses watched from their windows for the duration of the attack without

3 This decision-making process is derived from the bystander intervention decision model of Latané and Darley (see Dovidio and Penner 2001) and Schwartz's four-step model in the activation of personal norms (Schwartz 1977).

intervening (Manning, Levin and Collins 2007). The “38 witnesses’ parable” results in the inference that “crowds, and groups more generally, could be dangerous because they promote inactivity” (ibid: 560). However, “the three key features of the Kitty Genovese story that appear in social psychology textbooks (stating there were 38 witnesses, that the witnesses watched from their windows for the duration of the attack, and that the witnesses did not intervene) are not supported by the available evidence” (ibid: 559). By challenging the story of 38 witnesses, Manning, Levin and Collins (2007) elucidate on the potential of the group to promote helping behaviour. For example, the possibility of communication among bystanders protected against the bystander effect (Darly et al. 1973 quoted in Manning, Levin and Collins 2007). In addition, if a group is more cohesive before an emergency, this prevents the inactivity of the group in terms of providing help (Rutkowski et al 1983 quoted in Manning, Levin and Collins 2007).

In short, while the characteristics of the situation influences one’s decision to provide help, not everyone behaves in the same way under the same circumstances. Our behaviour is also dependent on our perception, motives and values we adhere to (Musick and Wilson 2008).

2.1. Perception

In order to volunteer, people first must become aware of the need for support, then to see themselves as able to help and responsible for providing support (Musick and Wilson 2008, Schwartz 2010). Perceiving a need involves noticing a negative discrepancy between another’s current state and what is desirable for the other on one or more dimensions of wellbeing (Batson 2011). Elements of wellbeing that are considered desirable are the absence of physical pain, anxiety, stress, danger, and disease, but also the presence of physical pleasure, positive affect, satisfaction, and security (ibid).

Awareness of needs is usually the result of the activities of those who seek help or organizations on behalf of them (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011). Media facilitate awareness of needs. Natural disasters covered by mass media usually provoke quick actions by individuals willing to help those who suffer (ibid.).

Solicitation of volunteering is particularly important for the perception of needs and the resulting action. In most cases, volunteering follow solicitations. Solicitation increases both the likelihood of giving time (Putnam 2000) and the number of hours volunteered (Sokolowski 1996). The study of the probabilities that people volunteer time given they are solicited conducted on the 1994 Independent Sector Survey of Giving and Volunteering in the USA shows that 80% of those solicited for volunteering did volunteer (Bryant et. al. 2003). In other words, most often, people volunteer because someone asked them to do so.

Although the information regarding the suffering of others and appeals to help those in need are all around us, we do not always take notice of these appeals, nor do we pay much attention to them. Subjective perceptions of need are crucial. We often give to causes that are close to our hearts or have touched

us personally. For example, people who have relatives suffering from a specific illness are more likely to give to charities fighting those diseases (Bekkers and Wiepking 2011, Walter et al 2015).

Finally, values we adhere to influence our perception (Schwartz 2010).⁴ In short, what we notice as a need, and who we see as needy, as well as the way we see our role in providing help, depends on our experiences, goals and values we adhere to.

2.2. *Motives*

In deciding whether to volunteer motives are crucial. To be motivated to do something requires that we have a desire to achieve a certain state and a belief about how to achieve that state (Sober and Wilson 1998). Motives are goal-directed psychological forces in a given situation, which means that they urge us to achieve a desirable change in the experienced world (Batson et al. 2002, Batson 2011). This change might be tiny, such as having a sandwich (when feeling hungry), but it can also be of a greater magnitude, such as improving the living conditions of refugees. A goal may be, and most often is, consciously set. However, we may act without really being aware of the goal we want to attain. Thus, the goal may be unconsciously set.

Motives are psychological forces, meaning that they are desires that push us to attain the goal (ibid.). To have a desire means wanting to have something or wishing for something to happen. The concept of desire does not necessarily include feelings and sensations, but feelings sometimes accompany desires. They are often different in different situations (ibid.). Goals can be instrumental or ultimate. While an instrumental goal is a means towards something else, an ultimate goal is an end in itself. In any given situation, we can have different goals, and thus various motives, which can complement or conflict with each other. Apart from goals, each action may also have unintended consequences.

What motivates individuals to volunteer? Batson et al. distinguish four motives of communal actions: egoism, altruism, collectivism and principlism (Batson et al. 2002). The differences in these four motives are based on the differences in ultimate goals. While the ultimate goal of egoism is the increase of one's own wellbeing, the ultimate goal of altruism is an increase in the wellbeing of another person. In the case of collectivism, the ultimate goal is the welfare of the group. When one's goal is adherence to a certain principle, then motivation is called principlism.

Egoism

Sometimes, people dedicate their time to others to gain benefits for themselves. There are evidence that helping others produces positive psychological consequences (rewards) – the so-called empathic joy (Andreoni 1990). In addition, there are studies that show the correlation between personal well-being and volunteering (Bruni 2006). However, psychological benefits

⁴ Schwartz value theory is elaborated in the section 2.3.

could be only unintended consequences of volunteering. When someone jumps into a lake to save a drowning child, he is probably not thinking of rewarding feelings he might experience once he successfully rescue the child. Even when such psychological benefits are foreseen, an actor can still be motivated by the wellbeing of the person in need. The fact that a psychological benefit can be foreseen does not mean that achieving it was the goal of the action (Marsh 2016). Volunteering may also be motivated by social and material benefits, such as for example gaining valuable skills, approval by their peers, increased chances for job success, etc.. Research findings suggest that many young people around the world volunteer to “build” their CV (Handy et al. 2010). A study conducted in the USA finds that volunteering is associated with 27% higher odds of employment (Spera et al. 2013).

