

ABSTRACT

HOLSOPPLE, ELIZABETH HATCH. *The Gift of Time: The Impact of Political and Human Nature Perspectives on the Decision to Volunteer.* (Under the direction of Andrew J. Taylor.)

This study examines the relationship between a person's volunteer activity and their attitude toward government involvement in social programs, feelings of efficacy in the political system and interest in politics in general. The connection between political views and volunteering is an important one to consider when evaluating public outcry against government intrusion into what some claim is a community's prerogative to take care of their own. Does the outcry emanate from citizens who shoulder responsibility for communal problems and involve themselves in its activities and needs?

In addition, the analysis tests part of Robert Putnam's Social Capital Theory by evaluating its role in determining who volunteers in America. It seeks to prove that an individual's positive feelings of trust, helping behavior and fairness in others are a motivating force behind his or her decision to volunteer. Finally, the study attempts to confirm that those who read the newspaper *more* and watch television *less* are more apt to give time back to their communities.

Survey data from the 1996 General Social Survey was used to create an index measurement of the dependent volunteering variable. Next, indexes were created to gauge both a person's feeling of efficacy within the political system and their attitude towards government's role in supporting social programs. When tested against the dependent variable, survey respondents' views regarding personal efficacy within the

political system, faith in American democracy in general, and support for government responsibility in multiple social areas did not play a significant role in determining whether or not a person volunteered. Supporting existing literature, however, interest in politics in general did have a positive and significant relationship to volunteering.

The same volunteer index was tested against various factors that were considered to approximate aspects of Putnam's theory. Time spent watching television did not have an impact on the level of volunteering among respondents to the survey. Similarly, frequency of reading the newspaper did not increase one's propensity to volunteer, despite the findings of Putnam which positively associated news reading with stronger levels of social trust and group membership. The variable asking respondents whether people are helpful most of the time, versus people look out for themselves, did not have a significant effect on the dependent variable. However, an individual's opinion that it is important to teach children to help others yielded the strongest positive standardized coefficient within its particular model than all other independent variables tested in the analysis. Finally, the feeling that people are fair and can be trusted had a small, yet significant, effect on the volunteer variable. In keeping with Putnam's argument, trust makes volunteering more likely, and that increased involvement in one's community – in theory – could encourage an even greater level of community efficacy and trust.

**THE GIFT OF TIME:
THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL AND HUMAN NATURE PERSPECTIVES
ON THE DECISION TO VOLUNTEER**

by
ELIZABETH HATCH HOLSOPPLE

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Arts

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Raleigh

2001

APPROVED BY:

Chair of Advisory Committee

BIOGRAPHY

Elizabeth Hatch Holsopple is a native of Chapel Hill, North Carolina. She received her degree of Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Guilford College in Greensboro, North Carolina. She currently resides in Raleigh, North Carolina.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY	6
VOLUNTEERS AND THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR	8
WHAT DO WE VOLUNTEER FOR?	9
MEASUREMENT PROBLEMS	10
WHO VOLUNTEERS?	12
DEMOGRAPHIC TRAITS	12
RELIGION	16
BELIEF SYSTEMS, PERSONALITY TRAITS AND LIFE EXPERIENCE	18
AN INTEGRATED THEORY	20
WHY DO PEOPLE VOLUNTEER?.....	21
DISINCENTIVES TO VOLUNTEERING	23
GOALS OF THIS STUDY	24
HYPOTHESIS ONE.....	25
HYPOTHESIS TWO.....	26
DATA AND METHODS	26
DEPENDENT VARIABLE.....	26
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	28
CONTROL VARIABLES	32
FINDINGS	32
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	41
REFERENCES	46

LIST OF TABLES

1. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN VOLUNTEERS.....	14
2. BELIEFS OF VOLUNTEERS.....	19
3. EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT FAITH INDEX ON VOLUNTEER RATES	33
4. EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT ROLE INDEX ON VOLUNTEER RATES.....	33
5. EFFECT OF POLITICAL INTEREST ON VOLUNTEER RATES.....	34
6. EFFECT OF NEWSPAPER READERSHIP AND TELEVISION VIEWERSHIP ON VOLUNTEER RATES.....	37
7. EFFECT OF FEELING THAT PEOPLE ARE HELPFUL ON VOLUNTEER RATES	37
8. EFFECT OF FEELING THAT PEOPLE ARE FAIR ON VOLUNTEER RATES	38
9. EFFECT OF FEELING THAT PEOPLE CAN BE TRUSTED ON VOLUNTEER RATES.....	38
10. EFFECT OF FEELING THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO TEACH CHILDREN TO HELP OTHERS ON VOLUNTEER RATES	39

INTRODUCTION

In a speech to the National Press Club in February 1995, former Senator Bill Bradley spoke of society as a three-legged stool – the three legs being government, corporate America and the civic sector. Bradley expressed concern that the civic sector had weakened, causing a societal imbalance (Bradley speech referenced in Moseley, 1995). Civic society is where we live with our families, where we play sports, view art and go to church, coffee shops, neighborhood parks and Junior Leagues. Incorporated within the civic sector are charitable or nonprofit organizations – the “independent sector” – and this area of American society needs the support and involvement of citizens to stay alive and healthy. And part of that involvement means giving one’s time freely and generously. It is in this context that the importance of survey research comes into play: Is, as Bradley suspects, American society today different from Alexis de Tocqueville’s vision of a nation of “joiners” and, if so, can democracy survive?

Many writers agree that society’s progress in such areas as education, child welfare, urban poverty, unemployment, crime and healthcare depends on strong social networks and simple human contact (Loewenstein, Thompson and Bazerman, 1989; Maxwell and Oliver, 1993; Murnighan, Kim and Metzger, 1993; Putnam, 2000). Frank Baumgartner and Jack Walker write, “As Americans become more active in groups, even ostensibly nonpolitical ones such as charities or sports leagues, they become more attuned to the impact of governmental activities and are drawn into public life. Greater activity in groups leads to more political activities and discussion within groups, and this, in turn, leads to greater political participation even outside the group system” (1988:924).

In his espousal of Social Capital Theory, Robert Putnam writes, “Social ties, including friendship networks and organizational memberships, supply information, foster trust, make contacts, provide support, set guidelines, and create obligations. They make volunteer work more likely by fostering norms of generalized reciprocity, encouraging people to trust each other, and amplifying reputations (1995:67).” When economic and political decision-making is embedded in dense networks of social interaction that span social cleavages, incentives for opportunism and malfeasance are reduced and future collaboration is encouraged. Putnam distinguishes between “bridging” (or inclusive) and “bonding” (or exclusive) social capital. The former encompasses people across diverse social cleavages, whereas the later encourages inward-looking, homogenous groupings that often inspire strong out-group antagonism (2000:22-3).

Putnam (2000) operationalizes social capital largely by memberships in social organizations, finding that people who join are people who trust, and fears that associational membership has deteriorated since the 1950s. He places the majority of the blame on two factors: the invention of television, in both its drain on free time otherwise spent socially outside the home and its overemphasis on violence that warps reality and damages trust; and on generational change – the replacement of a long civic generation (born between 1910 – 1940) with their less-involved children and grandchildren.

This generational change also helps to explain changes in volunteer rates. If, as his research found, membership in clubs (which are often recruiting pools for volunteers) is decreasing, then why are volunteer rates increasing? Putnam writes that virtually the entire increase is concentrated among people aged sixty and older. This age group votes

more, trusts more, and joins more, and their continued good health and ample free time allows them to volunteer more. On the other hand, volunteering among late baby boomers (in their 30's and 40's in the 1990s) is lower than among people that were the same age in the 1970s. This accounts for the decline in volunteering in areas that are physically demanding, such as volunteer fire departments and blood donation.

Critics of Putnam, however, point to research showing that he is missing a new and different direction in American life that is evolving, not dissolving (Ladd, 1996; Pettinico, 1996; Galston and Levine, 1997). Rather than traditional political clubs and political parties, Americans are becoming more involved in organizations which are oriented towards local and issue-based concerns, and provide more direct social impact (Verba, Schlozman and Brady, 1995; Moseley, 1995). Putnam counters part of this criticism by questioning the legitimacy of counting a contribution to an organization as an equivalent to active membership. Putnam's detractors further argue that, in fact, volunteering has increased across all age cohorts, especially younger ones (Greeley, 1997). Critics also complain that faulty survey methods and problems with data comparison create an illusion of decline in both group memberships and certain measures of volunteering (Baumgartner and Walker, 1988; Hayghe, 1991; Freeman, 1997).

Beyond the data presented regarding individual membership, Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1996) discovered that between 1977 and 1994 the independent sector experienced a higher percentage of growth than either the for-profit business sector or government. But it is important to note that with this expansion came increased government funding of the independent sector as a percentage of its overall revenue, coupled with a decrease in private donations.

