human relations
THE TAVISTOCK INSTITUTE

Volunteer decisions (not) to leave: Reasons to quit versus functional motives to stay

human relations
65(7) 883–900

DOI: 10.1177/0018726712442554
hum.sagepub.com
SAGE

Jurgen Willems
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Gert Huybrechts
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Marc Jegers
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Tim Vantilborgh
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Jemima Bidee
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Roland Pepermans
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Abstract

In this article we test whether reasons to quit volunteering can be structured as the commonly used six functional motives to volunteer of Clary et al. (1998). We conjecture that owing to volunteer involvement in an organization, additional contextual factors influence the choice to stop volunteering for that organization. Based on a literature review and a qualitative exploratory analysis, we present items respectively measuring motives to volunteer among active volunteers and reasons to quit among former

Corresponding author:
Jurgen Willems, Applied Economics, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, Brussels 1050, Belgium.
Email: jurgen.willems@vub.ac.be

volunteers in the context of the Scouts and Guides Organization in Flanders (Belgium). We test content-wise symmetry based on expert-rater agreement, while structural symmetry is tested based on factor analyses. Results show that no symmetry can be found. However, additional contextual factors clearly determine the decision to leave an organization. We theorize on how these individual, interpersonal and organizational factors are continuously traded off by volunteers during their involvement in a particular organization.

Keywords
exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, inter-rater agreement, reasons to quit, volunteer dropout, volunteer turnover, volunteer motives

Introduction

In order to deal with their volunteer force, organizations should have a thorough understanding of why people want to volunteer and what determines whether or not they stop after a while (Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Liao-Troth and Dunn, 1999; Machin, 2008). Farmer and Fedor (2001) confirm that motives to join an organization as a volunteer differ among people. Therefore, a well developed organizational strategy regarding attracting, retaining and motivating volunteers ought to be adapted to the particular objectives of the organization (Callen, 1994; Hartenian, 2007). A major contribution has been made by Clary and colleagues on the functional motives behind why people volunteer (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998). From this perspective, volunteering is seen as behavior that results from different types of motives, or combinations of them, which can be fulfilled by being involved as a volunteer in a nonprofit organization (Clary et al., 1996).

However, intuitively the assumption is often made in contemporary literature that, while fulfillment of functional motives drives people to volunteer, insufficient fulfillment drives them to quit (the symmetry assumption). Nevertheless, decreasing fulfillment of motives might not lead directly to lower volunteer satisfaction and/or performance, or to higher dropout and turnover, as contextual factors might moderate this process (Yanay and Yanay, 2008). A major contribution on this is made by Grube and Piliavin (2000). They discuss the distinction between the general role identity and the contextual role identity of volunteers. The general role identity of a volunteer regards those individual characteristics, including functional motives, which are unique to the volunteer and unrelated to any context. The contextual role identity deals with those characteristics that a volunteer develops through continuous interaction with a particular context. As a result, during one's involvement as a volunteer in an organization, additional contextual and/or organizational factors might gain relevance and thus influence the decision whether or not to leave the organization after a while (Gagné, 2003; Ross et al., 1999; Yan and Tang, 2003).

Consequently, in this article we explore reasons to quit volunteering in contrast to motives to volunteer in order to assess whether they are conceptually symmetric. If not, we can infer that other factors than the ones inducing volunteering can determine the decision to stop volunteering. As a result, our research question is as follows: are reasons

to quit symmetric to the dimensions of functional motives to volunteer or are additional contextual aspects relevant? If the latter is true, what are these additional factors?

In the next two subsections we review the functional motives as described by Clary and colleagues (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998) and the literature on how contextual factors might become increasingly relevant owing to volunteer involvement in a particular organization. Subsequently we analyse two related survey data sets, one from active volunteers and one from former volunteers of the same organization. Finally, we discuss our findings, summarize our conclusions and postulate avenues for future research.

Functional motives

Clary and colleagues (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998) distinguish six functional motives of individuals to participate in volunteer work: 'values', 'understanding', 'social', 'career', 'protective' and 'enhancement'. The functional motive 'values' deals with the extent to which one can express personal altruistic values through volunteering. 'Understanding' as a functional motive expresses the desire to learn or practice skills and abilities through volunteering. For the 'social' motive, Clary et al. (1998: 1518) describe its functionality as follows: '[v]olunteering may offer opportunities to be with one's friends or to engage in an activity viewed favorably by important others'. Within this definition we distinguish an internal aspect, directed toward other volunteers regarded as friends, and an external aspect, directed toward important others. We elaborate on this distinction later on. Based on the 'career' motive, volunteering is seen as a way to create or enhance professional career opportunities. Volunteering as a means to compensate for own negative feelings, such as guilt or sorrow, is encompassed in the 'protective' motive. In the context of the 'enhancement' motive volunteering is a means to enhance self-esteem, personal satisfaction and/or growth. The extent to which these functional motives are satisfied by the opportunities available in the volunteering environment is argued to determine the alignment between an individual and an organization, and the commitment to (continue to) participate in the organization (Clary and Snyder, 1999). Functional motives have been studied mainly in relation to other individual characteristics, such as demographics, volunteer behavior, volunteer activities (Clary et al., 1996), task preferences (Houle et al., 2005), commitment, citizenship, antisocial behavior, health and socio-economic achievements (Wilson, 2000). In addition, functional motives have been applied and adopted for different sub-domains such as for sports volunteers (Hoye et al., 2008; Wang, 2004) and volunteers in board positions (Inglis and Cleave, 2006).

