

Pathways to Late-Life Volunteering: A Focus on Social Connectedness

Dury, Sarah; Brosens, Dorien; Smetcoren, An - Sofie; Van Regenmortel, Sofie; De Witte, Nico; De Donder, Liesbeth; Verte, Dominique

Published in:
Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly

DOI:
[10.1177/0899764019881509](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019881509)

Publication date:
2019

License:
Unspecified

Document Version:
Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Dury, S., Brosens, D., Smetcoren, A. . S., Van Regenmortel, S., De Witte, N., De Donder, L., & Verte, D. (2019). Pathways to Late-Life Volunteering: A Focus on Social Connectedness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49(3), 523–547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019881509>

Copyright

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, without the prior written permission of the author(s) or other rights holders to whom publication rights have been transferred, unless permitted by a license attached to the publication (a Creative Commons license or other), or unless exceptions to copyright law apply.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document infringes your copyright or other rights, please contact openaccess@vub.be, with details of the nature of the infringement. We will investigate the claim and if justified, we will take the appropriate steps.

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly

- ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION -

Pathways to late-life volunteering: A focus on social connectedness

Journal:	<i>Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly</i>
Manuscript ID	NVSQ-AR-18-0092.R2
Manuscript Type:	Articles
Keywords:	volunteering, social connectedness, mixed-methods, potential volunteers, older people

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Pathways to late-life volunteering: A focus on social connectedness

Abstract

Utilizing a mixed-methods research design consisting of two consecutive phases, this study investigates older adults' perceptions and understanding of social connectedness factors influencing late-life volunteering. In the first phase, quantitative data from the Belgian Ageing Studies project ($n = 24,508$, from 89 municipalities) was analyzed through regression modeling. In the second, qualitative phase, focus groups with older people were conducted in each of the six research locations, in order to elucidate and build on the quantitative results. The research findings indicate that formal connectedness is highly influential for both the potential to volunteer as well as actually doing so. Membership of an association and being a new resident are key determinants for volunteering in later life. Moreover, local policy also functions as an important bridge between long-term residents and new residents in terms of the social structure of the society and the extent to which people are integrated into the community.

Keywords: volunteering, social connectedness, mixed methods, potential volunteers, older people

Introduction

The 21st century faces the challenge of an aging population, a consequence of reduced fertility combined with a decline in old age mortality (Bytheway, 2011). By 2050, in Europe, the number of citizens aged 60 years or more is estimated to reach 35% of the population (United Nations, 2017a). The rising proportion of older persons in the total population has profound implications for a wide range of social, economic, and political processes (Börsch-Supan et al., 2013), with approaches such as “healthy and active aging” gaining increasing attention on the global political agenda (Beard, et al., 2016). The World Health Organization redefined health and active aging in 2015 by defining healthy aging “that centers on the notion of function ability: the combination of the intrinsic capacity of the individual, relevant environmental characteristics, and the interactions between the individual and these characteristics” (Beard et al., 2016, p. 2145). This interaction can also be conceived of as participation, with volunteering a common form of it (i.e., social roles that go beyond paid employment) (Scharf et al., 2001).

As social roles and networks both appear to be highly predictive in the decision to volunteer, and because more research is needed on the relevant social context, social roles, and social networks (Einolf & Chambré, 2011), the aim of the present study is to explore this interaction between the individual and their environment by analyzing if and how social connectedness affects the process of (potential) volunteering in later life. Prior research has established that the dynamics of decision-making change over people’s life courses (Wilson, 2012; Warburton & Gooch, 2007). For instance, the desire to remain active and to help others are more prevailing motives for older adults, while instrumental goals, such as developing skills and career advancement, are more important for younger and middle-aged adults (Okun &

1
2
3
4 Schultz, 2003). On the other hand, older adults are less likely to be asked to volunteer
5
6 (Independent Sector, 2001).
7
8
9

10 Volunteering in later life is perceived as a pathway to an engaged lifestyle for older adults,
11 and, as such, has been emphasized in contemporary gerontological theories such as
12 “productive aging,” “healthy aging,” “successful aging,” and “active aging” (Boudiny, 2013;
13 Chambré & Netting, 2016). More generally, it is a universal activity within the adult
14 population, and can be defined as “donating time without payment under the auspices of
15 nonprofit organizations and government agencies” (Chambré & Netting, 2016, p. 2).
16 Specifically, it is an important civic activity that older adults can perform during retirement
17 (Chambré & Netting, 2016; Morrow-Howell, 2010), and has been shown to be beneficial to
18 the individual, the community, and the wider society (Greenfield & Marks, 2007).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Conceptualizations of volunteering also differ by political context and culture (Anheier &
33 Salamon, 1999). Belgium is the setting for the present study and is the 25th oldest country in
34 the world in terms of population structure. Within its population, 24.6% are 60 years old or
35 older (United Nations, 2017a). Also, in Belgium, compared to other European countries, a
36 high percentage of older adults is married (Hank & Wagner, 2013): that is, 56.6% are
37 married, 26.9% are widowed, 11.08% are divorced, and 5.46% are unmarried (Statbel, 2018).
38 Additionally, the proportion of older people living independently is also very high in
39 Belgium, and, of these, 77.6% live independently (alone or with a partner) in a single-family
40 house, apartment, or studio. Only a small minority lives together with their children (15.8%)
41 (United Nations, 2017b). Another study establishes that in 2014 8.8% older adults lived in
42 long-term care facilities (OECD, 2019).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Belgium also has a high percentage of young retirees: 61.3 years and 59.7 years are the
5
6 average ages for men and women to leave the labor force, respectively (OECD, 2017), while
7
8 the mandatory retirement age will be 65 years and 67 years in 2030. According to Hustinx
9
10 and colleagues (2015), 10.3% of Belgian people aged between 61 and 76 years old volunteer.
11
12 A “Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe” (SHARE) compared 12 European
13
14 countries with respect to volunteering, and Belgium was found to have a medium rate of
15
16 older adults who volunteer (Haski-Levethal, 2009). Furthermore, in Belgium, people perceive
17
18 volunteering as an activity freely chosen, through a formal organization, and in the proximity
19
20 of the beneficiaries, but accepting nonmonetary benefits is not experienced as a violation, in
21
22 contrast to the experience of volunteers in other Western European countries and regions
23
24 (Meijs et al., 2003).
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Previous studies have predominantly focused on how individual resources affect volunteering
32
33 in later life (Morrow-Howell, 2010; Musick & Wilson, 2008), with examples of such
34
35 resources including education, income, and health (Dury et al., 2015). Current research,
36
37 however, overlooks the social context of individuals (Martinson & Minkler, 2006), even
38
39 though it has been established that people assess their environments and make decisions
40
41 regarding voluntary participation based on context (Choi, 2003). Having contact with friends,
42
43 for instance, appears to be a stronger predictor for actual and potential volunteering than
44
45 older adults’ individual characteristics and resources (Dury et al., 2015). Likewise, being
46
47 socially integrated increases the chances of being aware of volunteer opportunities or being
48
49 asked to volunteer (Neymotin, 2016; Okun & Michel, 2006; Yörük, 2008).
50
51
52
53

54
55 *Social connectedness, as one theory of volunteering, has been shown to predict people’s*
56
57 *decision to volunteer (Lim, 2008; Paik & Navarre-Jackson, 2011). Withal, it appears to have*
58
59 *a stronger correlation compared to other theories of volunteering (such as individual*
60

1
2
3
4 characteristic theories on sociodemographic characteristics, motives and values and resource
5
6 theories on choices, skills and free time) (Einolf & Chambré, 2011). As a concept, “social
7
8 connectedness” refers to the quantity and quality of relationships in social and associational
9
10 networks (Lancee & Radl, 2012). Despite the evidence for the value of social connectedness
11
12 and volunteering in old age, though, two substantial gaps in the research pertaining to this age
13
14 group remain.
15
16
17
18

