

Individual Engagement with Nonprofit Organizations: Explaining Participation in Meetings and Events

Kirsten A. Grønbjerg

School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Indiana University Bloomington

Revised Version of Paper Presented at the
Annual Meetings of ARNOVA
Montreal, Canada
November 14-16, 2002

Mailing address:

School of Public and Environmental Affairs
1315 E. 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 855-5971, fax: (812) 855-7802
Email: kgronbj@indiana.edu

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University for its financial support of the survey on which this analysis is based. Laurie Paarlberg did much of the initial work in developing the survey instrument with much valuable feedback on several versions of the instrument from Tom Guterbock, Mark Chaves, John McCarthy, and John Kennedy. I also express my appreciation to the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University for the professionalism with which they undertook the interviews, to Brent Never for his efforts to compile a review of the literature and undertake some of the initial bi-variate analysis, and to Rich Clerkin for comments on a previous draft. The efforts of all of these individuals strengthened this work enormously and I am grateful to them all. Of course, any remaining problems are my responsibilities entirely.

Individual Engagement with Nonprofit Organizations: Explaining Participation in Meetings and Events

Abstract

Drawing on theories of social capital and citizen engagement I use data collected in a telephone survey of 526 Indiana residents (May 2001) to examine the extent and nature of personal engagement with nonprofit organizations with particular attention to one form of engagement: participation in meetings or events. I first document the ways in which individuals are engaged with nonprofits through worship, attending association meetings, volunteering, or employment. I then explore four sets of factors that are expected to account for individual differences in the level and form of engagement: family status, socio-economic status, community attachment, and religious involvement. Finally, I examine the extent to which these four sets of factors account for attendance at association activities (other than religious services) and how these patterns vary by the type of association involved.

Introduction

A wide ranging debate on trends in civic engagement and social capital in the U.S. and elsewhere has focused on the significance of the trends and patterns observed (Putnam 1995, 2000; Skocpol, 1999; Skocpol, Ganz & Munson, 2000; Fiorina, 1999). In the process, a number of questions have been raised about how best to define civic engagement and social capital and measure their prevalence.

This paper seeks to enhance the empirical foundation for this debate. Here I examine the variety of ways in which individuals are engaged with nonprofit organizations and explore factors which appear to account for variations in one type of engagement – participation in meetings or events. Two previous papers (Grønbjerg & Never, 2002a, 2002b) have tested hypotheses about factors related to volunteering and specific types of volunteer work. Subsequent papers will examine the nature of individual engagement with nonprofits in greater detail by showing the extent to which individuals differ in the total number of nonprofits with which they are engaged through four mechanisms and in the extent to which their portfolio of nonprofit engagement is concentrated in one major nonprofit field or spread across several fields.

My analysis is based on responses to a random-digit dialing telephone survey of 526 Indiana residents (completed in May 2001) that questioned respondents about their active involvement with Indiana nonprofits. For this paper, I first document the extent and nature of engagement with nonprofits by reporting on the percent of respondents who attend religious services, participate in events or meetings of non-religious membership associations, volunteer, or work for nonprofits.

I then turn to one of these four types of engagement – participation in meetings or events of non-religious membership associations – to explore factors that may account for observed variations in the nature of engagement. I consider four types of explanatory factors: demographic characteristics, socio-economic status, community attachment, and religious involvement. I expect those with high socio-economic status, strongest community attachments, and protestant religious preferences to demonstrate the most extensive level of participation. I expect demographic factors to be important, but to vary by the type of organizations involved.

Civic Engagement and Social Capital

Social scientists and policy makers alike have expressed considerable concern in recent years about the apparent decline in citizen engagement and social capital (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba, 2001; Putnam, 1993, 2000). A growing body of research has sought to examine whether the decline postulated by Putnam and others has in fact occurred, and if so, what factors may account for it (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; Heyring, 1997; Clemens, 1999; Minkoff, 1997; Greeley, 1997; Levi, 1996; Skocpol, 1999). In the process, considerable efforts have also been directed at questions of how to measure various forms of engagement and on how personal networks that are characterized by trust and shared norms (social capital) manifest themselves (Wolcock, 1998; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; Greeley, 1997; Levi, 1996).

Involvement with nonprofit organizations, whether as members of local bowling leagues, labor unions, or national advocacy organizations, has played a central role in both the conceptual and methodological debates over civic engagement and social capital. Does it matter, for example, in what types of nonprofits people are engaged and how is their engagement structured? Is Putnam (1993, 2000) right that it is enough to look at formal membership in different types of associations? Is it fair to claim that joining local bowling leagues strengthens civic engagement because it involves face-to-face contact and allows personal networks, trust, and shared norms to develop while membership in large national organizations like the AARP does not?

Indeed, Putnam argues that the decline of local bowling leagues (and of other types of locally based membership organizations, such as veterans groups and fraternal organizations) is substantial and accounts for why such traditional indicators of civic engagement as voter participation are collapsing. However, holding membership in an organization doesn't mean that people attend activities. Nor is it necessarily appropriate to dismiss membership in national associations as irrelevant to civic engagement. Minkoff (1997), for example, argues that membership in national associations should be considered trace elements of more direct forms of involvement and Skocpol (1999) argues that membership in national associations generally involves participation in local chapters as well.¹

Personal networks that are characterized by mutual trust and shared norms undoubtedly facilitate interactions (Coleman, 1990) that benefit both participants and the larger community (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; Putnam, 2000). Of course, some strong networks structures may actually harm the broader community, depending on which norms govern network relations and on what actions network participants take (Paxton, 1999). In the case of gangs or the mafia, for example, benefits accrue almost entirely to members of the network, while the community at large suffers. In other words, the relationship between networks, norms, type of collective action, and community benefits is context-dependent.

Nonprofits facilitate the creation of human capital when they succeed in getting individuals to participate in meetings or events and when they provide opportunities for people to volunteer since that makes it possible for people to join larger social networks. More importantly, the benefits

¹ Given the extent to which election outcomes are now driven by the ability of powerful political action, lobbyist, or special interest groups to collect large sums of money for slick media campaigns, voter participation may no longer be a good or sufficient indicator of civic engagement. There are also reasons to think that large national advocacy organizations may counteract the power of special interest groups. Certainly, advocacy and other public interest groups have grown in size, visibility, and political influence (Berry, 1999) and individual citizens may promote their own political platform more effectively when choosing to support particular advocacy groups than by voting for a political candidate.

of this social capital accrue to the larger community because volunteering and attending association meetings or events strengthen the capacity of nonprofit organizations to engage in mutual or public benefit activities – activities that have been endorsed by the larger community as evidenced by the official tax-exempt status of the organizations involved.

This argument points to the importance of understanding why and how individuals come to be engaged with nonprofits. As discussed in greater detail elsewhere (Grønbjerg & Never, 2002a), one line of argument has centered on how faith strengthens the commitment of individuals to aid the larger community outside of their own particular faith network (Putnam, 2000; Park & Smith, 2000; Becker & Pawan, 2001). Indeed, participation in faith networks appears to increase expressions of community attachment beyond those based on involvement in other types of social networks (Liu et al., 1998). The effect is more pronounced if religious teachings hold community outreach to be important, as do some denominations (Wood, 1990; Clydesdale, 1990; May, 1990; Wilson & Janoski, 2000).

Although involvement in communities of faith is clearly important in predicting community engagement, so are other networks. The research literature points to three other types of networks: those relating to (1) family status and associated demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, marital status, presence of children, racial or ethnic status), (2) socio-economic status (e.g., employment, income, education), and (3) trace elements of connections to the community (e.g., length of time living there, intentions to stay, attention to local issues) (Putnam, 2000; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Hall et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001; Guterbock & Fries, 1997).

Research on voluntary association participation (Guterbock & Fries, 1997; Hall et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001; Saguaro Seminar, 2001; Putnam, 2002; Verba, Scholzman & Brady, 1995, generally concludes that people who are married or have children show higher rates of participation than other family status categories (and this is especially so for activities related to children). They also show that men participate more than women, but that this pattern depends on the type of organization, and they find that older adults (aged 45-64 years) participate more than people at younger and older ages. Similarly, people of higher socio-economic status tend to be more actively engaged than those of lower status (Verba, Scholzman & Brady, 1995; Saguaro Seminar, 2001). Further research suggests that community attachment (Guterbock & Fries, 1997) affects various forms of civic and community engagement. Our data from the Indiana Personal Affiliation Survey (2001) allows us to explore the joint effects of these relationships.

Measuring Engagement

To examine the extent and nature of individual engagement with nonprofit organizations, I draw on a telephone survey of Indiana residents conducted in late spring of 2001 as part of the “Indiana Nonprofit Sector: Scope and Community Dimensions” project.² The interviews constituted

² Related project components include: (1) creation of a comprehensive database of Indiana nonprofits by combining three institutional listings (nonprofits registered with the IRS as exempt entities with Indiana addresses, nonprofits incorporated in Indiana, and yellow page listings of Indiana congregations); (2) additions to the database from local nonprofit listings in eleven communities across the state; and (3) mail questionnaire data from about 2,100 nonprofits sampled from these sources or identified through the personal affiliation survey (Author, 2002). For more information about this project, please see [author web site address].

the first stage of a two-stage sampling process to survey Indiana nonprofits.³ The primary purpose of the survey was to obtain the names and location of nonprofits with which respondents were affiliated in order to use the list of nonprofits generated in this manner as a sample of Indiana nonprofits. These nonprofits, together with samples of Indiana nonprofits developed through standard approaches (Grønbjerg, 2002), were subsequently surveyed in a recently completed mail questionnaire of Indiana nonprofits.⁴

The telephone interviews focused on whether respondents had face-to-face contact with nonprofits during the previous year, thus excluding those to which the respondent had only made donations and those in which the respondent held formal membership, but without active participation. Respondents were asked about their affiliations with nonprofits during the previous 12 months as employees, attendees at religious services, participants in meetings or events for any of 21 different types of secular associations, and as volunteer workers in any of ten types of volunteer capacities.⁵ The focus on active, face-to-face engagement with nonprofits across four dimensions of engagement, not just formal membership, represents a significant improvement on traditional measures of engagement with nonprofits, as does the effort to obtain information on participation in specific, named nonprofit organizations, not just in selected categories of associations.

Sample and Interview Process

A total of 526 Indiana residents, aged 18 or older, were interviewed by telephone between late April and late May of 2001. The survey was conducted by the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University Bloomington, using a random selection of telephone numbers that encompassed the entire state of Indiana and allowed for the inclusion of unpublished numbers and new listings. All cases with confirmed valid telephone numbers were called up to 17 times, unless the household refused or the calls could not be completed by the time the target number of completed interviews was reached. Cases with unknown validity (persistent no answers or answering devices) were called a minimum of 10 times, with calls made during the morning, afternoon, evening, late evening (after 9 pm) and weekend. Two conversion attempts were made for each "refusal."