Contextual factors

Harrison (1995) argues that the time allocation of volunteers to a particular organization is episodic and complex. They continuously trade off four aspects based on their past experiences and future expectations: (1) potential return of future volunteer work; (2) the extent to which people from one's environment consider volunteer work important; (3) the opportunities to volunteer; and (4) the clarity of volunteer benefits to the individual. In the end, this trade-off influences the decision to stay at or to leave an

organization when benefits do not exceed costs anymore. As a result, we distinguish different factors continuously traded off by volunteers. From an individual perspective, emotions, perceptions and attitudes of volunteers change owing to their involvement in an organization, resulting over time in changed behavior, and finally leading to volunteer retirement (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008; Hooghe, 2003a). From an interpersonal perspective, when volunteers feel trusted, helped and appreciated, they will feel more related to the group of other volunteers and the activities performed collectively (Woolley, 1998). Furthermore, volunteers within groups can influence each other regarding increasing or decreasing volunteer efforts through socialization and/or signaling mechanisms (Becker and Connor, 2005; De Cooman et al., 2009; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008; Linardi and McConnell, 2011). As a result, the social interaction with other volunteers seems relevant for the individual decision as to whether or not to stay as a volunteer in an organization. From an organizational perspective, volunteers evaluate the extent to which their expectations are met by the organization in order to determine their level of involvement (Farmer and Fedor, 1999; Richard et al., 2009). Organizations that want to manage their volunteer turnover and/or dropout, require insights into the contextual factors influencing volunteer decisions (Miller et al., 1990). By creating a favorable context taking a volunteer's generic motives as well as specific preferences into account, organizations can reduce volunteer dropout and turnover (Jamison, 2003). In contrast, a lack of volunteer support leads to higher turnover (Cuskelly and Boag, 2001).

To our knowledge, the only study linking motives to volunteer and reasons to quit in one particular context is the article by McLennan et al. (2008). They analyse reasons for resignation among volunteer firefighters in Australia and find four clusters of reasons for resignation related to personal characteristics (age and health concerns) and their environment (work and family; the organization in which they volunteer; changing distance from the place of volunteering). In addition, they find a positive impact of volunteer benefits and the environment in which people volunteer on their satisfaction and intention to remain with the organization.

In sum, we conjecture that the choice of whether or not to continue volunteering for a particular organization is determined by a complex set of individual, interpersonal and organizational factors shaped through the interaction of a volunteer with the organization (Ross et al., 1999; Yan and Tang, 2003). We investigate in the next section what these factors are and whether they can be assumed symmetric to the functional motives as described by Clary and colleagues (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998).

Method

Within the context of a particular volunteer organization – the Scouts and Guides Movement in Flanders (Belgium) – we have probed among the active volunteers for their motives to volunteer, while among those who left during the last two years, we probed for the reasons why they stopped volunteering. Items are generated based on insights from literature, mainly from Clary and colleagues (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998), and from an additional qualitative analysis within the case organization (open question surveys and focus panels. Details are given below.).

We conducted two expert ratings to assess the extent to which two judges who were not involved in the item generation would sort items about both motives to volunteer and reasons to quit into the six dimensions from Clary et al. (1998). The expert judges were researchers on volunteering and were given the Clary et al. (1998: 1517–18) description of the dimensions before sorting the items.

After the item sorting procedure, we analysed the factor structure of the two sets of items using factor analysis in order to determine the degree to which the factor structures match the six Clary et al. (1998) dimensions.

Organization context and sample

The Scouts and Guides Movement in Flanders is a federated structure in which 561 local chapters (groups) perform the day-to-day educational, pedagogic and entertaining activities for children between six and 17 years old (about 60,000 in total). These activities are supported by volunteers in sub-teams according to the age of the children. Activities for children take place during the weekends and vacation periods. Volunteer tasks mainly focus on these activities, but also include preparatory activities, fundraising activities, social events, training, etc.

In general, volunteers commit themselves to a particular function for a full year (September–August). Volunteers start at the age of 18, after the last year of being a member. The average age of the total active volunteer force is 21.4 (median = 20, standard deviation = 6.0). The official maximum age is 35 for volunteers directly involved with children. The average age of volunteers quitting the organization in 2009 or 2010 was 22.9 (median = 22, standard deviation = 4.8). Volunteers stay on average about four to five years, meaning that the yearly turnover is about 20 percent. In December 2010 about 11,000 volunteers were active in the organization. In 2009 and 2010 (August) about 5000 volunteers did not formally renew their commitment.

Online questionnaires were sent to current as well as former volunteers based on their personal email addresses, which were available at the central registration database of the organization (about 90% availability). About one week after the initial invitation email, reminders were sent to those respondents who had not completed the survey at that time.

From the 9812 active volunteers that we invited, 3034 started the survey, and 2212 completed the survey (22.54%). We invited 4974 former volunteers, from which 1264 started the survey and 1085 completed the survey (21.81%).

Item generation

A multiphase procedure was followed to generate items for motives to volunteer and for reasons to quit. On the one hand, the items were generated inspired by literature (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998; Inglis and Cleave, 2006; Tschirhart et al., 2001; Wang, 2004; Ziemek, 2006). On the other hand, additional qualitative steps were taken to assure as much exhaustiveness as possible. We consider this a necessary step to verify whether no other factors might be important within the particular organization of our study.

