VOLUNTEERING

John Wilson

Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708;
e-mail: JWils@soc.duke.edu

Key Words   Volunteers, activism, motives, human capital, social capital,
  commitment

■ **Abstract**   Volunteering is any activity in which time is given freely to benefit an-
other person, group or cause. Volunteering is part of a cluster of helping behaviors,
entailing more commitment than spontaneous assistance but narrower in scope than
the care provided to family and friends. Although developed somewhat independently,
the study of volunteerism and of social activism have much in common. Since data
gathering on volunteering from national samples began about a quarter of a century
ago, the rate for the United States has been stable or, according to some studies, rising
slightly. Theories that explain volunteering by pointing to individual attributes can be
grouped into those that emphasize motives or self-understandings on the one hand and
those that emphasize rational action and cost-benefit analysis on the other. Other the-
ories seek to complement this focus on individual level factors by pointing to the role
of social resources, specifically social ties and organizational activity, as explanations
for volunteering. Support is found for all theories, although many issues remained
unresolved. Age, gender and race differences in volunteering can be accounted for, in
large part, by pointing to differences in self-understandings, human capital, and so-
cial resources. Less attention has been paid to contextual effects on volunteering and,
while evidence is mixed, the impact of organizational, community, and regional char-
acteristics on individual decisions to volunteer remains a fruitful field for exploration.
Studies of the experience of volunteering have only just begun to plot and explain spells
of volunteering over the life course and to examine the causes of volunteer turnover.
Examining the premise that volunteering is beneficial for the helper as well as the
helped, a number of studies have looked at the impact of volunteering on subjective
and objective well-being. Positive effects are found for life-satisfaction, self-esteem,
self-rated health, and for educational and occupational achievement, functional ability,
and mortality. Studies of youth also suggest that volunteering reduces the likelihood
of engaging in problem behaviors such as school truancy and drug abuse.

INTRODUCTION

Volunteering means any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another
person, group, or organization. This definition does not preclude volunteers from
benefiting from their work. Whether these benefits can include material rewards

is open to debate. Some scholars believe that work is not truly volunteered if it is remunerated (J Smith 1991:115), whereas others believe that people who have elected to work in poorly paid jobs because they wish to do good should at least be considered "quasi-volunteers" (Smith 1982:25). Whether or not the definition of volunteering should include some reference to intentions is also subject to debate. Some think the desire to help others is constitutive of volunteering. Others subscribe to the view that volunteering means acting to produce a "public" good: No reference to motive is necessary. The recent emphasis on volunteering as a productive activity is compatible with this behavioral approach because volunteering is simply defined as an activity that produces goods and services at below market rate; no reference is made to the reasons for activity.

Volunteering is part of a general cluster of helping activities. Unlike the spontaneous help given to the victim of an assault, where it is necessary to decide rapidly whether or not to take action and the encounter is brief and often chaotic, volunteerism is typically proactive rather than reactive and entails some commitment of time and effort. Whether or not it should include behavior conventionally described as caring is currently under debate. In everyday usage, caring is associated with person-to-person emotional labor on behalf of family and friends; volunteering is thought of as being more formalized and public (Snyder & Omoto 1992:218). There are some obvious differences between these activities: There is a level of obligation implied by the care relationship that is not found in volunteering, and much of the social activism rightly labeled volunteering is caring only in a loose sense of the term. However, it would be wise not to make too much of this distinction. Volunteering can be seen as an extension of private behavior into the public sphere (Brudney 1990:3)—this is how many emergency squad volunteers see their work (Gora & Nemerowicz 1985:29)—and there is little question that volunteering should include informal helping behaviors, such as driving one's elderly neighbor for a medical check-up (Cnaan & Amrofell 1994:343).

Sociological convention distinguishes being an active participant in a voluntary association from volunteering (Cutler & Danigelis 1993:150, Gallagher 1994b:20, Payne & Bull 1985:253). There is something to be said for separating these roles. The first consumes the collective goods the organization provides, while the second helps produce those goods. Allowing this distinction, there is still some question as to whether people who help maintain the association they belong to should be counted as volunteers because the public good created is restricted to fellow members. But there seems to be no convincing reason to rule out such activities, although it might be useful to separate associational volunteers, who are members working for their organization, from program volunteers, who are members working on behalf of their organization (Smith 1997:20; see also Barkan et al 1995:116).

The relation between volunteering and activism also needs to be addressed. Conventional wisdom holds that social activists are oriented to social change while volunteers focus more on the amelioration of individual problems (Markham & Bonjean 1995:1556). There is some merit to distinguishing these roles: They might

well attract different kinds of people (Caputo 1997). But it should not be forgotten that the roles of activist and volunteer are social constructions; the volunteers Eliasoph (1998:12) studied wanted to "care about people," not about politics, and were thus quick to deny they were activists. When the government was slow to respond to the AIDS crisis volunteers had to double up as activists to help mobilize resources to deal with the problem (Chambre 1991:273). Social circumstances thus help determine the meaning of these two roles and their relation to each other. There is no good sociological reason to study them separately (Marwell & Oliver 1993).