Altruism

One can volunteer with a goal to increase the welfare of another person, which is the case of altruism. According to Batson, altruistic behaviours are driven primarily by emotion, triggered by empathy and compassion (Batson 2011). Batson defines empathy as the “other-oriented emotion elicited by and congruent with the perceived welfare of someone in need” (ibid: 11). Empathy involves feelings towards another such as “feeling sympathy for, compassion for, sorry for, distress for, concerned for, and so on” (ibid), which may prompt us to act in order to help a person who we perceive is in need. Empathy for those less fortunate than oneself is certainly a frequent motivator of volunteer work (Music and Wislon 2008). However, empathy is not very reliable motivator, since it is difficult to feel empathy for complete strangers (ibid.)

Some people hold particular worldview, the so-called altruistic perspective, which is a perception of oneself as strongly linked to others through a shared humanity (Monroe 1996). Such a perspective maintains that “each individual is linked to all others and to a world in which all living beings are entitled to certain humane treatment merely by virtue of being alive” (ibid: 206). When one has this way of seeing the world, setting the welfare of others as an ultimate goal results from the recognition that on the one hand the actor is human and therefore required to act in a certain way, and on the other that a person in need is human and therefore entitled to certain treatment. A study on heroic acts of rescuing Jews during WWII has shown that rescuers had an altruistic perspective (ibid.).

Collectivism

Batson and colleagues further argue that some people volunteer in order to increase the welfare of a group (Batson et al. 2002). People are more likely to volunteer on behalf of a group if they identify with that group (Music and Wilson 2008). The distinction is made between volunteers from volunteer service programs, which are volunteer departments in the paid-staff-based non-profit organisations, and “association volunteers” who volunteer in a non-profit group that “regularly provides services that help meet the operative goals of

that group” (Smith and Stebbins 2016: 5). The latter are also known as “active members of associations” and they are likely to be driven by the group’s welfare. For the former, volunteer service programs represent instruments or resources for volunteering, where the volunteer actions are usually directed towards other groups.

Principlism

When volunteers are motivated to uphold certain principle or norm, then it is the case of principlism. Caring about another is often the right thing to do, so how can we then distinguish between altruism and principlism? This distinction is based on Durkheim’s differentiation of people who are “good” and those who are “responsible” (Durkheim 1961). While the former is concerned with others’ welfare and doing good for others, the latter are concerned with the maintenance of rules and adherence to them. Thus, one can be indifferent about the other and her/his welfare, but the very fact that a person is in need and that helping the needy is the right course of action can induce volunteering. Volunteers often invoke ideas like duty or justice, as well as that they should do their “fair share” (Music and Wilson 2008).

2.3. Values

Not only situation-dependent motives, but also values that we deeply treasure guide our prosocial behaviour. The concept of values has an important role in social sciences (Schwartz 2012). It is applied in characterizing groups, societies and individuals, and it is used to explain individual behaviour. However, it is a contested concept, as there are many conceptions of values. Here we will analyse Schwartz’s theory of values. According to Schwartz (1996), values are desirable goals that serve as guiding principles in people’s lives. There are six characteristics of values as defined (Schwartz 1992, 2010). First, values are cognitive structures, closely linked to affect. This means that when values are activated, they induce feelings. For example, if someone highly values social status and prestige, when this is threatened, he feels anxious, while when he achieves it, he feels satisfaction. Second, values refer to desirable goals. For example, someone may wish to gain a success in his career and his behaviour is driven by this goal. Third, values transcend specific actions and situations. This is particularly important distinction between values and motives. While motives are related to particular situations, values are relevant across situations. For example, being humble may be a value that leads someone’s behaviour with his friends and family members, but also at work and sport club. Fourth, values serve as standards or criteria. Based on values, we judge whether actions, policies, people and events are good or bad, desirable or undesirable. Fifth, values are ordered by importance relative to one another. Each of us has an ordered set of values which leads our behaviour. For example, one may value achievement more than pleasure. Finally, Schwartz argues that the relative importance of the set of relevant values guides action. In other words, each action may be guided by several values.

Schwartz value theory identifies 10 broad value orientations: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence and universalism (Schwartz 2007). All values are characterised by the six features. What distinguishes one value from another is the goal it expresses. Values are social concepts that represent these goals (*ibid.*). Ten basic values and the goals they express are summarised in the Table 1.

Table 1. Types of Values and Core Goals

Value	Defining goals
Self-direction	independent thought and action; choosing, creating, exploring.
Stimulation	excitement, novelty, and challenge in life
Hedonism	pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself
Achievement	personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards
Power	social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources
Security	safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self
Conformity	restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms
Tradition	respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one's culture or religion provides
Benevolence	preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact (the 'in-group').
Universalism	understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature

Source: Schwartz 2007

Schwartz argues that these ten values are likely to be universal because they are grounded in universal requirements (Schwartz 2010). Existence of individuals as biological organisms, then the possibility of coordinated social interaction, as well as group survival and welfare require articulation of appropriate goals, their communication and cooperation in their pursuit (*ibid.*). However, individuals and groups differ in the relative importance they attribute to each basic value, meaning that individuals and groups have different value priorities. The sources of these differences in value priorities are seen in needs and inborn temperaments of individuals on the one hand, and on the other in their experiences, both as a part of groups and as individuals (*ibid.*)