An open-question survey was sent to and answered by a sample of 17 active or former volunteers, probing for motives to volunteer and reasons to quit. In addition, we held two focus panels, one with a group of active volunteers and one with volunteers that had quit, in order to find the right level of detail. Subsequently, for both groups of respondents a separate set of items was developed and pretested to improve exhaustiveness, clarity and practical relevance. In the end the respective questionnaires included 43 items on motives to volunteer, and 47 items on reasons to quit. Respondents had to answer for each statement how applicable it was for them on a seven-point Likert-scale: 'not at all applicable to me' (–3) – 'totally applicable to me' (+3). Items were randomly shuffled for each respondent.

Results

Expert ratings

We use Fleiss' kappa to report on the expert ratings as it enables us to assess agreement (or accordance) of two or more different categorical classifications, with the same number of categories per classification (Fleiss, 1971; Gamer et al., 2010). The kappa-value can range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating full agreement, supplemented with a *p*-value reporting on the significance of the kappa-value.

Table 1 shows kappa-values for both rater analyses. In contrast to the items on motives to volunteer, not all items on reasons to quit were classified. For 17 out of 47 items at least one rater indicated that the content was too different from one of the six categories provided. We chose not to insist on classifying these items in a second rating in order to avoid artificial and counterintuitive results. Therefore, Table 1 shows results for reasons to quit for the 30 items classified by both raters. For both expert ratings an overall kappa-value is calculated. In addition, for each of the categories provided (i.e. the six

Table 1 Fleiss's kappa inter-rater agreement among raters for motives to volunteer and reasons to quit

	Motives to volunteer (43 items)	Reasons to quit (30 items)[a]
Overall kappa test		
Fleiss's kappa	0.801***	0.406***
Category-wise kappa-values		
Values	0.919***	0.515***
Understanding	0.758***	0.712***
Social	0.756***	0.615***
Career	1.000***	0.649***
Protective	1.000***	0.200
Enhancement	0.488***	0.000[b]

*$p = 0.1$; ** $p = 0.05$; *** $p = 0.01$.

[a]Only 30 out of 47 items were used for analysis (63.8%). Other items were indicated by at least one of the raters as not to be classifiable in the six dimensions.

[b]Values below zero are set at zero, totally no agreement found (Gamer et al., 2010).

motivational dimensions; Clary et al., 1998), a category-wise kappa is given, reporting the agreement for each particular category (Gamer et al., 2010).

Both overall kappa-values are significantly different from zero, but substantially more agreement is found for motives to volunteer than for reasons to quit (respective kappa-values are 0.801 and 0.406). When looking at agreement regarding motives to volunteer, (extreme) high agreement is found for the categories 'career' (1.000), 'protective' (1.000) and 'values' (0.919). Substantial agreement is found for the categories 'understanding' (0.758) and 'social' (0.756), while moderate agreement is found for the category 'enhancement' (0.488). For the 30 items on reasons to quit, substantial agreement could be found for the dimension 'understanding' (0.712), while moderate agreement could be found for 'values' (0.515), 'social' (0.615) and 'career' (0.649). No significant agreement could be found for 'protective' and 'enhancement'.

Factor analyses: Motives to volunteer

In order to analyse the motivation items surveyed among active volunteers we use a combined approach (Fabrigar et al., 1999). We start with an exploratory factor analysis in order to (1) sort out ambiguous and low quality items, and (2) have a starting structure for confirmatory factor analysis. We continue with confirmatory factor analysis to evaluate the optimal number of factors to be specified, given the observed data. In particular, we look at whether a six-factor structure similar to the motivational dimensions of Clary et al. (1998) can be found. Furthermore, we make a substantive comparison of the structure found with the classifications made by the expert-raters.

Based on the exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotation, 32 of the 43 items remain in the analysis. Seven factors emerge, cumulatively explaining 56.4 percent of the variance of all items. The maximum correlation between factors does not exceed 0.354. Five out of the seven factors seem to match with the motivational dimensions found by Clary et al. (1998). These factors are 'values', 'understanding', 'career', 'protective' and 'enhancement'. However, the two other factors both seem to relate to the sixth motivational dimension ('social'). The six items of one of these factors probe for the importance of social aspects, however particularly directed toward other people volunteering within the organization. We refer to this factor as 'internal social'. In contrast, the four items of the other factor also probe for the importance of social aspects, however directed toward people outside the organization. We label this factor 'external social'. The items and factor loadings are presented in Table 2. We compare the remaining 32 items with the two classifications made by the raters with the third classification based on the factor solution. In order to make comparison possible, we reduce the seven factors to six categories by grouping the ten items of the internal and external social dimension as a single social dimension. We obtain an overall Fleiss' kappa-value of 0.767. Category-wise kappa-values are 0.589 (values), 0.582 (understanding), 0.911 (career), 0.897 (protective), 0.643 (enhancement) and 0.903 (social). All values are significant at $p < 0.05$. The overall kappa-value indicates substantial match. A high match exists for the grouped 'social' items, 'career' and for 'protective'. Significant, though moderate, accordance exists for 'values', 'understanding' and 'enhancement'.