RATES

In the past twenty years, quite a large number of social surveys have asked respondents about their volunteer work, including the 1998 *General Social Survey.* The most accurate count is probably that provided by the biennial surveys conducted by the Gallup Organization on behalf of the Independent Sector. The 1998 survey reported 56% of the United States population as having volunteered at some point during the past year. Social surveys report higher rates when they focus explicitly on volunteer activities, define volunteer work broadly to include informal assistance, and use lists of volunteer activities to jog respondents' memories.

Practitioners have always been worried about maintaining a supply of volunteer labor, but this topic has received fresh scrutiny in recent years as a result of the debate over the possibility that civic life is declining in modern societies, making them less democratic. In fact, volunteering rates in the United States are either stable (Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1996:2) or rising (Ladd 1999:64). Neither an increase in the labor force participation of women nor a decline in club and union memberships has lowered the volunteer rate (Segal 1993:87–93). Many new grassroots community organizations have arisen to replace the older clubs and associations; women have simply changed what they volunteer for as they take up paid employment; and a "third age" population of healthy elderly is volunteering at higher rates than ever before.

THEORIES OF VOLUNTEERING

This overview of theories of volunteering follows the outline used by House (1981) in his survey of research on social support, of which volunteering is one instance. He identifies three sets of factors associated with the provision of social support: characteristics of the individual, the properties of the relationships in which that individual is involved, and the community context. The overview is largely restricted to material published during the last decade. An overview of earlier material is provided by Smith (1994). Space considerations dictate that this review be confined mainly to work conducted in the United States.

At the level of the individual, two perspectives on volunteering predominate. One assumes a complexity in the constitution of the person while treating the

context as background; the other treats the human actor as driven by fairly simple mechanisms while treating the context in which those mechanisms work as complex. The first perspective is associated with more subjectivist approaches to sociological explanation, the second with more behaviorist. The first is dominated by the search for the motives behind volunteering; the second assumes that actors are rational and that the decision to volunteer is based largely on a weighing of costs and benefits in the context of varying amounts of individual and social resources.

Motives, Values and Beliefs

Many sociologists are skeptical of the existence of any identifiable drives, needs, or impulses that might inspire volunteerism. They dismiss the idea of motivation altogether from sociological discourse on this topic. This is a mistake because talk about motives is a key organizing feature of everyday life. Humans impute motives—to themselves and to others—and thereby validate or challenge identities, strengthen or weaken commitments (Broadbridge & Horne 1996:259). Motives play an important role in public thinking about volunteerism: Activities that seem to be truly selfless are the most esteemed (Cnaan et al 1996:375).

Social psychologists have devoted considerable effort to compiling an inventory of motives for volunteering (Clary et al 1996, Okun et al 1998, Snyder et al 1999, Sokolowski 1996). Much can be learned from this research about how people think about their volunteer work. However, most sociologists would not regard these motives as predispositions. Rather, they would treat motives as constitutive of action, part of a discourse giving meaning to and helping to shape behavior (Fischer & Schaffer 1993, Midlarsky & Kahana 1994, Smith 1982:28). Thus, one reason why teenagers are more likely to volunteer if their parents volunteer (Rosenthal et al 1998:490, Segal 1993:105, Sundeen & Raskoff 1994:392) is that their parents have taught them a positive way to think about volunteer work. They have learned motivational attributions as part of a larger set of cultural understandings passed on to them by their parents (Wuthnow 1995:105). Parents teach their children volunteer motivations when they teach them about social responsibility, reciprocity, and justice (Flanagan et al 1998:462, Fogelman 1997:150). For their teaching to be effective, they must practice what they preach, and they must actively manage their children's volunteer work to ensure it is neither too trivial nor too demanding (Pancer & Pratt 1999:43). Parents can even encourage pro-social attitudes in their children by *how* they raise them. Strong support (e.g. affection, praise, encouragement) is associated with a variety of positive outcomes among children and adolescents, including "the exhibition of considerate and altruistic behavior" (Amato & Booth 1997:17; see also Franz & McClelland 1994). There is little evidence, however, that motive talk learned in early childhood has a *direct* effect on adult volunteerism (Rosenthal et al 1998:491).

Besides their parents, young people learn how to think about volunteer work through schools. Children who volunteer during their high school years develop more pro-social attitudes and are more likely to volunteer in college and later in

their adult life (Astin 1993, Damico et al 1998). Learning to think of citizenship as carrying responsibilities as well as rights encourages teenagers to volunteer when they become adults regardless of whether they volunteered when young (Janoski et al 1998).

If motive talk is learned as part of a larger set of cultural understandings, it makes sense to expect these frameworks of consciousness to influence the decision to volunteer directly (Schervish & Havens 1997:241, Straub 1997). Volunteers do indeed rate working to improve their communities, aiding the less fortunate, and doing something for their country (Flanagan et al 1999:149) higher than nonvolunteers. They also rank the life-goals of personal charity and helping others higher than nonvolunteers (Sundeen 1992). But overall, the relation between values and volunteering is weak and inconsistent (religious and civic values do little to encourage volunteering) (Greeley 1999, Hoge et al 1998, Ladd 1999:72, Smith 1998:39, Wilson & Janoski 1995).