Values form a circular structure, as depicted at the Figure 1. The closer values are, the more similar their underlying goals are, and the more distant they are, the more antagonistic they are (Schwartz 2012). Values are seen as organized along two bipolar dimensions (*ibid.*). First dimension contrasts 'openness to change' and 'conservation' values. This dimension captures the conflict between values that emphasize independence of thought, action, and feelings and readiness for change (self-direction, stimulation) and values that emphasize order, self-restriction, preservation of the past, and resistance to change (security, conformity, tradition). Second dimension contrasts 'self-enhancement' and 'self-

transcendence' values. This dimension captures the conflict between values that emphasize concern for the welfare and interests of others (universalism, benevolence) and values that emphasize pursuit of one's own interests and relative success and dominance over others (power, achievement). Hedonism shares elements of both openness to change and self-enhancement. Values in the top section (power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction) primarily regulate how people express personal interests and characteristics, while the values in the bottom section (benevolence, universalism, tradition, conformity, security) primarily regulate how people relate socially to others and affect their interests.

Figure 1. Relations among Ten Motivational Types of Value



Source: Schwartz 2012

Basic values are abstract and their relevance in particular situations is often not obvious (Cieciuch, Schwartz, and Davidov 2015). Values affect behaviour only if they are activated and if experienced as relevant, while the activation may or may not entail self-conscious thought about the value (ibid.). Actions often have implications for several values and the attractiveness of an action is determined by the trade-off between positive and negative affective responses (Schwartz 2010). Three mechanisms link values to behaviour (Cieciuch, Schwartz, and Davidov 2015). First, values determine the importance that people assign to the consequences of any action, where actions are more attractive when they promote attainment of valued goals (ibid.). However, the value-based assessment of choices most often occurs unconsciously. Second, values influence behaviour through their effects on planning. When we give a high priority to a value, we are more likely to make action plans that can lead to its expression. Finally, values affect attention, perception, and interpretation of situations (ibid.). People pay more attention to those aspects of any situations that threaten their cherished values, or that provide possibilities for attainment of valued goals.

When it comes to prosocial behaviour, values are relevant for the conscious awareness of need, then for perceiving oneself as able to help, and finally sensing some responsibility to become involved (Schwartz 2010). Some values, such as benevolence or universalism, direct our attention to others' needs, while self-enhancement values may reduce our attention for other's needs (ibid.). Moreover, self-transcendence values positively influence self-efficacy beliefs, which are important for prosocial behaviour (ibid.). Finally, self-transcendence as well as conformity and tradition values may increase one's feeling of responsibility towards others, while self-enhancement values legitimize attending to own needs and avoiding involvement with others' who are needy (ibid.). In short, examining the possibility of acting in a prosocial manner usually activates self-transcendence values but it might also prompt the opposed values that the action may harm. Thus, prediction of prosocial behaviour on the basis of values should consider those values that promote such behaviour as well as the values opposed to it (ibid.).

However, some authors argue that values and behaviour are only remotely related (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004) or that there is only a slight connection between values and volunteering (Wilson 2000). In other words, values are always dynamic and multidimensional, and we should refrain from making straightforward causalities (Schwartz 1992).

3. Empirical evidence from Serbia

3.1. Methodology

The data analysed in this paper are data from the national representative survey conducted in 2014.⁵ The target population were fifteen- year-olds and older, excluding the institutionalised persons. The sample is representative sample, selected to provide statistically reliable estimates at the national level. The surveying was carried out in the period 12th May– 30th August 2014. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews and 1,528 individuals were interviewed.

The respondents were asked about volunteering in the past 12 months. They were offered a list of organisations and asked if they provided any unpaid work or assistance or made monetary contributions to them in the previous 12 months. These organisations were: charitable (humanitarian) organisations, other non-governmental organisations, churches and religious communities, schools, public social service providers (such as shelters for homeless, day care centres for the elderly, institutions for children without parental care, shelters for migrants, etc.), tenants' assembly, organisations of culture and arts, sport clubs, political parties, organisations of hobby, business organisations, trade union and other. Thus, volunteering was operationalized as giving time to any of these organisations.

In order to access motives for volunteering, respondents were given a list of twelve statements and asked to assess which of those on the list were important

5 This research was a part of author's PhD research on individual giving of time and money in Serbia and Canada. The questionnaire used in research in Serbia is adjusted from the questionnaire used in the Canadian *General Social Survey – Giving, Volunteering and Participating* (GSS:GVP) 2013. https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/statistical-programs/instrument/4430_Q1_V7

reasons in making a decision to volunteer. The most common way to explain why people volunteer is to ask them reasons for doing so, which is the most often done through survey, but such approach is troublesome (Music and Wilson 2008). Whether stated reasons correspond with the “real” reasons that motivated individuals to volunteer cannot be assessed through surveying. All self-reports are only estimates of motives and goals, and there are unconscious motivations, affects, goals, and cognitions (Smith et al. 2016). Moreover, it could be expected that to some extent respondents were biased towards socially desirable answers, such as, for example, making a contribution to the community (Salamon et. al. 2017). Thus, the survey results when it comes to the motives for volunteering should be taken with caution. In order to assess barrier to volunteering, respondents were also asked whether any of ten listed statements was a reason for why they did not volunteer at all or volunteered more in the past 12 months.