³ Similar approaches have been used to develop samples of respectively work organizations (Bridges & Villemez, 1991; Kalleberg et al., 1990, 1994), congregations (Chaves, 1999), and membership associations (McPherson, 1982).

⁴ The structure of the personal affiliation survey and access to mail questionnaire data for the nonprofits identified through survey will allow for some unique analyses. Because the personal affiliation survey sought to obtain a list of nonprofits with which people are involved, the survey provides information on the number of nonprofits with people are engaged, not just on the number of different categories of nonprofit associations as do most other surveys (e.g., Putnam, 1995, 2000). In addition, by merging the list of identified nonprofits with information contained in a comprehensive database of Indiana nonprofits and with results of the nonprofit mail questionnaire it will be possible to characterize the portfolio of nonprofits with which individuals are engaged (e.g., major field of activity, mission, target population, religious denomination) and to examine variations in such portfolios among individuals.

⁵ If respondents indicated an affiliation of these types, they were asked to provide the name and location information for the organizations involved. In the case of volunteering or attendance at meetings or events, respondents were probed for the names of up to five different organizations for each type of volunteer work or association meeting/event. The 526 respondents identified 1,290 organizations through these mechanisms. Closer analysis revealed that 113 (9 percent) were in fact public or for-profit organizations and that 71 (6 percent) were internal duplicates, e.g., mentioned by two or more respondents. This left 1,106 nonprofit organizations identified through this personal membership/affiliation approach, or an average of 2.1 per respondent. All were included in our sample of Indiana nonprofits as were 8,200 nonprofits sampled through other mechanisms.

A total of 1,850 phone numbers were sampled of which 318 (17 percent) turned out to be ineligible (e.g., non-working/disconnected or non-residential), suggesting an overall response rate of 34 percent. If another 268 numbers (15 percent) of unknown eligibility (e.g., no answer or always busy after 17 attempts) are excluded from the base as well, the response rate increases to 42 percent. At each residential telephone number, an adult household member was randomly selected to be interviewed. The interviews lasted an average of 19 minutes.

A comparison of the characteristics of the sample with the corresponding characteristics of Indiana residents as reported in the Census for 2000 suggests that the sample is reasonably representative of the adult Indiana population, although only some dimensions and categories are sufficiently similar to warrant comparisons (see Appendix table). The sample resembles the state's population in terms of gender composition and most of the available age and income categories, but has somewhat more whites and fewer Hispanics and African Americans than does the state overall. The sample also under-represents people without a high school degree and over-represents college graduates.

Extent of Nonprofit Engagement

I summarize here findings on the overall extent of nonprofit engagement before turning to one of the major ways in which people are involved with nonprofits – attending voluntary association meetings or events. Indeed, the vast majority (91 percent) of respondents had some form of direct face-to-face contact with nonprofits during the previous 12-month period, although there is only limited information on the frequency or intensity of participation.

Religious Engagement

The single most pervasive contribution to personal engagement with nonprofits is participation in religious services. As shown in Table 1, 90 percent reported some religious preference, primarily protestant (37 percent) or “other Christian” (26 percent) denominations.⁶ As Table 2 shows, almost as many – 86 percent – said they had attended religious services during the past year (other than for weddings, funerals, and the like), thus accounting for much of the extensive involvement with nonprofits noted above.

<<Tables 1 and 2 about here>>

More than one-third (37 percent) of all respondents reported attending religious services at least once a week with another 20 percent attending at least once a month.⁷ Overall more than half (57 percent) of all respondents reported monthly or more frequent contact with this type of nonprofit organization. Further analysis shows that religious attendance varies significantly by religious preference. Thus more than half (52 percent) of Catholics attend religious services at least once a week, compared to 44 percent of protestants and 36 percent of other Christians. However,

⁶ The range of choices for expressing religious preference presented in Table 1 is narrower than ideal and does not adequately capture the variety of religious traditions among Protestant and other Christian denominations in the U.S., but it reflects the need to allow time for other components of the interviews. We plan to incorporate data from our survey of Indiana nonprofits about the specific congregations that respondents attended, including denominational affiliation and other characteristics of the congregations. We hope this will allow us to develop more refined categories, although we recognize there may be some slippage between a person's expression of religious preference and the denomination of the congregation he or she had attended most recently at the time of the survey.

⁷ Some recent analysis suggests that such self-reports of religious attendance most likely reflect some notable degree of over-reporting (Hadaway, 2002).

other Christians have the highest rate of attending religious services more than once a week.⁸

Nonprofit Employment

At the other extreme, only 8 percent reported having worked for an Indiana nonprofit organization during the past year, although presumably this involved daily contact. This amounts to about 11 percent of those who reported being employed in Indiana, and the percentage increases slightly if we include second jobs that some people held during the year. It is possible that some of those whose place of work was in another state also worked for nonprofit organizations, but only respondents who working in Indiana were asked about type of employer.

Volunteering

As shown in Table 3, more than two-fifth (43 percent) reported performing some type of volunteer work for at least one organization during the past year. A little more than a quarter of respondents (28 percent) were involved in only one type of volunteer task with 8 percent involved in two tasks and another 8 percent in three or more types of task. Some respondents were deeply involved in volunteering as indicated by performing a great variety of volunteer tasks – up to seven of the ten types of tasks that the survey probed for. Previous papers have examined the extent and determinants of volunteering (of any type) among survey respondents (Author(s), 2002a) and of different types of volunteer work (Author(s), 2002b).

<<Table 3 about here>>

Attending Non-Religious Meetings or Events

Finally, more than two-thirds (67 percent) had attended at least one meeting or event during the past year, not counting their participation in religious services. As shown in Table 4, the survey probed for 20 specific types of associations or groups and included also the option of mentioning some other type not already listed. Note that attendance within the state varies a good deal among the various groups, suggesting that not all participation occurs in local settings.

<<Table 4 about here>>

The highest rate of attendance is for professional, business, or trade association meetings or events and for health, sports, or other recreation clubs, with about one in seven adult resident (14 percent) attending each of these types of events or meetings at least once during the year. This is followed closely by the percentage attending various types of fraternal service organizations, such as the Elks, Eastern Star, Lions, or Kiwanis, and those attending PTA, PTO or other school support groups during the year (12 respectively).

About 10 percent of Indiana residents participate in labor union meetings during the year followed by attendance at meetings of a health issues or disease group during the year (9 percent), social club or Greek letter fraternity or sorority organization (8 percent), and dance or amateur performance group, such as glee club, band, or orchestra (also 8 percent). About 7 percent attended a meeting or event at a neighborhood or homeowners association or a youth organization, such as the Scouts or 4-H. Next come veterans' organizations (6 percent) and computer, gardening, craft,

⁸ The prevalence of very frequent church attendance among “other Christians” suggests that these respondents are disproportionately members of evangelical protestant denominations, while the choice of “protestant” primarily captures those belonging to mainline protestant denominations. We won’t be able to fully test these assumptions until we can link our individual survey data to characteristics of the particular congregations from our nonprofit survey.

other hobby clubs (5 percent). Participation in the remaining eight types of groups or associations dropped below the five percent level.

Explaining Attendance at Non-Religious Meetings or Events

I turn now to a consideration of the last of these four types of nonprofit engagement and to factors that may help explain why some individuals attend non-religious associations or groups while others do not. I consider attendance at ANY of the types of meetings or events listed in Table 4 as well as attendance at meetings or events involving specific types of nonprofits. I pay most attention to the types of associations for which at least 10 percent of respondents indicated participation during the past year, although I include also analysis of associations for which at little as only 5 percent of the respondents reported participation. The latter group includes so few respondents (25 or so) that the analysis can only suggest possible explanatory factors rather than test any specific hypotheses with much confidence.

As noted earlier, the civic engagement literature points to the critical role played by four types of networks in recruiting individuals to voluntary associations and keeping them engaged in such associations: networks relating to (1) family status and associated demographic characteristics, (2) socio-economic status, (3) connections to the community, and (4) faith (Putnam, 2000; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Hall et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001; Guterbock & Fries, 1997; Liu et al., 1998). Information about these networks comes from questions about the background and other characteristics of respondents.

The family status category includes questions related to marital status, the number of children under the age of 18 in the household, gender, age, and race or ethnicity. The socio-economic status variable group includes items about employment status, household income, and the highest level of education completed. Variables measuring community attachment include the number of years lived in the community, how likely it is that respondents will live in the same community five years from now, whether they are currently registered to vote, whether respondents own or rent their home or apartment, where they get most of their news about local events, and how frequently they obtain such news from that source. Finally, faith connections include the two features described above – religious preference and attendance.

Explaining Attendance – Bi-variate Analysis

I turn now to cross tabular and Chi-square analysis to examine the bi-variate relationships among the dependent variables (any attendance and attendance at specific types of associations) and the four sets of independent variables (family status, socio-economic status, community attachment, and religious involvement). This analysis helps describe the types of individuals that are active in different types of associations.

Association Attendance and Family Status

I examine first whether meeting and event attendance is related to various measures of family status, but note only relationships that are significant or appear relevant in our multi-variate analysis. As indicated earlier, I use indicators that describe family status in various ways: Age, gender, marital status, and presence of children in the household. Panel A of Table 5 shows that of these variables only age is significantly related to overall meeting/event attendance (column 1). As expected, those aged 45-64 are significantly more likely to attend meetings (77 percent) than the overall sample (68 percent) with those in the youngest age category (18-29) least likely to be attending meetings or events, although more than three-fifths (61 percent) are active.

<<Table 5 about here>>

A number of interesting patterns appear when you look at attendance at events or meetings by type of association. Although age is significantly related to meeting attendance for most of the specific types of associations, there are some important variations from the overall pattern. For example, those in the two middle age groups (30-64 years of age) are much more likely to be active in professional and business associations (19 and 18 percent respectively, column 2) than younger (8 percent) or older (5 percent) individuals. Most likely this is because the youngest group has not reached career levels where this type of participation is expected, while some of those in the oldest group have entered retirement. A similar pattern holds for attending school (column 5) or youth related activities (column 11), undoubtedly reflecting the fact that neither the young nor old are likely to have school-aged children. This interpretation is supported by the finding that the presence of children in the household (Panel D) is associated with significantly greater attendance at both of these types of activities, as is being married, divorced or separated (Panel C).

Panel A of Table 5 also shows that middle aged adults have the highest rate of attending service or fraternal organizations (19 percent) compared to 12 percent overall (column 4), while those over the age of 65 are disproportionately likely to be attending veterans groups (13 vs. 6 percent overall, column 12) as are those who are widowed (Panel C) and don't have any children in the household (Panel D).