There are a number of reasons why values fail to predict volunteering reliably. Volunteering takes many forms, each inspired by a different set of values. Highly generalized value questions fail to capture this variation. Another reason is that different groups in the population attach different values to the same volunteer work (Serow & Dreyden 1990:560, Sundeen & Raskoff 1995). For example, some religious beliefs encourage helping AIDS victims while other religious beliefs discourage it (Omoto & Snyder 1993). A third reason is that values tend to be ineffectual outside support communities where norm enforcement is possible (Wuthnow 1991:156). In general, then, values are less important in helping decide who volunteers than in helping decide what volunteering means to the people who do: Members of conservative religious denominations in the United States think of volunteer work in terms of sacrifice; liberals think of it in terms of self-improvement.

Human Capital

Individual-level theories of volunteering founded on behaviorist assumptions argue that the decision to volunteer is based on a rational weighing of its costs and benefits. Ability to work is determined by resources. Earlier theories tended to associate volunteering with status differentiation. Doing good works was believed to be part of an ensemble of characteristics giving a person prestige and respect (Smith 1994:247). From the rational choice perspective, individual attributes such as level of education assume a different significance. They become inputs that make it easier to face the demands of volunteering. From this perspective, volunteering is a productive activity—its meaning to the volunteer is not particularly relevant (Herzog et al 1989:S129).

Education   Level of education is the most consistent predictor of volunteering (McPherson & Rotolo 1996:181, Sundeen & Raskoff 1994:392). Education boosts volunteering because it heightens awareness of problems, increases empathy, and

builds self-confidence (Brady et al 1995:285, Rosenthal et al 1998:480). Educated people are also more likely to be asked to volunteer (Brady et al 1999), which is partly a function of the fact they belong to more organizations (Herzog & Morgan 1993:137), where they develop more civic skills, such as the ability to run a meeting (Brady et al 1995:285). Nevertheless, the importance of education varies by type of volunteer work. For example, it is positively related to political volunteering and to AIDS-related volunteering but not related at all to informal community work (Omoto & Snyder 1993). The salience of education also increases if the task assigned requires literacy skills as opposed to social skills (Okun & Eisenberg 1992). In some instances, education has a curvilinear relation to volunteering: Volunteer firefighters are more likely than other members of their community to have graduated from high school but less likely to have a college degree (Thompson 1993a).

Human capital theory offers an explanation for why children inherit their parents' volunteering habits different from that found in motivation studies. Rather than modeling ideals, parents supply resources. And indeed, children of high-status parents are more likely to volunteer (Sundeen & Raskoff 1994:392). However, the scope of conditions of human capital theory are not clear. Janoski & Wilson (1995) show that offsprings' volunteering for groups concerned with community problems is predicted by parents' volunteering and by their own marital and parent status at the time, while neither parents' nor volunteers' socioeconomic status has much effect. Conversely, volunteering for more self-oriented organizations, such as unions and professional associations, is predicted by parents' and the volunteers' own socioeconomic status but is negatively related to the volunteers' family status. Parents role model the first but provide the resources for the second.

Work   It was long supposed that the volunteer labor force consisted mainly of women with time on their hands, the implication being that paid employment and volunteering were incompatible. A competing hypothesis is that work is a form of social integration and a means of building civic skills, both of which increase the chances of volunteering.

Free Time.   Role overload theory (Markham & Bonjean 1996) predicts a negative relation between paid work hours and volunteer hours. Time constraints do seem to operate *among the employed,* because part-time workers volunteer more than full-time workers. However, the relation between paid work and volunteer work is complicated by two other facts. The lowest rates of volunteering are found among those not in the labor force at all—unemployed people and homemakers (Stubbings & Humble 1984:27). This suggests that work is a form of social integration, which encourages volunteering. Getting a paid job can also boost self-confidence and teach organizational skills (Brady et al 1995, Schoenberg 1980:S264). It is worth noting in this context that the positive effect of employment on volunteering is stronger for women than men (Gerstel & Gallagher 1994:526). The other fact complicating the relation between work and volunteering is that, among full-time

workers, there is a slight *upward* curve in volunteering as paid work hours increase (Segal 1993:84, Wuthnow 1998:76). Perhaps working hours are measuring not only the time demands of the job but also its importance—and people with higher-prestige jobs tend to volunteer more.

Further insight into the connection between work hours and volunteering awaits the exploration of a number of other issues. First, rather than hours worked, what might be important is the individual's control over those hours: The self-employed and people with flexible work schedules are the most likely to volunteer (Freeman 1997:S156, Thompson 1993a,b). Second, rather than counting how many hours people work for pay, it might be more important to learn *why* they are working those hours. Part-time workers for whom reduced hours are a matter of choice are the most likely to volunteer. Third, other demands on free time need to be considered simultaneously. When people say they are "too busy" to volunteer they are as likely to be referring to other caring responsibilities as they are to the demands of their job (Brady et al 1995:274, Gallagher 1994a:575).