19 The first concerns the types of social connectedness that influence the decision to volunteer
20
21 (Musick & Wilson, 2008; Paik & Navarre-Jackson, 2011): how do informal (i.e., social
22
23 networks) and formal connectedness (i.e., associational networks) promote or hinder
24
25 volunteering in later life? The current literature lacks insight on whether informal and/or
26
27 formal connectedness is most influential in whether an individual is willing to volunteer (Paik
28
29 & Navarre-Jackson, 2011).
30
31
32
33

34 The second research omission is that no prior studies, except for the study of Paik and
35
36 Navarre-Jackson (2011), have examined whether social connectedness is conditional on the
37
38 willingness to volunteer. The majority of the research has been on people who are already
39
40 volunteering, which means that there is an insufficient understanding about people who are
41
42 willing to volunteer (Dury et al., 2015). Hence, research lacks information on whether the
43
44 effects of informal and formal connectedness are conditional on (not) being asked to
45
46 volunteer or (not) start volunteering.
47
48
49
50

51 **Social connectedness**

52 In studying social connectedness, it is important to acknowledge that definitions of the term
53
54 differ from author to author, depending on the varying perspectives of their research
55
56 paradigms (Kohli, Hank, & Kunnemund, 2009) and their research contexts. This leads to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 theoretical and methodological ambiguity (Carpiano, 2006). In the social sciences, for
5
6 example, many researchers refer to the concept of social capital (Granovetter, 1983; Putnam,
7
8 2000), whereas others use related concepts, such as social integration (e.g., Lee & Brudney,
9
10 2010; Paik & Navarre-Jackson, 2011) or social resources (Lin, 1982; Musick & Wilson,
11
12 2008). These terms are just a few out of many that describe concepts related to social
13
14 connectedness, and most have been contested owing to the lack of definition (Jeanotte, 2008).
15
16
17
18

19 In the present study, social connectedness is defined as participation in social life, referring to
20
21 the quantity and quality of relationships in social and associational networks (Lancee & Radl,
22
23 2012). Many aging studies distinguish between “informal connectedness” (i.e., frequency and
24
25 quality of social networks) (i.e., Musick & Wilson, 2008) and “formal connectedness” (e.g.,
26
27 membership in associations) (Kohli, Hank, & Kunnemund, 2009; Putnam, 2000). This
28
29 division is also common practice in the wider social capital literature (Lancee & Van de
30
31 Werfhorst, 2012; Musick & Wilson, 2008), and is further elucidated in the remainder of this
32
33 section of the present paper.
34
35
36
37
38

39 Informal connectedness comprehends the frequency and satisfaction of contact with family,
40
41 neighbors, and friends. It encompasses informal interactions, connections, and alliances with
42
43 others (Campbell & Lee, 1992). Research has shown that older adults who maintain wide-
44
45 ranging informal ties are associated with an increased likelihood of volunteering (e.g., Dury
46
47 et al., 2015; Lee & Brudney, 2010). For instance, people who have frequent contact with their
48
49 neighbors have been found to be more likely to volunteer (Wilson & Son, 2018). Yet, contact
50
51 such as simply saying “hello” is rather superficial, and no relationship has been found for
52
53 neighbor engagement such as having a conversation or social get-togethers (Wilson & Son,
54
55 2018). Relatedly, volunteers are also more likely to have other volunteers in their social circle
56
57 (Nesbit, 2013; Warburton et al., 2001). Befriended volunteers are powerful recruiters and
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 provide information that manages the expectations of potential volunteers (McNamee &
5
6
7 Petersen, 2016). Yet, having friends who volunteer does not appear sufficient to make people
8
9 start volunteering (Musick & Wilson, 2008). On the other hand, having supportive family
10
11 members increases organizational connectedness and encourages people to remain
12
13
14 volunteering (Huynh, Xanthopoulou, & Winefield, 2013; Nesbit, 2013).
15

16
17 The second type of social connectedness - formal connectedness - describes bonds that older
18
19 adults have because of membership in an association (Cornwell & Harrison, 2004; Brown &
20
21 Ferris, 2007). Members of associations are typically demographically homogeneous
22
23 (Baggetta, 2016). Through being the member of an association or organization, people
24
25 develop networks of friends and acquaintances (Baggetta, 2009; Brown & Ferris, 2007; van
26
27 Ingen & Kalmijn, 2010; Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995) as well as developing civic skills,
28
29 and consequently they are often asked to participate in other activities such as volunteering
30
31 (Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995). These types of activities are often social, as both types
32
33 of activities imply a sociable and civic nature (Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995; Brown &
34
35 Ferris, 2007). Moreover, a U.S. study found that baby boomers who had been asked by an
36
37 organization are more likely to remain volunteering (70.5%) compared to those asked by
38
39 their employer (53.9%) (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2007).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 It is thought that organizational membership increases the likelihood of volunteering because
47
48 membership is a way to integrate into the community and to be asked to volunteer therein
49
50 (Cornwell & Harrison, 2004). Adults who have strong social and communal ties tend to act
51
52 out such commitments as volunteers (Jones, 2006; Sills, 1957). Likewise, norm-based social
53
54 capital, such as having trust in others and civic institutions, is strongly related to increased
55
56 volunteering (Daniels, 1985; Brown & Ferris, 2007). In addition, group membership proves
57
58 to be important when the primary networks of paid work and family cease, which is
59
60

1
2
3
4 especially the case in later life (Warburton & Stirling, 2007). For example, later life often
5
6 entails role losses in partnership and parental statuses (Greenfield & Marks, 2004).
7
8
9

10 Furthermore, associations often indicate that volunteering is one of the obligations of
11 membership (Wuthnow, 1998, p. 80, 207–208). However, a study on political activists
12 revealed that formal ties generated through civic associations may not be more effective than
13 other types of ties in terms of recruiting volunteers. In fact, the content of relationships rather
14 than their strength would appear to be more important with regard to recruitment (Lim,
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research aim

The specific objective of this study is to identify the ways in which social connectedness can either promote or hinder volunteer participation in later life. Studies on social connectedness are often based on quantitative data, frequently leading to the impossibility of locating micro-processes of social engagement within the wider social context (Victor et al., 2008). This study, therefore, draws together both quantitative and qualitative data in a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) in two consecutive phases. First, quantitative data are used to identify which indicators of (informal and formal) social connectedness are significantly associated with volunteering in older adults. In addition, these quantitative data were used to purposefully guide the selection of six study locations (see Data and Methods section for details). Second, a qualitative study was performed to investigate older adults' perceptions and understanding of social connectedness factors influencing late-life volunteering. The mixed-methods explanatory design allows us to explore the following research questions.

1
2
3
4 In the first *quantitative* phase of the study, the research question is:
5
6

- 7 1. Does social connectedness predict (potential) volunteering among older persons and,
8 if so, which is the most influential: informal (family, friends or neighbors) or formal
9 (membership in associations) connectedness?
10
11
12

13 In the second phase, the following *qualitative* research question is addressed:
14
15

- 16 2. How do older adults experience their social connectedness? Does this affect their
17 (potential) volunteering and, if so, why is this the case?
18
19

20 Finally, the *mixed-methods* explanatory design allows us to explore the following question:
21
22

- 23 3. In what ways do older adults' experiences of social connectedness help to clarify the
24 processes underlying variations in (potential) volunteering between the different
25 research locations?
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Data and methods**

32
33

34 We applied a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design “to obtain different but
35 complementary data on the same topic” (Morse, 1991, p. 122), in order to understand the
36 research problem as well as possible answers. Following this model, we collected and
37 analyzed quantitative and qualitative data on the same phenomenon; subsequently, the
38 different results were converged (by comparing and contrasting the different results) during
39 interpretation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). In each of the selected study locations,
40 qualitative data were gathered to explain and build upon initial quantitative results.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Quantitative data generation and analysis**