Volunteers were asked whether they received any payment, direct benefit or skills from volunteering. They were also asked if the volunteering activities would help them in getting a job or improve the chances of success in a current job. Being able to gain material and non-material benefits from volunteering does not necessarily imply that the motive of voluntary actions is to benefit oneself. However, as it has already been discussed, some people volunteer from egoistic motives, thus to gain some personal benefits. An environment in which volunteers are in certain way compensated, or in which skills gained from volunteering are perceived as valuable, is more favourable for volunteering, as it may induce egoistically motivated volunteers to give their time, who otherwise would not engage in volunteering. Therefore, the volunteers were asked whether they gained any material or non-material benefits from volunteering

Finally, respondents’ value orientations were accessed through the instrument modelled on the questionnaire used in the European Social Surveys for Schwartz value theory.⁶ Respondents were given a list of forty statements – portraits that were supposed to measure basic values (Schwartz 2007). For each portrait, respondents answered the question: ‘How much like you is this person?’ choosing one of six possibilities ranging from ‘very much like me’ to ‘not like me at all’. In this way, respondents’ own values were inferred from their self-reported similarity to people who were described in terms of particular values. Then their answers were transformed into a six-point numerical scale. The score for the importance of each value is the mean response to the items that measure it.

3.2. Motives for Volunteering

Approximately a quarter of the inhabitants of Serbia (27.7%) volunteered their time to a formal organisation within a period of one year (Radovanović 2019). As many as 73.1% of them stated that “to make a contribution to the community”, and 60.8% “to help people in need” were important reasons for volunteering. For more than a half of the volunteers (55.2%), the fact that their friends volunteered was an important reason for volunteering. Improvement of the sense of well-being was important for 39.5% and implementation of one’s

6 Please find the details regarding the items used for measuring value orientations in the following link <http://essedunet.nsd.uib.no/cms/topics/1/4/all.html>

skills and experiences for 35.5% volunteers. Only a tenth of volunteers reported that they were driven by improving job prospects.

Table 2. Stated Reasons for Volunteering

Statement	% of volunteers	N	Motive
To make a contribution to the community.	73.1%	406	Collectivism
To help people in need.	60.8%	405	Altruism
Because your friends volunteer.	57.9%	400	Principlism/ Altruism/ Collectivism
To improve your sense of well-being or health.	39.5%	407	Egoism
To use your skills and experiences.	35.5%	403	Egoism
To network with or meet people.	32.1%	406	Egoism
To fulfil religious obligations or moral duties.	30.7%	406	Principlism
Because a family member volunteers.	30.6%	408	Principlism/ Altruism/ Collectivism
You or someone you know has been personally affected by the cause supported by this group or organisation.	28.0%	402	Altruism/Egoism
To support a political, environmental or social cause.	26.9%	403	Principlism
To explore your own strengths.	22.2%	404	Egoism
To improve your job opportunities.	10.3%	401	Egoism

The stated reasons for volunteering listed in the questionnaire could be grouped into four-type motives, following Batson et al (2002). However, since we cannot know for certain how the respondents interpret any of the given reasons, any grouping of the reasons is likely to be arbitrary. It is particularly difficult to assign a goal for the statement “You or someone you know has been personally affected by the cause supported by this group or organisation.” It might be interpreted as one’s motive to help others, as knowing how it feels to be affected by the cause the organisation supports gives one the able to empathise with those who have had similar experiences. This may be the case, for example, when someone who has beaten cancer, or whose family member suffered from this disease, volunteers for cancer research. Thus, we could interpret such motivation as altruism. However, the same statement can also be interpreted as a way to benefit oneself, thus as egoism. For example, one could volunteer in a sport club where she plays basketball.

Moreover, the fact that a friend or a family member decides to volunteer can be interpreted as principlism in a way that a respondent is following a social norm created in a group of friends or family. This too may be altruism. She may want to make her friend or a family member happy by helping the cause the friend is supporting. The goal may as well be to increase the welfare of the group a respondent and her friend or a family member belong to or supports.

In short, both taking the stated reasons as motives for volunteering and grouping them should be done with caution. Therefore, we use the stated reasons as an approximation of the motives for volunteering. Thus, we can argue that the majority of volunteers in Serbia are driven by collectivism and altruism.

Table 3. Barriers to Volunteering (more)

Statements	% of survey respondents	N
You did not have the time.	49.4%	1508
Because no one asked you.	32.2%	1512
You were unable to make a long-term commitment.	32.1%	1512
You had health problems, or you were physically unable.	25.1%	1509
The financial cost of volunteering.	21.0%	1511
You did not know how to get [more] involved.	15.9%	1510
You had no interest.	15.9%	1507
You gave enough time already.	14.5%	1508
You preferred to give money instead of time.	11.8%	1510
You were dissatisfied with a previous volunteering experience.	9.3%	1510

When it comes to barriers to volunteering more or volunteering at all, a lack of time was reported as an impediment for the greatest number of respondents (49.4%). A third of respondents said that the fact that no one asked them was a reason why they did not volunteer (32.2%). It has been argued that being asked is an important predictor of volunteering (Putnam 2000, Sokolowski 1996). The non-profit sector is rather young and small (Radovanović 2019), which might explain why Serbians are not exposed to solicitations for volunteering. A third of respondents stated that they were unable to make a long-term commitment (32.1%), while a quarter reported that they had health problems or were physically unable (25.1%). Thus, personal resources in terms of time and health reportedly are important impediments to volunteering in Serbia.