Table 2 Factor loadings of exploratory and confirmatory seven-factor solution for motives to volunteer

	EFA	CFA
Enhancement		
My commitment to the Scouts Movement makes me feel important	0.789	0.914*
My commitment makes me feel needed	0.770	0.783*
My efforts for the Scouts Movement make me feel better about myself	0.640	0.877*
My efforts for the Scouts Movement raise my self-esteem	0.581	0.847*
Values		
By being a part of the Scouts Movement I can contribute to important policy issues in our society	0.733	1.085*
Through my efforts for the Scouts Movement, I can show that I am concerned with social problems	0.707	1.051*
As a result of my commitment for the Scouts Movement, my voice is heard in society through an organization that is relevant	0.681	1.138*
Within the Scouts Movement I get a better view on what is important in our society	0.657	0.951*
I had many chances in the past, and therefore I want to contribute to a good cause through my efforts in the Scouts Movement	0.491	0.759*
Protective		
At moments when I am busy with the Scouts Movement, I can forget my personal problems	0.919	1.337*
When I feel bad, I can forget about it by being busy with affairs of the Scouts Movement	0.821	1.276*
My efforts for the Scouts Movement help me to solve my personal issues	0.618	0.911*
Internal social		
My best friends are also in the Scouts Movement	0.787	0.949*
Being committed to the Scouts Movement for me means especially to accomplish something together with friends	0.670	0.703*
My friends in the Scouts Movement would regret it if I were no part of it any more	0.603	0.680*
I certainly feel that I share ideas with my fellow leaders, even on matters that have nothing to do with the Scouts Movement	0.590	0.658*
With other people from the Scouts Movement I can discuss things that I cannot discuss with people outside the Scouts Movement	0.569	0.823*
Being a part of the Scouts Movement is a way to make friends	0.493	0.688*
Career		
By being active in the Scouts Movement I learn to know people who may be important for my future job	0.767	1.219*
In the Scouts Movement I get in contact with new people who can assist me with my studies and/or work situation	0.687	1.043*
I can follow trainings through which my chances to find a good job are higher	0.684	1.118*
Experience in the Scouts Movement looks good on my resume	0.639	0.744*
Through my commitment, I can get a view of what I want to be doing later	0.489	0.915*

Table 2 (Continued)

	EFA	CFA
External social		
People I know from outside the Scouts Movement find it commendable that I am committed to the Scouts Movement	0.760	0.752*
My friends outside the Scouts Movement regard it as an asset that I am a part of the Scouts Movement	0.704	0.889*
The people that I appreciate myself, consider it positive that I am commited to the Scouts Movement	0.669	0.739*
My parents, brothers and/or sisters think it is good that I am committed to the Scouts Movement	0.594	0.617*
Understanding		
I gain experience about things that I cannot learn anywhere else	0.740	0.674*
Being involved in the Scouts Movement enables me to learn by direct practical experience	0.630	0.655*
By being active in the Scouts Movement I can teach people something that they cannot learn elsewhere	0.593	0.526*
Being committed in the Scouts Movement ensures that I get a new perspective on things	0.525	0.655*
I can explore my own strengths	0.516	0.598*

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA): Principal components; oblique rotation; lowest initial eigenvalue = 1.076; cumulative explained variance = 56.28%.
Only factor loadings greater than 0.400 are shown. No items load on two factors with loading larger than 0.400.
Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA): Congeneric model (Graham, 2006);
RMSEA = 0.0506; CFI = 0.968; SRMR = 0.0472; PNFI = 0.860.
*All CFA loadings are significant at $p < 0.01$.

Subsequently, based on confirmatory factor analysis we compare fit-statistics for the seven-factor solution, where we differentiate between internal and external social items, and the six-factor solution in which we combine all social items in a single factor. For the evaluation of the fit-statistics of the models specified, we use indicators based on the discussion by Hu and Bentler (1999) and Marsh et al. (2004): the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) with cut-off < 0.06, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) with cut-off > 0.95, and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) with cut-off < 0.08. In addition, we look at the Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI), for which we prefer the highest values when comparing different models for the same dataset.

Fit-statistics regard the congeneric model (Graham, 2006), meaning that we assume that each item loads on one and only one latent variable (selection based on highest loading of exploratory factor analysis), no correlations exist among item errors, and variances of latent variables are all restricted to 1. Furthermore, given the significant correlations between the factors found in the oblique rotated exploratory factor analysis, we allow the latent variables to be correlated. Results for the six-factor solution are RMSEA = 0.0634 ≅ 0.06; CFI = 0.955 > 0.95; SRMR = 0.0555 < 0.08; PNFI = 0.860. Results for the seven-factor solution are RMSEA = 0.0506 < 0.06; CFI = 0.968 > 0.95;

SRMR = 0.0472 < 0.08; PNFI = 0.860. Except for a negligible deviation (0.0034) for the RMSEA of the six-factor solution, all cut-off values for both confirmatory factor analyses are within the proposed boundaries. However, with a similar level of parsimony (both PNFI-values are 0.860), the RMSEA, CFI and SRMR values are more convincing for the seven-factor model.

Factor analyses: Reasons to quit

As we want to assess whether symmetry exists between motives to volunteer and reasons to quit, we test whether either a six-factor solution or a seven-factor solution would be appropriate given the actual answers from former volunteers. We use a combined approach of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, similar to our approach on motives to volunteer (Fabrigar et al., 1999). In addition, we verify whether content of reasons to quit matches with motives to volunteer by comparing the optimal factor structure obtained with the rater classification answers.

Based on the exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotation, we leave out nine ambiguous or low quality items. A six-factor solution explains 46.6 percent of the total variance, while a seven-factor model explains 49.5 percent. However, based on the Kaiser-criterion and the scree-plot analysis a ten-factor solution seems appropriate, explaining 56.6 percent of the total variance. We compare these three potential factor solutions, based on the fit-statistics of confirmatory factor analyses. Table 3 shows fit-statistics for all three models (with 38 remaining items). We compare the congeneric models (Graham, 2006) and allow latent variables to correlate freely. Only the SRMR-metric of the ten-factor solution meets the required cut-off value. Nevertheless, the RMSEA and CFI values for the ten-factor solution are close to the cut-off values proposed. Distances from the cut-off values are clearly higher for the six- and seven-factor solutions.