52
53

54 The analyses were performed on data originating from the Belgian Ageing Studies project, a
55 survey that evaluated aspects of the quality of life and living conditions of home-dwelling
56 people aged 60 years and over (e.g., social contacts, volunteering, membership of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 associations, potential support, etc.). The present study used cross-sectional data from 24,508
5
6 respondents in 89 municipalities in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium (Flanders). The
7
8 Belgian Ageing Studies survey data were collected through peer research, a participatory
9
10 methodology that embraces older adults not only as the researched group, but also as active
11
12 researchers, by involving them in every step of the project. For instance, older adults
13
14 themselves were responsible for the data collection. In every municipality, 30–80 older
15
16 volunteers were recruited and trained to facilitate and monitor the data collection process; one
17
18 of their main tasks was delivering questionnaires to respondents personally and collecting
19
20 them when they were completed. When collecting the questionnaire, the volunteer was
21
22 trained and allowed to clarify the meaning of questions; however, the questionnaire was
23
24 developed to be self-administering. Respondents were also assured of the voluntary nature of
25
26 their involvement in the study, and the privacy of their responses. Participation in the study
27
28 was entirely voluntary, and no remuneration was offered. The first response rate per
29
30 municipality varied between 65% and 85%. To reduce the potential bias of non-responses,
31
32 replacement addresses in the same quota category from an additional sample were used. In
33
34 every municipality, the same research protocol was followed.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In each of the participating municipalities, a representative sample was randomly selected
43
44 from the census records. A proportionally stratified sampling method was applied per
45
46 municipality, using gender and age (60–69, 70–79, and 80 years and over) as stratification
47
48 variables. The rationale, and one of the advantages of this specific sampling method, was the
49
50 assurance of the proportional presence of the most vulnerable age group (80 years and over).
51
52 The entire methodology of the study is described in De Donder et al. (2014).
53
54

55 For the present study, we used data collected between 2007 and 2011. Cases with missing
56
57 responses to the main measures were excluded, leading to a sample size of 24,508
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 respondents from 89 different municipalities. Descriptive characteristics of the survey
5
6 respondents are presented in Table 1. The mean age of respondents was 70.7 years (range =
7
8 60–99) of whom 53.6% were female. The majority of respondents (75.2%) were married,
9
10 19.5% were widowed, and 3.0% were divorced, while 86.6% owned their homes.
11
12

13 <Insert Table 1 here>
14
15

16 **Quantitative measures**

17

18 The dependent variable was based on two questions. First, respondents were asked if they
19
20 had volunteered during the previous 12-month period. If they had, they were asked which
21
22 type of voluntary work they had performed, referring to a list of ten different categories of
23
24 activities with organizations. These categories were as follows: recreational, manual labor,
25
26 keeping company, domestic, educational, caring in hospices, sociocultural, administrative,
27
28 social, and managerial. Respondents who indicated at least one of these activities were
29
30 classified as volunteers. Those who reported no volunteering were asked whether they were
31
32 willing to volunteer in the near future, leading to a distinction between non-volunteers and
33
34 potential volunteers. Therefore, the categorical dependent variable comprised three values:
35
36 volunteers, potential volunteers, and non-volunteers.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Informal social connectedness and formal social connectedness were the independent
45
46 variables. Two variables related to informal social connectedness were considered: frequency
47
48 and satisfaction with contacts. To measure the *frequency of informal connectedness*,
49
50 respondents were asked how often—coded “0” (never to monthly) or “1” (weekly to almost
51
52 daily)—they had contact (i.e., visiting someone, receiving a visit, or speaking on the
53
54 telephone) with social connections, who were categorized as follows: “1” = nuclear family
55
56 (children or children in-law and grandchildren), “2” = extended family (brothers, sisters, and
57
58 other relatives), “3” = neighbor, and “4” = friend or acquaintance.
59
60

1
2
3
4 The *satisfaction of informal connectedness* was measured through the question “To what
5 extent are you satisfied with your contacts with the following people?,” with responses coded
6
7 “0” for dissatisfied or “1” for satisfied in relation to the following social connections: “1” =
8
9 nuclear family (children or children in-law and grandchildren), “2” = extended family
10
11 (brothers, sisters, and other relatives), “3” = neighbor, and “4” = friend or acquaintance.
12
13
14 In order to measure formal connectedness—*membership and board membership of an*
15
16 *association*—21 possible social associations or clubs were presented to the respondents,
17
18 varying from hobby clubs to associations for the amateur practice of art, and from anti-
19
20 pollution associations to sports clubs. Responses were categorized as “0” (non-member), “1”
21
22 (member), or “2” (board member).
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 As control variables, we used age, gender, level of education, physical health, marital status,
30
31 and homeownership, given that these have been shown to have significance for volunteering
32
33 in earlier studies (e.g., Dury et al., 2015). *Age* ranged between 60 and 99 years old, with a
34
35 mean of 70.7 years. *Gender* was coded as a dummy variable: 0 = female and 1 = male. *Level*
36
37 *of education* was measured using the highest educational qualification on a 10-item response
38
39 scale ranging from “no degree” to “university degree.” A measure of *physical health*
40
41 (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.89$) was developed in accordance with the manual of the Medical Outcome
42
43 Scale short-form General Health Survey (Kempen, Brilman, Heyink & Ormel, 1995) the
44
45 continuous scale ranged from 1 (“worse physical health”) to 2 (“better physical health”).
46
47
48 *Marital status* was coded as 0 = never married, 1 = divorced, 2 = cohabiting, 3 = widowed,
49
50 and 4 = married. Homeownership was coded as a dummy variable: 0 = tenant and 1 =
51
52 homeowner.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Quantitative analysis

First, a multicollinearity analysis was performed to eliminate correlated predictors (VIF > 2.0). Second, a multinomial logistic regression analysis was conducted, and reported by odds ratios (ORs). Given the large sample size, a stricter significance cut-off of 0.001 was applied for all analyses (Pallant, 2013). Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS 22.0 software.

Qualitative data generation and analysis

Qualitative data were collected through focus groups to obtain in-depth information on how people think about issues related to volunteering and social connectedness, and how ideas develop and operate within a given cultural context (Christensen et al., 2011). Despite the fact that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed in focus groups, they were selected to organize the six data collection points for several reasons. First, focus groups aim to interactively encourage and generate understanding in a variety of insights of participants regarding the research issues (Krueger & Casey, 2015), such as their attitudes, behavior, opinions, or perceptions (Hennink, 2007). Second, focus groups appear to eliminate the power imbalance that might occur in individual interviews due to the “authoritative voice” of the investigator. Subsequently, respondents of focus groups appear less reluctant to discuss issues and other topics are possibly offered that may not be discussed during an individual interview (Liamputtong, 2011).

In order to guarantee a variety of volunteering environments, six municipalities were selected from the quantitative data set (see Table 2): the two municipalities with the highest rate of volunteer participation, Hove (25.1%) and Heusden-Zolder (23.1%); two with a medium rate of volunteering, Beersel (13.7%) and Ieper (16.4%); and the two with the lowest rate of

1
2
3
4 volunteer participation, Ternat (7.6%) and Wellen (7.7%). Frequency of contact with
5
6 neighbors was the highest in Heusden-Zolder (60.5%), and the lowest percentage was in
7
8 Hove (41.3%). Satisfaction of contact with friends was the highest in Hove. Membership in
9
10 an association was also the highest in Hove (59.9%), and the lowest in Wellen (42.4%). The
11
12 highest percentage of divorcees was in Beersel, with 4.1%, and the lowest percentage was in
13
14 Wellen (1.5%).
15
16

17
18 <Insert Table 2 here>
19

20
21 In total, six focus groups were conducted. For each of the six research locations, one focus
22
23 group (with a note-taker) was undertaken with a heterogeneous group of older, retired
24
25 volunteers and older, retired non-volunteers. Recruitment of respondents ($n = 53$) was carried
26
27 out through both formal and informal contacts by officials of the community council and the
28
29 social service department, relevant community organizations, including social service centers
30
31 and voluntary organizations, and through older adults asking acquaintances or people from
32
33 their association or organization. The sample is summarized in Table 3. Every focus group
34
35 had between 7 and 12 participants. In every focus group, the proportions of men and women
36
37 were equal. With regard to the age of the participants, the mean age for every group ranged
38
39 from 65 to 70 years old. Volunteers as well as non-volunteers were included in every group,
40
41 and the latter numbered between one and five.
42
43
44

45
46 <Insert Table 3 here>
47

48 **Qualitative measures**

49

50
51 For the focus groups, we used a topic list covering participants' experiences of living in the
52
53 municipality (e.g., "Do you know where you can volunteer in your municipality?"), (informal
54
55 and formal) social connectedness in the municipality (e.g., "With whom do you have contact
56
57 and why?"), and how this had had an impact upon their volunteer participation (e.g., "How
58
59 did you become a volunteer?").
60

Qualitative analysis

All focus groups were audiotaped, and these records were in turn transcribed (McLellan et al., 2003). We used a hybrid approach of inductive and deductive thematic analysis (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). For the deductive analysis, we used a priori variables from the quantitative section as the main labels. In order to detect sublabels, inductive analysis was used. New themes that emerged from the focus groups in the analysis were allocated a sublabel. Subsequently, codes with similar themes were clustered and organized into thematic categories in order to identify how these themes were interrelated (Neuman, 2011). The focus group data were then re-read to refine and verify the key themes and achieve validity in the findings. To increase the credibility of the findings, the coding frames and strategies were subject to inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was performed in which a systematic review was made by the principal investigator and then refined through a process of consensus with the other researchers involved. All focus groups were analyzed using the MAXQDA 11 software package.