Table 4. Benefiting from Volunteering

Payments and benefits from volunteering	Share of volunteers	N
payment to cover out-of-pocket expenses	3.2%	413
monetary compensation for any of your volunteer time	3.1%	413
benefit	15.7%	413
formal recognition from this organisation	12.1%	413
Skills gained from volunteering		
interpersonal skills such as understanding people, motivating people, or handling difficult situations with confidence, compassion or patience	45.5%	413
communication skills such as public speaking, writing, public relations or conducting meetings	27.7%	413
organisational or managerial skills such as how to organize people or money, to be a leader, to plan or to run an organisation	24.6%	413
fundraising skills	24.2%	413
increased knowledge of such subjects as health, women's or political issues, criminal justice or the environment	18.7%	412
technical or office skills such as first aid, coaching techniques, computer or bookkeeping	12.1%	413
Employment opportunities through volunteering		
getting a job or starting a business	12.1%	412
success in paid job or business	12.8%	401

A negligible number of volunteers reported that they received any monetary remuneration, while 15.7% reported that they received a benefit, such as a free or discounted membership, event pass or a meal and 12.1% received formal recognition from this organisation, such as a letter, certificate or invitation to a volunteer appreciation event. The greatest number of volunteers stated that they gained interpersonal skills such as understanding people, motivating people, or handling difficult situations with confidence, compassion or patience, while approximately a quarter reported that they gained communication skills, organisational or managerial skills and fundraising skills. Most of volunteers did not think that volunteer activities would help them to get a job, start a business or improve the chances of success in a current job.

Benefiting from volunteering is not the same as being motivated to acquire skills and opportunities through volunteering. Nevertheless, since a majority of respondents does not perceive volunteering as a way of gaining material and non-material benefits for themselves, we could assume that Serbian context is not very favourable in attracting people who seek to benefit from volunteering in this way.

3.3. Values and Volunteering

Three most cherished values among Serbian volunteers are benevolence, security and universalism (Table 5).

Table 5. Ten Basic Values among Volunteers

Value orientation	Min	Max	M	SD	N
Benevolence	1.25	6.00	4.89	.78	404
Universalism	1.00	6.00	4.71	.87	403
Self-direction	1.00	6.00	4.49	1.03	396
Stimulation	1.00	6.00	3.47	1.40	393
Hedonism	1.00	6.00	3.50	1.46	397
Achievement	1.00	6.00	3.50	1.31	396
Power	1.00	6.00	2.86	1.30	395
Security	1.00	6.00	4.81	.91	403
Conformity	1.25	6.00	4.66	.95	404
Tradition	1.00	6.00	4.21	1.07	402

It was argued that self-transcendence values (benevolence and universalism) direct our attention to the needs of others and may increase feelings of responsibility towards others, which may result in pro-social behaviour (Schwartz 2010). The values on the opposite side of the circle – self-enhancement values (power and achievement) legitimize attending to own needs, avoiding involvement with others' who are needy, thus making us refrain from acting pro-socially (ibid.). Thus, we could expect that self-transcendence values are more important for volunteers than self-enhancement values. Moreover, we could also expect that self-transcendence values are more important for volunteers than for those citizens who do not volunteer. Finally, it could be expected that self-enhancement values are more important for citizens who do not volunteer than

those who dedicate their time for the benefit of others. In this section, we will examine these three assumptions.

Firstly, using Cronbach's alpha, we evaluated the reliabilities of the indexes used to measure these two higher-order value orientations. As reported in the Table 6, Cronbach's alphas for self-transcendence is 0.79 and for self-enhancement is 0.80, which should indicate that the scales are reliable.

Table 6. Reliability of the Scales

Value orientation	Cronbach's alpha	Number of items	N
Self-transcendence	.79	2	1477
Self-enhancement	.80	2	1436

Descriptive statistics indicate that there are differences between the above categories both within and between the groups (Table 7). Higher mean for self-transcendence than for self-enhancement among volunteers indicates that the self-transcendence values are more important for volunteers than self-enhancement values. According to the independent samples *t* test, there is a statistically significant difference between the average scores of the variables self-transcendence and self-enhancement in the sample of respondents who claim to volunteered their time, as $t(660) = 23.41$, $p < .001$, equal variances not assumed, as Levene's test shows that there is no equality of variances. Moreover, it is notable that there is slightly higher mean for self-transcendence among volunteers than among non-volunteers, which is another expected result. According to the independent samples *t* test, there is a statistically significant difference between the average scores of the variables self-transcendence between volunteers and those who did not volunteers, as $t(1480) = 2.70$, $p = .007$, equal variances assumed, as Levene's test showed that the null hypothesis of equality population variances cannot be rejected. However, the mean scores for self-enhancement are also higher among volunteers than among non-volunteers. This difference is also statistically significant, as $t(1425) = 2.32$, $p = .020$, equal variances assumed, as Levene's test showed that the null hypothesis of equality population variances cannot be rejected. This is a surprising finding, since according to the literature we would expect that self-enhancement values are more common among people who do not volunteer than among volunteers. This might be due to differences in the types of organisations we looked at, which have all merged into the category "formal organisation". Perhaps, volunteers to one type of organisation, e.g. charities, have different value orientation than for example volunteers to religious organisations or sport clubs, which requires further examination in the future research. However, it might as well be that there is an ambiguous relationship between values and prosocial behaviour, which is pointed out in the literature.