Could these trends be considered a barometer for citizens' attitudes and perhaps point to an affinity for trusting the independent sector increasingly more than government? Perhaps civic life, rather than providing guidance for wider political involvement, actually provides a refuge from and an alternative to it. Charles Clark (1996) suggests that one reason for the recent rise in volunteerism is the fact that many Americans who crave civic involvement appear turned off by politics. He points to a 1996 Points of Life Foundation survey of 240 volunteer leaders which found that 76% of respondents viewed the political process as ineffective in helping citizens change their communities. The same percentage felt that volunteers could help make politics better. Further survey evidence shows that people who volunteer and are members of church groups, neighborhood associations, and sports leagues are more likely to follow politics and vote (Gerard, 1985; C. Clark, 1996; Galston and Levine, 1997). It could be that, whereas frustration with the political system is possibly leading to increased local civic involvement, the political system remains a necessary means to desired ends.

Some social and political observers have written that the best way for government to promote volunteerism and the independent sector is to keep government out of social programs. With the increase of the welfare state, big government has crowded out private initiative and subverted civil society, hurting the economy and causing a "disincentive effect" (von Hayek, 1944; Cornuelle, 1965; Olasky, 1992; Payne, 1993; Strange, 1996). Fischer and Schaffer (1993) point to studies that suggest that when government reduces its spending on social welfare, increases in volunteer programs occur. James Payne (1993) writes that the free rider problem is fallacy and simplistic, assuming that everyone is selfish and neglecting the human capacity for generosity. Such writers call for a return

to the days of Tocqueville, when society – not government – addressed common needs, and called for public assistance only when unable to handle problems on its own.

Critics of such theories complain that these anti-statist views do not provide evidence that the same solutions used centuries ago would work today. Nor do they mention the social and economic changes which account for most of the developments they bemoan: i.e., suburbanization which segregates people by economic class, and the excessive individualism that democracy breeds – both providing less incentive and practicality for people taking care of “one’s own” in their community. Citizens, often individually powerless, fail to solve today’s complicated problems cooperatively and instead rely on government to confront difficulties (Meyer, 1969; C. Clark, 1996; Wolpert, 1995). National studies have shown that only a small percentage of those who volunteer do so in “human services,” a broad category that includes aiding the homeless, family counseling and helping the Red Cross. Here it is an inefficient market: most volunteers are not deployed effectively to solve the hardest, most critical problems which require a much larger time commitment and must often be performed one-on-one in low-income neighborhoods (DeParle, 1997; Gerson, 1997). Finally, there are certain areas, such as public school, poverty and healthcare problems, for which charity is ill suited because it is insufficient, particularistic, paternalistic and amateur. It is inadvisable to experiment with human lives to test how a paring back of government would effect the balance (Salaman, 1996).

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

This study seeks to add to the debate by narrowing the focus on the independent sector to volunteerism. It examines the relationship between a person's volunteer activity and their attitude toward government involvement in social programs, feelings of personal efficacy in the political system and interest in politics in general. It is important to consider the connection between political views and volunteerism in order to ascertain which people speak out against government intrusion into what they feel should be a community's prerogative to take care of their own. Are they the people who are practicing what they preach by helping their neighbor? Or do they vent frustration about their lack of personal power within the democratic system, yet stay within the confines of their home in front of their television set rather than becoming an active participant in their community? Is there even a link between politics and volunteering?

Intuitively, it would seem that people who are involved in their community and give their time to the betterment of society would, in turn, be more interested in the political decisions that affect that community. Furthermore, if, as studies suggest, people are disenchanted with the role that government plays in the social sphere and this is leading to an increase in involvement at the local level, then it follows that volunteerism would rise, as volunteering is most often done within one's own community.

Specifically, this study looks at survey data from the 1996 General Social Survey to create a measurement of volunteering per respondent. It uses indexes that are formulated to gauge both a person's feeling of efficacy within the political system and their attitude towards government's role in supporting social programs. These indexes are then tested against the dependent variable – volunteering – in an attempt to prove that

those with less support for the current governmental system are more personally engaged in their communities through volunteer work. Finally, the same volunteer variable is used to confirm that interest in government is an influence on an individual's propensity to volunteer.

In addition, if we are to believe Robert Putnam, associational membership has not shifted but rather decreased overall. This study seeks to test part of his social capital theory on an individual level by evaluating its role in determining who volunteers in America. To paraphrase his theory, communal trust, active involvement of members within the community and high levels of newspaper readership help lead to strong social capital. This study seeks to prove that an individual's positive feelings of trust, helping behavior and fairness in others are a motivating force in his or her decision to volunteer. It further seeks to confirm that those who read the newspaper *more* and watch television *less* are more apt to give time back to their communities. The identical measurement of volunteering used in the above analysis is tested against the various indicators of "individual social capital." Perhaps finding a similar connection between a person's sense of community and belief in mankind and his willingness to act on such feelings could shed further insight on the nature of the volunteer in our society.

First, however, we will examine volunteerism in America by looking at the literature regarding the independent sector in general and the volunteer in particular, in terms of demographic, motivational and other factors. Next, the data and methods to be used for analyzing the various relationships are discussed, and finally the results of the analysis are presented and their significance and implications discussed.

VOLUNTEERS AND THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

The charitable or nonprofit sector accounted for 7% of the U.S. national income in 1990, rising from 5.8% in 1987 and falling to 6.3% in 1994. Between 1977 and 1994, the annual rate of change in national income for all sectors of the economy was 2.2%. Regardless of whether financial values for volunteer time were included, the independent sector experienced a higher percentage of growth during that time period than either the for-profit business sector or government. The subsectors that contributed the most to growth in the independent sector were health services and social/legal services, with the education subsector contributing the least (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996).

Between 1977 and 1992, the composition of the major sources of funding for the independent sector shifted. In 1977, private contributions accounted for 26% and government payments were 18% of funding to the independent sector. However, in 1992, private contributions declined to 18%, while government payments increased to 31%. Private payments, such as dues, fees, and charges, remained largely unchanged (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). A 1995 Independent Sector study found that some 600,000 charitable organizations received 37% of their estimated \$575 billion in expenses from different levels of government.

In 1994, volunteer time provided 36% of total employment to the independent sector, compared with only 9% in government and a negligible amount in private business. Utilization of volunteers in certain subsectors is even more dramatic and obviously provides the lifeblood of those organizations: 71% of total employment in religious organizations, 60% in the arts, and 56% in civic, social and fraternal organizations. Based on 89.2 million Americans (or 47.7% of adults over the age of 18)

volunteering an average of 4.2 hours per week, and assuming that each volunteer hour is worth \$11.58 (the average hourly wage of a nonagricultural worker in 1991), the volunteer input to the economy in 1994 was \$182 billion. (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). Clearly, without volunteering, the U.S. would need a much larger public sector or would lose considerable charitable, cultural and educational activities.

What Do We Volunteer For?

Studies have shown that the majority of volunteer time is given to the independent sector, with roughly a quarter devoted to the public sector, mostly schools, and the remainder to other nonprofit or for-profit organizations such as work-related associations. Volunteers were more likely to work for churches or other religious organizations than for any other kind of organization. For males, the second and third ranking sectors were “civic or political organizations” and “sports or recreational organizations.” For females, the second and third ranking sectors were “schools or other educational institutions” and “hospitals or other health organizations” (Hayghe, 1991; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1988 & 1996). The number of people saying that they had worked on a community project has dropped since 1975, while people saying that they volunteered increased over the same time period. This trend implies that people are becoming more involved in one-on-one volunteering (Putnam, 2000).

Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995) found that a higher proportion of U.S. citizens takes part in non-political than political activities, and that the overall volume of donated time is greater as well. However, among *active* respondents, the volume of time per volunteer is greater for political campaign work (7.5 hours/week) than for charity

(4.5) or church work (3.1). Therefore, although a smaller share of the public takes part in political campaigns, their individual involvement appears to be more intense.

Demographics are an important tool in analyzing the type of group in which an individual volunteers. Miller McPherson and Thomas Rotolo (1996) conducted a study based on the idea that sociodemographic variables define social niches in which voluntary groups grow and decline, share and compete, and change or remain static. There is competition between groups for people in zones of demographic overlap (such as MADD competing with the PTA), and groups that have niches spanning regions of elevated competitive pressure will be affected by the increased difficulty of recruitment and retention, and will experience a shift in its niche. Expanding on this notion, Popielarz and McPherson (1995) found that the remarkable homogeneity of volunteers is in fact a major barrier to social integration that depends on intergroup relations. Organizations compete for the same basic group of people; in fact, organizations lose fastest those members who are atypical of the group. Volunteer organizations should be ideal arenas for social integration, but they are not and in fact *inhibit* contact between dissimilar groups.

Measurement Problems

During the last decade, studies have varied in their reporting of American volunteers as a percentage of the general population from a low of 20% to as high as 55% (Baumgartner and Walker, 1988; Hayghe, 1991; C. Clark, 1996; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996; Freeman, 1997). Some scholars argue that volunteer rates peaked in 1989 and attribute the subsequent decrease in volunteering to the economy. Real or

perceived erosion in household income appears to have affected volunteerism. Statistics have shown that people who are less worried about their financial future are more likely to volunteer (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). Andrew Greeley (1997) argues that, despite a relative decline since 1990, the volunteer rates by Americans have seen a notable increase since 1981 and rank highest in the world.