Results

Quantitative findings

Table 4 presents the results of the multinomial logit regression analysis. *Formal connectedness* was the most influential predictor. Membership of association(s) was positively correlated with being an actual volunteer and with the probability of volunteering, compared with non-volunteers. Members were 4.4 times more likely to volunteer and 1.6 times more likely to be a potential volunteer than older adults who were not a member of an association. Board members were almost 29 times more likely to be actual volunteers and 2.2

1
2
3
4 times more likely to be willing to volunteer, compared to older adults who were non-
5
6 members.
7

8
9 <Insert Table 4 here>

10
11 *Informal connectedness* was also significantly related to (potential) volunteering in later life
12
13 in some cases. The frequency of contacts with neighbors had a significant positive relation to
14
15 being an actual volunteer or potential volunteer. Having weekly contact with neighbors
16
17 increased the odds to 21% for being an actual volunteer and 21% for willingness to volunteer,
18
19 compared to those who had less contact with their neighbors. As for frequency of contact
20
21 with friends, older adults were more likely to volunteer when they had weekly to daily
22
23 contact with their friends. The more frequent contact older adults had with their friends, the
24
25 more likely they were to be actual volunteers (1.2 times), compared to older adults who never
26
27 had monthly contact with their friends.
28
29
30
31

32
33 Furthermore, concerning *satisfaction with informal connectedness*, a significant positive
34
35 gradient was detected for extended family. Respondents who reported being satisfied with
36
37 their social contact with extended family were 17% more likely to be actually volunteering
38
39 than not.
40
41

42
43 The control variables *age, gender, level of education, physical health, and marital status* were
44
45 significantly associated with (potential) volunteering.
46
47

48 49 **Qualitative findings**

50
51
52 The quantitative findings revealed significant variations between (potential) volunteering in
53
54 terms of older adults' social connectedness. The qualitative discussion extends the above-
55
56 noted insights into older adults' experiences of volunteering and their social connectedness,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 with a particular focus on the influence of informal and formal connectedness, which was
5
6 found to be significant in the quantitative section of our study.
7
8
9

10 **Informal connectedness**

11
12 Informal connectedness has often been cited as an important factor in volunteering. In our
13
14 study, participants from all focus groups confirmed that having regular contact with their
15
16 neighbors and friends is vital. More specifically, they commented that being acquainted with
17
18 volunteers among their neighbors or friends reduced the threshold for volunteering. The
19
20 participants explained that they were more aware of which organizations needed volunteers,
21
22 and for which tasks and activities. Furthermore, the acquaintance often personally recruited
23
24 these volunteers. A 60-year-old male volunteer expressed this in the following way:
25
26
27

28
29 A friend of mine is a board member and asked me “What do you think about ... ?”

30
31 They were looking for someone, and my friend thought of me and I joined.
32
33

34
35 Nevertheless, our findings also suggest that older adults, despite their social connectedness,
36
37 consciously choose to invest time in other activities. Several non-volunteers explained that,
38
39 even though they were well aware of volunteering opportunities, they deliberately chose to
40
41 perform other activities, such as taking walks with the hiking club or picking up their
42
43 grandchildren from school.
44
45
46

47 **Formal connectedness**

48
49 A recurring theme across all study locations was the importance of formal connectedness for
50
51 volunteering. In keeping with the results of the multinomial logit regression analysis, some
52
53 respondents indicated that the relationships between informal connectedness and volunteering
54
55 were important but were less prominent compared to formal connectedness.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 First, membership of an association increased the chances of being recruited for volunteering.
5
6 Additionally, most actual volunteers indicated that they were also a member of one or more
7
8 associations. We infer that this membership ensured that they would be asked to volunteer.
9

10
11 The importance of formal connectedness is illustrated through the following comment:
12

13 You are a member of an association and you get to know people. That's also the
14
15 reason why they ask you to volunteer. They already know you. (70-year-old male
16
17 volunteer)
18
19

20
21
22 Second, some respondents—mostly non-volunteers and less integrated people—explicitly
23
24 linked their willingness to volunteer to aspects of formal connectedness and social
25
26 integration. Respondents stated that formal connectedness, such as ties to associations, was a
27
28 key factor for social integration within the community. Yet, it was not necessarily directly
29
30 related to becoming or being a volunteer. Instead, it reflected individuals' uncertainties about
31
32 their integration within their community. This was expressed, for example, by older people
33
34 who had experienced difficulties in building formal relationships or who feared joining
35
36 activities. A 60-year-old female non-volunteer articulated the issue in the following way:
37
38

39 Since I'm retired, I want to meet people and I've thrown myself into it, I joined an
40
41 association. I know a lot of people by sight, but not by their name; I don't know them
42
43 personally. To get to know them, I joined an association. But I still don't volunteer
44
45 because people don't ask. I would really like to volunteer, but where?
46
47
48
49

50
51 In this example, a discrepancy between wanting to become a volunteer and not feeling
52
53 sufficiently integrated to know where to be useful as a volunteer has contributed to the
54
55 individual remaining a potential or a non-volunteer.
56
57
58
59
60

New arrivals

As previously stated, feeling integrated within the community is an important determinant of volunteering. In our study's sample, social integration was thought to have been lost because of a considerable increase of new arrivals: people not born or not living for many years in the municipality in which they reside. Many long-term residents in our study reported that changes in "community spirit" could be attributed to lifestyle differences with respect to the new arrivals. For instance, greeting each other, have a chat with a neighbor, etc., were cited as important characteristics of that community spirit, yet several respondents felt that many new arrivals do not do these kinds of things, regardless of the wider municipalities having high, medium, or low rates of volunteers.

Furthermore, concerning the six municipalities, respondents commented on the changing composition of their locality, and how it had affected the social life of their community. The impact of the changing composition ranged from a positive influence, such as an open community through willingness to include new arrivals, to a negative influence, represented by the development of a closed community toward new arrivals. This issue is illustrated in the following comment:

There are a lot of newcomers in Hove, the majority of the people are not born in Hove. People find their own friends and they are not village bound. Of course, you know your neighbors, but, when new people arrive, I no longer have the tendency to get to know them. I'll always be friendly, but no more than that anymore. These new people have a different mentality, they don't want to integrate or be pulled in. (70-year-old male volunteer)

1
2
3
4 Participants made a distinction between people who were born and never moved, and people
5
6 who entered the municipality at a later stage in their life. New arrivals were perceived as
7
8 outsiders and the strong ties between the local residents excluded the new residents. A typical
9
10 observation was as follows: “People in Wellen have a closed outlook. Their social life is
11
12 closed against new arrivals” (67-year-old male volunteer). Such divisions were also reflected
13
14 in the compositions of associations and volunteer organizations, which consisted mainly of
15
16 long-term residents and barely any newcomers. This resulted in a mixed perception. Among
17
18 the long-term residents, the impression prevailed that newcomers were not interested in
19
20 getting involved into community life, while newcomers had the feeling that they were not
21
22 welcome. The impact of being a new arrival when it comes to exclusion from community
23
24 relationships concerned thus both informal and formal connectedness.
25
26
27
28