Jobs.   Rather than counting how many hours people spend at work it might be more important to ask what they do when they get there. As occupational status increases so does the likelihood of volunteering (Smith 1994, Stubbings & Humble 1984:12, Wilson & Musick 1997b). Status generalization suggests that managerial and professional level people are more likely to be asked to volunteer. It is also probable that such people get more intrinsic rewards from their work, building up an attachment to work and work-like activities that easily translates into volunteerism (Herzog & Morgan 1993:140). Although it is possible that some people find in their volunteer work compensation for what is denied them in paid employment, rational choice theory predicts that volunteer work replicates paid work because the volunteer is using skills developed in the workplace. People who have self-directed jobs, those that score high on autonomy, decision-making, complexity and variety, volunteer for a wider range of activities than other workers (Wilson & Musick 1997b).

Income   Rational choice theorists assume that volunteer hours are inversely related to wages because opportunity costs rise as pay rises (Wolff et al 1993:25). The evidence is mixed. Looking at hours volunteered among those who volunteer, Freeman (1997:S152) finds a negative relation between wage income and volunteering. Menchik & Weisbrod (1987) find that hours of volunteering work are positively related to income from all sources, but at a decreasing rate (their data excludes married women). Segal (1993:47) finds that, among single adults (18–54), volunteer hours are positively related to wages and negatively related to wealth, but only among men. Among the elderly, income has a positive effect on the number of groups to which people belong, but has no effect on the number of hours volunteered overall (Gallagher 1994a:36). Raskoff & Sundeen (1995) find that income is positively associated only with health-related and education-related volunteering and has no impact on religious or informal volunteering. Although

the balance of these studies denies the contention that an increase in income will depress volunteering hours, the net effect of income on volunteering varies by how income is measured, how volunteering is measured, and which other variables are included in the model.

Exchange Theory

Labeling human capital a resource does little more than predict that people with more human capital are more likely to volunteer. It does not provide a mechanism to explain why they do so. The rational choice assumption is that actors will not contribute goods and services to others unless they profit from the exchange (Smith 1982:39). There is reason to believe this might help explain some of the variation in volunteering. First, actors clearly do weigh costs and benefits when considering volunteer work. For example, the stigma attached to some kinds of volunteering makes it harder to recruit people (Snyder et al 1999). Second, many volunteers clearly have a stake in their volunteer work: Parents are more likely to join the PTA when their children enter school. Third, many people volunteer because they anticipate needing help themselves or have already received help and want to give something back (Banks 1997, Broadbridge & Horne 1996, Freeman 1997:S164, Kincade et al 1996). Fourth, volunteers explicitly acknowledge the benefits they receive from their work, as when homosexuals deal with their own fears and apprehensions by volunteering to help AIDS victims [Omoto & Snyder 1993:167, Chambre 1995:123; see Field & Johnson (1993:1627) for hospice workers]. Fifth, volunteers are not indifferent to rewards—principally recognition for their efforts—and are more likely to drop out if they fail to receive them (Field & Johnson 1993:1629). Sixth, volunteering often provides solidary benefits, the pleasure of socializing with staff, other volunteers, and clients to whom emotional attachments may be formed (Wuthnow 1998:149)—although these benefits will be most appealing to those who volunteer in order to make friends (Leighley 1996). Finally, some volunteers are quite explicit about seeking compensation for deprivations they experience in their paid employment or work as homemakers (Gora & Nemerowicz 1985:40).

A number of criticisms can be made of the explanation of volunteering in terms of exchange. First, in an attempt to apply their utilitarian calculus, exchange theorists focus too much on easily quantified costs, such as time spent and income lost, and not enough on the other resources demanded by volunteer work, such as civic skills—the ability to speak or write well, or organize and participate in meetings (Brady et al 1995)—that might be more important but are more difficult to quantify. Second, while volunteer work might provide psychic benefits, they are not necessarily the reason why people volunteer. A volunteer might feel good about doing the right thing, but she does not do it because it makes her feel good; rather it makes her feel good because she thinks she ought to have done it. Third, when volunteers say how much they benefit from serving others, they could simply be engaging in reciprocity talk in which they articulate their need to complete

the transaction by indicating how much they enjoy the work so that a balance is restored to the relationship (Wuthnow 1991:95). Fourth, exchange theory assumes that people must act in a self-interested manner in order for social equilibrium to be achieved, placing their own interests before those of others, but a competing theory argues that people's identity is important and that many people think of themselves as the kind of person who helps others regardless of whether their actions receive praise (Hart et al 1996, Schervish & Havens 1997:240). This theory, better than exchange theory, might explain why it is often easier to get people to sign up for risky, challenging, demanding work than for mundane, trivial, and routine tasks: "they want to be challenged by what they're doing, and they don't hesitate to do something that's going to be hard" (Chambre 1991:276). A final criticism of exchange theory introduces the topic of the next section. Exchange theory assumes individuals make their volunteer decisions in isolation when, in reality, people assess their environments and decide on courses of action in the context of formal and informal networks that are expressive of feelings of group solidarity (Rochon 1998:97). What makes a resource like education capital is determined by the larger social context in which it is embedded.

Social Resources

Social Networks   Extensive social networks, multiple organizational member-ships, and prior volunteer experience all increase the chances of volunteering (Jackson et al 1995:75, Marwell & Oliver 1993, McPherson et al 1992:157, Smith 1994:255, Walsh 1988:125, Wilson & Musick 1997a). Few volunteers learn about opportunities through the mass media, and face-to-face invitations are much more effective than impersonal appeals (Midlarsky & Kahana 1994:219), especially if they come from a volunteer who knows something about the work (McAdam & Paulsen 1993:644). Social resources play a crucial role when volunteering means activism to bring about social change or when collective goods, such as safer streets, are the goal. In this case, anything that promotes social solidarity among members of a community, such as frequent interaction, increases the rate of volunteering (Rochon 1998:102).

