VOLUNTEERING FOR NONPROFITS:

THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS ENGAGEMENT[1]

By

Kirsten Grønbjerg and Brent Never

School of Public and Environmental Affairs

Indiana University

Revised Version of Paper Presented at

Association for Sociology of Religion Annual Conference

Annual Meetings

Chicago, IL, August 15-17, 2002

[1]We are 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. We also express our appreciation to the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University for the professionalism with which they undertook the interviews and to Rich Clerkin for comments on a previous draft. The efforts of all of these individuals strengthened this work enormously. Of course, any remaining problems are our responsibilities entirely.

VOLUNTEERING FOR NONPROFITS:

THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS ENGAGEMENT

ABSTRACT

Given current U.S. efforts to strengthen volunteering and promote faith-based provision of social services, it is appropriate to examine the underlying dynamics of how religious engagement relates to other types of social engagement, specifically volunteering. This paper, drawing on a telephone interview survey of 526 Indiana residents, considers the effects that religious preference and frequency of attending religious service have on the extent to which people are engaged in their local communities through volunteering. Using measures of demographic characteristics, socio-economic status, and community attachment, we find that volunteering has some relationship to age, marital status, income, education, voter registration, and frequency of obtaining local news. We find that religious engagement has an independent effect on volunteering apart from these other contributing factors.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. has long valued volunteering and other forms of private initiatives to address a broad range of social issues (Hall, 1987). Many of these initiatives emerged out of religious motivations and institutions (Hammack, 1998) and large segments of the nonprofit sector still have some form of religious identity or linkages (Jeavons, 1998; Grønbjerg & Nelson, 1998). Over the last 35 years or so, a number of public policy developments have sought to strengthen volunteering, beginning with the VISTA, Peace Corps, and RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteer) programs of the 1960s and more recently the Americorps program, all of which are operate under the auspices of the Corporation for National and Community Service (established in 1993). These initiatives are part of a broader set of policy developments that made significant levels of public funding available to nonprofit institutions across a wide range of service fields, e.g., education, health, human services, community development, and arts and culture (Salamon, 2002; Grønbjerg & Salamon, 2002).

Only since the mid-1990s, however, have there been specific public policy efforts to promote faith-based provision of services. The so-called "Charitable Choice" provision of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA, alias Welfare Reform) of 1996 for the first time made federal grants and contracts available to religious organizations without restrictions on their display and use of religious symbols. The "Armies of Compassion" initiative by the Bush administration in early 2001 intensified efforts by the federal government to reduce barriers for religious congregations to compete for federal funding. A number of states have also actively sought to identify religious service providers and encourage and train congregations to seek and obtain contract funding (Kennedy, 2001; Kennedy & Bielefeld, 2002).

The arguments used to promote these faith-based initiatives emphasize the power of faith to change human behavior and therefore the presumed greater effectiveness of sacramental organizations in achieving desirable outcomes compared to traditional nonprofit providers (Kennedy, 2001; Kennedy & Bielefeld, 2002). Supporters also argue that congregations are able to mobilize and rely on deeply engaged volunteers rather than depend on paid staff, thus making services more efficient as well (Grønbjerg and Salamon, 2002).

Given these claims and related efforts to strengthen volunteering more broadly, it seems appropriate to examine the underlying dynamics of how religious engagement is related to volunteering and other forms of community engagement. In this paper we draw on telephone interviews with 526 Indiana residents about their affiliations with nonprofits to examine the effects that religious participation has on the extent to which respondents are directly engaged in their local communities through volunteering. We consider both volunteering in general and the variety of volunteer work performed and control for major alternative explanations of volunteering: family status and related demographic characteristics, socio-economic status, and community attachment.

VOLUNTEERING: SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

In recent years, the study of voluntary action (including volunteering) has become entwined with considerations of "social capital" – the norms and networks facilitating collective action for mutual benefit" (Woolcock, 1998: 155). Social scientists have sought to link the nature of social networks with the propensity of individuals in those networks to become engaged in broader array of social activities. Policy makers and others have focused on whether and how changes (particularly

the postulated decline) in social capital are related to civic participation (Putnam, 1993; 2000; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1998; Heyring 1997; Minkoff, 1997; Greeley, 1997; Levi, 1996). In turn, a lively academic debate has emerged about both the definition of social capital and on how to operationalize the study of this concept[2] (Wolcock, 1998; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1998; Greeley, 1997; Levi, 1996).

Building on neo-liberal economic ideas of physical capital and sociological consideration of individual human capital, Bourdieu (1985) and Coleman (1988) defined social capital as a system of networks and associated norms that serve to facilitate interactions (Coleman, 1990). Just as physical capital in the form of manufacturing equipment aids in efficiently constructing an automobile, social capital in the form of the network of relations between individuals aids in creating trusting social interactions. The trust generated through social networks helps to solve the traditional Prisoner's Dilemma game where individuals have an incentive to cheat others in an attempt to secure the highest payoff, which in the end results in everybody receiving a lower payoff.

However, while physical capital is tangible and fungible, social capital is largely intangible because it centers on the strength of social networks. These networks may produce both positive and negative public (or private) goods and may create either private (or public) benefits or costs (Woolcock, 1998). As a result, one of the challenges for researchers has been how to link micro considerations of individual benefit with macro considerations of the public good (Putnam, 2000). Indeed, contrary to a strict interpretation of neo-liberal, rational choice explanations of individual action, individuals do not necessarily always act in the hopes of receiving specific individual reward for their actions (Portes, 1998). Rather than expecting direct reciprocity (Herzog, House & Morgan, 1991), individuals may share more generalized norms of reciprocity that involve feelings of solidarity, compliance, or overall satisfaction with helping others.

The captivating question of whether Americans indeed now "bowl alone" rather than together (Putnam, 1995, 2000) has stimulated a major debate about individual involvement in social networks and the appropriate indicators of a geographical community's overall civic health. Coleman (1988) argued that social capital was generated within specific networks of individuals: communities based either on functional commonality (e.g., Parent-Teacher Organizations or a labor union) or on repeated interaction (e.g., diamond traders). Putnam takes this argument further by

[2] Wolcock (1998) provides a thorough summary of the evolution and matters of contention in this debate.

postulating that as local networks create trust among individuals, the region's relative civic health improves (Putnam, 1993).[3] However, while social capital may be very strong in a particular network (e.g., the mafia in southern Italy), the latter may have either positive or negative impacts on the broader community depending on which norms govern network relations and on what actions network participants take (Paxton, 1999). In other words, the relationship between networks, norms, type of collective action, and community benefits is context-dependent. In the case of the mafia, for example, benefits accrue almost entirely to members of the network, while the community at large suffers.

We argue that volunteering is one of several ways in which social capital is constructed and that it represents a particular type of social capital in which benefits do accrue to the larger community. Thus people join larger social networks when they volunteer and interact with other volunteers, staff, and clients or beneficiaries and volunteering positively impacts the civic health of communities by strengthening the capacity and operations of local nonprofits organizations engaged in public benefit activities (the basis for their tax-exempt status).