29
30 Similarly, regardless of who makes the recruitment attempt of the potential volunteer, the
31
32 type and content of the relationship is significant. Members of associations and volunteer
33
34 organizations found it very difficult to get in contact with new arrivals and to get to know
35
36 them. Moreover, it appeared that the long-term residents in particular experienced this barrier
37
38 in trying to integrate newcomers. Equally, newcomers had the feeling that a wall had been set
39
40 up for them by the locals. Being excluded from informal and formal connectedness is
41
42 reflected in the following comments from a 60-year-old female non-volunteer and new
43
44 arrival:
45
46
47
48

49 I have lived here since 1971, but, before I retired, I didn't have a lot of contact with
50
51 the neighbors, people in the village. You work all day long, raise children, have a
52
53 household to run, you never meet people. It's difficult to find your way to
54
55 associations as a newcomer, even when you live here more than 40 years already.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Because you're not part of that social network. You don't participate within the
5
6 municipality. But I would like to be part of the social life of the village.
7
8
9

10 Besides formal connectedness in associations, there was an overall view that municipalities
11
12 nowadays need to extend actions in order to enhance social life at a municipal level; "You
13
14 need to create activities to meet these new people" (67-year-old-man and volunteer). Many
15
16 respondents, particularly volunteers, referred to these activities for new arrivals and the local
17
18 policy involved with it. The following comment reflects how this has affected the social life
19
20 of their community:
21
22

23
24 Every year, the municipality organizes a meeting for the new arrivals. The
25
26 policymakers, organizations, and associations are presented. As of today, they at least
27
28 know where to go. Chatting, drinking ... and these people were accepted and felt at
29
30 home. (73-year-old-male non-volunteer)
31
32
33

34 Our findings suggest that some older adults who were already active within their community
35
36 and volunteer organizations asked to involve new arrivals more consciously in strong
37
38 collaboration with the municipality. For example, some commented on their shared
39
40 willingness with other associations and volunteer organizations to organize accessible
41
42 activities in the neighborhood together with the municipality for new arrivals and people not
43
44 yet integrated in civic life. Volunteer organizations and associations experienced difficulties
45
46 in organizing for themselves activities that attracted such people, and were more effective in
47
48 collaboration with other organizations, associations, and the municipality.
49
50
51
52

53 Analyses of the focus group interviews in the six municipalities also highlighted differences
54
55 between volunteers and non-volunteers in terms of (in)formal connectedness. For example,
56
57 two municipalities with the lowest rate of actual volunteers also exhibited the lowest level of
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 membership of associations. In this respect, our study points at the role of the content that is
5 exchanged through a formal tie instead of the strength of that relationship. People who were
6
7 already volunteering in those two municipalities reported that they were always seeking new
8
9 volunteers and approached many people to join their volunteer organization. Some
10
11 respondents, mainly non-volunteers, indicated that they never experienced this or knew that
12
13 volunteers were being sought. In those municipalities too, formal connectedness still appears
14
15 crucial for actual and potential volunteering.
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Discussion**

22
23
24
25 This study considered the thesis that older adults' social connectedness is an important
26
27 predictor of their volunteer behavior. It can also be seen as a response to the need for aging
28
29 research to bring the micro processes of social engagement within the macro social context
30
31 back into focus (Victor et al., 2008). Our research was distinctive because it used a mixed
32
33 methods approach, enabling the underlying dynamics of social connectedness related to
34
35 volunteering to be explored. Moreover, collecting data in Belgium offers significant insight
36
37 into a wider, Western European context. A key finding of this study is that social integration
38
39 within the local context is key for volunteering in later life.
40
41
42
43

44
45 Regarding the first quantitative research question on which type of social connectedness is
46
47 most influential for volunteering, our findings show that both informal and formal
48
49 connectedness predict actual and potential volunteering among older adults. An enriched
50
51 understanding of the social contextual nature of volunteer participation can be perceived in
52
53 the remarkably different effects of formal and informal social connectedness we identified. In
54
55 particular, formal connectedness, such as membership and board membership in an
56
57 association, accounted for both actual volunteering (Musick & Wilson, 2008; Okun, Pugliese,
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 & Rook, 2007) and potential volunteering. A plausible explanation is that new members of
5 associations are more frequently targeted by current members (Lim, 2008). Members of
6 associations might also have a stronger propensity toward participation, being more socially
7 and other directed (Dury et al., 2015, 2016; Lim, 2008; Reed & Selbee, 2003), as well as
8 being more aware of volunteering needs (McBride et al., 2011; Okun & Michel, 2006). As
9 for informal connectedness, frequent contact with neighbors and friends for actually
10 volunteering and neighbors for potential volunteering also influences older adults'
11 willingness to volunteer, according to our study's results.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 This finding can be attributed to the likelihood that such outcomes are not only about the
25 strength or type of the relationship, but, rather, about what is exchanged in that relationship
26 (Jasper & Paulsen, 1995; McNamee & Peterson, 2016), such as being asked to volunteer
27 (Wilson & Son, 2018). Nor is it about the diversity of an individual's friendships, which does
28 not necessarily bring the individual into associational networks (Brown & Ferris, 2007). It
29 might be that members of associations have a greater tendency to speak about their activities
30 as well as to recruit new members.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 As for the second research question on experiences of social connectedness and volunteering,
42 the study discovered that informal connectedness arises through contacts made in
43 associations (formal connectedness). The qualitative results elucidate how formal
44 connectedness increases people's chances of being integrated in their community as well as
45 the likeliness to volunteer. The ties generated through formal connectedness enable the
46 development of informal connectedness and the opportunity to become integrated into the
47 community (Cornwell & Harrison, 2004; Handy & Greenspan, 2009).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 However, informal connectedness also appears to be important for volunteering. Social
5
6 integration, which is a consequence of (in)formal connectedness, is a key factor for
7
8 volunteering in later life (Dury et al., 2015). Older adults who are already socially integrated
9
10 are more likely to be active formally through their informal connectedness (being recruited
11
12 by friends or neighbors who already volunteer), while older adults who are not socially
13
14 integrated depend on the contacts they generate through their formal connectedness. These
15
16 contacts make it possible to generate informal contacts and integrate. This dynamic may be
17
18 linked to the bridging function of weak ties as an important source of social mobility (new
19
20 contacts and the spread of information made possible by formal connectedness) (Granovetter,
21
22 1983). Members of associations might also have a stronger propensity toward participation,
23
24 being more socially and other directed (Dury et al., 2015, 2016; Lim, 2008; Reed & Selbee,
25
26 2003), as well as being more aware of activities, such as volunteering, and understanding the
27
28 role of volunteering (McBride et al., 2011; Okun & Michel, 2006).
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Nevertheless, our respondents emphasized that joining an association without knowing
36
37 another member is very unlikely. Older adults who are willing to volunteer not only need to
38
39 be socially connected but need to be integrated into their community before being able to
40
41 participate in community life, such as through volunteering. Prior research Lim (2008) has
42
43 established that it is not the type of tie per se, but the content of the relationship that is of
44
45 utmost importance for becoming a volunteer. Consequently, formal as well as informal
46
47 connectedness are necessary as a basis of the social infrastructure (Flora, 1998).
48
49
50
51

52 Our study's mixed methods explanatory design also allowed us to explore the ways in which
53
54 older adults' social connectedness helped to clarify the processes underlying variations in
55
56 volunteer participation between the different research locations (i.e., our third research
57
58 question). A key finding here is that, when comparing the different research locations, the
59
60

1
2
3
4 variation was mainly in relation to new arrivals. The impact of the community differed from
5
6 being a positive influence (i.e., an open community willing to include new arrivals) to a
7
8 negative influence (i.e., the development of a closed community toward new arrivals).
9

10
11
12 Additionally, an earlier study by Dury et al. (2016) found that length of residence does not
13
14 play a role. Instead, it is crucial to feel connected and a part of one's neighborhood.