Finally, the oldest and youngest age groups are more likely to be attending social and Greek society activities (13 and 12 percent respectively) than the two middle age groups (4-6 percent, column 8). Most likely, this results from a combination of student Greek societies and other social groups in this category and is consistent with findings in Panel C showing that those who are widowed or never married are also most likely to attend these types of activities. Similarly, those without children are disproportionately likely to be active in these types of organizations.

Although gender is not related to overall meeting/event participation, Panel B shows that women are twice as likely to attend school-related activities (15 vs. 8 percent, column 5) and health or disease-related activities (11 vs. 6 percent, column 7). As noted above, marital status (Panel C) is related to participating in school, youth, social/Greek, and veterans groups, but also to participating in dance or performance activities (column 9), craft or hobby meetings (column 13), and neighborhood/homeowners activities (column 10). The latter is also associated with the presence of children in the household (Panel D). Finally, only race (Panel E) is related to participation in sports or health activities (column 3) with whites more likely to attend these types of events than nonwhites. No family status variables have any significant relationship to labor unions (column 6).

Association Attendance and Socio-Economic Status

I consider three measures of socio-economic status: Employment, income, and education. Panel A of Table 6 shows the relationship between employment status and attendance. The group with the lowest rate of attending any type of nonprofit activities (46 percent, column 1) is the unemployed followed by those who are retired (56 percent), while the highest rate of attendance is among those who work part-time (83 percent), followed by those working full-time (71 percent).

<<Table 6 about here>>

Employment status is also significantly related to participation in six of the 12 types of nonprofit associations: professional or trade associations (column 1), sports or recreation groups (column 2), school or youth activities (columns 5 and 11), labor groups (column 6), and veterans organizations (column 12). The patterns are generally consistent with who are likely to be in various

types of employment status. For example, those employed part-time are much more likely to attend sports or recreation clubs, labor unions,⁹ or school groups, and retired people are disproportionately active in veterans groups (consistent with the higher participation in these groups by those aged 65 and over noted above), while those not in the labor force are disproportionately active in youth groups.

Panel B of Table 6 shows that household income is also significantly related to overall meeting attendance (column 1), with higher income groups showing very high rates of participation – approaching 90 percent or more for those with incomes above \$75,000 compared to only about half of those with household income of less than \$20,000. The same general pattern of increasing participation for higher income groups also holds for five of the 12 types of groups examined: business or trade associations (column 2), sports or recreation clubs (column 3), school groups (column 5), neighborhood or homeowners association (column 10), and youth groups (column 11). Only participation in Greek or other social groups deviates from that pattern with pockets of high participation spread across all the income categories.

Finally, more highly educated individuals (Panel C of Table 6) are significantly more likely to participate in nonprofit events or meetings (column 1) with college graduates twice as likely to participate as those without a high school degree (81 vs. 40 percent). This pattern holds for 7 of the 8 types of organizations for which significant relationships are found: Professional or trade associations (column 2), sports or recreation clubs (column 3), fraternal associations (column 4), health or disease groups (column 7), dance or performance groups (column 9) and neighborhood or homeowners associations (column 10). Only for labor unions (column 6) is the highest rate of participation found among those with only some college education – presumably skilled workers.

Association Attendance and Community Attachment

A third set of independent variables measure various forms of community attachment. I consider six variables: length of time in the community, expressed likelihood of remaining there for at least five years, whether registered to vote, whether a home owner, frequency of getting local news, and type of media respondents rely on for local news (see Table 7). Of these, only voter registration (Panel C) and home ownership (Panel D) are related to attending association meetings or events, with registered voters and home owners significantly more likely to be active in associations than those don't have those characteristics. The remaining measures of community attachment are not related to overall participation or to most of the specific types of association involvement.

<<Table 7 about here>>

Registered voters (Panel C) are significantly more likely to be active in business or trade associations (column 1), school groups (column 5), labor unions (borderline, column 6), or health and disease groups (column 7). Education and health are significant areas of government spending, while business and trade groups and labor unions have vested interests in a broad array of government programs. The relationship between voter registration and involvement in these three types of voluntary associations is therefore easily accounted for.

As expected, home owners (Panel D) are significantly more likely to be active in neighborhood or homeowner associations (column 11). But they are also more active in school groups (column 5), perhaps reflecting both the extent to which families with children own their

⁹ The very few (11) unemployed people in the sample had the highest rate (27 percent) of participation in labor unions. They are included in the “other” category.

homes and the fact that public schools absorb large proportions of property taxes.

Association Attendance and Religious Involvement

Finally, I look at the relationship between associational engagement and religious involvement. As Table 8 shows, religious preference is not related to any type of associational engagement, while frequency of religious attendance is related to both overall associational involvement and to participation in school groups and in veterans associations. In both cases the relationship appears to be negative with those who attend church most frequently somewhat less likely to be involved in these other associations.

<<Table 8 about here>>

Explaining Attendance – Multi-variate Analysis

I turn now to a more detailed examination of the personal characteristics that help predict who attends association meetings or events. To do so, I first use multivariate logistic regression to explore how the four sets of participant characteristics help explain overall attendance. I then examine factors that predict participation in each of the twelve different types of associations.

Explaining Overall Attendance

To examine how well the four sets of participant characteristics jointly explain whether people participate in non-religious associations, I use logistic regression analyses to explore several models. I enter the independent variables in four separate blocks (family status, socio-economic status, community attachment, and religious involvement) with the addition of each block constituting a separate model. I also undertake both backward and forward stepwise logistic regression using all predictor variables to determine which combination of variables most efficiently explains association attendance. Table 9 shows the results for each of the models, but reports only the odds ratios for items significant at the .10 level or better.

<<Table 9 about here>>

The first column in Table 9 shows that model 1, which considers all measures of family status jointly, is not significant, although age is, with those aged 45-64 more than twice as likely as younger individuals to participate in association events or meetings. Gender, marital status, presence of a child in the household, and race are not significant.

Model 2 incorporates both family status and socio-economic status control variables. As the last rows in column 2 of Table 9 shows, the addition of variables measuring employment status, income, and education increases the odds of predicting volunteering by about 2 percentage points from 67 percent when controlling for family status to 69 percent when controlling also for socio-economic status. Among the family status variables, age remains borderline significant, with those aged 30-44 and those aged 65 and over respectively two and four times as likely to participate as those aged 18-29 (the reference group).

Among the socio-economic status variables, neither employment nor household income are significant overall, although those with incomes of \$75,000 or more are significantly more likely to participate than those with income of less than \$20,000 (the reference category). Education is significant at the .01 level with High School graduates about twice as likely, those with some college more than three times as likely, and college graduates more than four times as likely to attend association meetings or events as those without a High School diploma (the reference category).

Adding the third block, the community attachment variables, to the prediction equation

marginally improves ($p < .10$) our ability to correctly predict association attendance to almost 71 percent. Of the six community attachment variables, only voter registration contributes significantly to the prediction equation, increasing the odds of attending association meetings or events by a factor of more than two to one compared to those who are not registered.

Although the remaining community attachment variables are not significant, the odds of attending association meetings or events decline for those who have lived 6-15 years in the community, compared to more recent arrivals. Finally, a comparison of models 2 and 3 shows that the addition of the community attachment variables has virtually no impact on the odds ratios associated with any of the family status and socio-economic status variables, except to decrease the odds of participation for retired people (to about a third of the rate for those not in the labor force) enough to become significant at the .05 level.

The addition of the fourth block of independent variables (religious preference and attendance) does not significantly increase our ability to predict volunteering, despite the percentage increase to 73 percent. Neither of the two religious variables is significant in the overall model and their addition has no discernable effect on the odds ratios associated with any of the other variables. Employment, education, and voter registration remain the only three significant variables in the equation, although some categories of age, household income, and frequency of local news are significant as well.

I also performed both forward (Model 5) and backwards (Model 6) stepwise logistic regression in order to determine whether a smaller set of variables might be as efficient in predicting volunteering as the full model (Model 4). The forward stepwise regression (Model 5, next to last column in Table 9) is highly significant and stops after step 3 with just three predictor variables: Education, voter registration, and household income, although the latter is of only borderline significance. These three variables only marginally increase the accuracy of predicting association attendance from 67.5 percent (using no equation, just the overall marginal distribution) to 69.6 percent. The backward stepwise regression (Model 6, last column in Table 9) stops after 14 steps, with the same three variables in the equation.

The forward and backward stepwise logistic regressions not only produce identical results, but both also resemble Model 4 in which all control and independent variables are included. There are minor differences in the accuracy of the prediction equations, but most of same variables are significant and with roughly the same expected odds-ratios: most notably education and voter registration. In general, then, the distinguishing features of people who attend non-religious association activities are that they are relatively well educated, registered to vote, not retired, over the age of 45 and have household income of \$75,000 or more.

Explaining Attendance at Varies Types of Association Events/Meetings

I turn now to analyses of participant profiles for the twelve types of associations with the most widespread participation – those for which at least 5 percent of respondents indicated attendance at a meeting or event sometime during the previous year. To do so, I again undertake multivariate logistic regression of the four sets of independent variables on meeting participation for the selected types of associations. Given the small percentages involved for several of the types of associations, this analysis remains exploratory.

I report only on the final full model, using all available independent variables¹⁰ in the analysis

¹⁰ In a few cases, up to two independent variables have been excluded from the final logistic regression analyses. These are cases where it appears that the predictive capacities of these independent variables are

(see Table 10), and present only those coefficients that are significant at the .10 or better level of significance to simplify the presentation (full tables are available upon request). The models are significant for eight of the twelve types of associations examined, with two additional models reaching borderline significance. However, the improvements in correctly predicting attendance are marginal at best – rarely exceeding one or two percentage points (see last two rows of Table 10).

<<Table 10 about here>>

Professional, Trade or Business Associations

As noted earlier, the highest rate of attendance is for meetings or events organized by professional, business, or trade association, with about one in seven adult resident (14 percent) attending at least once during the year. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that those attending this particular type of association tend to be of working age (ages 30 to 64), have a child in the household, be employed, live in high income households, be college educated, and/or be registered to vote. The multivariate analysis reported in column 1 of Table 10 shows that only age, education, and voter registration are significant at the .05 level when all four sets of participant characteristics are allowed to enter the prediction equation. Those aged 30-64 are significantly more likely to be attending these types of association events than those below the age of 30, and college graduates are significantly more likely to be attending these types of associations than those without a high school degree, as are those who are registered to vote. Finally, those who are separated or divorced are significantly ($p < .05$) less likely to participate (by a factor of 1 to 4) than those living with a partner, as are those who attend church several times a month or more frequently (by a factor of 1 in 3) compared to those who never attend church.