In addition, as shown by Independent Sector (1999), Hall et al. (1998); Hall, McKeown & Roberts (2001), volunteers are usually recruited through existing networks. Thus Independent Sector (1999) reports that the great majority (81 percent) of people who volunteer for nonprofits do so because they are asked to do so by someone, usually a friend (50 percent), someone at their religious establishment (32 percent), a family member or relative (19 percent), or someone at work (12 percent). Similarly, people learn about volunteer opportunities through their place of worship (56 percent), place of work (24 percent), school or college (15 percent), membership in service club or professional association (13 percent) or another voluntary organization (13 percent). In other words, volunteering is one of the important mechanisms by which the social networks of individuals (social capital) connect to and positively impact the larger community.

This argument points to the importance of understanding why and how individuals come to participate in volunteering more generally. One line of argument has centered on how faith, measured variously as religious denomination (Wilson & Janoski, 1995), frequency of religious

[3] Both Putnam (2000) and Paxton (1999) consider the two interconnected variables of generalized reciprocity and trust. In non-authoritarian exchange relationships, generalized reciprocity occurs when there is either a formal institution that will enforce the exchange or an informal norm of trust that the individual is a member of the same social network and will be held to his word.

attendance (Hodgkinson, Weitzman, & Kirsch, 1990), and faith-based outreach, affects the commitment of individuals to being active outside of their particular faith network (Putnam, 2000; Park & Smith, 2000). Becker & Pawan (2001) argue that such dimensions of faith not only impact the strength of ties within the faith network but also the commitment that members of faith networks have to aiding the larger geographical community. This is consistent with findings that participation in religious organizations is positively related to both voluntary action and charitable giving (Weitzman et al., 2002; Hall et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001; Guterbock & Fries, 1997; O'Neill & Roberts, 1999; Independent Sector, 1999).

Indeed, participation in faith networks appears to increase expressions of community attachment beyond those based on involvement in other types of social networks, like those based on age, education, etc. (Liu et al., 1998). The effect is more pronounced if religious teachings hold community outreach to be important, as do some religious denominations, e.g., Catholics, Church of Latter Day Saints, and several liberal mainline protestant denominations (Wood, 1990; Clydesdale, 1990; May, 1990; Wilson & Janoski, 2000).

Although involvement in faith networks is clearly important in predicting community engagement (including volunteering), so are other networks. The research literature points to three such networks: (1) those relating to family status and related demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, marital status, presence of children, race or ethnicity), (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).

In general, the literature suggests that married people and those with children in the household show higher rates of volunteering than other family status categories; that women volunteer more than men; and that middle-aged adults (45-64 years) volunteer more than people at younger and older ages (Weitzman et al., 2002: 76-77). The findings on minority status are mixed, with some research concluding that racial and ethnic minority groups volunteer less than whites (Weitzman et al. 2002), while others find that there are no significant racial or ethnic differences once education and income are controlled (O'Neill & Roberts, 1999). For purposes of this paper we hypothesize that minority status by itself will be associated with lower rates of volunteering. Similarly people of higher socio-economic status, as measured by education and income, tend to volunteer more than those of lower status (Guterbock & Fries, 1997; O'Neill & Roberts, 1999; Hall

et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001). Finally, research suggests that community attachment – as measured by length of time in the community, commitment to stay in the community, home ownership, voter registration, and attention to local news sources (Guterbock & Fries, 1997) – affect community engagement, including volunteering. Our data from the Indiana Personal Affiliation Survey (2001) allows us to explore all of these relationships.

DATA AND METHODS

We rely on a telephone survey on personal affiliations with nonprofits conducted in late spring of 2001 as part of the "Indiana Nonprofit Sector: Scope and Community Dimensions" project.[4] The telephone interviews constituted the first stage of a two-stage sampling process to survey Indiana nonprofits.[5] The purpose of the survey was to obtain the names and location information for nonprofits with which respondents were affiliated in order to use the list of nonprofits as a sample of Indiana nonprofits. Together with samples of Indiana nonprofits developed through standard approaches (Grønbjerg, 2002), the list of nonprofits generated through the personal affiliation telephone interviews has served as the basis for a recently completed mail questionnaire of Indiana nonprofits.

The telephone interviews focused on whether respondents had some 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, as attendees at religious services, as 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.[6] In this paper, we focus on the extent of involvement in volunteer work and in

---

[4] 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 (Grønbjerg, 2002). For more information about this project, please see www.indiana.edu/~nonprof.

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

[6] 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

religious activities.

Sample and Interview Process

A total of 526 Indiana residents, aged 18 or older, were interviewed in a telephone survey 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."

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.

---

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.

Dependent Variable: Volunteering

Respondents were asked whether they had performed any of ten different types of volunteer work for a nonprofit during the past year (our major dependent variables). As noted by Rooney, Steinberg, & Schervish (2001), different survey formats and levels of probing result in significantly different levels of giving and volunteering behavior as reported by respondents. Following their approach and that of O'Neill & Roberts (1999), the interviews probed for ten different types of volunteer work (see Table 1) with examples for each type. In this analysis, we focus on whether respondents performed any volunteer work, regardless of the type of work involved. We also consider how immersed respondents are in volunteer work as indicated by the number of different types of volunteer work performed.[7]

More than two-fifths (43 percent) of our respondents indicated they had performed some type of volunteer work. 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 and indicated by performing a great variety of volunteer tasks – up to seven of the types of tasks reported in Table 1.

<<Table 1 about here>>

We believe this focus on behavioral aspects of volunteering provides a more robust measure of volunteering than asking about volunteering for a particular type of nonprofit (e.g., arts and culture). The latter is the approach taken by the Gallup/Independent Sector national surveys on giving and volunteering and appears to produce lower estimates of both giving and volunteering than probing for types of behavior involved (O'Neill & Roberts, 1999; Rooney, Steinberg & Schervish, 2001). Our approach allows us to examine not only determinants of whether individuals volunteer or not, but the factors associated with different types of volunteer work, a dimension that is rarely considered. Future papers will examine the major types of volunteer work and the number and types of nonprofits for which respondents volunteer. We also hope to incorporate information about the particular nonprofits for which people perform volunteer work from our survey of Indiana nonprofits (now in the data-cleaning stage).

[7] Because of time limitations, respondents were not asked how many hours a week they volunteered.

Independent Variables: Religious Involvement

Our independent variables reflect answers to questions about religious preference and frequency of attending religious services derived mainly from the General Social Survey. When asked about their religious preferences, respondents were offered the choices listed in Table 2. More than a third (37 percent) indicated they were protestant with another quarter (26 percent) choosing "other Christian" followed by Catholic (18 percent) or no religious preference (10 percent). Very few indicated Jewish, Muslim, or other religious preferences.