Much of the variability in reporting volunteer rates can be attributed to conflicting definitions of volunteerism across surveys, especially whether or not volunteering includes informal actions such as helping a neighbor cut down a tree. Furthermore, if the basic definition of volunteering is based on paid versus unpaid, then programs that provide small stipends, such as the Foster Grandparent program, would be excluded. There are often problems with counting union memberships, especially in closed-shop unions that require membership as a condition of employment. Or perhaps the motives involved are largely economic, as in trade associations or professional organizations. Certainly, one person's definition of "doing good" can vary from someone else's interpretation.

Many surveys do not adequately question the number of hours spent volunteering which is an important aspect in assessing a volunteer's overall contribution. For example, in a survey asking for overall categories in which one volunteered in the previous year, someone who volunteered three separate Saturdays building a Habitat house with their church, cleaning a river and serving Thanksgiving dinner at the local homeless shelter looks better on paper than a volunteer who spent two hours every week of the year tutoring an underprivileged child.

Survey data can also differ due to misleading or absent probes asking for affiliations. Categorization and popularity of group types change over time, and furthermore, in the eyes of many membership in an organization – whether active or merely as a contributor – is not necessarily the equivalent of volunteering. (Baumgartner and Walker, 1988; Hayghe, 1991; Freeman 1997). Volunteering is often seasonal; therefore surveys taken at different times of the year could yield methodological problems. These differences lead not only to inflated or deflated results but lack of cohesion between surveys. As is the case with most surveys, statistics on volunteering cannot be accepted at face value, and must be carefully examined before generalizations can be made.

With this caveat on the potential problems of surveys, we will turn to looking deeper into the results of such surveys, and who in America is most likely to volunteer and the motivations that drive their efforts.

WHO VOLUNTEERS?

Demographic Traits

Countless studies have considered demographic factors such as age, income, sex and race in an attempt to predict who in America volunteers and suggest a prototypical volunteer. If such characteristics are viewed as resources that affect both the costs and opportunities for volunteering, then deficits in these resources would raise the cost of volunteering and restrict opportunities. Furthermore, many demographic characteristics, such as education and income, are interrelated; it is often difficult to determine which is

the more important or which holds the greater influence in an individual's decision to volunteer.

Survey results on demographic traits of volunteers from both the 1989 CPS Supplement of Volunteers (Hayghe, 1991) and the 1996 Gallup survey for the Independent Sector (C. Clark, 1996) are summarized in Table 1. Hayghe (1991) felt that one factor, having children, partially explained increased volunteer rates in several demographic categories, namely work and marital status, sex and age. Married middle-aged men and women, especially women not working full-time, were more likely to have kids living with them and, therefore, have increased exposure to certain volunteer opportunities through their children's school, sports or religious activities.

College graduates had higher volunteer rates than persons with fewer years of schooling: 4 out of 10 college graduates aged 25 and older volunteered, compared with fewer than 1 in 10 of high school dropouts. Employed persons were more likely to volunteer than those who did not work were – in fact almost 7 out of 10 volunteers held paying jobs. Age can play into this factor as well: employed men and women tend to be in the age group (35-54) in which the volunteer rate was highest. On the contrary, those who are unemployed or not in the labor force are more concentrated in the youngest or oldest age groups.

With regards to education and income, again the various demographic factors are inter-related: generally, people who have completed college have higher income than those with fewer years of schooling do. In addition, participation in volunteer activities often involves some out-of-pocket expenses for things such as transportation, appropriate clothing or incidental supplies which people in lower income categories may not be able

TABLE 1**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN VOLUNTEERS**

Demographic Trait	More Likely to Volunteer	Less Likely
Age	Aged 35-54	Aged 18-24 Aged 65+
Sex	Female	Male
Work Status	Part-time or unemployed women Full-time men	Unemployed
Marital Status	Married	Single or widowed
Education	College graduates	High school or less
Income	Over \$50,000	Under \$20,000
Race	White	Black or Hispanic
Religion	Stated denomination or "other"	Stated "none"

Source: 1989 CPS Supplement of Volunteers (Hayghe, 1991), &
Survey for the Independent Sector by the Gallup Organization, 5/4-6/16/96 (C. Clark, 1996)

to afford. Age may also be a related factor; individual incomes peak at years that coincide with the age groups in which volunteering is most prevalent. Blacks and Hispanics tend to be more concentrated than whites in demographic groups with relatively low volunteer rates, such as less educated and lower income groups.

Richard Freeman (1997) found similar trends. One might expect that volunteers would consist largely of people with a low opportunity cost of time, such as low-wage workers or the jobless. On the contrary, volunteers are mostly people with higher potential earnings or greater demands on their time: the employed, married persons, those with larger families, persons in the 35-54 year old peak earning ages, the more highly educated, professionals or managers. Freeman theorized that perhaps differences in the productivity of time spent in voluntary activities could help explain supply responsiveness in volunteering. For example, asking a corporate president to head a fund drive rather than spending more hours ladling soup for the local homeless shelter may be better utilizing the skills in which he has a competitive advantage, namely network connections and marketing expertise. Paralleling the above findings, McPherson and Rotolo (1996) and Andrew Greeley (1997) found strong correlations between education and both group affiliation and volunteering. Raymond Liedka (1991) attributes this consistency to the expanded range of networks for people with higher levels of education.

It is important to note, however, that many of the demographic groups associated with low volunteer rates in the above studies tended to devote more hours per week in their volunteer activities when compared to other volunteers. These groups

include Blacks, Hispanics, those 65 years and older, high school dropouts, unmarried persons, and those with lower earnings capacity.

Religion

Much has been written regarding the link between volunteerism and religion. Andrew Greeley (1997) found that, based on the 1991 European Values Study, respondents who attended church once a week or more were twice as likely to volunteer than those who attended rarely if ever. The number of Americans “churched” in the U.S. has risen steadily since before the Revolutionary War, and now has the highest levels of religious devotion of all western nations save Ireland (Finke and Stark, 1994). Greeley feels that the high levels of religious devotion in the U.S. play a substantial role in America’s lead over other countries in the proportion of the population engaged in unpaid volunteer work.

Fischer and Schaffer (1993) speculate that the reason church members are more likely to volunteer is that it is considered a part of everyday church work – churches rely on unpaid labor. Also, religion encourages altruistic values and behavior, fostering a sense of community cohesion and responsibility, and it should therefore come as no surprise that religion and giving of time and money are closely linked. It also provides a focal organization and network of potential volunteers. They point to the example of churches, especially southern black ones, as the organizational linchpin of the civil rights movement in the 1960s.

Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry Brady, in their book *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics* (1995), stress the importance of

churches for political mobilization. They write that churches provide an important counterbalance to cumulative resource accumulation through education and occupation, for example. Churches provide civic skills to those who would otherwise be resource-poor, such as the working class. The authors theorize that, since Americans go to church more than citizens of most other Western nations, this substitutes a relatively conservative set of institutions for what elsewhere are leftist institutions, such as unions and social democratic parties, which affects what the government hears.

It should be noted, however, that when religious volunteering was excluded, U.S. dominance is diminished: the American advantage is clearly concentrated in church-related voluntary efforts. While church attendance and membership in church-related organizations *does* have a positive impact on secular voluntary service, Robert Putnam (2000) found that secular involvement appears to have an even greater effect than religious involvement. He found that “pure” churchgoers volunteer an average of five times per year, while “pure” clubgoers averaged twelve volunteer acts per year. In addition, involvement in secular associations was found to be more closely associated with participation in community projects.

John Wilson and Mark Janoski (1995) also caution against generalizing about the connection between religious preference or involvement and volunteering. Using a test sample from a three-wave Youth-Parent Socialization Panel Study (Jennings and Niemi, 1981), they found that actual frequency of church attendance did not make much of a difference to the chances of volunteering, at least to the sample as a whole. The most significant difference between groups was that between those who never attended and those who attended, a break that overlaps with members versus nonmembers. Overall,

the data seemed to suggest that the impact of church attendance on volunteering varied mostly by denomination and, within middle-age, by life-course stage. Furthermore, members of certain denominations seemed to gravitate towards certain types of volunteer work, varying from thinly disguised missionary activities to secular work in the community, perhaps an indication of the theological interpretation of volunteer work provided by their particular denomination.

Belief Systems, Personality Traits and Life Experience

Beyond demographic characteristics, psychological and other traits gained through socialization can influence an individual's propensity to volunteer. David Gerard (1985) looked at "What makes a volunteer?" and published the findings listed in Table 2 based on survey evidence from both the U.K. and the U.S.

Studies show that volunteers are more extroverted and emotionally stable, need less autonomy, possess greater ego strength, have a positive attitude toward themselves and others, and demonstrate greater empathy. Successful volunteers have higher scores on intelligence and trust, lower social inhibitions, more imagination and self-assurance, and are less prone to self-guilt and sorrow (Clary and Snyder, 1991; Fischer and Schaffer, 1993; Spitz and MacKinnon, 1993). In examining personality changes after volunteer service, several studies have found positive personality and motivation-relevant changes as a result of volunteering (Allen and Rushton, 1983; Clary and Miller, 1986).