Health, Sports, Athletic, or County Clubs

The second most popular group is health, sports, or other recreation clubs, also with 14 percent of Indiana residents attending during the year. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that attendance at these types of groups generally increased with income, education, and/or white racial status and is also related to employment status. Column 2 of Table 10 shows that employment status, household income, and education are all significant in the final prediction equation – those not working full-time, with very fairly high incomes (\$75,000 - \$99,000), and college educated are more likely to attend these types of activities than the comparison groups. The overall prediction equation is significant at the .05 level of significance.

Fraternal Service Organizations

More than 12 percent attended activities at various types of fraternal service organizations, such as the Elks, Eastern Star, Lions, or Kiwanis. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that attendance rates were highest for those above the age of 45 and/or those with a college degree. The full model (see column 3 of Table 10) is not significant. When I undertook a backwards stepwise regression on fraternal service organizations, the overall model is significant ($p < .002$) with two variables remaining in the equation: age and education. The same two variables were the only ones to enter in the forward stepwise regression. Controlling for education, those aged 65 or over were more likely to participate in fraternal service organizations than younger individuals. Controlling for age, people with a college degree were also more likely to participate in these types of organizations than those

already captured by other variables in the questions – the odds ratios are very large, but not significant – and occurs only for associations with very low rates of overall attendance. The coefficients for the excluded variables are shown as “excl” in the table. Excluding these variables has very little, if any, effect on the overall prediction equations or on the odds ratios for variables remaining in the equations.

without a high school degree.

School Support Organizations

Some 12 percent of Indiana residents attended events or meetings for various PTA, PTO or other school support groups during the year. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that rates of attendance at these types of associations were related to a broad range of personal characteristics. Thus, attendance was notably high for those of middle age, women, married or separated/divorced, those with a child in the household, working part-time, with higher household income, at least some college education, registered to vote, and/or home owners. Those attending church frequently were also more likely to be active in these associations.

The multi-variate analysis shows that gender and having a child in the household remain important in the final model (column 4 in Table 10) - in each case increasing the rate of attendance by a factor of at least three to one compared to the reference category. In addition, those who have higher household income are more likely to attend school support organizations than those with lower income. The overall prediction equation is highly significant ($p < .001$) and improves the overall prediction by about three percentage points.

Labor Unions or Workers Associations

About 10 percent of Indiana residents participate in labor union or workers association meetings during the year. The bi-variate analysis in Tables 5-8 showed earlier that the likelihood of attending is relatively high for those who are working (or unemployed), with some college or technical training, and perhaps also for those that are registered to vote ($p < .051$). The full model (column 5 in Table 10) is significant ($p < .025$) but the improvement in prediction is trivial. Only voter registration remains significant, with those registered to vote more than five times as likely to participate in labor groups than those not registered to vote – I suspect the causal direction here goes from participation in labor unions to voter registration rather than the reverse.

Health Issues or Disease Groups

About 9 percent of Indiana residents attend meetings of a health issues or disease group during the year. The bi-variate analysis shows that attendance is most widespread among those who are female, relatively well educated, and/or registered to vote (see Tables 5-8 earlier). The multivariate analysis indicates that only gender remains a significant factor when all independent variables are allowed to operate (see column 6 of Table 10), with women almost three times more likely to attend these types of associations than men. Those aged of 65 or older, with relatively high household incomes, and those attending religious services less than monthly are also more likely to attend these types of association events than their respective comparison groups.

The full model is not significant, however. The stepwise backwards regression analysis leaves only two variables in the equation: gender and income. The stepwise forwards regression analysis allows only two variables to enter: gender and education. Both equations are highly significant ($p < .01$) and in both cases, women are twice as likely to attend health-related meetings or events as men and those of higher income and higher levels of education are more likely to do so as well.

Social Clubs or Greek-Letter Fraternity/Sorority Organizations

About 8 percent of Indiana residents report attending a meeting or event at a social club or Greek letter fraternity or sorority organization. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that attendance at these types of associations is significantly related to age, marital status, presence of children in the household, and/or household income. Of these, household income remains significant in the

multivariate analysis (see column 7 in Table 10) with those in the middle income groups more likely to participate. Also important is likelihood of remaining in the community, although those who indicated that they most likely would stay in the community for at least five years reported attending this type of organizations less frequently than those who expect to leave the community. In addition, the analysis shows significantly higher rates of attendance for those who attend church monthly or less frequently compared to those who never attend.

Dance or Amateur Performance Groups

About 8 percent of Indiana residents attend events or activities at a dance or amateur performance group, such as glee club, band, or orchestra. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that attendance was related to marital status and education. Only one of these, however, remains significant in the multivariate analysis (column 8 of Table 10) – marital status, with those living with a partner (reference group) more likely to be attending dance or amateur performance groups than others. So are people with children in the household. Several other categories are also significant in the multivariate analysis: older middle-aged people (aged 45-64) and those attending religious services 2-3 times a month are most likely to participate in these types of groups. Those who have lived in the community the longest (more than 30 years) are significantly less likely to participate than newcomers (the reference category).

Neighborhood or Homeowners Associations

More than 7 percent attended a meeting or event at a neighborhood or homeowners association. Tables 5-8 suggested earlier that the likelihood of attending these types of associations is related to marital status, presence of children in the household, income, education, and homeownership. The multivariate analysis (column 9 in Table 10) shows that only two variables remain fully significant when all factors are considered simultaneously – those with children in the household and those of very high income are much more likely to attend these types of associations than the reference categories. However, this analysis is based on relatively few respondents and therefore remains suggestive at best.

Youth Organizations

About 7 percent of respondents reported attending meetings or events at youth organizations, such as the Scouts or 4-H. Tables 5-8 showed earlier that attendance at these associations was not surprisingly related to age, marital status, presence of children in the home, employment, and income. The multivariate analysis reveals that presence of children in the household remains important, but participation in youth organizations is also prevalent among those who rely mainly on the radio for their news. However, this analysis is based on relatively few respondents and therefore remains suggestive at best.

Veterans' Organizations

While 6 percent overall had attended meetings or events at one or more veterans' organizations during the past year, Tables 5-8 suggested earlier that attendance is most extensive among those who are older, widowed, retired, without children in the household, and attending church less frequently. Column 11 of Table 10 shows that only religious attendance is significant with those who never attend church (the reference category) more likely to be participating in a veteran's organization. As in the case of several of the types of associations discussed immediately above, this analysis is based on relatively few respondents and remains suggestive at best.

Hobby Clubs

Finally, about 5 percent of Indiana residents report attending a meeting or event at computer, gardening, craft, other hobby clubs. Tables 5-8 suggest that participation in this type of association is related to marital status, presence of children in the household, and/or length of time in the community. Column 12 in Table 10 shows that none of these variables survive the multivariate analysis and that only gender is significantly related to participation in these groups, with males more likely to attend than females. In addition, those attending church more frequently are more likely to attend these types of activities than those who never attend. Because of the relatively few respondents who participate in these types of associations, the findings remain tentative.

Discussion and Conclusion

More than two-thirds of all respondents reported participating in events or meetings held various types of nonprofits associations. The analysis presented here allows for four broad conclusions about how rates of overall participation in nonprofit associations (other than congregations) differ among respondents to the survey. My conclusions about factors that appear to explain participation in specific types of associations must necessarily remain more tentative because of the small number of cases involved for several of the types of association.

Explaining Overall Participation

First, looking at overall participation in various types of secular nonprofit associations or groups, the analysis shows that three of the four types of participant characteristics considered – family status, socio-economic status, and community attachment, but not religious involvement – play significant roles in predicting overall attendance. While only two age categories are important in the final analysis (Model 4 in Table 9) and the family status variables as a group were not significant (Model 1 in Table 9), the block of socio-economic status variables is highly significant (Model 2 in Table 9) and two of these variables are significant in the final model. The block of community attachment variables are only marginally significant (Model 3 in Table 9) when considered by as a separate step and one of these variables is significant in the full model (Model 4).

Second, in the final analysis our ability to predict overall participation in secular associations or groups increases by almost six percentage points, from two thirds (67.5 percent) with no controls to almost three quarters (73.0 percent) when all variables are controlled. While this is a modest improvement, the overall model is nevertheless significant at the .001 level of significance or better.

Third, the more detailed analysis suggests that controlling for all other factors, participation in nonprofit association meetings or events is significantly

- Higher among older age groups (by a factor of more than two to one for those 45-64 years of age and by a factor of more than four to one for those aged 65 or more, compared to those who are younger)
- Higher among those who are not in the labor force “for other reasons” or who are unemployed (by a factor three to one), compared to those who are retired
- Higher among those with incomes of \$75,000 or more (by a factor of at least three to one), compared to those with incomes of less than \$20,000
- Higher among those who have at least some college or technical training (by a factor of more than two to one for those with some college and more than three to one for college graduates, compared to those without a high school diploma)
- Higher among those who are registered to vote (by a factor of more than two to one,

compared to those not registered)

- Higher among those who obtain local news weekly or less frequently (by a factor of about half compared to those that obtain such news more frequently).

Finally, these findings stand in some contrast to a previous analysis of volunteering using the same dataset (Author(s), 2002a) which found that volunteering was significantly related to religious attendance as well as education and voter registration (but no other variables). While education and voter registration appears to be significant for both volunteering and associational attendance, the remaining predictors differ for the two forms of engagement suggesting that they are characterized by different mechanisms of recruitment and retention.

Of course, the analysis presented here only demonstrates which personal characteristics appear to be associated with participation in voluntary associations, not what the causal mechanism might be – for example, whether those who are better education are more interested in participating in various types of associations (or have more flexible time so that they can do so) or whether associations actively seek to recruit those with higher levels of education.

Explaining Participation in Various Types of Association

My conclusions about factors that appear to explain participation in particular types of associations are necessarily more tenuous. Only 14 percent of respondents participate in the most popular associations – business, trade or professional associations and sports, health, or recreational groups. I considered twelve types of associations in this analysis and excluded those for which less than five percent of respondents reported active involvement. Three broad conclusions stand out from the analysis.

First, the four sets of participant characteristics considered here – family status, socio-economic status, community attachment, and religious involvement – jointly contribute significantly to explaining participation in most of the twelve types of associations. For eight types of associations, the final logistic regression equation is significant at the .05 level or better, for another two the equations are borderline significant ($p < .10$). In other words, these four sets of variables appear to be relevant predictors, although they allow for only marginal improvements in our ability to predict participation – in part because the rates of participation are so low for any given type of association. For the final two groups, fraternal associations (e.g., Lions, Kiwanis, Elks, and Moose) and health/disease groups, the four sets of independent variables were not significant in the multivariate analysis, although both backward and forward stepwise regressions were significant with only two variables included.