<<Table 2 about here>>

This is a narrower range of choices than ideal and does not adequately capture the variety of religious traditions among Protestant and other Christian denominations, but it reflects the need to allow time for other components of the interviews. However, we plan to incorporate data from the survey of Indiana nonprofits about the specific congregations that respondents attended, including denominational affiliation and other characteristics of the congregations, when those data become available.[8] We hope this will allow us to develop more refined categories.

Respondents were also asked how often they had attended religious services during the past 12 months other than for weddings, funerals, or the like. Table 3 shows the response categories and associated distribution. More than two-fifths (41 percent) reported attending religious services at least once a week with another quarter (23 percent) attending at least once a month. About one-fifth (21 percent) attended less than once a month and 14 percent had not attended religious services at all during the previous year. Further analysis shows that the two religious variables are strongly related to one another. As Table 4 shows, 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, other Christians have the highest rate of attending religious services more than once a week.

<<Tables 3 and 4 about here>>

[8] 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.

Control Variables: Personal Characteristics and Community Attachment

Our control variables come from questions about the background and other characteristics of respondents. We group these into three categories: family status, socio-economic status, and community attachment. Previous research has found these dimensions to contribute significantly to explaining variations in volunteering and other forms of civic engagement (Guterbock & Fries, 1997; Putnam 2000; Weitzman et al., 2002; Rooney, Steinberg, & Schervish; 2001; O'Neill & Roberts, 1999; Hall et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001; Reed, 2001).

The family status category includes questions related to age, gender, marital status, the number of children under the age of 18 in the household, and race and 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 in five years, whether respondents are currently registered to vote, whether they 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.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

We use crosstabs and Chi-square analysis[9] to examine the bivariate relationships among our two dependent variables (volunteering, diversity of volunteer work), independent variables (religious participation, religious preference), and control variables (family status, socio-economic status, and community attachment). We then use logistic regression to explore multivariate models of how religious participation and preference affect volunteering independent of other background characteristics.

Volunteering and Religious Involvement

We turn first to an analysis of the bi-variate relationship between our two dependent variables, volunteering and variety of volunteer work, and our two independent variables of religious preference and participation. Panel A of Table 5 shows that religious preference is significantly

[9] We also performed several one-way analyses of variance to examine the relationship between the raw count of volunteer task types and the various independent and control variables. In general, these results are consistent with those from the chi-square analyses described below.

related both to whether people volunteer at all and to the variety of volunteer tasks they perform. Close to half of Protestants (51 percent) and other Christians (48 percent) volunteer, compared to 38 percent of Catholics and 33 percent of those with other religious preferences, while only 21 percent of those with no religious preference volunteered. Protestants and other Christians were also more likely (17-19 percent) to be involved in two or more volunteer tasks than were those with other religious preferences (14 percent), while those expressing no religious preferences lagged far behind at 4 percent on this indicator as well. This is generally consistent with other research (e.g., Becker & Pawan, 2001; Hall et al. 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001). As we noted above, our categories of religious preferences are broader than ideal, but we plan to add more detailed information about the congregations from the separate survey of Indiana nonprofits.

<<Table 5 about here>>

Panel B of Table 5 shows that the frequency of religious attendance is even more strongly related to our two measures of volunteering. The more frequently respondents attended religious services during the year, the higher was their rate of volunteering and the greater variety of volunteering tasks they performed. This is also consistent with findings from other research (e.g., Hall et al., 1998; Hall, McKeown & Roberts, 2001; Hodgkinson, Weitzman, & Kirsch, 1990). Most likely, those with the most frequent religious attendance devote much of their volunteer work to their own congregations and/or perform a variety of volunteer tasks for their congregations. We will be able to examine that possibility once we are able to link the personal affiliation survey responses to the survey responses of Indiana nonprofits.

Volunteering and Family Status

We turn now to the question of whether volunteering also is related to various measures of family and socio-economic status and community attachment – our control variables. We report only relationships that are significant or appear relevant in our multi-variate analysis. As indicated earlier, we have indicators that describe family status in various ways: Age, gender, marital status, presence of children in the household, and race. Of these, only age is significantly related to volunteering, although there are some notable patterns for marital status and presence of children in the household.

Panel A of Table 6 shows the relationship between age of respondent and our two measures

of volunteering (whether respondent volunteer and the diversity of volunteer tasks).[10] As expected, volunteering is most extensive (52 percent) among those aged 45-64, followed closely by those aged 65 or older (46 percent), with younger respondents volunteering at the rates of 35-38 percent ($p<.02$). The Chi-square analysis for age and variety of volunteer work does not reach statistical significance. However, some interesting patterns are suggested. People in the oldest category (aged 65 or older) are about as likely as the most active age category (45-64) to be involved in just one type of volunteer task (32 percent each). However, when it comes to being involved in the greatest diversity of volunteer tasks (3 or more), those aged 20-44 begin to rival the most active age category (9 and 10 percent respectively), with the very youngest and oldest categories engaged at about half that rate.

<<Table 6 about here>>

Panel C of Table 6 shows the distribution between marital status and our two measures of volunteering. Although the relationships do not reach statistical significance, those who are married are almost twice as likely to volunteer (48 percent) as are those living with a partner, but not married (26 percent). The table also shows that those who are married are about twice as likely (11 percent) to be involved in two types of tasks as are those in other marital status categories (3-6 percent), but they are rivaled by those never married when it comes to three tasks or more (10 percent each).

There is no relationship between the two measures of volunteering and gender (Panel B) or race (Panel E). However, presence of children in the household has a relationship of borderline significance with the number of volunteer tasks (Panel D). Thus, while there is very little difference between those with and without children in terms of whether they volunteer at all, those with children are twice as likely to perform three or more types of volunteer activities as those without children. In short, it appears that people who are middle-aged and/or married are most likely to volunteer and that those with children in the household seem to be engaged in a broader array of volunteer tasks than those without children.

Volunteering and Socio-Economic Status

We examine three measures of socio-economic status: employment, income, and education.

[10] Hendricks and Cutler (2001) provide a thorough review of literature regarding the effects of age on participation in volunteering.

All three have significant relationships with at least one of the two dependent variables. Panel A of Table 7 shows the relationship between employment status and volunteering and variety of volunteering tasks. While employment is not significantly related to whether people volunteer or not, it is related to the variety of tasks performed ($p < .01$). Those working part-time for pay are about as likely to volunteer as the entire sample, but are more likely to be involved in three or more tasks (22 vs. 8 percent).

<<Table 7 about here>>

Panel B of Table 7 shows the relationship between income and volunteering and variety of volunteer tasks. Those with household income between $30,000 and $40,000 have the lowest rate of volunteering (28 percent), but as household income increases above that level, so does the rate of volunteering. In general, the variety of volunteer tasks performed also increases with income, with almost a fifth of those earning $100,000 or more involved in three or more types of volunteer tasks – more than twice the overall rate and more than three times the rate of the next lower income category.