Four factors are stable for all three factor solutions, meaning that all the items for these factors are grouped in the same way. These factors could be labeled as (1) ‘struggles with other volunteers in the group’, (2) ‘being too old to volunteer in the Scouts and Guides Movement’, (3) ‘not enough available time’, and (4) ‘unhappy about own involvement’. The 22 items of these four stable factors are listed in Table 4. Furthermore,

Table 3 Fit-statistics comparing 6-, 7-, and 10-factor solution for reasons to quit (confirmatory factor analysis)

Fit-statistics	Cut-off values	6-factor model	7-factor model	10-factor model
RMSEA	<0.060	0.0807	0.0765	0.0626
CFI	>0.950	0.887	0.898	0.932
SRMR	<0.080	0.0935	0.0921	0.0699
PNFI		0.805	0.807	0.807
Degrees of freedom		650	644	620
χ^2 (*p*)		5202.465 (0.000)	4697.354 (0.000)	3234.380 (0.000)

Table 4 Factor loadings of exploratory and confirmatory 10-factor solution for reasons to quit

	EFA	CFA
Struggles with other volunteers in the group		
I became too annoyed about some fellow leaders	0.806	1.622*
I could not agree with the beliefs that some fellow leaders had	0.737	1.602*
I did not feel fully appreciated for the efforts that I did	0.775	1.469*
There were some decisions made in our group that I really did not support	0.710	1.443*
My opinion was taken too less into account by some of the fellow leaders	0.711	1.370*
The other leaders of the group were not able to bring as much commitment as I did	0.721	1.114*
Being too old to volunteer in the Scouts and Guides Movement		
I began to feel too old to be a leader	0.736	1.597*
It was time to leave the floor for younger leaders	0.706	1.467*
In case I decided to remain a leader, I would have had to collaborate especially with people who are much younger than me	0.692	1.337*
I think it is better that the age difference between leaders and members is not too large	0.672	0.872*
I did not feel connected any more with the young leaders in our group	0.603	0.960*
I believe it is a bit pathetic to be a leader for too long	0.498	0.755*
Most of my best friends also stopped being a leader	0.469	0.952*
Too little available time		
I wanted to make time available for other things in my life	0.802	1.084*
I wanted to spent more time for those things that will be important in my later life	0.794	1.193*
I wanted to have again some more time for myself	0.635	1.301*
Being a leader requires too much of your free time	0.508	1.054*
Being a leader was difficult to combine with my work and/or studies	0.626	0.713*
Few new opportunities		
There were only little new things for me to learn anymore	0.729	1.279*
There were only few new challenges to remaining a leader	0.694	1.284*
I couldn't bring in much new input to our group anymore	0.637	0.897*
I couldn't bring in much new input to the Scouts and Guides Movement in Flanders any more	0.607	0.883*
Lack of higher level support		
I received too little guidance from above in order to fulfill my duties as a leader to the utmost	0.747	0.926*
From time to time we were left without guidance too much	0.667	0.979*
The responsibility that we take as leaders is too big	0.625	0.667*
Unhappy about own involvement		
I couldn't invest as much commitment as my fellow leaders	0.789	1.036*
I repeatedly had to find the motivation for extra activities such as group councils, parents' evenings, parties and extra activities among the leaders	0.684	1.303*
I wasn't able any more to be a leader in a qualitative way, and in that case it is better to quit	0.520	0.974*

(Continued)

Table 4 (Continued)

	EFA	CFA
Values mismatch with the Scouts and Guides Movement		
The values of the Scouts and Guides Movement in Flanders are not consistent with how I think about certain things	0.882	0.948*
I did no longer agree with the policy conducted by the Scouts and Guides Movement in Flanders	0.850	0.947*
Keep good memories		
I wanted to quit at a moment when things were going very well in order to keep especially good memories	0.873	1.485*
I just had a great year and the chance was small to have another year like this	0.864	1.406*
Next year's team preferences		
In the year that followed, I probably could not have been in the same team with the fellow leaders that I preferred (Team: subgroup of leaders for particular age group)	0.793	1.149*
In the years that followed, I probably could not have been in the team that I preferred (Team: subgroup of leaders for particular age group)	0.770	0.876*
Other commitments		
I wanted to commit myself to another organization	0.757	0.605*
I wanted to spent more time to other hobbies	0.641	1.950*

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA): Principal components; oblique rotation; lowest initial eigenvalue = 0.948; cumulative explained variance = 63.75%.

Only factor loadings greater than 0.400 are shown. No items load on two factors with loading larger than 0.400.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA): Congeneric model (Graham, 2006);

RMSEA = 0.0626; CFI = 0.932; SRMR = 0.0699; PNFI = 0.807.

*All CFA loadings are significant at $p < 0.01$.

the 16 other items are also listed based on the ten-factor solution. Other dimensions we refer to as (5) 'few new opportunities', (6) 'lack of higher level support', (7) 'values mismatch with the Scouts and Guides Movement', (8) 'keep good memories', (9) 'next year's team preferences', and (10) 'other commitments'.