Robert Putnam found that people that "schmooz" – entertain people at home – are more likely to volunteer. Furthermore, people who are involved in the community and within social networks are not only more likely to volunteer in the first place, but they are

TABLE 2
BELIEFS OF VOLUNTEERS

Attitudes & values	Volunteers (%)	All others (%)
Attitudes towards others:		
Believe everyone basically good	25	17
Believe most people trustworthy	52	40
See people as more helpful than 10 yrs ago	40	25
Willing to sacrifice life itself	52	30
Religious commitment:		
Perceive self as religious person	71	54
Believe in life after death	65	41
Attend church at least monthly	51	16
Gain comfort and strength from religion	69	40
Have had profound religious experience	30	17
Political activism:		
Active interest in politics	11	3
Indicators of reflectiveness:		
Often think about the meaning of life	45	31
Often/sometimes think about death	67	56
Pray, meditate, contemplate	70	45
Attitudes to material factors:		
Importance to successful marriage of:		
good housing	38	52
adequate income	38	49
Less emphasis on money and possessions desirable	76	59
Good pay important in job	49	62
(No. in sample)	(230)	(1001)
NB: All differences statistically significant at the 5% level		

Source: Gerard, 1985

more likely to work in long-range voluntary efforts over a period of years rather than in more episodic ones (Putnam, 2000).

The 1996 Gallup poll for the Independent Sector reported that factors that heavily encourage volunteerism include experience volunteering as a youth, spending time socially with people in volunteer organizations, recent experience giving time to a friend or loved one, and membership in a youth group. Different people take different “paths” to volunteering: for example, a less-educated person may have had a childhood full of volunteer experiences, leading him to volunteer as an adult despite his lack of education.

An Integrated Theory

John Wilson and Mark Musick (1997) constructed an integrated theory of formal and informal volunteer work based on the premises that volunteer work is 1) productive work that requires human capital, 2) collective behavior that requires social capital, and 3) ethically guided work that requires cultural capital. Measures of human capital were education, income and functional health; measures of social capital were number of children in household and informal social interaction; and measures of cultural capital were whether the respondent felt that living the good life demands helping others, and religiosity (an index using frequency of religious prayer and church attendance). The model found that formal volunteering was positively related to human capital, number of children in household, informal social interaction and religiosity, whereas ability, opportunity and obligations primarily determined informal helping behavior. Wilson and Musick concluded that age, race and gender have largely indirect effects on volunteering

in that they determine how much of the capital crucial to volunteering an individual can accumulate.

Why do People Volunteer?

The most commonly cited motivations for volunteerism are altruistic, ideological, religious concerns, interest in the activity, egoistic, material gain, status gain, social relation, leisure time, personal growth, or a combination of these. Other motivations are situational factors and social context, such as pressing need, no alternative source of help, and a strong likelihood of a direct and positive impact (Clary and Snyder, 1991). Some authors feel that, except for altruism benefiting close relatives, volunteer behavior is undertaken with the expectation of reciprocation with no net cost. There is almost always some kind of expected tangible or intangible reward involved, such as job contacts or making friends (Smith, 1983; Murnighan, Kim and Metzger, 1993). Social observers have compared volunteering to the reason why people vote: one's vote will probably not change the outcome of an election, but society views voting as proper behavior, and encouraging volunteerism reflects a moral perspective. At some point, however, all people are "free riders" – believing that, despite the overall benefit to society that their contribution would provide, someone else or an institution will pick up the slack resulting from their absence (Fischer and Schaffer, 1993).

Robert Freeman (1997) presents evidence that one social event – whether a person was asked to volunteer – is key to understanding why people work for nothing. When a "were you asked" variable is added to the volunteer equation, it dominates the scenario with a highly significant 0.485 coefficient, and all other variables, except hourly wage,

are reduced, including employment, family income, education, age, race, marital status, number of household earners and number of children. This is an important dimension of volunteerism to consider: perhaps groups defined by certain demographic characteristics are less likely to volunteer because they are not in an environment conducive to being asked. For example, one of the reasons given by older adults for not volunteering, according to studies, is that no one asked them. Freeman hypothesizes that two factors underlie the response of individuals to the request to volunteer: 1) they value that particular charitable activity; and 2) the request carries some social pressure with it.

The data show a relationship between age and motive. For example, younger volunteers are more likely to report motives of gaining career-related experiences, making social contacts and learning/self development. Older volunteers are less likely to be motivated by material or status rewards, and are more likely to cite free time and religious concerns as reasons for volunteering. Frequency and level of commitment are also linked to the basic motivation for volunteering in the first place. Fully committed volunteers were found to be more altruistic, whereas partially committed volunteers appeared to be more motivated by self-concerns involving social rewards and/or punishments. Not all studies found similar results, however (Clary and Snyder, 1991).

In the above review of literature regarding motivations for volunteering, the most important factor varied from probable impact to the desire to do something useful to being asked. More than likely, answers available to the respondent differed between surveys. Other survey problems arise from the fact that volunteer groups differ from each other as far as the type of people associated with them and their corresponding motivations. For example, large cities provide different volunteer environments and

needs than those of rural communities. Finally, it is important to note that studies of volunteers cannot be extended to conclusions about nonvolunteers and their reasons for *not* volunteering.

Disincentives to Volunteering

Volunteers are often easily discouraged by a long commute, working in an unfamiliar setting, or a desire to limit their volunteering to a tight circle of familiar friends, places and institutions. There are also economic realities, such as long hours in the work place and other time constraints. A 1990 Red Cross study found that the main barriers to volunteering are language and cultural differences, economic hardships, physical handicaps, time constraints, distance from sites, and too few opportunities for family togetherness (C. Clark, 1996).

Organizations can often be a chaotic place: inefficient, underfinanced, lacking in rigorous evaluation, and largely exempt from the self-policing that the market coaxes from corporations and elections instill in government. Ineffectiveness can be a disincentive for occasional volunteers to volunteer again. Most volunteers want gratification, and need management and guidance. Johns Hopkins University scholar Lester A. Salamon found that the alienation that often accompanies steady contact with poverty is more apt to discourage volunteers than professionals. He also discovered that nonprofits staffed with the highest proportion of professionals actually spent more time addressing the problems of the poor than those staffed by volunteers (Salamon, 1996). So it should not be surprising that there is a failure on the part of organizations to give volunteers quite as meaningful work, instead relying on credentialed professionals. But if

organizations continue to recruit volunteers who eventually feel that they are not being put to good use, a new wave of disillusionment rather than a civic awakening could result.

GOALS OF THIS STUDY

Sparse literary attention has been given to the relationship between a respondent's propensity to volunteer and his or her political beliefs and attitude toward government. Some literature suggests that American civic life is evolving and citizens are more involved in groups that emphasize local concerns and work that provides direct impact. Other scholars suggest that recent increases in volunteer rates are concentrated in an older, "long civic" generation that is more resistant to civic disengagement. This would directly contradict the thesis that younger generations, disenchanted with government, are rolling up their sleeves to get the job done themselves. It is, however, widely accepted that people are moving away from involvement in traditional political parties and clubs. Does this, combined with declining voting rates, signal a frustration with or feeling of inefficacy within the political system? Baumgartner and Walker (1988) have written that group membership, even nonpolitical activity, leads to greater political participation even outside the group system. Is the inverse true? Does interest in politics, irrespective of one's attitude towards government, influence volunteering?

Furthermore, if big government causes a "disincentive effect" in private initiative and civil society, then it is a curious proposition to question whether those who call for a shrinking of government are also the ones who are most actively involved within their

communities. As they continue to view government as ineffective in meeting the needs of society, is it because they see what can be achieved at the communal level?

This study hopes to shed some light on the issue by examining the following:

Hypothesis One

- (a) People who are more distrustful of government and have a lower sense of efficacy within the existing political system are more likely to volunteer.**
- (b) People who have an interest in politics are more likely to volunteer.**
- (c) People who are less supportive of government's role in the social sector and in the necessity of government providing a "safety net" for American citizens are more likely to volunteer.**

Complaints have been leveled against Robert Putnam for not sufficiently analyzing the "volunteer phenomenon" in composing his Social Capital Theory. In his recent book, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (2000), he stresses that doing good *for* other people is not part of the definition of social capital – rather, doing *with*. Volunteering is part of the syndrome of good citizenship and political involvement, not an alternative to it. He does, however, find that volunteering and helping behavior are strongly predicted by civic engagement. As a second part to this study, components of his theory are tested in relation to individual volunteering rather than associational membership within the community at large. It follows that what makes a community exhibit strong levels of trust will also make the individual willing to give

his time and effort freely and generously. If people become more politically aware through social associations and communities are in turn strengthened as citizens become personally invested in economic decisions affecting them and their neighbors, then volunteering is an important dimension in shoring up the civic sector in particular and society in general.

Hypothesis Two

People who volunteer are more likely to provide survey responses linked to higher social capital than nonvolunteers.

DATA AND METHODS

This study utilizes survey data from the 1996 General Social Survey conducted for the National Data Program for the Social Sciences at the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago. The survey used full probability sampling and consisted of an independently drawn sample of 2,904 English-speaking persons age 18 or over and living in non-institutional arrangements (excluding those in dormitories, military quarters and nursing homes, for example) within the United States.