Finally, the relationships between education and our two measures of volunteering are stronger than those for household income and show more of a monotone relationship. As Panel C of Table 7 shows, the higher the level of education completed, the more likely people are to volunteer and the more likely they also are to be involved in a greater variety of volunteer tasks. Both relationships are highly significant ($p < .001$). Overall, socio-economic status is clearly a major factor in whether people volunteer or not, and in the variety of volunteer tasks they perform. We speculate that age and education may condition the impact of employment status.

Volunteering and Community Attachment

Our final set of control variables measure various forms of community attachment. We consider six variables: length of time in the community, likelihood of remaining there in five years, whether registered to vote, home owner, type of media respondents rely on for local news, and frequency of getting local news. Of these, length of time in the community, likelihood of remaining in the community, home ownership, and type of media for local news are not related to volunteering at the bi-variate level. However, because length of time in the community is important at the multi-variate level we consider it here. Thus Panel A of Table 8 shows that although the

relationship between length of time in the community and our two measures of volunteering are not significant, longer-term residents do tend to be more likely to volunteer. Of course, length of time in the community is related to the age of respondents.

<<Table 8 about here>>

The remaining variables are more clearly important. Panel B of Table 8 shows that registered voters are more than twice as likely to volunteer as those not registered to vote (49 vs. 21 percent) and that this pattern holds regardless of the diversity of volunteer tasks performed. Both of these relationships are significant at the .001 level of better. Similarly, as Panel C of Table 8 shows, people who show interests in their community by seeking out local news on a daily basis are also significantly ($p<.03$) more likely to volunteer (47 percent) than those who obtain local news a few times a week (40 percent) or less frequently (29 percent). Those how obtain local news most frequently may be somewhat more likely to be involved in a greater variety of volunteer tasks, but the relationship fails to meet statistical significance ($p<.11$). Finally, respondents who rely on newspapers for local news are notably more likely to volunteer than those who get their local news from TV (48 vs. 38 percent), although the overall pattern is not significant. In short, people who most engaged in their communication as indicated by being registered to vote and/or frequently obtaining local news are also most likely to volunteer and to engage in a variety of volunteer tasks.

Volunteering: Multivariate Analysis

To examine how well our control and independent variables jointly explain whether people volunteer or not, we performed several logistic regression analyses. We first entered the control variables in three separate blocks (family status, socio-economic status, and community attachment) – constituting models 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Model 4 added our two independent variables (religious preference, religious attendance) to the equation as the fourth block in order to determine the extent to which religion helps explain volunteering independently of the control variables. We also undertook both backward and forward stepwise logistic regression using all predictor variables to determine which combination of variables most efficiently explains participation in volunteering

activities. Table 9 shows the results for each of the models.[11]

<<Table 9 about here>>

The first column in Table 9 shows that model 1, which considers measures of family status only, does significantly ($p<.043$) contribute to explaining whether individuals volunteer or not. However, the improvement in prediction is very slight (only two percentage point, from 56.1 to 58.4 percent). Neither gender nor presence of a child in the household is significant in explaining volunteering, and age and marital status contribute only marginally when all categories are considered.

However, the odds ratios are generally in the expected directions based on the bi-variate analysis presented above. In particular, the two oldest age groups (aged 45-64 and aged 65 and older) are significantly ($p<.05$) more likely to volunteer than other age categories, especially when compared to the youngest age group (by a factor of more than two to one) even when controlling for other family status conditions. In addition, people who are married and as well as those who have never married are marginally more likely to volunteer ($p<.10$) than those who live with a partner.

Model 2 incorporates both family status and socio-economic status control variables. As the last rows in Table 9 show, the addition of variables measuring race, employment status, income, and education significantly increases the odds of predicting volunteering – by almost 6 percentage points from 58.4 percent when controlling for family status to 64.1 percent when controlling also for socio-economic status. However, none of the family status variables remain significant by themselves, although the age category of 45-64 appears to be borderline more likely to volunteer than those in the youngest age category.

Among the socio-economic status variables only education is significant, although all odds ratio are generally in the expected direction. Thus the odds of volunteering improve notably for the two best educated groups: those who are college graduates or have some college education – they are respectively four and three times as likely to volunteer as those without a High School diploma, even when controlling for other family and socio-economic characteristics.

[11] In other analysis (not presented here) we used dummy variables to capture key dimensions of particular control and independent variables, rather than the full set of categories. The results are generally consistent with the data presented in Table 9.

Adding our third block, the community attachment variables, to the prediction equation significantly improves ($p<.000$) our ability to correctly predict volunteering to 67.7 percent, up from 64.1 percent when incorporating only family and socio-economic status. Of the six community attachment variables, only voter registration contributes significantly to the prediction equation, increasing the odds of volunteering 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, we note some expected patterns: The odds of volunteering appears to increase slightly with the number of years in the community, relying on newspapers or the radio for local news, and obtaining local news more than once a week.

However, once controlling for other factors, it appears that owning a home may be associated with lower probability of volunteering ($p<.10$), not more as we had hypothesized. The pattern for likelihood to remain in the community for five years is also opposite of what we had expected, but the effects are not significant. 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.

The addition of our fourth block: religious preference and attendance, once again significantly ($p<.000$) increases our ability to correctly predict volunteering, by a notable five percentage points, from 67.7 percent in Model 3 to 71.7 percent in Model 4. The addition of these two variables has no discernable effect on the odds ratios associated with any of the family status, socio-economic status, or community attachment variables; education and voter registration remain the only two significant control variables.

Religious preference is marginally significant ($p<.10$), mainly reflecting the relatively high odds ratio of 2.6 ($p<. 08$) for protestants and 2.3 ($p<.12$) for other Christians, compared to those with no religious preference. This is again consistent with the bi-variate analyses described above. Religious attendance contributes significantly ($p<.000$) to explaining volunteering, but entirely because of the extra-ordinary high odds of volunteering for those who attend religious services several times a week, especially when compared to those who rarely or never attend religious services (by a factor of five to one).

We 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) stops after step 3 with just three predictor variables: Education, voter registration, and religious attendance. These three variables jointly increase the accuracy of predicting volunteering from 56.1 percent (using no equation, just the overall marginal distribution) to 68.8 percent – or by almost 13 percentage points. The backward stepwise regression (Model 6, last column in Table 9) stops after 14 steps with the same three variables remaining in the equation (education, voter registration, and religious preference).