Social resources help explain why people of higher socioeconomic status volunteer more: They join more organizations and are more likely to be active in them (Wilson & Musick 1997a). Social networks help explain why extroverted people are more likely to volunteer, because there is nothing in extroversion as such that would predict helping others. Extroverts get to know more people and join more clubs and associations, and this in turn increases the chances they will volunteer (Herzog & Morgan 1993:136). Social networks help explain the higher rate of volunteering among married people and parents. Social networks also help explain why religious people volunteer more: They attend church more frequently (National Association of Secretaries of State 1999:35; Wilson & Janoski 1995). Social resources also work *in combination with* human capital. The effect of

social resources on volunteering is stronger among higher-status people (Wilson & Musick 1998).

The mechanisms that link social resources to volunteering are only now being investigated. Social ties generate trust, and trust makes it easier for us to step forward and donate our time (Brady et al 1999:162, Wood 1997:601). Social ties also encourage manifold relations that can be used as "side payments" to overcome the free rider problem; we do not want to let our friends down. Social ties to organizations also help define the volunteer role and thus make it easier to perform (Wuthnow 1991:201). Organizations help spread the word about the need for volunteers and reduce uncertainty about who else will volunteer (Walsh 1988). They also share the work, reduce the risk, and defray the expense. This is one reason why recruiting appeals are more effective in smaller organizations (Murnighan et al 1993, Schaubroeck & Ganster 1991). Finally, social ties increase the chances of being asked to volunteer (Brady et al 1999:158), which helps explain why people with lots of human capital are more likely to volunteer—they have more social ties to expose them to being asked (Freeman 1997:162).

Integrating the idea of social resources into a theory of volunteering undoubtedly enriches it. A number of problems remain to be dealt with. First, whether social ties are positive or negative for volunteering depends on the nature of the volunteer work. Conventional activities, such as Meals on Wheels, might be supported by service clubs or church organizations, but less conventional activities, such as picketing, might be shunned (Anderson 1996). Family ties might encourage volunteering at a hospice but discourage taking part in dangerous civil rights campaigns (McAdam & Paulsen 1993, Wiltfang & McAdam 1991:995) or helping AIDS patients (Snyder et al 1999). Second, social ties can be relatively insignificant, depending on the nature of the volunteer work. Neither AIDS volunteers nor animal rights activists were recruited through network ties but were more likely to be responding to something they had seen in the mass media (Jaspers 1997:175, Omoto & Snyder 1993:167). Third, it is frequently difficult to decide in advance what will constitute a social resource, and the determination can be made only after the volunteering occurs. Not only does this mean that the term social capital varies in meaning from one study to another, but it also makes the theory difficult to disprove—something that must have functioned as social capital can always be found. For example, church attendance is often cited as an example of social capital, but it has no effect on the volunteer rate of moderate Protestants (Wilson & Janoski 1995). Does this disprove the theory or simply mean that church attendance is not a social resource for this group? Similarly, McAdam & Paulsen (1993) found that the sheer number of social ties did not encourage participation in civil rights campaigns. Only those ties with meaning and significance in light of the civil rights work for which these people were being recruited produced this result.

A fourth problem with the social resources theory is that one of its key elements, trust, does not predict volunteering consistently. The 1995 *Independent Sector Survey of Giving and Volunteering* shows that volunteers are more trusting than

nonvolunteers, but another major study finds no relationship between volunteering and either institutional or interpersonal trust once a person's age, education and income are taken into account (Kohut 1998:6). Indeed, for African-Americans, the less they trust government the more likely are they to volunteer (Kohut 1998:44). Institutional trust is unlikely to increase volunteering when people are using their volunteer time to protest the government or work in some way to ameliorate the conditions created by a government they do not trust (Deckker et al 1997:230). Similar questions can be raised about interpersonal trust. It is a lack of trust in others to do what is right that spurs people to take action (Oliver 1984).

Family Relations   Although studies of charitable donations usually treat the household as the unit of analysis, this is rarely done in the study of volunteering. This is an error because much volunteer work is organized by and around family relations.

Marital Status.   Married people are more likely to volunteer than single people, although single people without children volunteer the most hours (Sundeen 1990:497). If one spouse volunteers, the chances are the other does also (Freeman 1997:S148, Thompson 1993b). If only one spouse volunteers, it is most likely to be the wife (Wuthnow 1995:272). A wife's volunteering *complements* her husband's—as his volunteer hours increase, hers also increase; but a husband's volunteering is a *substitute* for his wife's—as her hours increase, his decrease (Segal 1993:100).