Dependent Variable

Respondents were asked whether, in the last 12 months, they had volunteered in (not just belonging to a service organization, but actually working in some way to help others without pay) the following areas: 1) education; 2) religious organizations; 3) health area; 4) human services; 5) environment; 6) public / society benefit; 7) recreation - adults;

8) arts, culture and humanities; 9) work-related organizations; 10) political organizations and campaigns; 11) youth development; 12) private and/or community foundations; 13) international / foreign; 14) informal / alone / not-for-pay; and 15) other (specify). It should be noted that the respondent determined under which category his or her particular voluntary act fell.

The survey did not provide an opportunity for the respondent to indicate the amount of hours he or she worked in a volunteer capacity. In order to operationalize the dependent variable on an interval level reflecting a level of intensity, a “Volunteer Index” was created. Each of the above 15 categories resulted in a dichotomous response of “Yes” or “No,” to which respective values of “1” and “0” were given. The Volunteer Index resulted from the summing of all responses from each of the 15 categories, with results ranging from 0 to 15. For example, if a respondent volunteered in the arts, youth development and education in the previous year, their Volunteer Index score was “3.”

Unfortunately, the creation of this index has an inherent flaw. A respondent who volunteers in three separate areas, even for short periods of service, would score a higher Volunteer Index score than an individual who devoted more total hours within only one category. Intuitively, however, the index remains the most effective tool in analyzing this particular data that is absent any other indicators of intensity of commitment. Furthermore, confidence in the measure is ensured by the large size of the data set and its ability to incorporate multiple areas of volunteer activity.¹

¹ It should be noted that with all three indexes used in the study, if respondents skipped or responded “Don’t know” or “Can’t choose” to any of the original inquiries (creating a “Sysmis” score), the index was nulled (“Sysmis”) and the answers to the other, possibly answered, questions would be disregarded. This resulted in a 10% drop in the number of possible respondents (n) in creating the Volunteer Index, an 11% drop in the Government Faith Index, and a 17% drop in the Government Role Index.

Independent Variables

In order to test Hypothesis 1(a), a second index called “Government Faith” was created to capture a respondent’s attitude toward government and personal feeling of political efficacy. The following questions / statements were provided to respondents with possible answers given in parenthesis:

- 1) The average citizen has considerable influence on politicians (5-point Likert scale with “1” = “Disagree strongly,” “3” = “Neither agree nor disagree,” and “5” = “Agree strongly”);
- 2) Does the government have too much or too little power (5-point scale with “1” = “Far too much,” “3” = “Right amount of power,” and “5” = “Far too little”);
- 3) People like me don’t have any say about what government does (5-point Likert scale with “1” = “Strongly Agree,” “3” = “Neither agree nor disagree,” and “5” = “Strongly Disagree”); and
- 4) All in all, how well or badly do you think the system of democracy in America works these days (4-point scale with “1” = “Needs to be completely changed,” “2” = “It needs lots of changes,” “3” = “It works well but needs changes,” and “4” = “It works well and needs no changes”).

Answers to the above four questions were summed, with possible index scores varying from a low of 4 to a maximum of 19, with higher scores indicating elevated levels of belief in the governmental system and citizen efficacy, and lower scores showing more skepticism.

To capture Hypothesis 1(b), the following question was used: “How interested are you personally in politics?” Respondents provided answers on a 5-point scale from “1” = “Not at all interested,” to “3” = “Somewhat interested,” to “5” = “Very interested.”

Next, in order to analyze Hypothesis 1(c), a third index named “Government Role” was created to determine respondents’ attitudes toward government responsibility in the social sector. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they believed that it is government’s responsibility to: 1) Provide jobs for everyone who wants one; 2) Provide healthcare for the sick; 3) Provide a decent standard of living for the old; 4) Provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed; 5) Reduce income differences between the rich and poor; 6) Give financial assistance to college students from low-income families; and 7) Provide decent housing for those who can’t afford it.² Answers were scaled from “1” being “Definitely should not be,” “2” being “Probably should not be,” “3” being “Probably should be,” to “4” being “Definitely should be.” Answers were summed to create the Government Role Index and could range from “7” to “28” with higher scores reflecting support for government involvement in these areas and lower scores indicating the reverse.

Finally, in order to examine the data in relation to Hypothesis Two, several variables in the GSS were operationalized into indicators of social capital as defined mostly in the writing of Robert Putnam. One of the most important variables that he found to reflect social capital, group affiliation, is in itself closely linked to the study’s

² Two pairings of factors within the Government Role Index yielded high collinearity: “Provide a decent standard of living for the old” and “Provide healthcare for the sick” yielded a correlation value of 0.643 (significant at the .000 level); and “Provided a decent standard of living for the unemployed” and “Provide decent housing for those who can’t afford it” produced a value of 0.577 (significant at the .000 level). It should be cautioned that such findings may indicate a slightly exaggerated Government Role Index.

dependent variable. The Volunteer Index, while indicating volunteer *activity* as opposed to mere group membership, captures a vital measure of the social involvement that Putnam was examining in his study. However, he associated other factors with stronger or weaker levels of social capital within a community. This study will adapt some of these in relation to the likelihood of respondents' volunteerism.

Putnam (1995) found that newspaper readership is associated with high levels of social capital, while television viewership is linked with low levels. Specifically, controlling for education, income, age, race, place of residence, work status and gender, TV viewing was found to be strongly and negatively associated with social trust and group membership, while news reading yielded positive correlations. In fact, pure readers (those who never watched television) were found to be 55% more trusting than pure watchers (those who never read the newspaper). Noting a nearly 50% decrease in daily news readership over the previous three decades, Putnam expressed concern over the resultant impact on levels of social capital. This study examines the GSS variables reflecting the frequency with which the respondent reads the newspaper, the number of hours spent watching TV, and their impact on volunteerism. Respondents indicated the frequency with which they read the newspaper, ranked on a 5-point scale from "1" = "Never," to "3" = "Once a Week," to "5" = "Every day." Television viewing was measured on an interval level of hours per day.

Four questions asked to respondents of the GSS survey were utilized in this study to assess whether a relationship existed between volunteers and their view of human nature / trust in humanity. In Putnam's writings, trust within a community was viewed as both a byproduct of civic engagement and a necessary element for effective social

integration. This study examines a person's view of human nature in general rather than a feeling of trust within one's own community. Granted, people could have high levels of confidence in the actions of persons with whom they are close and knowledgeable yet not feel as secure with humanity in general. Despite this, however, the variables used in this study will still shed some clarity on Putnam's theory and provide a different viewpoint.

Survey participants were asked to position their personal feelings with regards to the following observations about human behavior. These variables were all tested independently. Their responses were coded:

- 1) "1" = "People look out for themselves," and "2" = "Most of the time people are helpful;"
- 2) "1" = "People take advantage of you if given the chance," and "2" = "People try to be fair;"
- 3) "1" = "You can't be too careful," and "2" = "People can be trusted;"³
- 4) It is important to teach children to help others to prepare for life (5-point scale with "1" = "Least important," "3" = "Third important," and "5" = "Most important."⁴

³ The preceding three variables all included a third answer choice, "Depends." However, in order to facilitate the data analysis, this answer was recoded into a missing variable, leaving only the above dichotomous answers that were then treated as dummy variables in the regression equations. The procedure resulted in data reduction of between 5% and 7% for each of the variables.

⁴ In the original plan for the study, other variables indicating social capital were to be evaluated in addition to those listed above. However, due to the design of the GSS dataset, all questions in the survey were not asked of all respondents. As a result, no variability was found between volunteering and the following: 1) 7 point scale from "Humanity is basically good" to "Humanity is fundamentally perverse and corrupt;" 2) 4 point scale asking for the respondent's feeling of closeness with both his neighborhood/village and his

Control Variables

Because the literature suggests that certain demographic factors affect rates of volunteering, certain control variables were introduced into the analysis. The variables used were education, age, marital status, race, and religiosity. In short, those who are more highly educated, middle aged, married, white and attend church regularly are more likely to volunteer. Level of education was measured by the last year of school completed, with “12” being high school graduate, “16” being college graduate, and numbers beyond 16 indicating graduate work.⁵ Age was coded as an interval variable corresponding to respondents’ exact age in years. Marital status responses included “Married” and “Non-married,” and two choices were provided for race – “White” and “Non-white.” Finally, respondents’ religiosity was operationalized by examining the frequency of attendance in religious services on a 9-point scale, with “0” = “Never,” “4” = “Once a month,” and “8” = “More than once a week.”⁶

FINDINGS

Results of the various simple OLS regression analyses are presented in Tables 3 through 10. As discussed previously, higher scores on the Government Faith Index signaled increased levels of belief in the governmental system and feeling of personal efficacy in politics. Table 3 shows that the effect of this variable on volunteer rates was

town/city; and 3) 5 point Likert scale regarding “You should take care of yourself first, and if there is energy left over, help others.”

⁵ Family or respondent income would have been another important factor to consider, however the GSS survey design provided for only a maximum value of “\$25,000 or more” which was felt to be too imprecise for the study’s purposes. Review of the literature, however, indicates that education can be a useful proxy for other demographic factors, including income and work status.

⁶ All independent and control variables were tested for multicollinearity and the results were within comfortable limits to not risk the validity of using them together in the study.