15
16 Our results also demonstrate the need for policy involvement in integrating new arrivals at
17
18 the local level. From this perspective, formal connectedness not only includes associations,
19
20 but also local policy. In line with Granovetter's (1983) perspective, we posit that a
21
22 municipality's policy project can serve as a bridging function for weak ties. Specifically,
23
24 local policy appears crucial in establishing ties between associations, volunteer organizations,
25
26 long-term residents, and new arrivals. The bridging function of the local policy together with
27
28 associations, volunteer organizations, and long-term residents would make it possible to
29
30 mobilize individuals socially and to establish the social structure of society and agency
31
32 among its older citizens. Here again, it is not the type of tie that prevails but the content of the
33
34 exchange. Approaching older potential volunteers should take place at a local level and a
35
36 more diverse population should be targeted, such as people with fewer resources (Chambré &
37
38 Netting, 2016; Dury et al., 2016). The participants that were new residents, especially,
39
40 stressed that formal connectedness was crucial to finding the way to volunteering.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Limitations and strengths of the study**

49

50
51 Several limitations of our study warrant further consideration. First, we could not research the
52
53 full social networks of older adults because the survey did not ask about the number of
54
55 people or contacts of each type that their network contained (Cornwell, 2011). Second, the
56
57 cross-sectional nature of the data prevented us from determining causality.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 However, the paper has its strengths, too, such as the interpretation of the quantitative
5 findings, which became more meaningful through the qualitative phase. The results also point
6
7 to other factors that need further exploration, though, such as people's attachments to their
8
9 place of residence (Buffel et al., 2013), other leisure activities, and informal obligations
10
11 (child care and informal care) (Dury et al., 2016), as these may be relevant to volunteering as
12
13 well. Further research should focus on which factors of the neighborhood and other
14
15 activities/obligations may influence older adults' volunteering.
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Conclusion**

22
23
24
25 This study adds to the growing body of literature and empirically refined existing theoretical
26
27 frameworks on volunteering by highlighting that the topic cannot be studied without taking
28
29 into consideration the social connectedness of older adults. Its results lead us to conclude,
30
31 from the quantitative discussion, that there is a positive correlation between informal
32
33 connectedness and contacts with friends and neighbors for volunteering, and with neighbors
34
35 for potential volunteering. However, formal connectedness appears the most influential
36
37 element for both actual and potential volunteering.
38
39
40
41

42 We have also established that formal connectedness prevails, owing to its bridging function.
43
44 For new arrivals, as well as for long-term residents, formal connectedness generates informal
45
46 connectedness. Hence, it enables people to integrate within their community. Nevertheless, it
47
48 is unclear whether new arrivals have formal connectedness within their municipality, and, for
49
50 that reason, local policies as well as associations and organizations have a crucial role to play.
51
52 Moreover, being recruited personally prevails, both in the informal and formal networks, and
53
54 it is not the type of tie that is important but the content of the relationship.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 In terms of practical and policy recommendations, our research suggests that formal
5
6 connectedness, including policy involvement, is crucial to integrating (new) residents. One
7
8 response could be to extend neighborhood and new arrivals' activities to enable local meeting
9
10 opportunities, formal as well as informal. Consequently, new arrivals would gain more
11
12 insight into the makeup of the municipality, but also into that of community life. Finally,
13
14 further research is needed on how associations, volunteer organizations, and local policy can
15
16 integrate new arrivals and connect this group to the local community.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

References

- Anheier, H.K., & Salamon, L. (1999). Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Initial comparisons. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 43-66.
- Baggetta, M. (2009). Civic opportunities in associations: Interpersonal interaction, governance experience, and institutional relationships. *Social Forces*, 88, 175-199.
- Baggetta, M. (2016). Representative bridging: voluntary associations' potential for creating bridging ties in demographically diverse urban areas. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(1), 72-94.
- Beard, J.R., Officer, A., Araujo de Carvalho, I., Sadana, R., Pot, A.M., Thiagarajan, J.A. ... Peeters, G. (2016). The World report on ageing and health: a policy framework for healthy ageing. *Lancet* 387: 2145–2154.
- Boudiny, K. (2013). 'Active aging': from empty rhetoric to effective policy tool. *Aging & Society*, 33(6), 1077-1098.
- Börsch-Supan, A., Brandt, M., Hunkler, C., Kneip, T., Korbmacher, J., Malter, F., ... Zuber, S. (2013). Data resource profile: The survey of health, ageing and retirement in Europe (SHARE). *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 42(4), 992-1001.
- Buffel, T., De Donder, L., Philipson, C., Dury, S., De Witte, N., & Verte', D. (2013). Social participation among older adults living in medium-sized cities in Flanders, Belgium: The role of neighborhood perceptions. *Health Promotion International*, 29, 655–668.
- Brown, E. & Ferris, J.M. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: an analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 85-99
- Bytheway, B. (2011). *Unmasking age. The significance of age for social research*. Bristol: Policy Press, University of Bristol.

- 1
2
3
4 Campbell, K., & Lee, B. (1992). Sources of personal neighbour networks: Social integration, need
5
6 or time? *Social Forces*, 70(4), 1077-1100.
7
8
- 9 Carpiano, R.M. (2006). Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health:
10
11 Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social Science and Medicine*, 62(1), 165– 175.
12
13
- 14 Chambré, S.M. & Netting, F.E. (2016). Baby boomers and the long-term transformation of
15
16 retirement and volunteering. Evidence for a policy paradigm shift, *Journal of Applied*
17
18 *Gerontology*, DOI: 10.1177/0733464816663552
19
- 20 Christensen, L., Johnson, B., & Turner, L. (2011). Research methods, design, and analysis.
21
22 Eleventh edition. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
23
24
- 25 Choi, L.H. (2003). Factors affecting volunteerism among older adults. *Journal of Applied*
26
27 *Gerontology*, 22(2), 179–196.
28
29
- 30 Corporation for National and Community Service (2007). Keeping baby boomers volunteering. A
31
32 research brief on volunteer retention and turnover. Retrieved on September 3d 2018 from:
33
34 https://www.nationalservice.gov/sites/default/files/evidenceexchange/FR_2007_KeepingB
35
36 [abyBoomersVolunteering.pdf](https://www.nationalservice.gov/sites/default/files/evidenceexchange/FR_2007_KeepingB)
37
38
- 39 Cornwell, B., & Harrison, J.A. (2004). Union members and voluntary associations: Membership
40
41 overlap as a case of organizational embeddedness. *American Sociological Review*, 69,
42
43 862–881.
44
45
- 46 Cornwell, B. (2011). Independence through social networks: Bridging potential among older
47
48 women and men. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and*
49
50 *Social Sciences*, 66(6), 782-794.
51
52
- 53 Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*.
54
55 *Second edition*. London: SAGE.
56
57
- 58 Daniels A.K. (1985). Good times and good works: The place of sociability in the work of women
59
60 volunteers. *Social problems*, 32(4), 363-374.