Second, the variables that help predict overall participation do not necessarily help explain participation in specific types of associations. Thus a quick perusal of Table 10 (above) shows remarkably little consistency among the factors that explain participation in the different types of associations examined here. Variables that significantly contribute to predicting participation in one type of association may have no relevance for predicting participation in other types of associations. Indeed, the variable that is most consistently significant (presence of child in the household) is so for only four of the 12 types of associations – or only one third. If marginally significant coefficients are considered as well, the count increases to 7, but that is still only just above half. This suggests careful attention to the types of associations that respondents are asked about when seeking to measure civic engagement.

Third, some broad patterns are nevertheless discernable. Thus associations that focus on economic interests (business, professional or trade associations) or may involve substantial costs

(sports, health, recreation groups) show significant relationships with at least one of the socio-economic status variables.¹¹ Participation in business, professional, or trade associations, as well as participation in labor unions, is also significantly related to voter registration. This is consistent with the argument that these groups focus on protecting economic interests. As Verba, Scholzman & Brady (1995) conclude, low income groups have few opportunities to join these types of organizations.

Associations likely to be of interest to particular demographic groups (school, PTA, or PTO groups; youth, scouts, or 4H groups; and health or disease groups) show significant relationships with several of the family status variables. Several other types of associations show relationships with some of these variables as well – most notably the presence of children in the household. Finally, religious preference appears to be important for those participating in youth development organizations while religious attendance is negatively associated with participation in veterans groups. In addition, certain frequencies of religious attendance are important for selected other organizations. The latter may reflect decisions about allocation of time.

* * *

The findings presented here point to the importance of careful attention to the distinctive patterns of individual participation in association activities. Individuals who are active in certain types of associations are not necessarily active in other types. Efforts to measure civic engagement that rely on questions about associational involvement therefore depend critically upon not only who is asked, but how respondents are questioned about their participation. Prompting for a wider range of associational types may well result in findings of more extensive engagement. Asking about actual attendance at meetings and events will exclude associations in which people only hold formal membership, but is likely to produce more robust measures of participation. Moreover, participation in meetings or events organized by voluntary associations is only one of several ways in which individuals are engaged with nonprofits – they may work for them, volunteer for them, support them with financial or other material support, or use the services they provide.

In subsequent papers I plan to examine the extent and nature of individual engagement with nonprofits in greater detail by merging the interview data used in this analysis with two other datasets: (1) the list of organizations identified by respondents and (2) questionnaire data from nonprofits identified by respondents. The merged datasets will allow me to explore a number of important topics. Thus, I will be able to show the extent to which individuals differ in the total number of nonprofits with which they are engaged through worship, associational attendance, volunteering, or employment and to examine which factors predict engagement with more rather than fewer nonprofits. I will also be able to examine the extent to which individual portfolios of nonprofit engagement are concentrated in one major nonprofit field or spread across several fields and which types of individuals are associated with specialized vs. diverse portfolios of nonprofit engagement. Finally, I will be able to examine how the characteristics of individuals relate to certain key characteristics of the nonprofits with which they are engaged – for example, whether well educated individuals are more likely to volunteer for large (or old) nonprofits than those with lower levels of education.

¹¹ Surprisingly, participation in labor unions is only marginally related to education and not at all to income, although it is strongly related to unemployment. However, the number of unemployed in the sample is too small (11 people) to maintain as a separate analytic category.

REFERENCES

- Author. 2002.
- Author(s). 2002a.
- Author(s) 2002b.
- Becker, Penny E. & Pawan, H. D. 2001. "Religious Involvement and Volunteering: Implications for Civil Society." Sociology of Religion, 63 (Aug), 315.
- Berry, Jeffrey M. 1999. "The Rise of Citizens Groups." Pp. 367-94 in Theda Skocpol & Morris P. Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.), Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Brehm, John & Rahn, Wendy. 1997. "Individual-Level Evidence for the Causes and Consequences of Social Capital." American Journal of Political Science, 41 (Jul), 999-1023.
- Bridges, William P. & Villemez, Wayne J. 1991. "Employment Relations and the Labor Market: Integrating Institutional and Market Perspectives." American Sociological Review, 56 (Dec), 748-64.
- Burns, Nancy; Scholzman, Kay Lehman, & Verba, Sidney. 2001. The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chaves, Mark. 1999. "Religious Congregations and Welfare Reform: Who will Take Advantage of Charitable Choice?" American Sociological Review, 64, 836-46.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1999. "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of American Politics, 1890-1920." Pp. 81-110 in Theda Skocpol & Morris P. Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.), Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Clydesdale, Timothy T. 1990. "Soul-Winning and Social Work: Giving and Caring in the Evangelical Tradition." In Wuthnow, Robert; Hodgkinson, Virginia A.; & Associates (eds.), Faith and Philanthropy in America: Exploring the Role of Religion in America's Voluntary Sector. San
- Coleman, James S. 1990. Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1999. "Extreme Voices: A Dark Side of Civic Engagement." Pp. 395-426 in Theda Skocpol & Morris P. Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.), Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Greeley, Andrew. 1997. "Coleman Revisited." American Behavioral Scientist, 40: 587-595.
- Guterbock, Thomas M., & Fries, John C. 1997. Maintaining America's Social Fabric: The AARP Survey of Civic Involvement. Washington D.C.: American Association of Retired Persons.
- Hadaway, C. Kirk. 2002. "Taking Attendance: Estimating the Number of U.S. Worshipers." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion." Salt Lake City, October 30-November 2.
- Hall, Michael; Knighton, Tamara; Reed, Paul; Bussiere, Patrick; McRae Don; & Bowen, Paddy. 1998. Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating. Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.

- Hall, Michael H.; McKeown, Larry; & Roberts, Karen. 2001. Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating. Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Heyring, Charles H. 1997. "Civic Elites and Corporate Delocalization: An Alternative Explanation for Declining Civic Engagement." American Behavioral Scientist, 40 (5): 657-68.
- Kalleberg, Arne L.; Knoke, David; Marsden, Peter V., & Spaeth, Joe L. 1994. "The National Organizations Study: An Introduction and Overview." American Behavioral Scientist, 37 (June), 860-71.
- Kalleberg, Arne L.; Marsden, Peter V.; Aldrich, Howard E.; & Cassell, James W. 1990. "Comparing Organizational Sampling Frames." Administrative Science Quarterly, 35 (4, December), 658-88.
- Levi, Margaret. 1996. "Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work." Politics & Society, 24 (1): 45-56.
- Liu, Qiaoming Amy; Ryan, Vernon; Aurbach, Herbert, & Besser, Terry. "The Influence of Local Church Participation on Rural Community Attachment." Rural Sociology, 63 (3): 432-451.
- May, Dean L. 1990. "The Philanthropy Dilemma: The Mormon Church Experience." In Wuthnow, Robert; Hodgkinson, Virginia A.; & Associates (eds.), Faith and Philanthropy in America: Exploring the Role of Religion in America's Voluntary Sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- McPherson, J. Miller. 1982. "Hypernetwork Sampling: Duality and Differentiation among Voluntary Organizations." Social Network, 3, 225-50.
- Minkoff, Debra C. 1997. "Producing Social Capital: National Social Movements and Civil Society." American Behavioral Scientist 40 (5):606-19.
- Park, J., & Smith, C. 2000. "To Whom Has Much Been Given ...: Religious Capital and Community Voluntarism among Churchgoing Protestants." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 39: 272-286.
- Paxton, Pamela. 1999. "Is Social Capital Declining in the United States? A Multiple Indicator Assessment." American Journal of Sociology, 105 (1): 88-127.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. Making Democracy Work. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." Journal of Democracy, 6 (1), 65-78.
- _____. 2000. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- _____. 2002. "Bowling together...."
- Reed, Paul. 2001. "Interpreting the Signals: Change, Uncertainty and the State of the Voluntary Sector in Canada." Paper presented at the 2001 Annual Meetings of ARNOVA. Miami, FL: November 28 – December 1.
- The Saguaro Seminar. 2001. Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America. John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. <http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/index.html>.

- Skocpol, Theda. 1999a. "How America Became Civic." Pp. 27-80 in Theda Skocpol & Morris P. Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.), Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- _____. 1999b. "Advocates without Members: The Recent Transformation of American Civic Life." Pp. 461-510 in Theda Skocpol & Morris P. Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.), Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Skocpol, Theda & Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.). 1999. Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Schlozman, Kay Lehman, & Brady, Henry E. 1995. Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press.
- Wilson, John & Janoski, Thomas. 1995. "The Contribution of Religion to Volunteer Work." Sociology of Religion, 57 (May): 137.
- Wood, James R. 1990. "Liberal Protestant Social Action in a Period of Decline." In Wuthnow, Robert; Hodgkinson, Virginia A.; & Associates (eds.), Faith and Philanthropy in America: Exploring the Role of Religion in America's Voluntary Sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Woolcock, Michael. "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework." Theory and Society, 27: 151-208.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1990. "Religion and the Voluntary Spirit in the United States: Mapping the Terrain." In Wuthnow, Robert; Hodgkinson, Virginia A.; & Associates (eds.), Faith and Philanthropy in America: Exploring the Role of Religion in America's Voluntary Sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- _____. 1999. "Mobilizing Civic Engagement: The Changing Impact of Religious Involvement." Pp. 331-366 in in Theda Skocpol & Morris P. Fiorina, Morris P. (Eds.), Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

**TABLE 1: RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Q: What is your religious preference? Do you consider yourself:	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Catholic	95	18.1	18.3	18.3
Protestant	193	36.7	37.2	55.5
Other Christian	136	25.9	26.2	81.7
Jewish	3	.6	.6	82.3
Muslim	2	.4	.4	82.7
Some other religion	37	7.0	7.1	89.8
No religious preference	53	10.1	10.2	100.0
Total Valid Responses	519	98.7	100.0	
Don't Know	3	.6		
Refused	4	.8		
Total Missing Responses	7	1.3		
Total	526	100.0		

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

**TABLE 2: FREQUENCY OF ATTENDING RELIGIOUS SERVICES
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Q: Other than on special occasions, such as weddings, funerals or baptisms, how often have you attended religious services in the past 12 months?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
More than once a week	76	14.4	16.3	16.3
Once a week	116	22.1	24.9	41.2
2 to 3 times a month	57	10.8	12.2	53.4
About once a month	51	9.7	10.9	64.4
Less than once a month, or	99	18.8	21.2	85.6
Never	67	12.7	14.4	100.0
Total	466	88.6	100.0	
Missing Responses (no religious preference)	60	11.4		
Total	526	100.0		

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

**TABLE 3: TYPE OF VOLUNTEER WORK
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Type of Help/Volunteer Work Performed in Past Year	Percent Volunteered in Past Year*	Percent Located in Indiana	Maximum Number for which Volunteered	Valid N
Help raise funds or other support	28.3	95.9	5	526
Help provide religious services	13.9	97.3	2	526
Help with leading/managing the organization	12.4	98.5	4	526
Help provide direct service	11.8	93.5	5	526
Help with facilities/buildings/grounds/trails	6.7	97.1	2	526
Help with communication	5.9	90.3	2	526
Help educate/influence policy makers, public officials	3.4	61.1	3	526
Help with office/clerical assistance	3.2	94.1	2	525
Help educate/influence public opinion	2.9	85.7	5	526
Provide other types of help	11.8	88.7	4	526
Perform any type of Volunteer work (includes all options above)	43.3			525

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

Note: * Includes nonprofits located outside of Indiana.