Table 7. Self-transcendence and Self-enhancement among Volunteers and Non-volunteers

		Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Volunteers	Self-transcendence	2.13	6	4.92	.75	408
	Self-enhancement	1	6	3.26	1.20	396
Non-volunteers	Self-transcendence	1	6	4.80	.79	1074
	Self-enhancement	1	6	3.10	1.18	1058
All respondents	Self-transcendence	1	6	4.83	.78	1482
	Self-enhancement	1	6	3.14	1.18	1454

We performed multiple regression analyses in order to examine further if the volunteers and non-volunteers have different value orientations, in terms of the two higher-ordered values – self-transcendence and self-enhancement. We examined two models containing the same set of independent variables, consisting of one key explanatory variable (volunteering to organisations) and four control variables (age, gender, level of education, marital status), and differ in terms of the dependent variable (self-transcendence and self-enhancement). The two dependent variables considered are numerical, while the key explanatory variable is defined as an artificial variable that takes the value 1 if the respondent is a volunteer and 0 if not. The two control variables are numerical (age and education in years) and the two control variables are defined as artificial (gender and marital status).

The model with the self-transcendence dependent variable is shown in the Table 8.

Table 8. Multiple regression – Self-transcendence

		b	SE b	β
Step 1	constant	4.846	.114	
	volunteering	-.051	.047	-.029
	age	-.001	.001	-.021
	education	.002	.007	.008
	gender	.010	.041	.007
	Marital status	.037	.043	.023

Notes: R²=.02

The estimated values of the regression coefficients in the model are not statistically significant at the level of 5% significance, both in terms of key independent and control variables. The only regression coefficient exhibiting statistical significance is the constant estimate. Considering the very low value of the estimated coefficient of determination of only 2%, it can be concluded that the model as a whole, as well as at the level of individual variables, does not manifest the desired explanatory power in explaining the variability of the dependent variable.

In the case of model with self-enhancement (Table 9), as in the previous case, the estimated values of the regression coefficients are not statistically significant

at the level of 5% significance, and the value of the estimated coefficient of determination is slightly higher and amounts to 6%, but is still unsatisfactory.

Table 9. Multiple regression – Self-enhancement

	b	SE b	β
constant	3.486	.174	
volunteering	.075	.071	.029
Step 1			
age	-.005	.002	-.071
education	-.011	.010	-.032
gender	-.017	.063	-.007
Marital status	-.005	.065	-.002

Notes: R²=.06

Considering the results of both models, it can be concluded that the key explanatory variable – volunteering does not contribute to explaining the dependent variables of self-transcendence and self-enhancement value orientations at a statistically significant level, and that the model as a whole has very weak explanatory power. A possible explanation for such an unfavourable result relates may be in the relatively small variability of the dependent variables (dispersion of the individual values of the dependent variables around respectable averages) relative to the significantly expressed variability of the key independent variable, as illustrated in the Table 10. It can be seen that in the case of dependent variables, especially the self-transcendence variable, the standard deviation is many times lower than the average, while in the case of the key independent variable – volunteering, the standard deviation is almost twice the average.

Table 10. Variability of dependent and independent variables

	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Self-transcendence	1	6	4.83	.78	1482
Self-enhancement	1	6	3.14	1.18	1454
Volunteering	0	1	.27	.445	1528

Our findings, thus, cannot confirm that, controlled for other factors, volunteers and non-volunteers have different value orientations in terms of self-transcendence and self-enhancement values.

3.4. Who volunteers in Serbia?

Next to be analysed are the predictors of volunteering. We are interested in demographic characteristics and value orientations important in predicting volunteering. We are also interested in whether values explain volunteering better than demographic characteristics. Dependant variable in the models is dichotomous (whether a respondent volunteers), while some independent variables are continuous (age, years of formal education, self-enhancement, self-transcendence value orientations) and some are dichotomous (gender, marital status), which makes binary logistic regression the most appropriate technique

for analysing the data. In the Model 1 the independent variables are gender, age, education and marital status, while in the Model 2 we added self-transcendence and self-enhancement value orientations.

Based on the literature, we would expect that education is an important predictor of volunteering in Serbia, as education is seen as an important resource (Musick and Wilson 2008). When it comes to the relationship between volunteering and other demographic characteristics, the findings are inconclusive (Radovanović 2029a). We expect that self-transcendence value orientation is a predictor of volunteering. We also expect that greater variance would be explained by the model that includes both demographic characteristics and value orientations, then by the model with only demographic characteristics as independent variables.

Table 11. Logistic regression

	Model 1				Model 2			
	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
gender	.152	.120	1.605	1.164	.143	.124	1.328	1.153
age	-.020***	.004	28.456	.980	-.019***	.004	25.227	.981
education	.103***	.021	24.686	1.108	.102***	.021	23.247	1.108
marital status	.023	.126	.034	1.024	.037	.129	.080	1.037
self-transcendence					.216**	.083	6.771	1.241
self-enhancement					.091	.052	3.045	1.095
constant	-1.393***	.351	15.749	.248	-2.756***	.568	23.570	.064
Cox & Snell R Square	.052				.056			
Nagelkerke R Square	.075				.081			
N	1528				1409			

Notes: ***p<.001, **p<0.05

Both models are efficient, based on the -2LL which decreases with the introduction of independent variables in all models, and based on the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, which is not significant in neither of the models. There has been a slight increase in Cox & Snell R Square and Nagelkerke R Square in model 2, indicating that, as expected, greater variance is explained by the model which include both demographic characteristics and value orientations, then by the model with only demographic characteristics as independent variables. However, both models have poor explanatory power, as other factors are also likely to be a part of explanation of one’s decision to engage in volunteering.