- 1
2
3
4 De Donder, L., De Witte, N., Verté, D., Dury, S., Buffel, T., Smetcoren, A.-S., Brosens, D., &
5
6 Verté, E. (2014). Developing evidence-based age-friendly policies: A participatory
7
8 research project. In *SAGE Research Methods Cases*. London: SAGE.
9
10
11 Dury, S., De Donder, L., De Witte, N., Buffel, T., Jacquet, W., & Verté, D. (2015). To volunteer
12
13 or not: The influence of individual characteristics, resources and social factors on the
14
15 likelihood of volunteering by older adults. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*,
16
17 *44*(6), 1107-1128.
18
19
20 Dury, S., De Donder, L., De Witte, N., Smetcoren, A.-S., Brosens, D., Van Regenmortel, S., &
21
22 Verté, D. (2016a). Is volunteering in later life impeded or stimulated by other activities?
23
24 *Research on Aging*, *38*(1), 51-75.
25
26
27 Dury, S., Willems, J., De Witte, N., De Donder, L., Buffel, T., & Verte, D. (2016b). Municipality
28
29 and neighborhood influences on volunteering in later life. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*,
30
31 *35*(6), 601-626.
32
33
34 Einolf, C.J., & Chambré, S.M. (2011). Who volunteers? Constructing a hybrid theory.
35
36 *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *16*, 298-310.
37
38
39 Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid
40
41 approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal*
42
43 *of Qualitative Methods*, *5*(1), 80–92.
44
45
46 Flora, J. (1998). Social capital and communities of place. *Rural Sociology*, *63*,481–506.
47
48 Granovetter, M. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological*
49
50 *Theory*, *1*, 201.
51
52
53 Greenfield, E., & Marks, N. (2004). Formal volunteering as a protective factor for older adults'
54
55 psychological well-being. *Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences &*
56
57 *Social Sciences*, *59*, 258-264.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- Greenfield, E.A., & Marks, N.F. (2007). Continuous participation in voluntary groups as a protective factor for the psychological well-being of adults who develop functional limitations. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 62(1), 60–68.
- Handy, F. & Greenspan, I. (2009). Immigrant volunteering: a stepping stone to integration? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(6), 956-982.
- Hank, K., & Wagner, M. (2013). Parenthood, marital status, and well-being in later life: evidence from SHARE. *Social Indicators Research*, 114(2), 639-653.
- Haski-Leventhal, D. (2009). Altruism and volunteerism: The perceptions of altruism in four disciplines and their impact on the study of volunteerism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 39, 271-299.
- Hennink, M.M. (2007). *International focus group research: a handbook for the health and social sciences*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hustinx, L., Marée, M. De Keyser, L., Verhaeghe, L., & Xhauflair, V. (2015). *Het vrijwilligerswerk in België: Kerncijfers*. Brussel: Koning Boudewijnstichting.
- Huynh, J.Y., Xanthopoulou, D., & Winefield, A.H. (2013). Social support moderates the impact of demands on burnout and organizational connectedness: a two-wave study of volunteer firefighters. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 18(1), 9-15.
- Independent Sector (2001). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*. Washington DC: Independent Sector.
- Jasper, J.M., & Paulsen, J.D. (1995). Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests. *Social Problems* 42(4), 493-512.
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2008). Promoting social integration. A brief examination of concepts and issues. Experts Group Meeting, July 8–10, 2008, Helsinki, Finland. Retrieved from:

1
2
3
4 http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/social/meetings/egm6_social_integration/documents/Jeanotte_Concepts.pdf.

9 Jones, K.S. (2006). Giving and volunteering as distinct forms of civic engagement: The role of
10 community integration and personal resources in formal helping. *Nonprofit and Voluntary*
11 *Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 249-266.

16 Kempen, G., Brillman, E., Heyink, J., & Ormel, J. (1995). *MOS Short-form general health survey*.
17 Groningen: Noordelijk centrum voor gezondheidsvraagstukken.

20 Kohli, M., Hank, K., & Künemund, H. (2009). The social connectedness of older Europeans:
21 Patterns, dynamics and contexts. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 19, 327–340.

25 Krueger, R.A. & Casey, M.A. (2015). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*
26 (Fifth edition). London: SAGE Publications.

29 Lancee, B. & Radl, J. (2012). Social connectedness and the transition from work to retirement.
30 *The journals of Gerontology*, 67B(4), 481-490.

34 Lancee, B. & Van de Werfhorst, H. G. (2012). Income inequality and participation. A comparison
35 of 24 European countries. *Social Science Research*, 41(5), 1166-1178.

39 Lee, Y., & Brudney, J. (2010). Rational volunteering: A benefit-cost approach. *International*
40 *Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 29, 512-530.

43 Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus group methodology. Principles and practice*. London: SAGE.

46 Lim, C. (2008). Social networks and political participation: how do networks matter? *Social*
47 *Forces*, 87(2), 961- 982.

50 Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital. A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge: Cambridge
51 University Press.

55 Martinson, M., & Minkler, M. (2006). Civic engagement and older adults: A critical perspective.
56 *The Gerontologist*, 46(3), 318–324.

59 McBride, A. M., Gonzales, E., Morrow-Howell, N., & McCrary, S. (2011). Stipends in volunteer

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

civic service: Inclusion, retention, and volunteer benefits. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6), 850–858.

McLellan, E., MacQueen, K. M., & Neidig, J. L. (2003). Beyond the qualitative interview: Data preparation and transcription. *Field methods*, 15(1), 63-84.

McNamee, L.G. & Peterson, B.L. (2016). High-stakes volunteer commitment: a qualitative analysis. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 45(2), 275-294.

Meijs, L., Handy, F., Cnaan, R., Brudney, J., Ascoli, U., Ranade, S., Hustinx, L., Weber, S., & Weiss, I. (2003). All in the eyes of the beholder? Perceptions of volunteering across eight countries. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: A cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 19–34). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic.

Morrow-Howell, N. (2010). Volunteering in later life: Research frontiers. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 65B(4), 461–469.

Morse, J.M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40(2), 120-123.

Musick, M.A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Indiana University Press.

Nesbit, R. (2013). The influence of family and household members on individual volunteer choices. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(6), 1134-1154.

Neuman, L.W. (2011). Social research methods. *Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Seventh edition (7th ed.). Essex: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Neymotin, F. (2016). Individuals and communities: the importance of neighbors volunteering. *Journal of Labor Research*, 37, 149-178.

OECD (2017). Pensions at a glance 2017. Retrieved February 19, 2018, from http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/social-issues-migration-health/pensions-at-a-glance-2017_pension_glance-2017-en#.WoHoO5PwYWo

OECD (2019). Retrieved March 15th, 2019, from

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=HEALTH_LTCR#

- Okun, M.A., & Schultz, A. (2003). Age and motives for volunteering: A test of hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. *Psychology and Aging, 18*, 231–239.
- Okun, M.A., & Michel, J. (2006). Sense of community and being a volunteer among the young-old. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 25*(2), 173-188.
- Okun, M. A., Pugliese, J., & Rook, K. (2007). Unpacking the relation between extraversion and volunteering in later life: The role of social capital. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 1467-1477.
- Paik, A., & Navarre-Jackson, L. (2011). Social networks, recruitment, and volunteering: Are social capital effects conditional on recruitment? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*(3), 476–496.
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS. 5th edition*. Sidney: Allen & Unwin.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Shuster.
- Reed, P., & Selbee, L.K. (2003). Do people who volunteer have a distinctive ethos? A Canadian study. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: A cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 91–110). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic.
- Scharf, T., Phillipson, C., Kingston, P., & Smith, A. (2001). Social exclusion and older people: Exploring the connections. *Education and Ageing, 16*, 303-320.
- Sills, D. (1957). *The volunteers: means and ends in a national organization*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Statbel, 2018 Retrieved February 19th, 2019 from <https://bestat.statbel.fgov.be/bestat/crosstable.xhtml?view=1265590a-13b9-48bc-82c9-6bdf2f8e6e53>

- 1
2
3
4 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2017a). World
5
6 Population Ageing 2017 - Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/397).
7
8
9 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2017b). Living
10
11 Arrangements of Older Persons: A Report on an Expanded International Dataset
12
13 (ST/ESA/SER.A/407).
14
15
16 van Ingen, E., & Kalmijn, M. (2010). Does voluntary association participation boost social
17
18 resources? *Social Science Quarterly*, 91, 493–510.
19
20
21 Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L., & Brady, H.E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in*
22
23 *American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
24
25
26 Victor, C., Scambler, S., & Bond, J. (2008). Social relations and everyday life. In C. Victor, S.
27
28 Scambler, & J. Bond (Eds.), *The social world of older adults: Understanding loneliness*
29
30 *and social isolation in later life* (pp. 81-127). Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
31
32
33 Warburton, J., Terry, D.J., Rosenman, L.S., & Shapiro, M. (2001). Differences between older
34
35 volunteers and nonvolunteers: Attitudinal, normative, and control beliefs. *Research on*
36
37 *Aging*, 23(5), 586–605.
38
39
40 Warburton, J. & Gooch, M. (2007). Stewardship volunteering by older Australians: the generative
41
42 response. *Local Environment*, 12(1), 43-55.
43
44
45 Warburton, J., & Stirling, C. (2007). Factors affecting volunteering among older rural and city
46
47 dwelling adults in Australia. *Educational Gerontology*, 33, 23–43.
48
49
50 Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism Research: A Review Essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary*
51
52 *Sector Quarterly*, 41(2), 176-212.
53
54
55 Wilson, J. & Son, J. (2018). The connection between neighboring and volunteering. *City &*
56
57 *Community*, 17(3), 720-736.
58
59
60 Wuthnow, R. (1998). *Loose connections*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

1
2
3
4 Yörük, B.K. (2008). The power of asking in volunteering: Evidence from a matched sample.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Economics Letters, 99, 79-84.