TABLE 3**EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT FAITH INDEX ON VOLUNTEER RATES**

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	-.143	.420		.734
Age	-9.60E-03*	.003	-.091	.003
Education	.139**	.020	.222	.000
Race	-.300*	.142	-.066	.035
Marital Status	-.245*	.106	-.072	.020
Church Attendance	.125**	.020	.191	.000
Gov't Faith Index	4.249E-02	.022	.060	.054

** p ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .124	Adjusted R² = .119	Std Error = 1.5911	N = 952
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

TABLE 4**EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT ROLE INDEX ON VOLUNTEER RATES**

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	.263	.498		.597
Age	-9.77E-03*	.003	-.091	.005
Education	.138**	.021	.225	.000
Race	-.393*	.157	-.087	.013
Marital Status	-.260*	.111	-.077	.020
Church Attendance	.147**	.021	.224	.000
Gov't Role Index	-3.08E-03	.013	-.008	.816

** p ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .142	Adjusted R² = .136	Std Error = 1.5735	N = 856
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

TABLE 5**EFFECT OF POLITICAL INTEREST ON VOLUNTEER RATES**

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	-.288	.385		.455
Age	-1.12E-02**	.003	-.110	.000
Education	.131**	.018	.218	.000
Race	-.279*	.131	-.063	.033
Marital Status	-.205*	.100	-.060	.041
Church Attendance	.128**	.019	.197	.000
Political Interest	.151**	.043	.105	.000

** p ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .140	Adjusted R² = .135	Std Error = 1.5788	N = 1044
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------

extremely small, however, and had no statistical significance – a one point increase in the Government Faith Index corresponded to a scant 0.0042 increase in the Volunteer Index. The effect of the Government Role Index on volunteering, as exhibited in Table 4, was also diminutive and insignificant – for each unit increase on the 22-point scale, indicating increased support for government involvement in social areas, volunteer rates decreased by only 0.0003.

Interest in politics, however, proved to be a stronger and more significant predictor of volunteering. Table 4 illustrates that as political interest increased by one unit on the 5-point scale, the Volunteer Index increased by 0.151 when controlling for age, education, race, marital status and church attendance. The standardized regression coefficients (Beta) column shows that political interest had a greater impact on the equation as a whole than either race or marital status did, and nearly as much as age – but roughly half the effect of both education and church attendance.

In seeking to provide evidence in support of Hypothesis One, the data appear to suggest that feelings of frustration toward government, inefficacy in the political system and lack of approval of government involvement in social programs do not necessarily translate into personal action in the form of volunteering. The relationships examined were small and statistically insignificant. It does appear, however, that interest in politics and propensity to volunteer are related, even when controlling for various demographic variables. Perhaps political “junkies” feel that part of their role as a member of a free democratic society entails giving back to this community, just as it requires them to vote. And, as Baumgartner and Walker (1998) suggest, if group membership, even ostensibly nonpolitical activity, breeds greater political participation, the cycle would continue to

grow. Perhaps when a volunteer is exposed to various subcultures within and aspects of his community, an even greater interest in political decision-making is encouraged.

Turning to an analysis of Hypothesis Two, Table 6 displays the effect of television viewing and newspaper readership on volunteering. Results show that as respondents' frequency of reading the newspaper increases, it has a small positive effect on volunteering. Secondly, as number of hours spent watching television increased, the value of the dependent variable was lessened to a small degree. Again, however, neither coefficients were statistically significant. As seen in Table 7, the question regarding whether people are helpful or look out for themselves yielded surprising, though not significant, results: as the dichotomous variable increased to a view that people are helpful, the Volunteer Index actually *decreased* by an – albeit small – amount of 0.0045.

The final three tables reveal that the remaining independent variables in the analysis yielded significant results when controlling for age, education, race, marital status and church attendance. A unit increase in the dichotomous variable leading to an answer that people try to be fair resulted in a 0.251 increase in the Volunteer Index. Similarly, a 0.271 increase occurred in response to those having an underlying belief that people can be trusted. Finally, on the 5-point scale asking whether it is important to teach children to help others to prepare for life, for each one interval increase towards the highest point answer of “Most Important,” the Volunteer Index was increased by 0.199.

Looking at the regression equations as a whole, all three variables had more of an impact on the dependent variable than race did. The variable regarding the importance of teaching children to help others yielded higher standardized coefficients than both age

TABLE 6**EFFECT OF NEWSPAPER READERSHIP AND TELEVISION VIEWERSHIP ON VOLUNTEER RATES**

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	-.239	.450		.595
Age	-1.18E-02**	.003	-.120	.001
Education	.133**	.021	.227	.000
Race	-.209	.147	-.049	.155
Marital Status	-.125	.114	-.037	.273
Church Attendance	.135**	.022	.213	.000
Television	-3.16E-02	.022	-.051	.144
Newspaper	7.276E-02	.046	.055	.118

** p ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .148 Adjusted R² = .141 Std Error = 1.5538 N = 796

TABLE 7**EFFECT OF FEELING THAT PEOPLE ARE HELPFUL ON VOLUNTEER RATES**

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	.257	.463		.579
Age	-9.94E-03*	.004	-.100	.006
Education	.135**	.021	.226	.000
Race	-.375*	.159	-.083	.019
Marital Status	-.260*	.120	-.076	.031
Church Attendance	.149**	.023	.227	.000
Helpful	-4.47E-02	.123	-.013	.715

** P ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .139 Adjusted R² = .132 Std Error = 1.5973 N = 730

TABLE 8

EFFECT OF FEELING THAT PEOPLE ARE FAIR ON VOLUNTEER RATES

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	-.264	.467		.572
Age	-9.59E-03*	.004	-.099	.007
Education	.134**	.021	.232	.000
Race	-.229	.162	-.051	.159
Marital Status	-.307*	.120	-.090	.011
Church Attendance	.137**	.023	.214	.000
Fair	.251*	.125	.074	.045

** P ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .151 Adjusted R² = .144 Std Error = 1.5729 N = 709

TABLE 9

EFFECT OF FEELING THAT PEOPLE CAN BE TRUSTED ON VOLUNTEER RATES

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	.122	.446		.785
Age	-1.03E-02*	.003	-.106	.003
Education	.116**	.021	.199	.000
Race	-.287	.155	-.065	.064
Marital Status	-.320*	.117	-.095	.007
Church Attendance	.131**	.022	.205	.000
Trust	.271*	.127	.077	.033

** P ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .137 Adjusted R² = .131 Std Error = 1.6019 N = 787

TABLE 10

EFFECT OF FEELING THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO TEACH CHILDREN TO HELP
OTHERS ON VOLUNTEER RATES

Variable	b	Std Error	Beta	Sig
(Constant)	-.621	.493		.209
Age	-.9.80E-03*	.003	-.100	.004
Education	.135**	.020	.231	.000
Race	-.258	.151	-.058	.088
Marital Status	-.240*	.116	-.070	.039
Church Attendance	.140**	.022	.215	.000
Teach Children	.199**	.057	.117	.000

** P ≤ .001

* p ≤ .05

MODEL SUMMARY

R² = .149 Adjusted R² = .143 Std Error = 1.5885 N = 783

and marital status as well. Again, the largest impact on the linear equation came from the education and church attendance variables.

In general the data from this particular study do not support one of the main facets of Putnam's Social Capital Theory. Newspaper readership and television viewing have relatively minor – and statistically insignificant – effects on volunteering. Intuitively, one would think that a person whose life is consumed with large amounts of television would not have the time, energy or drive to volunteer. The data, however, do not definitively show that television watchers are less prone, or newspaper readers are more prone, to volunteer than their counterparts.

It is interesting to note the varying dimensions of respondent attitudes towards others. On the one hand, a notion that in general people are helpful does not appear to propel people in the survey to volunteer – while they themselves are obviously giving of their time and assistance. On the other hand, volunteers do appear motivated by the mantra that it is important to teach children the life lesson of helping others – and by a stronger feeling of trust in people and sense of fairness in others. Perhaps volunteers do not see many other people beyond themselves or their immediate circle helping out in their community – yet this does not necessarily extend to an innate mistrust of mankind. In fact, perhaps it is just that trust and faith in mankind that propels people to want to give time to others. And the cycle continues: exposure to different cultures and facets within their communities dispels stereotypes and builds more trust in volunteers.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this paper I have tried to shed some light on various influences on an individual's propensity to volunteer that have not been as closely examined by the recent literature. In particular, the analysis considers the impact of survey respondents' views regarding personal efficacy within the political system, faith in American democracy in general, and support for government responsibility in several social areas on the likelihood of their volunteering. The results suggest that none of these factors play a significant role in determining whether or not a person freely donates their time to their community. Supporting the previous literature, interest in politics in general *does* have a positive and significant relationship to volunteering.

The recent presidential campaign between Bush and Gore has brought with it renewed talk of the pros and cons of "big" government. Voter turnout on November 7, 2000, at approximately 50% of eligible voters, was slightly higher than in 1996 but still not nearly at the levels of the early 1960s and prior. Is this apathy on the part of the citizenry? Does it signal a frustration with government that manifests itself in a refusal to participate in the political process? Or is society satisfied with the condition of the country, the economy in particular, and feel that this is not attributable to either political party necessarily and therefore not much is at stake when choosing between the various candidates?