We note that the forward and backward stepwise logistic regressions produce virtually identical results and that both also resemble our Model 4 in which all control and independent variables are included. There are minor differences in the accuracy of the prediction equations, but the same variables are significant and with roughly the same expected odds-ratios: education, voter registration, religious attendance, and perhaps religious preference. We are currently exploring multivariate analysis of the variety of volunteering tasks. Preliminary findings suggest that the patterns are very similar to those reported here, however, the relatively few individuals who engage in two or more types of volunteer tasks complicates the analysis.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Our findings show that our four measures of family status, but primarily age and marital status, help predict volunteering when considered as a group by themselves, although only marginally. However, these effects largely disappear once controls are introduced for indicators of socio-economic status, especially education. Adding measures of community attachments, especially whether respondents are registered to vote, increases our ability to predict volunteering by a significant, but small amount. Most importantly, religious attendance contributes significantly to predicting volunteering, above and beyond the impact of family status, socio-economic status, and community attachment. Religious preference may have a marginal impact as well. In the final analysis, having completed college, being registered to vote, frequently attending religious services, and perhaps being protestant or other Christian significantly increases the odds of volunteering, all other factors controlled.

These findings confirm the conclusions of Guterbock & Fries (1997) and the Saguaro Seminar (2001) that there are two fairly independent routes by which people become engaged in their community: through their socio-economic status (primarily educational achievement) and

through involvement in their church. We cannot tell from our analysis whether educated people are more likely to volunteer because they are more interested in doing so than those with lower levels of education, whether they have more flexible time schedules that allows them to volunteer, whether they are more in demand by nonprofits, or whether they are able to obtain more interesting or rewarding volunteer assignments because of the range of skills they may possess. Possibly all of these factors operate. We will explore some of these issues when we consider different types of volunteer work in a future paper.

Similarly, we cannot from the analysis presented here determine the extent to which the strong relationship between religious attendance and volunteering reflects volunteering for the congregation itself. Other research suggests that this may be at least part of the explanation (Hendricks &. Cutler, 2001), but the relationship may vary from denomination to denomination (Wood, 1990; Clydesdale, 1990; May, 1990; Wilson & Janoski, 2000). We hope to examine this issue in greater detail once we have information on the organizations for which people perform different types of volunteer work. Current attention to Charitable Choice and the related policy debates about how effective and efficient congregations may be in providing human services, highlights the importance of addressing these questions.

We hesitate to consider voter registration to be a third route into volunteering because both behaviors may reflect underlying commitments to civic engagement. Nor does there seem to be any direct or obvious route by which registering to vote by itself would lead people to become volunteers. Nevertheless, our findings do suggest that nonprofits looking for volunteers might do well to peruse the voter registration lists.

In future papers, we will report on the multi-variate determinants of whether volunteers are specialists or generalists in the type of volunteer work they do and of the specific types of volunteer work they perform, e.g., fund-raising, religious services, leadership, or direct services. We will also explore the determinants of participation in meetings or events, both overall and by type of association. Finally, we plan to examine the relationship between the characteristics of individuals and of the organizations with which they are engaged. For example, can we predict which types of individuals are more likely to be engaged with congregations that aware of and/or interested in exploring charitable choice? Or that are engaged with diverse rather than similar nonprofits, large rather than smaller ones, those that depend more rather than less on volunteers or donations?

REFERENCES

Becker, Penny E. & Pawan, H. D. 2001. "Religious Involvement and Volunteering: Implications for Civil Society." Sociology of Religion, 63 (Aug), 315.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1985. "The Forms of Capital." In Richardson, J. G. (ed.) Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York: Greenwood.

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.

Chaves, Mark. 1999. "Religious Congregations and Welfare Reform: Who will Take Advantage of Charitable Choice"? American Sociological Review, 64, 836-46.

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 Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital," American Journal of Sociology 94 (Supplement): s95-s120.

_____. 1990. Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Greeley, Andrew. 1997. "Coleman Revisited." American Behavioral Scientist, 40: 587-595.

Grønbjerg, Kirsten A. "Evaluating Nonprofit Databases" American Behavioral Scientist 45 (11, July): 1742-78.

Grønbjerg, Kirsten A. & Nelson, Sheila. 1998. "Mapping Small Religious Nonprofit Organizations: An Illinois Profile." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 27 (No. 1, March): 13-31.

Grønbjerg, Kirsten A. & Salamon, Lester M. 2002. "Devolution, Privatization and the Changing Shape of Government-Nonprofit Relations." In Lester M. Salamon (Ed.), The State of the Nonprofit Sector. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

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.

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.

Hall, Peter. 1987. "A Historical Overview of the Private Nonprofit Sector." In Powell, Walter (ed.) The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hammack, David C. (Ed.). 1998. Making the Nonprofit Sector in the U.S.: A Reader. Bloomington, In: Indiana University Press.

Herzog, A R., J. House, & J. Morgan. 1991. "Relation of Work and Retirement to Health and Wellbeing." Psychology of Aging, 6: 202-211.

Heyring, Charles H. 1997. "Civic Elites and Corporate Delocalization: An Alternative Explanation for Declining Civic Engagement." American Behavioral Scientist, 40 (5): 657-68.

Independent Sector, 1999. Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector. www.independentsector.org/GandV/default.html.

Jeavons, Thomas H. 1998. "Identifying Characteristics of 'Religious Organizations': An Exploratory Proposal." Pp 79- 95 in N.J. Demerath III, Peter Dobkin Hall, Terry Schmitt, & Rhys H. Williams (eds.), Sacred Communities: Organizational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organizations. New York: Oxford University Press.

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, Aren L.; Marsden, Peter V.; Aldrich, Howard E.; & Cassell, James W. 1990. "Comparing Organizational Sampling Frames." Administrative Science Quarterly, 35 (4, December), 658-88.

Kaufman, Jason. 1999. "Three Views of Associationalism in 19th-Centery America: An Empirical Examination." American Journal of Sociology, 104 (5, March), 1296-345.

Kennedy, Sheila Suess & Bielefeld, Wolfgang. 2002. "Government Shekels without Government Shackles? The Administrative Challenges of Charitable Choice." Public Administration Review 62 (1): 4-11.

Kennedy, Sheila Suess. 2001. "Constitutional Competence of Nonprofit Managers." Paper presented at the 2001 Annual Meetings of ARNOVA. Miami, Fl.: November 28 – December 1.

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: Dualilty 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.

O'Neill, Michael & Roberts, Willliam. 1999. "Giving and Volunteering in California." Paper presented at ARNOVA conference, Washington, D.C., November 4-6.

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.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." Annual Review of Sociology, 24(1): 1-24.

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.

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.

Rooney, Patrick; Steinberg, Kathryn S.; & Schervish, Paul. 2001. "A Methodological Comparison of Giving Surveys: Indiana as a Test Case." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 30 (3, Sept), 551-568.

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.

Lester M. Salamon (Ed.). 2002. The State of the Nonprofit Sector. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

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.

Weitzman, Murray S; Jalandoni, Nadine T.; Lampkin, Linda M.; Pollak, Thomas H. 2002. The New Nonprofit Almanac and Desk Reference: The Essential Facts and figures for Managers, Researchers, and Volunteers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

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.

TABLE 1: VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

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

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: * Includes nonprofits located outside of Indiana.