For Peer Review

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for dependent and independent variables. $n = 24,508$

		Range	α	%/M(<i>sd</i>)	Actual volunteers	Potential volunteers	Non-volunteers
Dependent variable					16.0%	15.7%	68.3%
Demographics							
Age		60-99		70.7 (7.6)	68.8 (6.4)	66.7 (5.6)	72.0 (7.8)
Gender	Male	0-1		47.4%	48.8%	53.2%	45.8%
Level of education		0-10		4.7 (2.8)	5.9 (2.8)	5.4 (2.8)	4.2 (2.7)
Physical health		1-2	0.89	1.7 (0.3)	1.8 (0.3)	1.8 (0.3)	1.6 (0.4)
Marital status	Married	0-1		75.2%	78.7%	83.1%	72.5%
	Never married	0-1		0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Divorced	0-1		3.0%	3.3%	4.8%	2.6%
	Cohabiting	0-1		1.5%	1.4%	2.1%	1.5%
	Widowed	0-1		19.5%	15.6%	9.3%	22.7%
Homeownership	Owner	0-1		86.6%	91.0%	90.3%	85.6%
Social connectedness							
Informal connectedness							
Frequency: weekly to daily	Nuclear family	0-1		88.6%	89.3%	89.2%	88.3%
	Extended family	0-1		38.1%	39.6%	38.8%	37.6%
	Neighbors	0-1		52.0%	59.4%	54.1%	49.7%
	Friends	0-1		45.6%	54.4%	46.6%	43.2%
Satisfaction: Satisfied	Nuclear family	0-1		99.7%	99.9%	99.8%	99.7%
	Extended family	0-1		83.6%	86.8%	85.2%	82.5%
	Neighbors	0-1		81.0%	84.9%	80.8%	80.1%
	Friends	0-1		88.5%	92.7%	89.4%	87.3%
Formal connectedness							
Membership association	Member	0-2		53.6%	42.7%	60.5%	54.6%
	Board member			17.3%	51.5%	16.2%	9.4%
	Non-member			29.2%	5.8%	23.4%	36.1%

Table 2. Characteristics of the six selected municipalities.

	Mean	Highest rate of actual volunteers		Medium rate of actual volunteers		Lowest rate of actual volunteers		
		Hove	Heusden	Beersel	Ieper	Ternat	Wellen	
Volunteers	15.0%	25.1%	23.1%	13.7%	16.4%	7.6%	7.7%	
Potential volunteers	13.0%	11.0%	9.8%	12.3%	12.4%	8.9%	13.0%	
Non-volunteers	72.0%	74.9%	67.1%	78.3%	71.1%	83.5%	79.3%	
Objective characteristics¹								
Number of inhabitants	27464	8307	31017	23433	34949	14964	7265	
Population density	600	1391	588	786	267	604	266	
Population turnover	1.67	0.60	1.36	1.37	0.82	1.18	0.62	
Social connectedness²								
Informal connectedness								
Frequency: Weekly to daily contact								
	Nuclear family	85.9%	86.1%	90.3%	83.9%	85.4%	84.2%	87.1%
	Extended family	37.6%	26.4%	41.5%	33.2%	29.5%	36.6%	48.9%
	Neighbors	51.0%	41.3%	60.5%	44.9%	45.8%	48.9%	54.2%
	Friends	44.9%	40.4%	48.6%	42.6%	41.8%	41.1%	50.3%
Satisfaction with contacts: Satisfied								
	Nuclear family	95.5%	98.6%	97.8%	97.3%	95.2%	94.0%	93.9%
	Extended family	79.3%	81.3%	82.4%	74.6%	80.6%	73.9%	81.1%
	Neighbors	78.9%	82.3%	82.7%	76.3%	82.6%	79.3%	79.0%
	Friends	85.3%	92.2%	88.8%	86.9%	89.1%	83.9%	86.2%
Formal connectedness								
Membership association	Member	53.1%	59.9%	51.1%	45.8%	54.9%	48.3%	42.4%
	Board member	15.8%	17.1%	23.8%	10.2%	16.9%	11.2%	21.2%
	Non-member	31.1%	23%	25.1%	44%	28.2%	40.5%	36.4%
Individual characteristics								
Age		71.5	71.6	71.6	72.3	71.3	71.9	71.5
Gender	Male	46.8%	46.4%	46.3%	48.8%	44.9%	45.6%	47.4%
Education	High	28.5%	54.3%	22.6%	41.5%	22.3%	27.4%	20.1%

Table 2. Continued

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Physical health		1.68 (0.4)	1.76(0.3)	1.67(0.4)	1.68(0.4)	1.65(0.3)	1.65(0.4)	1.62(0.4)	
Marital status	Married	72.7%	76.5%	71.5%	74.2%	69.2%	74.9%	76.3%	1.
	Never married	3.6%	2.1%	3.1%	2.2%	4.8%	2.3%	3.6%	
	Divorced	2.9%	2.5%	2.4%	4.1%	2.7%	2.3%	1.5%	
	Cohabiting	1.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	3.0%	1.9%	1.5%	The
Homeownership	Widowed	19.2%	18.5%	22.7%	19.2%	20.4%	18.5%	17.0%	
	Owner	84.3%	87.0%	87.2%	87.0%	76.9%	85.9%	88.7%	1.

1. The objective municipality characteristics were derived from the Study Service of the Flemish government. The mean represents the mean of all 308 municipalities (cities, towns, and villages) in the Flemish region. They include the *number of inhabitants*, *population density* (number of inhabitants per km²), and *population turnover* (per 100 inhabitants over a period of one year).

2. The social connectedness factors and socio-demographic characteristics were derived from the Belgian Ageing Studies. The mean represents the mean of the sample (*n* = 24,508) in 89 municipalities.

Table 3. Characteristics of focus group participants.

Municipality	Highest rate of actual volunteers		Medium rate of actual volunteers		Lowest rate of actual volunteers	
	Hove	Heusden-Zolder	Beersel	Ieper	Ternat	Wellen
n	9	12	8	7	10	7
Female	6	7	5	5	5	4
Male	3	5	3	4	5	3
Mean age (in years)	67	65	69	70	69	68
Volunteers	7	9	5	5	5	6
Non-volunteers	2	3	3	2	5	1

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4 **Table 4. Multinomial logistic regressions of informal and formal social ties on potential, actual, and non-**
5 **volunteering. $N = 24,508$**
6
7

		Actual	Potential	Actual
		volunteers vs.	volunteers vs.	volunteers vs.
		non-volunteers	non-volunteers	potential
				volunteers
		O.R	O.R	O.R
Social connectedness: Informal connectedness				
Frequency of having				
contact: Weekly to daily	Nuclear family	NS	NS	NS
	Extended family	NS	NS	NS
	Neighbors	1.210	1.213	NS
	Friends	1.185	NS	1.151
Satisfaction	Nuclear family	NS	NS	NS
	Extended family	1.169	NS	NS
	Neighbors	NS	NS	NS
	Friends	NS	NS	NS
Formal connectedness				
Membership association	Member	4.358	1.626	2.680
	Board member	28.608	2.184	13.100
	Non-member (Ref.)	--	--	--
Individual characteristics				
Age		0.964	0.914	1.052
Gender	Female (Ref.)	0.627	NS	0.607
Level of education		1.166	1.095	1.065

Table 4. Continued

Physical health		1.902	2.235	NS
Marital status	Married (Ref.)	--	--	--
	Never married	NS	NS	NS
	Divorced	NS	1.520	NS
	Cohabiting	NS	NS	NS
	Widowed	NS	0.764	1.385
Homeownership	Owner	NS	NS	NS

Notes: Odds Ratios are shown. Reference outcome: $p < .001$. NS = Not significant