If, as the literature suggests, political apathy is leading people to become increasingly involved on a local level, then a practical application of this would be that respondents in this study would volunteer more as their "Government Faith" (as operationalized in the preceding analysis) decreased. The results did not show this to be

the case. Perhaps frustration with one's position in the political system extends to a lack of interest in society in general. Or maybe the shift to group activity that is closer to home is a natural shift in a country so large, diverse and impersonal – and *not* a necessarily a reaction against Washington. This would be supported by the finding that an interest in politics remains a moderate indicator of volunteering.

Similarly, whether or not an individual supported government involvement in social areas such as health care and housing for the poor, volunteer rates remained static. Frustration with “big” government does not appear to propel people into action. It is an ironic twist that perhaps the people arguing against an obtrusive government and calling for more local and civic responsibility, are not necessarily the ones that are working within their own communities to set up substitute social support systems for those government programs and institutions that they would choose to see abolished. Surely, however, they are also calling for greater personal responsibility from the part of the society that benefits from these programs, and this could help explain the absence of an impact on volunteering. Given the increase in the percentage of government funding of the independent sector during the last few decades (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996), continued debate on the subject is a certainty.

The second and final part of the analysis looked at various factors that were considered to approximate aspects of Robert Putnam's Social Capital Theory, and gauge their influence on the volunteer dependent variable. One of the main culprits on which Putnam places the blame for declining group associations in America (and thus lower levels of community efficacy) is television – its resultant drain on one's free time and the

fact that it is an activity that can be undertaken alone and in private. Time spent watching television did not, however, appear to have an impact on the level of volunteering in this study. Similarly, frequency of reading the newspaper did not increase one's propensity to volunteer, despite the findings of Putnam which positively associated news reading with stronger levels of social trust and group membership. Changes in the design of the study – for example, utilization of stepwise regression or narrowing the focus to particular forms of volunteer service – would perhaps uncover different trends.

Respondent views of human nature in general, particularly feelings of trust, a sense that people are fair and helpful, and the importance of teaching children to help others, were examined and tested against the dependent variable. Interestingly, the variable asking respondents whether people are helpful most of the time, versus people look out for themselves, did not have a significant effect on the dependent volunteer variable – despite the fact that the volunteers were themselves demonstrating helping behavior. On the other hand, an individual's opinion that it is important to teach children to help others yielded the strongest positive standardized coefficient within its particular model than all other independent variables tested in this analysis. This suggests that even those respondents who do not view others as being helpful are not necessarily discouraged from helping others themselves. Furthermore, those who feel that lending a helping hand is an important moral lesson to teach future generations appear to support their words with actions. Finally, the feeling that people are fair and can be trusted had a small, yet significant, effect on the dependent variable – an approximately equal impact as race or marital status. In keeping with Putnam's argument, trust makes volunteering

more likely, and that increased involvement in one's community – in theory – could encourage an even greater level of community efficacy and trust.

The study confirmed that two of the most important determinants of whether an individual volunteers are education and church attendance, as supported by the literature. Age had a lesser, yet significant, impact. The literature suggests that middle-aged persons are more likely to volunteer, and by using the age variable in this study as a strictly interval variable from aged 18 and up, perhaps some of the results were clouded. Furthermore, Robert Putnam suggests that recent increases in volunteer rates are concentrated in the generation of persons born between 1910 and 1940. It would be interesting to retest the above independent variables in a multimethod approach, by breaking the age factor into cohorts. Perhaps looking more closely at middle-aged persons, who are more likely to have children and be more gainfully employed (and therefore paying a higher percentage of taxes) would yield a different picture than the one painted by this study. Narrowing the focus on Putnam's "long civic" generation, one theoretically resistant to civic disengagement, might lead to different results as well.

Furthermore, the study does not distinguish between types of volunteer service and the resulting relationships with the independent variables. For example, certain political views could propel people to volunteer in human services, for example, rather than giving their time to religious organizations. Or perhaps respondents who have low levels of trust in others are unlikely to volunteer in work-related organizations, yet are more heavily represented among youth development groups. Would the addition of age as a control variable create an even richer portrait? Robert Putnam distinguishes between

“bridging” and “bonding” forms of social capital – perhaps there are similar distinctions among types of volunteer activities, which could lead to varying effects on this study’s dependent variables. He further suggests that one-on-one volunteering is increasing, while time devoted to community projects is shrinking. Follow-up studies would shed light on the connection between certain viewpoints of politics and human nature and the resulting likelihood of volunteering in various areas of civic society.

The phenomenon of volunteerism – motivations, demographics and so forth – will surely continue to provide fodder for academic and political discussion on into the future. It will be an especially interesting topic as the number of retirees increases in the next few decades, resulting from the aging of baby-boomers, increased life expectancy and early retirement. The data seem to show, however, that people are less apt to volunteer outside of their “comfort zone.” In fact, volunteering can even inhibit contact between dissimilar demographic groups as organizations compete for the same basic type of people and lose fastest those members who are atypical of the group (Popielarz and McPherson, 1995; McPherson and Rotolo, 1996). We cannot view this growing field of volunteers as an excuse to cut back on qualified and credentialed professionals, trusting that volunteers will fill the gap. There is, however, much that volunteers can accomplish – especially if they are provided the proper training and asked to help in the first place.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. and J.P. Rushton (1983). "Personality Characteristics of Community Health Volunteers: A Review." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 12: 36-49.
- American Red Cross (1990). *Taking Volunteerism into the 21st Century*.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Jack L. Walter (1988). "Survey Research and Membership in Voluntary Associations." *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 32: 908-927.
- _____ (1990). "Response to Smith's 'Trends in Voluntary Group Membership: Comments on Baumgartner and Walker.'" *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 34, No. 3 (August): 662-670.
- Birdsell, D., D. Muzzio, H. Taylor and D. Krane (1996). "A New Political Marketplace: The Web Snares Voters." *The Public Perspective* Vol. 7, No. 4 (June/July): 33-35.
- Blau, Peter (1997). *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. New York: Free Press.
- Boyte, Harry C. and Nancy N. Kari (1996). "Renewing Democracy through Public-Spirited Work." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* July 5: B3.
- Brehm, John and Wendy Rahn (1995). *The Changing Television Audience in America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza (1997). "Social Capital and the Cities: Advice to Change Agents." *National Civic Review* Vol. 86, No. 2 (Summer): 111-117.
- Carter, Stephen K. (1996). "'Bowling Alone' or 'A Nation of Joiners?': Two Views of Civic Life in the Information Age." *The Public Perspective* Vol. 7, No. 4 (June/July): 44-46.
- Clark, Charles S. (1996). "The New Volunteerism." *CQ Researcher*. December 13: 1083-1103.
- Clark, John (1996). "Shifting Engagements: Lessons from the 'Bowling Alone' Debate." *Hudson Briefing Report* No. 12 (October).
- Clary, E. Gil, et al (1998). "Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* Vol. 74, No. 6: 1516-1530.
- Clary, E.G. and J. Miller (1986). "Socialization and Situational Influences on Sustained Altruism." *Child Development* 57: 1358-1369.

- Clary, E. Gil and Mark Snyder (1991). "A Functional Analysis of Altruism and Prosocial Behavior: The Case of Volunteerism." In *Prosocial Behavior: Volume 12 of Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, edited by M. Clark. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications: 119-148.
- Cloud, John (1997). "Involuntary Volunteers." *Time* December 1: 76.
- Coleman, James (1994). "A Rational Choice Perspective on Economic Sociology." *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by N. Smelser and R. Swedborg. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 166-80.
- Cornuelle, Richard C (1993: reissued). *Reclaiming the American Dream: The Role of Private Individuals and Voluntary Associations*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. Originally published 1965: Random House, Inc.
- Davis, James Allan and Smith, Tom W.: General Social Surveys, 1972-1996 [machine-readable data file]. Principal Investigator, James A. Davis; Director and Co-Principal Investigator, Tom W. Smith. NORC ed. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, producer (1996); Storrs, CT: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut, distributor. 1 data file (35,285 logical records) and 1 codebook (1295 pp).
- DeParle, Jason (1997). "Volunteers: Pros and Cons." *Time* April 26: A1.
- Dionne, E.J. Jr. (1997). "Civil Society?" *The Brookings Review* Fall: 5-8.
- Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark (1994). "The Churching of America: 1776-1900." *The Public Perspective* Vol. 7, No.4 (June/July).
- Fischer, Lucy Rose and Kay Banister Schaffer (1993). *Older Volunteers A Guide to Research and Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fost, Dan (1996). "Farewell to the Lodge." *American Demographics* January: 40-45.
- Freeman, Richard B. (1997). "Working for Nothing: The Supply of Volunteer Labor." *Journal of Labor Economics* Vol. 15, No. 1, Pt. 2: S140-S166.
- Galston, William A. and Peter Levine (1997). "America's Civic Condition: A Glance at the Evidence." *The Brookings Review* Fall: 23-26.
- Gerard, David (1985). "What Makes a Volunteer?" *New Society* November 8: 236-238.
- Gerson, Michael J. (1997). "Do Do-Gooders Do Much Good?" *U.S. World and News Report* April 28: 26-34.