**TABLE 4: ATTENDANCE AT NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Type of Organization for Which Attended Meeting or Event in Past Year	Percent Attended Meeting in Past Year*	Percent Located in Indiana	Percent Attended More than One	Maximum Number Attended	Valid N
Professional/business/trade assoc.	14.3	64.0	2.7	4	525
Health/sports/athletic/country club	13.7	47.1	2.7	3	526
Fraternal/service (Elks, Lions, Kiwanis)	12.2	93.8	1.5	5	526
School support/PTO/PTA	12.0	90.5	1.0	3	526
Labor unions/workers assoc.	8.9	73.9	1.1	2	526
Health/disease group	8.7	88.9	1.5	4	526
Social/Greek letter fraternity/sorority	7.8	95.1	1.1	4	526
Dance/amateur performance group	7.8	80.5	2.1	4	525
Other civic/community group	7.6	97.5	1.1	3	526
Neighborhood/homeowners assoc.	7.6	95.0	0.4	2	526
Youth/Scouts/4-H organization	6.8	91.7	1.1	2	526
Veterans organization	5.9	87.1	0.6	3	526
Hobby/gardening/craft/computer club	5.1	63.0	--	1	526
Environment/animal protect group	4.6	75.0	0.2	2	526
Literary/art/discussion group	4.2	90.9	0.8	4	526
Support/12-step/self-help group	4.2	81.8	0.2	2	526
Club for older people	3.8	75.0	0.4	3	526
Farm organization	3.4	66.7	0.6	3	526
Political club/party committee	2.9	93.3	0.4	2	526
Advocacy/social issue group	1.9	80.0	0.2	2	526
Ethnic/nationality/civil rights group	1.3	85.7	--	1	526
Attended some non-religious meeting or event (includes all options above)	67.5				525

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

Note: * Includes nonprofits located outside of Indiana.

**TABLE 5: ATTENDANCE AT NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS BY FAMILY STATUS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Family Status Variables	N	Percent Attending Meetings or Events by Type of Association or Group												
		Any Meeting	Business Professional Trade	Sports Health	Frater-nal Service	School PTA PTO	Labor	Health Dis-ease	Social Greek society	Dance, Perform-ance	Neighor-hood Home-owners	Youth Scouts 4H	Veter-ans groups	Hobby Craft
A. Age		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
18-29	94	60.6	8.5	14.9	8.5	4.3	6.4	6.4	11.7	7.4	2.1	1.1	1.1	3.2
30-44	167	66.5	19.2	13.8	7.2	18.6	10.8	9.0	4.2	6.0	6.6	12.6	4.8	2.4
45-64	166	76.5	18.2	13.3	18.7	16.3	12.0	8.4	6.0	12.0	10.8	7.8	6.0	7.8
65 or more	93	62.4	5.4	14.0	14.0	--	3.2	11.8	12.9	4.3	9.7	--	12.9	6.5
All	520	67.9	14.5	13.8	12.3	11.9	9.0	8.8	7.7	7.9	7.7	6.7	6.0	5.0
Significance level (p<)		<u><.025</u>	<.003	ns	<.008	<.000	<.070	ns	<u><.027</u>	<.094	<.065	<.000	<.006	<.100
B. Gender														
Male	233	70.0	15.5	13.7	14.2	7.7	10.3	5.6	8.2	6.9	6.0	6.9	7.3	6.4
Female	293	65.5	13.4	13.7	10.6	15.4	7.8	11.3	7.5	8.6	8.9	6.8	4.8	4.1
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		<.102	ns	ns	ns	<.007	ns	<u><.022</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
C. Marital status														
Married	262	67.2	16.9	14.5	13.4	15.6	7.3	8.4	5.3	6.5	10.3	9.2	4.6	3.4
Living with partner	31	61.3	19.4	16.1	--	3.2	9.7	3.2	--	6.5	3.2	--	3.2	3.2
Widowed	63	61.9	3.2	11.1	15.9	3.2	6.3	9.5	15.9	1.6	11.1	1.6	14.3	6.3
Separated/divorced	90	72.2	12.2	14.4	14.4	15.6	14.4	11.1	5.6	11.1	3.3	8.9	8.9	11.1
Never married	77	70.1	15.6	11.7	7.8	5.2	10.4	9.1	14.3	14.3	2.6	2.6	1.3	2.6
All	523	67.5	14.4	13.8	12.2	11.9	9.0	8.8	7.6	7.9	7.6	6.7	5.9	5.0
Significance level (p<)		ns	<.067	ns	ns	<.005	ns	ns	<.003	<u><.043</u>	<u><.046</u>	<u><.038</u>	<.007	<u><.043</u>
D. Child in household														
No	314	67.5	11.8	13.1	14.0	5.4	8.0	7.6	10.2	6.4	5.7	3.2	8.0	6.7
Yes	212	67.5	17.9	14.6	9.4	21.7	10.4	10.4	4.2	9.9	10.4	12.3	2.8	2.8
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		ns	<u><.050</u>	ns	ns	<.000	ns	ns	<u><.013</u>	ns	<u><.049</u>	<.000	<u><.014</u>	<u><.049</u>
E. Race														
Non-white	33	54.5	15.2	--	9.1	18.2	9.1	6.1	3.0	12.1	9.1	6.1	3.0	--
White	493	68.4	14.2	14.6	12.4	11.6	8.9	8.9	8.1	7.5	7.5	6.9	6.1	5.5
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		ns	ns	<u><.018</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	Ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

Note: Significance levels refer to results of chi-square analysis between attendance and each variable. Significance levels of .05 or less meet generally accepted statistical criteria.

**TABLE 6: ATTENDANCE AT NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Socio-Economic Status Variables	N	Types of Meetings/Events												
		Any Meeting	Business Professional Trade	Sports Health	Frater-nal Service	School PTA PTO	Labor	Health Dis-ease	Social Greek society	Dance, Perform-ance	Neighor-hood Home-owners	Youth Scouts 4H	Veter-ans groups	Hobby Craft
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
A. Employment status														
Full-time for pay	295	70.8	16.7	12.2	13.2	13.9	13.2	7.1	6.1	7.8	7.5	7.5	5.1	4.7
Part-time for pay	36	83.3	19.4	27.8	8.3	27.8	--	19.4	13.9	11.1	8.3	8.3	5.6	5.6
Retired	96	56.3	5.2	10.4	14.6	--	3.1	9.4	12.5	5.3	8.3		13.5	5.2
Other/not in LF	99	62.6	14.1	16.2	8.1	12.1	5.1	9.1	6.1	9.1	7.1	11.1	1.0	6.1
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		<.007	<u><.035</u>	<u><.046</u>	ns	<.000	<.001	ns	<i><.093</i>	ns	ns	<u><.017</u>	<.002	ns
B. Household income														
0-19,999	73	52.1	4.1	5.5	5.5	4.1	2.7	2.7	6.8	6.8	4.1	--	11.0	2.7
20-29,999	59	64.4	6.8	13.6	8.5	3.4	3.4	8.5	11.9	10.2	5.1	5.1	6.8	8.5
30-39,999	67	59.7	11.9	10.4	9.0	10.4	7.5	6.0	1.5	4.5	3.0	11.9	7.5	3.0
40-49,999	72	63.9	13.9	8.3	15.3	6.9	11.1	8.3	16.7	6.9	2.8	4.2	1.4	2.8
50-74,999	114	67.5	14.9	14.0	10.5	14.0	11.4	13.2	2.6	10.5	10.5	5.3	5.3	6.1
75-99,999	65	84.6	21.9	18.5	20.0	23.1	13.8	4.6	4.6	7.8	7.7	7.7	4.6	6.2
100,000+	33	97.0	36.4	39.4	21.2	24.2	9.1	18.2	9.1	9.1	21.2	18.2		9.1
All	483	67.5	14.1	13.7	12.0	11.6	8.7	8.5	7.0	8.1	7.0	6.4	5.6	5.2
Significance level (p<)		<.000	<.000	<.000	<i><.067</i>	<.001	ns	<i><.060</i>	<.003	ns	<.008	<.008	ns	ns
C. Education														
No HS school degree	48	39.6	2.1	2.1	4.2	--	4.2	8.3	4.2	--	--	6.3	10.4	--
HS grad	197	58.9	6.6	10.7	10.7	7.6	6.1	4.6	5.6	2.5	7.1	5.6	6.6	5.1
Some college	116	74.1	14.7	12.1	9.5	13.8	15.5	8.6	12.1	12.1	5.2	6.9	3.4	4.3
College grad	165	81.2	26.8	21.8	18.2	19.4	9.1	13.9	8.5	13.4	12.1	8.5	5.5	7.3
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		<.000	<.000	<.001	<u><.022</u>	<.000	<u><.024</u>	<u><.019</u>	ns	<.000	<u><.020</u>	ns	ns	ns

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

Note: Significance levels refer to results of chi-square analysis between attendance at particular type of meeting or event and the indicated socio-economic status variable (**p<.01 for coefficients in bold**; p<.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for coefficients in *italics*). Significance levels of .05 or less meet generally accepted statistical criteria.