Given insufficient model fit for the six-factor solutions and the initially low agreement between the content of the items and the original motivational classification (Clary et al., 1998), we consider comparing the rater classifications and the six-factor solution based on a Fleiss' kappa test irrelevant. Furthermore, it is technically not possible to perform a Fleiss' kappa-based comparison of the rater classifications with the more likely ten-factor solution. However, based on qualitative comparison of the ten-factor solution with the classifications made by the raters, we find that two out of the three items in the factor 'values mismatch with the Scouts and Guides Movement' are rated by both raters as items of the 'values' dimension. Three out of the four items of the factor 'few new opportunities' are classified by both raters as items of the 'understanding' dimension. No other structural resemblances are found for the other eight factors.

Discussion

Our research question is whether reasons to quit volunteering are symmetric to the motives to volunteer – often an inherent assumption made in literature on volunteer motives (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1996, 1998; Houle et al., 2005; Wilson, 2000) – or whether to stay or to quit in a particular context depends on a continuous trade-off of personal motives and contextual factors (Farmer and Fedor, 1999; Harrison, 1995; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008; Miller et al., 1990; Richard et al., 2009). Therefore, we have generated two sets of items, one on motives to volunteer and one on reasons to quit for the particular context of one organization. First we have tested whether, from a content point of view, these items match to the six motivational categories described by Clary et al. (1998). As to the motive items, we find strong overall and category-wise agreement. Only for the dimension 'enhancement' moderate agreement emerges. In contrast, for the reasons to quit more than one out of three of the items was considered as too distinct to classify in one of the six motivational dimensions, and only moderate overall and category-wise agreement is found for the other items (with no significant agreement for 'protective' and 'enhancement'). Therefore, at least from a content point of view, there are limited grounds to relate reasons to quit to motives to volunteer.

In addition, we explored answers of respectively 2212 active volunteers and 1085 former volunteers to investigate the factor structure of these items. For the motives to volunteer, a seven-factor solution emerges. Although the number of factors deviates from the six-dimensional classification of Clary et al. (1998), we find a convincing match with previous literature on the motives to volunteer. Five of the factors are in line with the motivational dimensions. These dimensions are 'values', 'understanding', 'career', 'protective' and 'enhancement'. For the two remaining factors we can assume high conceptual relatedness with the 'social' motive as defined by Clary et al. (1998). This can be inferred from the high inter-rater agreement on the items in these two factors with the original description of the social dimension (Clary et al., 1998). In contrast, comparing results of the confirmatory factor analyses for a six- versus a seven-factor solution, fit-statistics show that a seven-factor solution is more appropriate. Although it is beyond the scope of this article, one may wonder whether such a seven-factor solution, with a clear distinction between internal and external social aspects, is an exception for the particular case organization of our analysis, or whether such distinction could be relevant in other contexts too. From a content perspective, Tschirhart et al. (2001) refer to the social dimension as 'focuses on one's use of volunteer service to enhance friendship and positive regard by others' (p. 426), mentioning both the internal and external aspects as found in our analysis. From an analytic perspective, Clary et al. (1998), in their seminal work in which they elaborately validate the items measuring the six motivational dimensions, find no congruence validity for the social dimension as measured by their original items (referred to as 'study 4' by Clary et al. [1998: 1523]). The need for a distinction between internal social and external social aspects might be at the base for this shortcoming. Although our data contribute to the discussion, further research is required.

Assuming a six- or seven-factor solution for the reasons to quit is not appropriate, given the low percentages of explained variance and the unsatisfactory fit-statistics of the confirmatory factor analyses. Fit-statistics for the ten-factor solutions are more convincing,

although not fully within the boundaries of the strict cut-off values that we use based on Marsh et al. (2004). The ten-factor solution does fit, however, within the more common but less strict cut-off values proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999). Consequently, we can build on these results for assessing the asymmetry between the structure of motives to volunteer and the structure of reasons to quit.

Three out of the ten factors describing reasons to quit relate to the motives to volunteer. Based on the classifications made by the two raters, 'few new opportunities' relates to 'understanding', while the factor 'values mismatch with the Scouts and Guides Movement' relates to the 'values' motive. In addition, we can assume that 'struggles with other volunteers in the group' is in line with the internal social dimensions found for the motivational items used in this study. In addition, several factors underscore the continuous and episodic nature of the volunteer decision process. Four dimensions refer to how people take past experiences into account, as well as future expectations and time spent as a volunteer within an organization: 'keep good memories', 'next year's team preferences', 'unhappy about own involvement', and 'being too old to volunteer in the Scouts and Guides Movement'. These factors show that, through interaction in a volunteer environment, changed individual perceptions and interpersonal interaction influence the individual characteristics determining the choice to stop volunteering. In contrast, the 'lack of higher level support' confirms the importance of organizational aspects. Also, we would like to point out that two factors mentioned earlier are organization specific ('being too old to volunteer in the Scouts and Guides Movement' and 'next year's team preferences'). The Scouts and Guides Movement is strongly focused on working in teams, meaning weekly and intensive collaboration with the same small group of team members. We can assume that in this particular context volunteers express their future concern regarding the fulfillment of the internal social motive in the dimension 'next year's team preferences'. Furthermore, at least for scouting in Flanders, a strong involvement of young adolescent volunteers is strived for and publicly promoted as one of its success factors (e.g. official maximum age for leaders and collaborators, or recurrently mentioning the young character of the organization in public communication). As a result, within this particular context, volunteers take the consequences of their age into account for the decision to continue or to stop volunteering. On the one hand, we can assume that these consequences relate to what volunteers perceive as being expected from them by the organization (Farmer and Fedor, 1999). On the other hand, consequences of age broader than the boundaries of the organization might become relevant too (e.g. moving, starting a new job, having a family, etc.) (Hooghe, 2003b; Hooghe and Stolle, 2003; McLennan et al., 2008). Finally, other criteria taken into account for the decision to leave a particular organization relate to the allocation of the time available: 'not enough available time' and 'other commitments'. As a result, the involvement in a particular organization is also traded-off in comparison with other activities. This shows that the fulfillment of functional motives can be strived for in other and/or multiple organizations at once, depending on the contextual factors of these different organizations.