The effect of marital status on volunteering is contingent on a number of other factors. It depends on where the volunteer work is being performed; studies of political volunteering find no marital status effect at all (Damico et al 1998, Schlozman et al 1994). The effect of marital status probably also varies by life course stage. If other studies of the social activities of retired persons are to be believed, it is likely when a couple reaches retirement age that the marriage becomes a constraint rather than a springboard to volunteering. However, the data on this topic are scarce and results confusing. Szinovacz (1992:243) finds that elderly married women volunteer more than single, but Gallagher (1994b:123) fails to replicate this finding.

Parental Status.   Children in the household are both a constraint and an opportunity when it comes to volunteering, depending on the number of children, the children's ages, the parents' ages, marital status and employment status, and the nature of the volunteer work. The effect of children on volunteering can also be indirect: Parents, particularly women, can choose to work only part time in order to rear their young children and for this reason have more time for volunteering.

Parents are more likely to volunteer if they have children at home (Wuthnow 1998:76), but parents with young children volunteer fewer hours than parents with older children (Damico et al 1998:20, Menchik & Weisbrod 1987:177, Schlozman et al 1994). School-age children forge social links to schools, sports organizations,

and other youth-oriented nonprofits. It is also likely that when children enter school, parents have more free time (Gora & Nemerowicz 1985:17).

A number of moderating effects are suggested by the research literature. Unemployed women are more affected by having school-age children, possibly because they are using their children as a medium of social integration (Gallagher 1994b:131). Having school-age children in the household has a positive effect on the volunteer rate of married but not single people (Segal 1993:181, Sundeen 1990). Finally, the impact of children varies by the nature of the volunteer task: When the volunteer work is helping community-oriented groups, children are a plus; when it is helping professional associations or unions, they are a minus (Janoski & Wilson 1995, Woodard 1987).

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF VOLUNTEERING

The theories outlined in the previous section can be used to explain some of the age, gender, and race variations in volunteering, although in all three cases residual and unexplained differences remain that might be attributable to prejudice and discrimination.

Age   As people age, their stock of human capital changes, and thus the likelihood they will volunteer. Aging also reconfigures social roles, creating fresh opportunities and imposing new constraints. Finally, people of different ages and generations have different outlooks on life, which may change their attitude toward volunteering.

The rate of volunteering tends to fall during the transition from adolescence to young adulthood, when the structure of school-related activities gives way to the social freedoms of the single and childless life. Volunteering rises to its peak in middle age (Herzog et al 1989:S134, Menchik & Weisbrod 1987, National Association of Secretaries of State 1999:23, Schoenberg 1980). The exception to this pattern is high-risk volunteering, which attracts mainly younger people, and this, coupled with a high burnout rate, skews its age profile toward youth (Thompson 1993a, Wiltfang & McAdam 1991:1005). Rational choice theory predicts an increase in volunteering at retirement because more free time becomes available. Exchange theory assumes that retirees seek volunteer work to replace psychic and social benefits formerly derived from paid employment (Fischer et al 1991:262, Midlarsky & Kahana 1994:53). On the other hand, all things being equal, social resource theory would predict a decline in volunteering to the extent that withdrawing from the labor force weakens social integration. Numerous studies have shown that retirement does not, in fact, draw people into the volunteering labor force, although it does increase the number of hours worked among those already volunteering (Caro & Bass 1995:74, Caro & Bass 1997, Gallagher 1994b:30, Herzog et al 1989). Only when infirmity or extreme old age sets in does the volunteer rate begin to fall (Glass et al 1995:S70, Kincade et al 1996, Wilson & Musick 1997a). Among the

retired, those most likely to be volunteering are actually working in a part-time job, enjoying both the social contacts of the job and the leisure provided by the part-time employment (Caro & Bass 1997, Okun 1994, Stephan 1991:232).

As people move from young adulthood to middle age, they move out of self- and career-oriented activism into more community-oriented work (Janoski & Wilson 1995). As they make the subsequent transition from middle to old age, they turn away from youth-related, political and ethnic groups and toward service organizations, recreational clubs and agencies to help the elderly (Gallagher 1994b:33, Romero 1987). To some extent, these shifts are quite compatible with exchange theory because people are taking up work from which they might one day benefit. However, changing values over the life course offer a better explanation of why volunteering in a religious context becomes more popular as people age and why religiosity becomes a more powerful influence on volunteering (Caro & Bass 1995:75).

Gender   In North America, females are slightly more likely to volunteer than males, but in Europe there is no overall gender difference because females volunteer less than males in some countries and more than males in others (Gaskin & Smith 1997:29, Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1996:D148, Hall et al 1998). It is not clear why these patterns vary from one country to another. Among volunteers, men and women contribute the same number of hours (Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1996:D148). The effect of gender varies by life cycle stage. Among younger people, females tend to volunteer more hours than males (Wuthnow 1995:152), but among older people the pattern is reversed (Gallagher 1994b:74).