**TABLE 7: ATTENDANCE AT NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS BY COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Community Attachment Variables	N	Types of Meetings/Events												
		Any Meeting	Business Professional Trade	Sports Health	Frater-nal Service	School PTA PTO	Labor	Health Dis-ease	Social Greek society	Dance, Music, Perform-ance	Neighor-hood Home-owners	Youth Scouts 4H	Veter-ans groups	Hobby Craft
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
A. Years in community														
5 yrs or less	100	68.0	16.0	14.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	9.0	10.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0
6 - 15 yrs	110	61.8	14.5	14.5	10.0	15.5	5.5	10.0	3.6	7.3	10.0	11.8	2.7	1.8
16 - 30 yrs	133	70.7	15.2	14.3	12.8	12.0	13.5	8.3	6.0	8.3	9.0	6.0	4.5	9.0
31 yrs or more	183	68.3	12.6	12.6	14.2	10.9	8.7	9.8	10.9	6.6	7.1	5.5	9.3	6.0
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.094	<.030
B. Likely to stay 5 years														
Very likely	369	66.9	12.8	14.6	13.3	12.2	8.7	8.7	7.0	7.6	7.9	7.9	5.4	5.7
Somewhat likely	88	75.0	18.2	10.2	11.4	14.8	12.5	11.4	8.0	9.1	9.1	6.8	5.7	3.4
Not too or at all likely	67	61.2	17.9	11.9	7.5	7.5	6.0	6.0	11.9	7.5	3.0	1.5	9.0	4.5
All	524	67.6	14.3	13.5	12.2	12.0	9.0	8.8	7.8	7.8	7.4	6.9	5.9	5.2
Significance level (p<)		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
C. Registered to vote														
No	101	53.5	5.0	10.9	9.9	5.9	4.0	--	6.9	5.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	3.0
Yes	425	70.8	16.5	14.4	12.7	13.4	10.1	10.8	8.0	8.5	8.5	7.3	6.8	5.6
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		<.001	<.003	ns	ns	<.038	<.051	<.001	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.063	ns
D. Own home														
Rent/other	143	58.7	11.9	10.5	9.1	4.9	9.1	7.7	41.0	5.6	0.7	4.9	4.9	4.9
Own	383	70.8	15.2	14.9	13.3	14.6	8.9	9.1	9.1	8.6	10.2	7.6	6.3	5.2
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.3	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		<.009	ns	ns	ns	<.002	ns	ns	ns	ns	<.000	ns	ns	ns
E. Frequency of news														
Every day	355	67.9	15.5	14.1	13.2	13.2	9.6	9.9	7.9	8.5	8.7	6.2	5.9	4.8
Few times week	113	62.8	13.3	12.4	10.6	6.2	8.8	8.0	9.7	3.5	3.5	6.2	3.5	6.2
Once/wk or less	58	74.1	8.6	13.8	8.6	15.5	5.2	3.4	3.4	12.1	8.6	12.1	10.3	5.2
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
Significance level (p<)		ns	ns	ns	ns	<.090	ns	ns	ns	<.103	ns	ns	ns	ns

Continued.

**TABLE 7 (continued): ATTENDANCE AT NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS BY COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Community Attachment Variables	N	Types of Meetings/Events												
		Any Meeting	Business Professional Trade	Sports Health	Frater-nal Service	School PTA PTO	Labor	Health Dis-ease	Social Greek society	Dance, Music, Perform-ance	Neighor-hood Home-owners	Youth Scouts 4H	Veter-ans groups	Hobby Craft
F. Source of news														
TV	130	62.3	15.4	15.4	9.2	10.8	6.9	6.9	6.9	3.8	6.9	3.8	6.2	6.2
Radio	58	67.2	15.5	12.1	12.1	12.1	8.6	10.3	8.6	12.1	6.9	8.6	3.4	6.9
Newspapers	244	69.7	13.2	13.1	14.3	13.9	9.0	9.4	9.4	9.1	7.4	7.8	6.1	4.1
Other	94	69.1	14.9	13.8	10.6	8.5	11.7	8.5	4.3	7.4	9.6	7.4	6.4	5.3
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
<i>Significance level (p<)</i>		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

Note: Significance levels refer to results of chi-square analysis between attendance at particular type of meeting or event and the indicated community attachment variable (p<.01 for coefficients in **bold**; p<.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for coefficients in *italics*). Significance levels of .05 or less meet generally accepted statistical criteria.

**TABLE 8: ATTENDANCE AT NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS BY RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Religious Involvement Variables	N	Types of Meetings/Events												
		Any Meeting	Business Professional Trade	Sports Health	Frater-nal Service	School PTA PTO	Labor	Health Dis-ease	Social Greek society	Dance, Perform-ance	Neighor-hood Home-owners	Youth Scouts 4H	Veter-ans groups	Hobby Craft
A. Religious preference		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Catholic	95	72.6	16.8	20.0	9.5	13.7	8.4	10.5	8.4	9.5	11.6	6.3	6.3	3.2
Protestant	193	71.0	14.1	12.4	16.6	12.4	8.3	10.4	10.4	7.8	6.7	7.8	6.7	7.3
Other Christian	136	66.2	14.0	13.2	9.6	10.3	11.0	7.4	6.6	7.4	4.4	5.9	4.4	5.1
Other Preference	42	59.5	14.3	11.9	9.5	11.9	7.1	4.8	7.1	9.5	11.9	11.9	7.1	2.4
None	53	54.7	11.3	9.4	7.5	13.2	7.5	5.7	1.9	3.8	9.4	1.9	5.7	1.9
All	519	67.4	14.3	13.7	11.9	12.1	8.9	8.7	7.9	7.7	7.7	6.7	6.0	5.0
<i>Significance level (p<)</i>		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
B. Relig. Attendance														
No preference/missing	60	56.7	11.7	10.0	10.0	11.7	8.3	6.7	1.7	5.0	8.3	3.3	5.0	3.3
Never	67	55.2	11.9	11.9	9.0	3.0	7.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	3.0	4.5	14.9	1.5
LT once a month	99	73.7	13.1	16.2	15.2	6.1	12.1	13.1	14.1	9.1	7.1	3.0	3.0	5.1
Once a month	51	78.4	20.0	13.7	9.8	21.6	13.7	3.9	11.8	5.9	13.7	9.8	9.8	3.9
2-3 times/month	57	68.4	21.1	22.8	10.5	19.3	8.8	10.5	7.0	10.5	5.3	7.0	7.0	10.5
Once a week	116	73.3	13.8	10.3	16.4	15.5	8.6	7.8	6.0	8.7	8.6	9.5	2.6	6.0
2-3 times/week	76	61.8	11.8	13.2	9.2	10.5	3.9	13.2	7.9	10.5	7.9	10.5	3.9	5.3
All	526	67.5	14.3	13.7	12.2	12.0	8.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.9	5.1
<i>Significance level (p<)</i>		<u><.018</u>	ns	ns	ns	<.008	ns	ns	<i><.077</i>	ns	ns	ns	<u><.015</u>	ns

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

Note: Significance levels refer to results of chi-square analysis between attendance at particular type of meeting or event and the indicated religious involvement variable (p<.01 for coefficients in **bold**; p<.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for coefficients in *italics*). Significance levels of .05 or less meet generally accepted statistical criteria.

**TABLE 9: LOGISTIC REGRESSION ON ASSOCIATION ATTENDANCE
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Predictor variables	Expected Odds Ratios					
	Model 1 Family Status Controls	Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls	Model 3 Family, SES, & Community involvement	Model 4 All Independ- ent Variables	Model 5 Full Forward Stepwise (Step 3)	Model 6 Full Backward Stepwise (Step 14)
<u>1. Family Status</u>						
Age (reference: aged 18-29)	<u>p<.035</u>	<u>p<.054</u>	<u>p<.076</u>	ns		
Aged 30-44	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Aged 45-64	<u>2.651</u>	<u>2.385</u>	<u>2.535</u>	<u>2.481</u>		
Aged 65+	ns	<u>4.436</u>	<u>4.713</u>	<u>4.419</u>		
Female (dummy, reference: male)	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Marital status (reference: living w/ partner)	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Married	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Widowed	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Separated/Divorced	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Never married	ns	ns	ns	ns		
Child in household	ns	ns	ns	ns		
White (dummy)	ns	ns	ns	ns		
<u>2. Socio-economic Status</u>						
Employment status (ref: other)		<u>p<.060</u>	<u>p<.023</u>	<u>p<.011</u>		
Full-time		ns	ns	ns		
Part-time		ns	<u>2.513</u>	ns		
Retired		<u>0.428</u>	<u>0.366</u>	<u>0.327</u>		
Household income (reference: LT \$20,000)		<u>p<.063</u>	<u>p<.088</u>	<u>p<.066</u>	<u>p<.054</u>	<u>p<.054</u>
\$20,000-\$29,999		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
\$30,000-\$39,999		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
\$40,000-\$49,999		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
\$50,000-\$74,999		ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
\$75,000-\$99,999		<u>3.074</u>	<u>3.011</u>	<u>3.242</u>	<u>2.765</u>	<u>2.765</u>
\$100,000 or more		<u>13.341</u>	<u>12.132</u>	<u>14.074</u>	<u>12.873</u>	<u>12.873</u>
Education (reference: not HS graduate)		<u>p<.002</u>	<u>p<.003</u>	<u>p<.011</u>	<u>p<.001</u>	<u>p<.001</u>
HS grad		<u>1.903</u>	ns	ns	<u>1.980</u>	<u>1.980</u>
Some college		<u>3.165</u>	<u>3.199</u>	<u>2.565</u>	<u>3.265</u>	<u>3.265</u>
College grad		<u>4.144</u>	<u>4.075</u>	<u>3.393</u>	<u>4.200</u>	<u>4.200</u>
<u>3. Community Attachment</u>						
Years in Community (reference: LT 6 yrs)			ns	ns		
6-15 years			<u>0.455</u>	<u>0.503</u>		
16-30 years			ns	ns		
31+ years			ns	ns		
Likely to stay in (reference: unlikely)			ns	ns		
Very likely to stay 5 years			1.685	ns		
Somewhat likely to stay 5 years			<u>2.227</u>	ns		
Registered to vote			<u>2.116</u>	<u>2.078</u>	<u>1.688</u>	<u>1.688</u>
Own home			ns	ns		

**TABLE 9: LOGISTIC REGRESSION ON ASSOCIATION ATTENDANCE
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Predictor variables	Expected Odds Ratios					
	Model 1 Family Status Controls	Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls	Model 3 Family, SES, & Community involvement	Model 4 All Independ- ent Variables	Model 5 Full Forward Stepwise (Step 3)	Model 6 Full Backward Stepwise (Step 14)
3. Community Attachment (cont.)						
Source of local news (reference: other)			ns	ns		
TV			ns	ns		
Radio			ns	ns		
Newspapers			ns	ns		
How often local news (reference: weekly)			ns	ns		
Every day			<i>0.486</i>	<u>0.466</u>		
Few times week			<i>0.437</i>	<i>0.436</i>		
4. Religion						
Religious preference (reference: none)				ns		
Catholic				ns		
Protestant				ns		
Other Christian				ns		
Other preference				ns		
Religious attendance (reference: never)				ns		
Less than once a month				ns		
Monthly				ns		
2-3 times month				ns		
Weekly				<i>2.195</i>		
2-3 times week				ns		
Constant	ns	<u>0.230</u>	ns	ns	<u>0.425</u>	<u>0.425</u>
Chi-square test of efficiency – Block added	14.761	56.523	<i>20.281</i>	10.622		
Degrees of significance	10	12	12	9		
Significance level	ns	p<.000	<i>p<.062</i>	ns		
Chi-square test of efficiency – Full Model	14.761	71.283	91.564	102.186	59.453	59.453
Degrees of significance	10	22	34	43	10	10
Significance level	ns	p<.000	p<.000	p<.000	p<.000	p<.000
Percent predicted correctly (base=67.5%)	67.3	69.6	71.5	73.0	69.6	69.6

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions

Note: p<.01 for coefficients in **bold**; p<.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for coefficients in *italics*.