Based on these considerations, we argue that both motivational and contextual aspects are traded off for the decision to stop volunteering for a particular organization (Farmer and Fedor, 1999; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008). Within this trade-off past, current and future volunteer costs and benefits are continuously evaluated (Harrison, 1995). Furthermore, the aspects taken into account relate to individual, interpersonal and organizational characteristics. While 'unhappy about own involvement' exemplifies

individual aspects, 'next year's team preferences' and 'lack of higher level support' respectively exemplify interpersonal and organizational aspects.

As a result, a strict focus on the motivational dimensions to explain the decision process of volunteers to leave an organization might be too limited, and thus reasons to quit cannot be assumed to be symmetric to the generic motives to volunteer.

Conclusions and further research

In this article, we aim at scrutinizing the motives why people volunteer and why they decide to leave an organization after a while. Focusing on the Scouts and Guides Movement in Flanders (Belgium) we investigate whether motives to volunteer and reasons to quit can be assumed to be symmetric. We explore two related data sets, one from active volunteers and one from volunteers that left the organization. We look at underlying factor structures, the way items and factors conceptually relate to each other, and to the six-dimensional classification of Clary et al. (1998).

The commonly used motivational dimensions (Clary et al., 1998) clearly emerge from the data from active volunteers. However, we suggest splitting the 'social' dimension, at least in this context, into two distinct sub-dimensions: internal versus external. In addition, when we focus on the decision to leave an organization, we find that a limited number of motivational dimensions influence such a decision. However, additional factors that result from the interaction of a volunteer in a volunteer environment also seem to play an important role. Therefore, we conclude that reasons to quit volunteering in a particular context are not symmetric to the generic motives to volunteer.

In our analyses, we focus on two aspects: motives behind why individuals volunteer and reasons to quit volunteering. In that sense we do not tackle all dynamic aspects of the decision process of volunteers. Further research should elaborate on the individual and contextual aspects of why people join organizations and on the determinants of the amount of volunteer effort donated. In this analysis we built on a cross-sectional data set in two groups of respondents, but the evolution of an individual within an organization (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008), and also over different organizations (Hooghe, 2003b), cannot be neglected in further analyses. Longitudinal research designs could substantially support such analyses.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the helpful suggestions made by Marlene Walk (University of Pennsylvania, USA).

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Becker BW and Connor PE (2005) Self-selection or socialization of public- and private-sector managers? A cross-cultural values analysis. *Journal of Business Research* 58(1): 111–113.

Callen JL (1994) Money donations, volunteering and organizational efficiency. *The Journal of Productivity Analysis* 5(3): 215–228.

Clary GE and Snyder M (1999) The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 8(5): 156–159.

Clary GE, Snyder M, Ridge RD, Copeland J, Stukas AA, Haugen J and Miene P (1998) Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(6): 1516–1530.

Clary GE, Snyder M. and Stukas AA (1996) Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 25(4): 485–505.

Cuskelly G and Boag A (2001) Organisational commitment as a predictor of committee member turnover among volunteers sport administrators: Results of a time-lagged study. *Sport Management Review* 4(1): 65–86.

De Cooman R, De Gieter S, Pepermans R, Hermans S, Du Bois C, Caers R and Jegers M (2009) Person-organization fit: Testing socialization and attraction-selection-attrition hypotheses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 74(1): 102–107.

Fabrigar LR, Wegener DT, MacCallum RC and Strahan EJ (1999) Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods* 4(3): 272–299.

Farmer SM and Fedor DB (1999) Volunteer participation and withdrawal: A psychological contract perspective on the role of expectations and organizational support. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 9(4): 349–367.

Farmer SM and Fedor DB (2001) Changing the focus on volunteering: An investigation of volunteers' multiple contributions to charitable organizations. *Journal of Management* 27(2): 191–211.

Fleiss JL (1971) Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychological Bulletin* 76(5): 378–383.

Gagné M (2003) The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial behavior engagement. *Motivation and Emotion* 27(3): 199–223.

Gamer M, Lemon J, Fellows I and Singh P (2010) Various coefficients on interrater reliability and agreement (R package). R Package 'irr', version 0.83, available at: http://www.r-project.org.

Graham JM (2006) Congeneric and (essentially) tau-equivalent estimates of score reliability: What they are and how to use them. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 66(6): 930–944.

Grube JA and Piliavin JA (2000) Role identity, organizational experiences, and volunteer performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26(9): 1108–1119.

Harrison DA (1995) Volunteer motivation and attendance decisions: Competitive theory testing in multiple samples from a homeless shelter. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80(3): 371–385.

Hartenian LS (2007) Nonprofit agency dependence on direct service and indirect support volunteers: An empirical investigation. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 17(3): 319–334.

Haski-Leventhal D and Bargal D (2008) The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers. *Human Relations* 61(1): 67–102.

Hooghe M (2003a) Value congruence and convergence within voluntary associations: Ethnocentrism in Belgian organizations. *Political Behavior* 25(2): 151–175.

Hooghe M (2003b) Participation in voluntary associations and value indicators: The effect of current and previous participation experiences. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32(1): 47–69.