TABLE 2: 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 Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project

Table 3: 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 Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project

TABLE 4: FREQUENCY OF RELIGIOUS ATTENDANCE BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

	Frequency (percent) by Religious Preference			
Religious Attendance	Catholic	Protestant	Other Christian	Other Preference
More than once a week	18.9	14.5	20.6	4.8
Once a week	32.6	29.0	15.4	19.0
2-3 times a month	10.5	10.9	13.2	19.0
Once a month	15.8	6.7	14.0	9.5
Less than once a month	13.7	20.2	25.7	29.6
Never	8.4	18.7	11.0	19.0
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Number of cases	95	193	138	42

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project

TABLE 5: VOLUNTEERING BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE/ATTENDANCE
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

	% Volunteer			Variety of Volunteer Work (percent)				
Independent Variables	Yes	No	Total	None	1 type	2 types	3+ types	Total
A. Religious Preference								
Protestant (n=193)	51.3	48.7	100.0	48.7	32.1	10.4	8.8	100.0
Other Christian (n=136)	47.8	52.2	100.0	52.2	30.9	6.6	10.3	100.0
Catholic (n=95)	37.9	62.1	100.0	62.1	24.2	9.5	4.2	100.0
Other Preference (n=42)	33.3	66.7	100.0	66.7	19.0	7.1	7.1	100.0
None (n=53)	20.8	79.2	100.0	79.2	17.0	--	3.8	100.0
Overall (n=519)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.7**	**7.9**	**7.1**	**100.0**
Significance level			**p<.01**					p<.02
B. Religious Attendance								
More than once a week (n=78)	72.4	27.6	100.0	27.6	42.1	13.2	17.1	100.0
Once a week (n=116)	52.6	47.4	100.0	47.4	30.2	10.3	12.1	100.0
2-3 times a month (n=57)	43.9	56.1	100.0	56.1	28.1	5.3	10.5	100.0
Once a month (n=51)	37.3	62.7	100.0	62.7	27.5	9.8	--	100.0
Less than once a month (n=99)	33.3	66.7	100.0	66.7	27.3	3.0	3.0	100.0
Never (n=67)	31.3	68.7	100.0	68.7	16.4	11.9	3.0	100.0
Overall (n=466)	**45.9**	**54.1**	**100.0**	**54.1**	**29.0**	**8.8**	**8.2**	**100.0**
			p<.001					**p<.001**

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for *coefficients* in italics.

TABLE 6: VOLUNTEERING BY AGE AND MARITAL STATUS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

Control Variables: Family Status	% Volunteer			Variety of Volunteer Work (percent)				
	Yes	No	Total	None	1 type	2 types	3+ types	Total
A. Age								
18-29 years old (n=94)	35.1	64.9	100.0	64.9	25.5	5.3	4.3	100.0
30-44 years old (n=167)	38.3	61.7	100.0	61.7	22.8	6.6	9.0	100.0
45-64 years old (n= 166)	52.4	47.6	100.0	47.6	31.9	10.8	9.6	100.0
65 or more years old (n=93)	46.2	53.8	100.0	53.8	32.3	8.6	5.4	100.0
Overall (n=520)	**43.7**	**56.3**	**100.0**	**56.3**	**27.9**	**6.1**	**7.7**	**100.0**
			p<.02					p<.12
B. Gender								
Male (n=233)	42.5	57.5	100.0	57.5	29.2	5.2	8.2	100.0
Female (n=293)	44.0	56.0	100.0	56.0	26.6	10.2	7.2	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.8**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			ns					ns
C. Marital Status								
Married (n=262)	48.1	51.9	100.0	51.9	27.9	10.7	9.5	100.0
Living with partner (n=31)	25.8	74.2	100.0	74.2	19.4	3.2	3.2	100.0
Widowed (n=63)	41.3	58.7	100.0	58.7	33.3	6.3	1.6	100.0
Separate or divorced (n=90)	37.8	62.2	100.0	62.2	26.7	5.6	5.6	100.0
Never Married (n=77)	44.2	55.8	100.0	55.8	28.6	5.2	10.4	100.0
Overall (n=523)	**43.6**	**54.1**	**100.0**	**54.1**	**27.9**	**8.0**	**8.2**	**100.0**
			p<.11					p<.21
D. Child(ren) in Household								
No (n=314)	44.6	55.4	100.0	55.4	30.9	8.0	5.7	100.0
Yes (n=212)	41.5	58.5	100.0	58.5	23.1	8.0	10.4	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.8**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			ns					*p<.087*
E. Race								
Non-white (n=33)	45.5	54.5	100.0	54.5	27.3	6.1	12.1	100.0
White (n=493)	43.2	56.8	100.0	56.8	27.8	8.1	7.3	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.8**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			ns					ns

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for *coefficients* in italics.

TABLE 7: VOLUNTEERING BY INCOME, EDUCATION, AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

Control Variables: Socio-Economic Status	% Volunteer			Variety of Volunteer Work (percent)				
	Yes	No	Total	None	1 type	2 types	3+ types	Total
A. Employment Status								
Full-time for pay (n=295)	43.7	54.3	100.0	56.3	30.2	8.1	5.4	100.0
Part-time for pay (n=36)	38.9	61.1	100.0	61.1	11.1	5.6	22.2	100.0
Retired (n=96)	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	35.4	9.4	5.2	100.0
All other (n=99)	37.4	62.5	100.0	62.6	19.2	7.1	11.1	100.0
Overall (n=526)	43.3	**56.7**	**100.0**	56.7	27.8	8.0	7.6	**100.0**
			p<.48					**p<.01**
B. Household Income								
$19,999 or less (n=73)	39.1	60.9	100.0	67.1	20.5	8.2	4.1	100.0
$20,000-$29,999 (n= 59)	42.4	57.6	100.0	57.6	25.4	6.8	10.2	100.0
$30,000-$39,999 (n= 67)	28.4	71.6	100.0	71.6	16.4	6.0	6.0	100.0
$40,000-$49,999 (n= 72)	40.3	59.7	100.0	59.7	23.6	8.3	8.3	100.0
$50,000-$74,999 (n= 114)	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	33.3	7.9	8.8	100.0
$75,000-$99,999 (n= 65)	56.9	43.1	100.0	43.1	41.5	10.8	4.6	100.0
$100,000 or more (n= 33)	56.3	43.8	100.0	42.4	24.2	15.2	18.2	100.0
Overall (n=483)	**43.5**	**56.5**	**100.0**	56.5	27.1	8.5	7.9	**100.0**
			p<.02					p<.04
C. Education Completed								
Less than High School (n=48)	25.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	14.8	6.3	4.2	100.0
High School graduate (n=197)	34.0	66.0	100.0	66.0	25.4	5.1	3.6	100.0
Some college (n=116)	48.3	51.7	100.0	51.7	31.0	9.5	7.8	100.0
College graduate (n=165)	56.4	43.6	100.0	43.6	32.1	10.9	13.3	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.9**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			p<.00					**p<.00**

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for *coefficients* in italics.