Human capital, motivations and beliefs, and social resources all help explain gender differences in volunteering. Females score higher on measures of altruism and empathy, attach more value to helping others (Wilson & Musick 1997a), feel more guilty when they have not been compassionate (Flanagan et al 1998:44), and believe they are expected to care for the personal and emotional needs of others (Daniels 1988). Many women see their volunteer work as an extension of their roles as wives and mothers (Negrey 1993:93). The reason these expectations do not produce much higher volunteer rates for women is that men have more human capital and free time. Women would volunteer even more if they had the same amount of human capital as men (Gallagher 1994b:74, Kendall & Knapp 1991:255, Rosenthal et al 1998:485). Men are also more likely than women, net of education, to hold the kinds of jobs that provide the civic skills on which much volunteering depends (Schlozman et al 1994:977). Resources also work better for men than women; for example, education has a stronger effect on the volunteering of men than women, at least in the political sphere (Schlozman et al 1994:969). There is some evidence, however, that women compensate for their lack of human capital by having more social resources, which brings their volunteer rate closer to that of men (Wilson & Musick 1997a).

Gender makes a difference not only to how much people volunteer but also to what kind of work they do. Women volunteers gravitate, or are steered, toward

"women's work," more of the caring, person-to-person tasks and fewer of the public, political activities, and they are less likely to be found in leadership positions (Cable 1992:38, Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen 1991, Menchik & Weisbrod 1987, Perkins 1990, Schlozman et al 1994:970, Thompson 1993a, 1995:55). This pattern does not vary by country (Gaskin & Smith 1997:35), race (Woodard 1987) or age group (Fischer et al 1991, Sundeen & Raskoff 1994, Wuthnow 1995:163).

Gender ideologies help explain why volunteering fits into the social lives of men and women differently. Men are more likely to regard their volunteer work as complementary to their real work; there is much more heterogeneity among women with regard to how they relate these two spheres (Little 1997). The same could be said for the relation between social resources and volunteering. Young females are more likely to volunteer in the company of friends, to see volunteering as a way to have a social life, and to seek the approval of their peers by volunteering (Wuthnow 1995:163). Young males are more likely than females to seek out volunteer opportunities on their own (Sundeen & Raskoff 1995). Similar gender differences are found among the elderly. Women link their involvement as volunteers to their existing friendships with other women, while men volunteer in order to make friends (Gallagher 1994b:84).

Race   Data from a 1995 US national sample show 51.9% of whites and 35.3% of blacks having volunteered in the past month (Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1996:D148). Human capital theory explains this racial difference by pointing to lower levels of education, income, and occupational status among blacks. Several studies support this theory, finding that racial differences in volunteering disappear after controls for education, income, occupational status, and neighborhood conditions (Clary et al 1996, Cutler & Danigelis 1993:155, Latting 1990:122, Romero 1987, Woodard 1987:286, Wuthnow 1998:114, 236). Other studies conclude that the lack of human capital is even more detrimental to blacks' chances of volunteering than it appears because some of the effect of human capital is suppressed by the compensating social resources (mainly ties to their church) that blacks possess (Sundeen 1992, Wilson & Musick 1997a). Despite these social resources blacks are less likely to be asked to volunteer (Ferree et al 1998:64, Hodgkinson 1995:44).

Like age and gender, race makes a difference to what kind of volunteer work people do. Black volunteers focus on needs more pressing in the black community—efforts to deal with crime, provide human services, and organize for local political initiatives (Ferree et al 1998:17, Portney & Berry 1997:639, Sundeen 1992).

Race differences in the explanation of volunteering have not received much attention. One clear pattern is that blacks are more influenced by their church than are whites [Ferree et al 1998:76, Musick et al 2000; but see Calhoun-Brown (1996), who finds no relation between black political volunteering and church attendance]. One study of Mobile, Alabama, residents found that trust had a stronger positive effect on black volunteering than white volunteering (Emig et al 1996), but a study of Philadelphia residents found trust to be unrelated to volunteering for either race (Kohut 1998).

As far as cultural understandings are concerned, there is little solid evidence of racial differences in values regarding altruism. Wilson & Musick (1997a) show that blacks are less likely than whites to believe that helping others is important to living a good life, but this value does not account for any racial differences in volunteering. It is possible that blacks and whites volunteer for different reasons, but the evidence is mixed. From a small sample, Latting (1990) shows that blacks are more likely than whites to indicate altruistic norms and motives for volunteering, but data from a more representative national survey show no difference (Clary et al 1996).

CONTEXTUAL EFFECTS

By context is meant ecological factors ranging from units as small as households, residential blocks, workplaces, and schools to those as large as cities, regions, and countries. The impact of context on individual volunteering is one of the least understood issues in the field (Smith 1994:246, Wuthnow 1998:112).

Since schooling is believed to encourage volunteering, it is natural to examine the school as context. Sundeen & Raskoff (1994:393) find that, net of individual differences, the chances a student will volunteer increase if he or she attends a school that requires or encourages community service. Serow & Dreyden (1990) find that students attending private colleges with a strong religious orientation participate in community service more frequently than students at private colleges with less emphasis on religion or at public universities. Other than these studies of schools, the impact of organizational context on volunteering has hardly been explored. Wilson & Musick (1997b) show that people who work in the public sector—government workers—are more likely to volunteer than people who work in the private sector or work for themselves. It is not clear whether this is a function of self-selection or a result of a "corporate culture" of service fostered by government agencies.