Controlling for other variables in the model, age, formal education and self-transcendence value orientation are predictors of volunteering in Serbia. When the age of the respondent increases by a year the likelihood of volunteering decreases by a factor of 0.98. As time spent in formal education increases by one year, the likelihood of volunteering increases by a factor of 1.1. As the self-transcendence value orientation increases by one, the likelihood of volunteering increases by a factor of 1.24. Thus, volunteers are more likely to be found among younger, better-educated population, with higher scores on self-transcendence value orientations.

4. Conclusion

A range of individual and contextual factors influences one's decision to engage in formal volunteering. In this paper we examined individual factors, in particular perception, motives and values. In order to volunteer, people first must become aware of the need for support, then to see themselves as able to help and responsible for providing support. What is particularly important for the perception of needs and the resulting action is the solicitation of volunteering. In most cases, volunteering follow solicitations. Although we are surrounded by information regarding the suffering of others and appeals to help those in need, we do not always take notice of these appeals, nor do we pay much attention to them. Subjective perceptions of need are crucial. We are often driven to help the causes that are close to our hearts or have touched us personally. In deciding whether to volunteer motives are crucial. Motives are goal-directed psychological forces in a given situation. Batson et al. distinguish four motives of communal actions: egoism, altruism, collectivism and principlism (Batson et al. 2002). Not only situation-dependent motives, but also values that we deeply treasure guide our prosocial behaviour. Values are desirable goals, that serve as guiding principles in people's lives. When it comes to prosocial behaviour, values can be relevant for the conscious awareness of need, then for perceiving oneself as able to help, and finally sensing some responsibility to become involved. Self-transcendence values (benevolence and universalism) direct our attention to the needs of others and may increase feelings of responsibility towards others, which may result in pro-social behaviour, while the values on the opposite side of the circle – self-enhancement values (power and achievement) legitimize attending to own needs and avoiding involvement with others' who are needy.

Approximately a quarter of the inhabitants of Serbia (27.7%) volunteered their time to a formal organisation within a period of one year. Reportedly, the majority of them volunteered to contribute to the community and to help people in need. Thus, they are likely to be driven by collectivism and altruism. The lack of time, lack of solicitation for volunteering and being unable to make long-term commitments were reported as the main barriers to volunteering. Serbian volunteers rarely obtain material and non-material benefits from volunteering, and they do not perceive volunteering as a valuable tool for getting employed or for job success. Benefiting from volunteering is not the same as being motivated to acquire skills and opportunities through volunteering. Nevertheless, since a majority of respondents does not perceive volunteering as a way of gaining material and non-material benefits for themselves, we could assume that Serbian context is not very favourable in attracting people who seek to benefit from volunteering in this way.

Our findings based on descriptive statistics and the independent samples *t* test show that self-transcendence values are more important for Serbian volunteers than self-enhancement values, and that self-transcendence values are more emphasized among volunteers than among non-volunteers. However, we also found that, on average, volunteers score higher on self-enhancement value orientation than non-volunteers, which is a surprising finding, as according to

the literature, we would expect that self-enhancement values are more common among people who do not volunteer than among volunteers. This might be due to differences in the types of organisations we looked at, which have all merged into the category “formal organisation”. Perhaps, volunteers to one type of organisation, e.g. charities, have different value orientation than for example volunteers to religious organisations or sport clubs, which requires further examination in future research. It might as well be that the relationship between value orientations and volunteering is not a straightforward one.

We performed multiple regression analyses in order to examine further if the volunteers and non-volunteers have different value orientations, in terms of the two higher-ordered values self-transcendence and self-enhancement. Our findings cannot confirm that, controlled for other factors, volunteers have self-transcendence value orientations more emphasised than non-volunteers, and that people who do not volunteer more deeply treasure self-enhancement values. This finding shows an ambiguous relationship between volunteering and values, which is in line with some findings in the literature.

Finally, we performed logistic regression analyses in order to see which demographic characteristics and value orientations are predictors of volunteering. Controlling for other variables in the model, age, formal education and self-transcendence value orientation are predictors of volunteering in Serbia. Thus, volunteers are more likely to be found among younger, better-educated population and those who score higher on self-transcendence values.

References

- Andreoni, J. 1990. Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-Glow Giving, *The Economic Journal*, vol.100, pp. 464–477.
- Batson, C. D. 2011. *Altruism in Humans*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Batson, C. D. and Powell, A. A. 2003. Altruism and Prosocial Behavior, *Handbook of Psychology, Part Three*, Wiley Online Library, pp.463–484.
- Batson, D., Ahmad, N. and Tsang, J-N. 2002. Four Motives for Community Involvement, *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 429–445.
- Bekkers, R. and Wiepking, P. 2011. A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 924–973.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. 2011. *A cooperative species: human reciprocity and its evolution*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Bryant, W.K., Jeon-Slaughter, H., Kang, H. and Tax, A. 2003. Participation in Philanthropic Activities: Donating Money and Time, *Journal of Consumer Policy*, Volume 26, Issue 1, pp. 43–73.
- Bruni Luigino 2008. *Reciprocity, Altruism and the Civil Society: In praise of heterogeneity*, Routledge, Oxon.
- Butcher, J. and Einolf, C. (eds.) 2017. *Perspectives on Volunteering: Voices from the South*, Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland.