TABLE 8: VOLUNTEERING BY COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

Control Variables: Community Attachment	% Volunteer			Variety of Volunteer Work (percent)				
	Yes	No	Total	None	1 type	2 types	3+ types	Total
A. Length in Community								
5 years of less (n=100)	35.0	65.0	100.0	65.0	22.0	6.0	7.0	100.0
6-15 years (n=110)	41.8	58.2	100.0	58.2	27.3	8.2	6.4	100.0
16-30 years (n=133)	44.4	55.9	100.0	55.9	24.8	12.0	7.5	100.0
31 years or more (n=183)	48.1	51.9	100.0	51.9	33.3	6.0	8.7	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.8**	**8.0**	**7.9**	**100.0**
			ns					ns
B. Registered to Vote								
Yes (n=425)	48.7	51.3	100.0	51.3	31.1	8.9	8.7	100.0
No (n=101)	20.8	79.2	100.0	79.2	13.9	4.0	3.0	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.9**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			p<.00					**p<.00**
C. Homeowner								
Rent/other (n=143)	39.2	60.8	100.0	60.8	24.5	6.3	8.4	100.0
Own (n=383)	44.9	55.1	100.0	55.1	29.0	8.6	7.3	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.8**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			ns					ns
C. Frequency of Local News								
Every day (n=355)	46.8	53.2	100.0	53.2	30.4	9.0	7.3	100.0
A few times a week (n=113)	39.8	60.2	100.0	60.2	22.1	7.1	10.6	100.0
Once a week or less (n=58)	29.3	70.7	100.0	70.7	22.4	3.4	3.4	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.8**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			p<.03					p<.11
D. Local News: Source								
TV (n=130)	37.7	62.3	100.0	62.3	25.4	6.9	5.4	100.0
Radio (n=58)	44.8	55.2	100.0	55.2	27.6	10.3	6.9	100.0
Newspapers (n=244)	48.0	52.0	100.0	52.0	30.7	7.8	9.4	100.0
Talking to people (n=76)	40.8	59.2	100.0	59.2	30.7	7.8	9.4	100.0
Other (n=18)	27.8	72.2	100.0	72.2	22.2	5.6	--	100.0
Overall (n=526)	**43.3**	**56.7**	**100.0**	**56.7**	**27.9**	**8.0**	**7.6**	**100.0**
			ns					ns

Source: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for *coefficients* in italics.

TABLE 9: LOGISTIC REGRESSION ON VOLUNTEERING
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001
(full set of categories for all variables)

Predictor variables	Expected Odds Ratios					
	Model 1 Family Status Controls	Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls	Model 3 All Controls	Model 4 Controls and Independ. Variables	Model 5 Full Forward Stepwise (Step 3)	Model 6 Full Backward Stepwise (Step 14)
1. Family Status						
Age (reference: aged 18-29)	*p<.051*	ns	ns	ns		
Aged 30-44	1.382	1.343	1.411	1.399		
Aged 45-64	2.296	*1.917*	1.856	1.516		
Aged 65+	2.461	2.180	1.853	1.097		
Female (reference: male)	.954	.998	1.037	1.049		
Marital status (reference: living w/ partner)	p<.049	ns	ns	ns		
Married	*2.255*	1.963	1.634	1.373		
Widowed	1.157	1.208	.967	1.050		
Separated/Divorced	1.300	1.144	.906	.922		
Never married	*2.335*	1.828	1.364	1.121		
Child in household (reference: none)	1.070	1.034	1.122	.952		
White (reference: nonwhite)	.749	.545	.539	.616		
2. Socio-economic Status						
Employment status (reference: other)		ns	ns	ns		
Full-time		1.258	1.223	1.430		
Part-time		.717	.705	.845		
Retired		1.955	1.976	1.972		
Household income (reference: LT $20,000)		ns	ns	ns		
$20,000-$29,999		1.248	1.197	1.060		
$30,000-$39,999		.676	.723	.764		
$40,000-$49,999		1.095	1.036	.874		
$50,000-$74,999		1.342	1.458	1.453		
$75,000-$99,999		1.611	1.712	1.815		
$100,000 or more		1.358	1.196	1.642		
Education (reference: not HS graduate)		**p<.000**	**p<.001**	**p<.003**	**p<.000**	**p<.000**
HS grad		1.638	1.734	1.745	1.643	1.727
Some college		2.975	3.013	3.207	**3.311**	**3.147**
College grad		**4.145**	**4.412**	**4.339**	**4.335**	**4.024**
3. Community Attachment						
Years in Community (reference: LT 6 yrs)			ns	ns		
6-15 years			1.108	1.160		
16-30 years			1.420	1.523		
31+ years			1.418	1.472		
Likely to stay in (reference: unlikely)			ns	ns		
Very likely to stay 5 years			.835	.657		
Somewhat likely to stay 5 years			.718	.616		
Registered to vote			**2.231**	2.211	**2.564**	**2.559**
Own home			*.624*	.645		

TABLE 9: LOGISTIC REGRESSION ON VOLUNTEERING
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001
(full set of categories for all variables)

Predictor variables	Expected Odds Ratios					
	Model 1 Family Status Controls	Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls	Model 3 All Controls	Model 4 Controls and Independ. Variables	Model 5 Full Forward Stepwise (Step 3)	Model 6 Full Backward Stepwise (Step 14)
3. Community Attachment (continued)						
Source of local news (reference: other)			ns	ns		
TV			.836	.750		
Radio			1.331	1.276		
Newspapers			1.341	1.113		
How often local news (reference: weekly)			ns	ns		
Every day			*1.911*	1.877		
Few times week			1.751	1.662		
4. Religion						
Religious preference (reference: none)				*p<..100*		
Catholic)				1.297		
Protestant				*2.609*		
Other Christian				2.321		
Other preference				1.812		
Religious attendance (reference: never)				**p<.000**	**p<.000**	**p<.000**
Less than once a month				.883	.850	1.205
Monthly				.860	.898	1.273
2-3 times month				.919	.955	1.361
Weekly				1.610	1.635	**2.317**
2-3 times week				**4.998**	**4.763**	**6.682**
No religious preference				--	.454	
Constant	*.334*	.154	**.061**	**.033**	**.112**	**0.084**
Chi-square test of efficiency – Block added	18.797	**36.355**	21.532	**38.786**		
Degrees of significance	10	12	12	8		
Significance level	p<.043	**p<.000**	p<.043	**p<.000**		
Chi-square test of efficiency – Full Model	18.797	**55.152**	**76.684**	**115.469**	**83.239**	**80.193**
Degrees of significance	10	22	34	43	10	9
Significance level	p<.043	**p<.000**	**p<.000**	**p<.000**	**p<.000**	**p<.000**
Percent predicted correctly (base=56.1%)	58.4	64.1	67.7	71.7	68.8	68.1

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for *coefficients* in italics.