- Gillespie, David F. & Anthony E.O. King, I. (1985). "Demographic Understanding of Volunteerism." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* Vol. 12: 798-816.
- Gose, Ben (1997). "Many Colleges Move to Link Courses with Volunteerism." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* November 14: A45-46.
- Greeley, Andrew (1997). "The Other Civic America: Religion and Social Capital." *The American Prospect* May-June: 68-73.
- Hayghe, Howard V. (1991). "Volunteers in the U.S.: Who Donates their Time?" *Monthly Labor Review* February: 17-23.
- Herzog, A.R. & J.S. House (1991). "Productive Activities and Aging Well." *Generations* 15: 49-54.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia (1995). "Key Factors Influencing Caring, Involvement, and Community." *Care and Community in Modern Society*, edited by P. Schervish, V. Hodgkinson, M. Gates, and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass: 21-50.
- Hodgkinson, V. and M. Weitzman (1988). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Hodgkinson, V. and M. Weitzman (1992). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia A., Murray S. Weitzman and Arthur D. Kirsch (1990). "From Commitment to Action: How Religious Involvement Affects Giving and Volunteering." *Faith and Philanthropy in America: Exploring the Role of Religion in America's Voluntary Sector*, edited by Robert Wuthnow, Virginia A. Hodgkinson and Associates. San Francisco, Oxford: Josey-Bass Publishers: 93-114.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia Ann, Murray S. Weitzman, Christopher M. Toppe and Stephen Noga (1994). *Nonprofit Almanac, 1992-1993*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia Ann and Murray S. Weitzman (1996). *Nonprofit Almanac, 1996-1997: Dimensions of the Independent Sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoskes, Richard P. (1996). "Acts of Democracy: Reconceptualizing Politics, Participation and Competence." *The Public Perspective* Vol. 7, No. 4 (June/July): 40-44.
- Jennings, M.K. and R. Neimi (1981). *Generations and Politics: A Panel Study of Young Adults and their Parents*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Johnson, Dirk (1998). "Volunteer: Now That's an Order." *New York Times* September 13 (Sec. 4): WK2.
- Ladd, Everett C. (1996). "The Data Just Don't Show Erosion of America's Social Capital." *The Public Perspective* Vol. 7, No. 4 (June/July).
- Lappé, Frances Moore, and Paul Martin Du Bois (1997). "Building Social Capital Without Looking Backward." *National Civic Review* Vol. 86, No.2 (Summer): 119-128.
- Lazerwitz, B. and M. Harrison (1979). American Jewish Denominations. *American Sociological Review* 44: 656-666.
- Lemann, Nicholas (1996). "Kicking in Groups." *Atlantic Monthly* April: 22-26.
- Liedka, Raymond (1991). "Who Do You Know in the Group: Location of Organizations in Interpersonal Networks." *Social Forces* 70: 455-474.
- Loury, Glenn C. (1995). "Three-Star Generalist." Review of *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* by Francis Fukuyama (1995, Free Press: 457 pp). *National Review* Vol. 47 (October 9): 56-58.
- Marriott Seniors Volunteerism Study* (1991). Commissioned by Marriott Senior Living Services and the United States Administration on Aging, Washington, DC.
- Marwell, Gerald and Pamela Oliver (1993). *The Critical Mass in Collective Action*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- McPherson, J. Miller and Thomas Rotolo (1996). "Testing a Dynamic Model of Social Composition: Diversity and Change in Voluntary Groups." *Sociological Review* Vol. 61 (April): 179-202.
- Meyer, Frank (1969). *The Conservative Mainstream*. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House.
- Mock, A. (1992). Congregational Religious Styles and Orientation to Society: Exploring our Linear Assumptions. *Review of Religious Research* 34: 20-33.
- Morlino, Leonardo (1995). "Italy's Civic Divide." Review of *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* by Robert D. Putnam, with Robert Leonardi and Raffaella Y. Nanetti (1993, Princeton University Press: 258 pp). *Journal of Democracy* 6.1: 173-177.
- Moseley, Matthew (1995). "The Youth Service Movement: America's Trump Card in Revitalizing Democracy." *National Civic Review* Summer-Fall: 267-271.

- Murnighan, J. Keith, Jae Wook Kim and A. Richard Metzger (1993). "The Volunteer Dilemma." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38 (December): 515-538.
- Olasky, Martin (1992). *The Tragedy of American Compassion*. Regnery Publishing.
- Payne, James L. (1993). "The End of Taxation?" *The Public Interest* Summer: 110-118.
- Pearce, J. (1993). *Volunteers: The Organizational Behavior of Unpaid Workers*. New York: Routledge.
- Pettinico, George (1996). "Civic Participation Alive and Well in Today's Environmental Groups." *The Public Perspective* Vol. 7, No. 4 (June/July).
- Popielarz, Pamela A. and J. Miller McPherson (1995). "On the Edge or in Between: Niche Position, Niche Overlap, and the Duration of Voluntary Association Memberships." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 101 (November 3): 698-720.
- Potapchuk, William R., Jarle P. Crocker and William H. Schecter, Jr. (1997). "Building Community with Social Capital: Chits and Chums or Chats with Change." *National Civic Review* Vol. 86, No. 2 (Summer): 129-139.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1993). "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Economic Growth." *Current* October: 4-9.
- _____ (1995). "What Makes Democracy Work?" *National Civic Review* Spring 1993: 101-107.
- _____ (1995). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Tradition in Modern Italy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- _____ (1995). "Tuning in, Tuning out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. The 1995 Ithiel de Sola Pool Lecture." *Political Science and Politics* December: 664-683.
- _____ (1995). "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6.1: 65-78.
- _____ (1995). "Bowling Alone, Revisited." *The Responsive Community* Spring: 18-33.
- _____ (1996). "The Strange Disappearance of Civic America." *The American Prospect* Winter: 34-48.
- _____ (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Riley, M.W. & J.W. Riley (1989). "The Lives of Older People and Changing Social Roles." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* May: 14-28.
- Rubenstein, Ed (1996). "Right Data." *National Review* December 9: 20.
- Salamon, Lester M. (1995). *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls (1997). "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* Vol. 277 (August 15): 918-924.
- Samuelson, Robert J. (1996). "Bowling Alone is Bunk." *Washington Post* April 10: A19.
- Schneiderman, Howard G. (1997). Review of *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics* by Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady (1995, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 640 pp). *Society* May/June: 92-95.
- Shapiro, Robert Y. (1996-1997). Review of *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics* by Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady (1995, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 640 pp). *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. III, No. 4 (Winter).
- Simmel, Georg (1922). *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliation*. Edited by K. Wolf and R. Bendix. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, David Horton (1975). "Voluntary Action and Voluntary Groups." *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol. 1: 247-270.
- Smith, David Horton (1983). "Altruism, Volunteers and Volunteerism." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 12: 21-36.
- Smith, Tom W. (1990). "Trends in Voluntary Group Membership: Comments on Baumgartner and Walker." *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 34, No. 3 (August): 646-661.
- Snow, David A., Louis A. Zurcher, Jr. and Sheldon Eckland-Olson (1980). "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment." *American Sociology Review* 45: 787-801.
- Spitz, Reuben T. and John R. MacKinnon (1993). "Predicting Success in Volunteer Community Service." *Psychological Reports* 73 (December): 815-818.

- Stengel, Richard (1996). "Bowling Together: Civic Engagement in America isn't Disappearing but Reinventing Itself." *Time* July 22: 35.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- von Hayek, Friedrich von (1944). *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Waldman, Steven (1997). "The Case for Paid 'Volunteering.'" *U.S. World and News Report* April 28: 36.
- Walljasper, Jay (1994). "Community, Italian-Style: A New Study Shows that Civic-Mindedness Spawns Economic Prosperity and Effective Government." *Utne Reader* March/April: 20-22.
- Watt, D. (1991). "United States: Cultural Challenges to the Voluntary Sector." In *Between States and Markets: The Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective*, edited by R. Wuthnow. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 243-287.
- Weinstein, Lawrence, Xiaolin Xie and Charalambos C. Cleanthous (1995). "Purpose in Life, Boredom, and Volunteerism in a Group of Retirees." *Psychological Reports* 76: 482.
- Wilson, John and Thomas Janoski (1995). "The Contribution of Religion to Volunteer Work." *Sociology of Religion* Vol. 56-2: 137-152.
- Wilson, John & Marc Musick (1997). "Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work." *American Sociological Review* Vol. 62: 694-713.
- Wolpert, Julian (1995). "Delusions of Charity." Works discussed: *The Tragedy of American Compassion* by Marvin Olasky (1992, Regnery Publishing) and *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State* by Lester M. Salamon (1995, Johns Hopkins University Press). *The American Prospect* No. 23 (Fall): 86 -88.
- Wuthnow, R. (1990). "Religion and the Voluntary Spirit in the United States: Mapping the Terrain." In *Faith and Philanthropy in America*, edited by R. Wuthnow, V. Hodgkinson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 3-21.
- _____ (1991). *Acts of Compassion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.