- Cieciuch, J., Schwartz, S.H., Davidov, E. 2015. The Social Psychology of Values, J.D.Wright, *International Encyclopedia of Social & Behavioral Sciences* (Second Edition). Amsterdam: Elsevier, 41–46.
- Cnaan, Ram A., and Amroffell, L. M. 1994. Mapping volunteer activity, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(4), 335–51.
- Cnaan, Ram A., Handy, F., & Wadsworth, M. 1996. Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3), 364–83.
- Smith, David H., Sardinha Boguslawa, Moldavanova Alisa, Dong Hsiang-Kai (Dennis), Kassam Meenaz, Lee Young-joo, and Sillah Aminata, *Conducive Motivations and Psychological Influences on Volunteering*
- Darley, J. M., Teger, A. I., and Lewis, L. D. 1973. Do groups always inhibit individuals' responses to potential emergencies?, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26, 395–399.
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education*. New York: Free Press.
- Handy, F., Cnaan, R. Hustinx, L. Kang, C. L. Brudney, J. Haski-Leventhal, D. Holmes, K. Meijs, L. Pessi, A. Ranade, B. Yamauchi, N. and Zrinščak, S. 2010. A Cross-Cultural Examination of Student Volunteering: Is It All About Resume Building? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*, Volume 39, Number 3, 498–523.
- Hitlin, S., & Piliavin, J. A. (2004). Values: Reviving a dormant concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 359–393.
- Hodgson, G. 2013. *From pleasure machines to moral communities: an evolutionary economics without homo economicus*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Leigh, R., Smith, D. H., Giesing, C., Leon, M. J., Haski-Leventhal, D., Lough, B. J., et al. 2011. *State of the world's volunteerism report: Universal values for global well-being*, Bonn, Germany, United Nations Volunteers.
- Manning, R., Levine, M. and Colins, A. 2007. The Kitty Genovese Murder and the Social Psychology of Helping: The Parable of the 38 Witnesses, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 62, No. 6, pp. 555–562.
- Marsh, A. 2016. Neural, cognitive, and evolutionary foundations of human altruism, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 59–71.
- Monroe, KR. 1996. *The heart of altruism: Perceptions of common humanity*, Princeton University Press. Princeton.
- Moody, M. 2008, Serial Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement, *Sociological Theory*, Volume 25, Issue 2, pp. 130–151.
- Musick, M. and Wilson, J. 2008. *Volunteers: a social profile*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Oliner, S. and Oliner, P. 1988. *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*, The Free Press, New York.
- Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling Alone*, Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, New York.
- Radovanović B. (2019). *Individual Giving: Theoretical Discussions and the Evidence from Serbia and Canada. Ethical Issues, Contextual and Individual Factors of Giving Time and Money to Organisations and People*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.

- Radovanović, B. (2019a). "Volunteering and Helping in Serbia: Main Characteristics", *Sociologija* 61 (1): 133–152.
- Richerson, P. and Boyd, R. 2005. *Not by genes alone: how culture transformed human evolution*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & Haddock, M. A. (2017). *Explaining civil society development: A social origins approach*. JHU Press.
- Schwartz, Shalom, 1977. Normative influences on altruism, in: Berkowitz L. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 221–279), New York, Academic Press.
- Schwartz, Shalom, 1996. Value priorities and behaviour: Applying a theory of integrated value systems, in: Seligman C., Olson J.M. and Zanna M. P. (eds), *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium*, Vol. 8, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum.
- Smith, D.H. and Stebbins, R. 2016. Introduction to Smith D.H., Stebbins R and Grotz J. (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Volunteering, Civic Participation, and Nonprofit Associations*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Snyder, M. and Dwyer, P.C. 2013. Altruism and prosocial behaviour, in T. Millon and M. Lerner, *Handbook of psychology*, Volume 5: Personality and Social Psychology, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, pp. 467–485.
- Sober, E. and Wilson D.S. 1998. *Unto others: the evolution and psychology of unselfish behaviour*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Sober, E. and Wilson, D.S. 1998. *Unto others: the evolution and psychology of unselfish behaviour*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Sokolowski, S.S. 1996. Show me the way to the next worthy deed: Towards a microstructural theory of volunteering and giving, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Volume 7, Issue 3, pp. 259–278.
- Spera, C. Ghertner, R. Nerino, A. and DiTommaso, A. 2013. *Volunteering as a Pathway to Employment: Does Volunteering Increase Odds of Finding a Job for the Out of Work?*, Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Evaluation.
- Staub, E. 2003. *The psychology of good and evil: why children, adults, and groups help and harm others*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1992. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp.1–65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1996. Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario Symposium*, Vol. 8 (pp. 1–24). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schwartz, S. H. 2007. Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents, and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, & G. Eva, Eds. *Measuring attitudes crossnationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey* (pp. 161–193). London: Sage.

- Schwartz, S. H. (2010). Basic values: How they motivate and inhibit prosocial behavior. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions, and behavior: The better angels of our nature* (pp. 221–241). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Schwartz, S. H. 2012. An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1).
- Walter, J., Griffith, K. and ReshmaJagsi, R. 2015. Oncologists' Experiences and Attitudes About Their Role in Philanthropy and Soliciting Donations from Grateful Patients, *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, Volume 33, Number 32, pp. 3796–3802.
- Wilson J. 2012. Volunteerism Research: A Review Essay, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*41(2), 176– 212.