TABLE 10: NOMINAL REGRESSION ON VARIETY OF VOLUNTEER TASKS
INDIANA RESIDENTS, MAY 2001

Variables or statistical terms	dof	Model 1 Family Status Controls Sign level	Model 1 Family Status Controls Chi-square	Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls Sign level	Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls Chi-square	Model 3 All Controls Sign level	Model 3 All Controls **Chi-square**	Model 4 Controls & Independent Variables Sign level	Model 4 Controls & Independent Variables Chi-square
Intercept	0	.	0.000	.	0.000	.	0.000		0.000
Family status									
Age	6	*0.058*	*12.183*	0.338	6.813	0.128	9.930	0.144	9.571
Gender	2	0.316	2.301	0.745	0.590	0.892	0.229	0.946	0.110
Marital status	8	0.046	15.772	0.167	11.665	0.181	11.390	0.694	5.579
Child in HH	2	0.245	2.813	0.734	0.619	0.651	0.859	0.562	1.153
White race	2	0.741	0.599	0.309	2.347	0.260	2.692	0.540	1.234
Socio-econ status									
Employ status	6			*0.088*	*11.003*	*0.092*	*10.897*	*0.087*	*11.039*
HH Income	12			0.400	12.584	0.497	11.372	0.404	12.536
Education	6			**0.001**	**23.450**	**0.000**	**24.319**	**0.003**	**19.797**
Comm. attachment									
Length in area	6					0.144	9.562	*0.075*	*11.458*
Likely to stay	4					0.155	6.667	0.142	6.891
Regist. voter	2					0.022	7.650	0.043	6.309
Own home	2					0.166	3.591	*0.093*	*4.745*
Freq. of News	6					0.722	3.666	0.767	3.324
News source	4					0.326	4.643	0.365	4.313
Religious status									
Relig. Prefer.	6							0.447	5.787
Relig. Attend.	10							**0.000**	**35.321**
Final Model		0.024	34.375	**0.000**	**86..942**	**0.000**	**124.159**	**0.000**	**173.017**
degrees of freedom			20		44		68		

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project
Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for coefficients in *italics*.

Table 11: Significant Odds ratios for performing One, two or more volunteer tasks

Indiana Residents, May 2001

	NOMINAL REGRESSION: SELECTED (SIGNIFICANT) ODDS RATIOS BY NUMBER OF VOLUNTEER TASKS							
	Model 1 Family Status Controls		Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls		Model 3 All Controls		Model 4 Controls & Independent Variables	
Significant Predictors in Final Models	1 Task (1)	2+ Tasks (2)	1 Task (3)	2+ Tasks (4)	1 Task (5)	2+ Tasks (6)	1 Task (7)	2+ Tasks (8)
1. Family Status								
Age (refer: aged 18-29)	ns	ns	ns	*2.217*	ns	3.511	ns	3.881
Aged 30-44	ns	ns	ns	*2.217*	ns	3.511	ns	3.881
Aged 45-65	*1.841*	**4.124**	ns	3.279	ns	4.136	ns	*3.167*
Aged 65+	ns	3.939	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Marital (ref: live w/ partner)								
Married or Widowed	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Separated/Divorced	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Never married	ns	*4.285*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
2. Socio-economic Status								
Employment (refer: other)								
Full-time			ns	ns	ns	ns	2.192	ns
Part-time			ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Retired			2.937	ns	*2.552*	ns	ns	ns
Income (refer: LT $20,000)								
$20-$29,999 or $30-$39,000			ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
$40-$49,999 or $50,000-$74,999			ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
$75,000-$99,999			*2.384*	ns	*2.551*	ns	ns	ns
$100,000 or higher			ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Educ. (refer: not HS graduate)								
HS grad			ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Some college			3.390	*2.746*	3.403	*3.305*	3.280	*3.272*
College grad			**3.966**	**4.807**	**4.210**	**6.116**	3.924	**5.805**

Table 11: Significant Odds ratios for performing One, two or more volunteer tasks

Indiana Residents, May 2001

	NOMINAL REGRESSION: SELECTED (SIGNIFICANT) ODDS RATIOS BY NUMBER OF VOLUNTEER TASKS							
	Model 1 Family Status Controls		Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls		Model 3 All Controls		Model 4 Controls & Independent Variables	
Significant Predictors in Final Models	1 Task (1)	2+ Tasks (2)	1 Task (3)	2+ Tasks (4)	1 Task (5)	2+ Tasks (6)	1 Task (7)	2+ Tasks (8)
3. Community Attachment								
Years in Area (refer: 5 or less)								
6-15 years or 16-30 yrs					ns	ns	ns	ns
31 years or more					ns	ns	*1.996*	ns
3. Community Attachment (cont.)								
Likely to stay (refer: unlikely)								
Very likely to stay 5 yrs					ns	ns	*0.463*	ns
Somewhat likely to stay 5 yrs					ns	ns	ns	ns
Registered to vote					2.014	2.724	1.997	*2.652*
Homeowner					ns	*0.471*	ns	0.389
Freq. of news (ref: weekly)								
Every day					ns	ns	ns	*3.234*
Few times week					ns	*2.928*	ns	ns
4. Religion								
Religious Prefer. (refer: none)								
Catholic							ns	*5.494*
Protestant							ns	10.541
Other Christian							ns	9.056
Other Religion							ns	*6.151*
Religious Attend. (refer: never)								
Less than once a month							ns	*0.290*
Monthly, 2-3 times month or wkly							ns	ns
2-3 times week							**6.569**	3.782

SOURCE: Personal Affiliation Survey, Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions Project

Table 11: Significant Odds ratios for performing One, two or more volunteer tasks

Indiana Residents, May 2001

	NOMINAL REGRESSION: SELECTED (SIGNIFICANT) ODDS RATIOS BY NUMBER OF VOLUNTEER TASKS							
	Model 1 Family Status Controls		Model 2 Family & SES Status Controls		Model 3 All Controls		Model 4 Controls & Independent Variables	
Significant Predictors in Final Models	1 Task (1)	2+ Tasks (2)	1 Task (3)	2+ Tasks (4)	1 Task (5)	2+ Tasks (6)	1 Task (7)	2+ Tasks (8)

Note: p<.01 for coefficients in bold; p <.05 for underlined coefficients; p<.10 for coefficients in *italics*. Gender, child in household, race, and source of news are not significant for either of the two categories of volunteer intensity and are therefore excluded from the table. For variables where two or more adjacent categories are not significant for any level of volunteer intensity, the categories have been combined and are noted as such.

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%	**-2.26**	p<.05
Hispanic	1.5%	3.1%	**-2.11**	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%	**2.40**	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.
Source: www.ibrc.indiana.edu (7/20/02).
* The difference in percentages for household income using the combined category of $75,000-$149,999 is not significant.