**TABLE 10: SIGNIFICANT ODDS RATIOS FOR ATTENDANCE AT VARIATOUS TYPES OF NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Significant Predictors in Final Logistic Regression Models	Selected (Significant) Odds Ratios by Type of Meetings/Events											
	Business Professional Trade (1)	Sports Health (2)	Frater-nal Service (3)	School PTA PTO (4)	Labor (5)	Health Dis-ease (6)	Social Greek society (7)	Dance, Perform -ance (8)	Neighor-hood Home-owners (9)	Youth Scouts 4H (10)	Veter-ans groups (11)	Hobby Craft (12)
1. Family Status												
Age (reference: aged 18-29)	<u>p<.043</u>	ns	<u>p<.073</u>	ns	ns	<u>p<.091</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Aged 30-44	<u>4.799</u>	ns	ns	<u>3.936</u>	ns	ns	<u>0.273</u>	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
Aged 45-64	<u>3.398</u>	<u>0.348</u>	ns	ns	<u>4.720</u>	ns	<u>0.261</u>	<u>6.235</u>	ns	excl	ns	ns
Aged 65+	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	<u>17.383</u>	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
Female (reference: male)	ns	ns	ns	<u>3.005</u>	ns	<u>2.860</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	<u>0.311</u>
Marital (refer: living w/ partner)	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	excl	<u>p<.001</u>	ns	ns	ns	<u>p<.043</u>
Married	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
Widowed	<u><.115</u>	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	excl	<u>0.056</u>	ns	excl	ns	ns
Separated/Divorced	<u>0.237</u>	ns	excl	<u>8.212</u>	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
Never married	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
Child in household (ref: none)	ns	ns	ns	<u>3.449</u>	<u>2.325</u>	<u>2.520</u>	<u>0.340</u>	<u>2.731</u>	<u>5.249</u>	<u>3.631</u>	ns	ns
White (reference: nonwhite)	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	excl
2. Socio-economic Status												
Employment (ref: other)	ns	<u>p<.029</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Full-time	ns	<u>0.416</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	<u>0.291</u>
Part-time or Retired	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Income (refer: LT \$20,000)	ns	<u>p<.011</u>	ns	ns	ns	<u>p<.066</u>	<u>p<.027</u>	ns	<u>p<.045</u>	ns	ns	ns
\$20-\$29,999	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	<u>7.459</u>
\$30,000-\$39,999	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
\$40,000-\$49,999	ns	ns	<u>3.626</u>	ns	ns	ns	<u>7.608</u>	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
\$50-\$74,999	ns	<u>3.379</u>	ns	ns	ns	<u>9.478</u>	ns	ns	<u>5.742</u>	excl	ns	<u>6.111</u>
\$75-\$99,000	ns	<u>5.424</u>	<u>4.519</u>	<u>8.507</u>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns
\$100,000 or more	<u>4.827</u>	ns	ns	<u>8.523</u>	ns	<u>10.755</u>	ns	ns	<u>11.146</u>	excl	ns	ns
Educ. (refer: not HS graduate)	<u>p<.000</u>	<u>p<.042</u>	ns	excl	<u>p<.062</u>	ns	ns	excl	excl	ns	ns	ns
HS grad or some college	ns	ns	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	excl	excl	ns	ns	excl
College grad	<u>13.330</u>	<u>9.632</u>	ns	excl	ns	ns	ns	excl	excl	ns	ns	excl
3. Community Attachment												
Yrs in Comm. (ref: LT 6 yrs)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	<u>p<.055</u>

**TABLE 10: SIGNIFICANT ODDS RATIOS FOR ATTENDANCE AT VARIATOUS TYPES OF NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Significant Predictors in Final Logistic Regression Models	Selected (Significant) Odds Ratios by Type of Meetings/Events											
	Business Professional Trade (1)	Sports Health (2)	Frater-nal Service (3)	School PTA PTO (4)	Labor (5)	Health Dis-ease (6)	Social Greek society (7)	Dance, Perform-ance (8)	Neighor-hood Home-owners (9)	Youth Scouts 4H (10)	Veter-ans groups (11)	Hobby Craft (12)
6-15 years	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.307	5.152	ns	ns	ns
16-30 years	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	6.191	ns	ns	4.513
31+ years	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.246	ns	ns	ns	ns
Likely to stay (refer: unlikely)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	p<.074	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Very likely to stay 5 yrs	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.224	ns	ns	8.911	ns	ns
Somewhat likely to stay 5 yrs	ns	ns	ns	4.316	ns	ns	0.161	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Registered to vote (refer: no)	3.858	ns	ns	ns	5.533	excl	ns	ns	5.724	ns	ns	ns
Homeowner (reference: no)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	2.861	excl	ns	ns	ns
Source of news (refer: other)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	p<.092	ns	ns
TV	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.341	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Radio	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.282	ns	ns	3.822	ns	5.776	ns	ns
Newspapers	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	4.914	2.005	ns	ns	ns	ns
Freq. of news (refer: weekly)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Every day	ns	ns	ns	ns	5.929	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Few times week	ns	ns	ns	0.275	5.185	ns	ns	0.277	ns	ns	ns	ns
4. Religion												
Religious Prefer. (refer: none)	p<.085	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	p<.023	ns	ns
Catholic	3.869	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Protestant	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Other Christian	ns	ns	ns	0.107	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Other preference	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	12.155	ns	ns
Religious Attend. (refer: never)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	p<.099	ns	ns	ns	ns	p<.012	ns
Less than once a month	ns	ns	3.383	ns	ns	9.814	6.680	5.259	ns	ns	0.095	ns
Monthly	ns	ns	ns	8.547	ns	ns	14.063	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
2-3 times month	0.341	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	9.547	ns	ns	ns	14.323
Weekly	0.295	ns	3.612	ns	ns	ns	ns	5.433	ns	ns	0.076	9.015
2-3 times week	0.334	ns	ns	ns	ns	5.477	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.132	10.209
Constant	ns	0.014	0.033	ns	ns	ns	0.002	0.010	ns	0.002	0.005	0.013
Chi-square test – full model	82.118	58.200	45.507	121.063	62.922	53.066	69.826	53.169	66.561	56.530	61.844	51.468

**TABLE 10: SIGNIFICANT ODDS RATIOS FOR ATTENDANCE AT VARIATOUS TYPES OF NON-RELIGIOUS MEETINGS OR EVENTS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001**

Significant Predictors in Final Logistic Regression Models	Selected (Significant) Odds Ratios by Type of Meetings/Events											
	Business Professional Trade (1)	Sports Health (2)	Frater-nal Service (3)	School PTA PTO (4)	Labor (5)	Health Dis-ease (6)	Social Greek society (7)	Dance, Perform -ance (8)	Neighor-hood Home-owners (9)	Youth Scouts 4H (10)	Veter-ans groups (11)	Hobby Craft (12)
Significance level	p<.000	<u>p<.049</u>	ns	p<.000	<u>p<.025</u>	ns	p<.002	<i>p<.079</i>	p<.004	p<.002	<u>p<.031</u>	<i>p<.087</i>
Degrees of freedom	43	42	39	40	43	42	39	40	39	30	43	39
Percent predicted correctly	86.5%	86.7%	87.6%	91.4%	91.8%	91.6%	93.0%	92.0%	93.7%	94.7%	94.5%	95.4%
Base percent	85.6%	86.5%	88.8%	88.2%	91.6%	91.6%	93.2%	92.0%	93.0%	93.7%	94.3%	94.9%

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey: Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project: Scope & Community Dimensions.

NOTE: Only coefficients significant at .10 or better are reported, with **bold coefficients** denoting p<.01, underlined coefficients denoting p<.05, and *coefficients in italics* denoting p<.10. All others are denoted as “ns” for “not significant.” For variables where two categories are not significant for any type of association, the categories have been combined and are noted as such. Some variables were excluded from some logistic regression analyses because their predictive capacities were already captured by other variables in the equations.

APPENDIX
Comparison of Sample Percentages with Census 2000

Demographic Characteristics	Sample Percentages	Census 2000 Percentages*	Z-Statistic**	Significance of Difference in Percentage
Gender (n=526)	Aged 18+	Aged 18+		
Male	44.3%	48.3%	-1.84	Not significant
Female	55.7%	51.7%	1.84	Not significant
Race (n=526/)	Aged 18+	Aged 18+		
White	93.7%	89.5%	3.12	p<.01
Black	5.1%	7.7%	<u>-2.26</u>	p<.05
Hispanic	1.5%	3.1%	<u>-2.11</u>	p<.05
Asian	1.1%	1.0%	0.11	Not significant
Age (n=520)	Aged 18+	Aged 18+		
18-19 years old	1.2%	NA		
20-24 years old	7.1%	9.4%	-1.82	Not significant
25-34 years old	17.3%	18.4%	-0.67	Not significant
35-44 years old	21.7%	21.3%	0.23	Not significant
45-54 years old	23.3%	18.1%	3.04	p<.01
55-59 years old	5.8%	6.5%	-0.70	Not significant
65 or more years old	17.9%	16.7%	0.73	Not significant
Home ownership (n=521)	Aged 18+	Occupied Units		
Owner	73.5%	71.4%	1.06	Not significant
Education (n=477)	Aged 25+	Aged 25+		
No HS	9.2%	17.9%	-4.96	p<.001
HS graduate	37.3%	37.2%	0.05	Not significant
Some college	26.2%	25.5%	0.35	Not significant
College Grad	24.5%	19.4%	2.83	P<.01
Household Income (n=483)	Aged 18+	Households		
Less than \$10,000	4.8%	8.1%	-2.66	p<.01
\$10,000-\$49,999	51.4%	51.3%	0.04	Not significant
\$50,000-\$74,999	23.6%	21.4%	1.18	Not significant
\$75,000-\$99,999***	13.5%	10.2%	<u>2.40</u>	p<.05
\$100,000-\$149,999***	3.3%	6.3%	-2.71	p<.01
\$150,000 or more	3.5%	2.9%	0.79	Not significant

Note: Basis for percentages is reported for each panel. Only coefficients significant at .05 or better are reported with **bold coefficients** denoting p<.01 and **underlined coefficients** denoting p<.05.

* Source: www.ibrc.indiana.edu (7/20/02).

** Z-statistics for difference between proportions.

*** The difference in percentages for household income using the combined category of \$75,000-\$149,999 is not significant.