Hooghe M and Stolle D (2003) Age matters: Life-cycle and cohort differences in the socialization effect of voluntary participation. *European Political Science* 3(2): 49–56.

Houle BJ, Sagarin BJ and Kaplan MF (2005) A functional approach to volunteerism: Do volunteer motives predict task preferences? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 27(4): 337–334.

Hoye R, Cuskelly G, Taylor T and Darcy S (2008) Volunteer motives and retention in community sport: A study of Australian rugby clubs. *Australian Journal on Volunteering* 13(2): 40–48.

Hu L and Bentler PM (1999) Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling* 6(1): 1–55.

Inglis S and Cleave S (2006) A scale to assess board member motivations in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 17(1): 83–101.

Jamison IB (2003) Turnover and retention among volunteers in human service agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 23(2): 114–132.

Liao-Troth M and Dunn CP (1999) Social constructs and human service: Managerial sensemaking of volunteer motivation. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 10(4): 345–361.

Linardi S and McConnell MA (2011) No excuses for good behavior: Volunteering and the social environment. *Journal of Public Economics* 95(5–6): 445–454.

Machin J (2008) Unraveling the complexities of volunteer management in the Third Sector. Paper presented at the international conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Barcelona, Spain.

McLennan J, Birch A, Cowlishaw S and Hayes P (2008) I quit! Leadership and satisfaction with the volunteer role: Resignations and organizational responses. Paper presented at the Australian Psychological Society Annual Conference, Hobart, Australia.

Marsh HW, Hau K and Wen Z (2004) In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling* 11(2): 320–341.

Miller LE, Powell GN and Seltzer J (1990) Determinants of turnover among volunteers. *Human Relations* 43(9): 901–917.

Richard OC, McMillan-Capehart A, Bhuian SN and Taylor EC (2009) Antecedents and consequences of psychological contracts: Does organizational culture really matter? *Journal of Business Research* 62(8): 818–825.

Ross MW, Greenfield SA and Bennett L (1999) Predictors of dropout and burnout in AIDS volunteers: A longitudinal study. *AIDS Care* 11(6): 723–731.

Tschirhart M, Mesch D, Perry JL, Miller TK and Lee G (2001) Stipendend volunteers: Their goals, experiences, satisfaction, and likelihood of future service. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30(3): 422–443.

Wang PZ (2004) Assessing motivations for sports volunteers. *Advances in Consumer Research* 31: 420–425.

Wilson J (2000) Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1): 215–240.

Woolley F (1998) Social cohesion and voluntary activity: Making connections. Paper presented at CSLS Conference on the State of Living Standards and Quality of Life, Ottawa, Ontario.

Yan EC and Tang CS (2003) The role of individual, interpersonal, and organizational factors in mitigating burnout among elderly Chinese volunteers. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 18(9): 795–802.

Yanay GV and Yanay N (2008) The decline of motivation? From commitment to dropping out of volunteering. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 19(1): 65–78.

Ziemek S (2006) Economic analysis of volunteers' motivations – A cross-country study. *Journal of Socio-Economics* 35(3): 532–555.

Jurgen Willems is a doctoral student at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium. His PhD focuses on volunteers, governance and organizational objectives in the nonprofit sector. He holds an MSc in Applied Economics (University of Ghent, Belgium), in Operations and Technology Management (University of Ghent), and in Quantitative Analysis in the Social Sciences (Catholic University of Brussels). He worked as a researcher at the Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School in the Operations and Technology Management Competence Centre. [Email: jurgen.willems@vub.ac.be]

Gert Huybrechts is a doctoral student at the Department of Applied Economics, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium. His research is mainly focused on the economic aspects of volunteering and non-profit organizations. He holds an MSc in Economics (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) and in Advanced Studies in Economics (Catholic University Leuven, Belgium). [Email: gert.huybrechts@vub.ac.be]

Marc Jegers holds a doctoral degree in economics from the University of Ghent, Belgium and is Professor of Managerial Economics at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium. His research interests include nonprofit organizations' management and governance, financial analysis, and competition policy. He has published in a wide range of academic journals such as *American Economic Review, Academy of Management Journal, Journal of Health Economics, Corporate Governance, Journal of Corporate* Finance, and most of the academic nonprofit related journals. He is also the author of *Managerial Economics of Nonprofit Organisations* (Routledge, 2008). [Email: marc.jegers@vub.ac.be]

Tim Vantilborgh is a doctoral student at the Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium. His research interests centre on psychological contracts, volunteering, individual differences and the interplay between these individual differences and the situation. His doctoral dissertation focuses specifically on the psychological contract of volunteers. His work has been published in journals such as *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, and *Personnel Review*. [Email: tim.vantilborgh@vub.ac.be]

Jemima Bidee is a doctoral student in the Department of Work and Organizational Psychology at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium. Her doctoral dissertation focuses on the psychological processes underlying the motivation to volunteer. Besides research on motivation and volunteering, her interests include research on individual differences and nonprofit management. Her work has been published in *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. [Email: jemima.bidee@vub.ac.be]

Roland Pepermans is Professor and Head of the Research Unit for Work and Organizational Psychology at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium. He holds a MSc from the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, from Birmingham University, UK, and a PhD from the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. He teaches on human resource management, organizational behavior and managerial psychology. The research unit attempts to build bridges between the profit and nonprofit sectors with projects on motivation, psychological contracts, reward management, talent management and political skills. He has authored a wide set of publications in international journals and books. [Email: roland.pepermans@vub.ac.be]