More attention has been directed at the impact of neighborhood conditions on volunteering: "membership in civic and other voluntary organizations is significantly lower in low-income, central city areas than elsewhere, and this difference persists when most characteristics of individual respondents are taken into account" (Wuthnow 1998:113). Residents regard these neighborhoods as unsafe, and neighboring relations are weaker—fewer people know other people on the block (Chavis & Wandersman 1990). Nevertheless, research has failed to find consistent neighborhood effects on volunteering. In a study of community volunteering in three US cities, Perkins et al (1996) found that volunteers were more likely to engage in informal neighboring but no consistent neighborhood effects were found. In some instances healthy neighborhoods seemed to encourage activism, but in others the deteriorating condition of the neighborhood seemed to spur activism. Portney & Berry (1997) examined the impact of the racial composition of the neighborhood on volunteering: Predominantly black neighborhoods boosted involvement in neighborhood associations and crime-watch organizations at every socioeconomic level; predominantly white neighborhoods boosted involvement in

issue-based organizations and social and service organizations. Each race seemed to be able to set its own agenda.

At a higher level of abstraction, context means urban-rural differences. Cities are thought to be less congenial to volunteering (Smith 1994:245), but data from a national sample fail to confirm this (Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1996:D153). Rather than determining whether people will volunteer, place of residence might influence their reasons for volunteering. Those who live in small towns emphasize solidarity benefits and norms of reciprocity while suburbanites emphasize self-development (Wuthnow 1998:136).

COMMITMENT

Practitioners' interest in holding onto the volunteers they recruit is one reason why sociologists have studied commitment to the volunteer role. Commitment can be thought of in two ways: as attachment to the volunteer role over time, and as commitment to a particular organization or task.

Little is known about the frequency and duration of involvement in the volunteer labor force. Segal (1993:79) found that, while 20% of the women in the National Longitudinal Survey were volunteering at any given time, only 9% volunteered for all five waves of the 15-year study. Robison et al (1995), following married women over a 30-year span, found that the average woman had volunteered for 12 years during that period, the most common pattern being one of intermittent involvement. Another panel study found that the strongest attachment was shown by volunteers who were white and highly educated, had children in the household and interacted frequently with their friends and neighbors (Wilson & Musick 1999).

Volunteer burnout is a serious problem for administrators, particularly where the work is costly or risky. This is one of several reasons why volunteer organizations have quite high turnover rates. Lack of resources can help explain some of the drop-out rate. The same set of variables that predict the decision to volunteer also predict commitment (Barkan (1995:131, McPherson 1981). For example, highly educated people are not only more likely to volunteer but also less likely to drop out. Motives also play a role. Snyder & Omoto (1992:231) were surprised to find that AIDS volunteers who espoused personal development reasons for their work were most likely to have stayed, while those who espoused values as reasons for volunteering were more likely to drop out. Any disjunction between the volunteer's motives for volunteering and the actual work assigned is likely to weaken commitment (Holden 1997, Snyder & Omoto 1992:229). Social resources also help explain commitment. AIDS volunteers are more highly committed if friends and family support them in their work (Snyder et al 1999:1180).

The peculiar moral economy of volunteering means that the normal predictions about the impact of job satisfaction on commitment do not apply. Level of satisfaction with current volunteering seems to have little to do with commitment (Penner & Finkelstein 1998:534, Wilson & Musick 1999), and people who stop

volunteering rarely say they did so because of low job satisfaction. They are more likely to say their efforts went unrecognized (Gora & Nemerowicz 1985:31), their skills and interests were not properly matched with the assignments they were given, or they were not given enough autonomy or freedom to help those they wished to serve (Harris 1996, Holden 1997:132, Perkins 1987, Wharton 1991).

CONSEQUENCES

Surveys show that most people believe that helping others is good for the donor as well as the recipient (Wuthnow 1991:87). This section reviews some recent research on the consequences of volunteering in four areas: citizenship, antisocial behavior, health and socioeconomic achievement.

Citizenship

Volunteers tend to be more politically active than non-volunteers. Suggested reasons for this relationship include the sharing of information (Knoke 1990), the opportunity to develop "civic skills" such as the ability to organize a meeting (Verba et al 1995) and the fostering of generalized trust (Stolle 1998). Volunteering seems to play some role in political socialization: Adolescent volunteers express stronger support for society's responsibility to care for the needy (Hamilton & Fenzel 1988) and attach more importance to serving the public interest as a personal life goal (Flanagan et al 1998). High school students who volunteer are more likely to be also engaged in a variety of conventional political behaviors such as working on a political campaign (Youniss et al 1999).

Antisocial Behavior

It is part of folk wisdom that volunteering helps "keep kids out of trouble." Sociological research lends quite strong support for this notion, whether it be cross-sectional analysis (Hart & Atkins 1998), a pre-test/post-test design (Allen et al 1994:627), or panel study (Eccles & Bonner 1999:15, Uggen & Janikula 1999). Despite the use of longitudinal data, skeptics might still be concerned that these results are distorted by selection bias caused by conforming children self-selecting into volunteer work. A number of other issues remain unresolved. It is not clear *why* being a volunteer keeps young people out of trouble. Social control theory would argue that volunteering exposes young people to informal social controls and supervision. Differential association theory would argue that volunteering inhibits contact with law violators.

Physical Health

Because volunteering is an additional social role, it can be expected to produce the beneficial health effects associated with more social ties. Additionally,

"the altruistic features of volunteerism might reduce destructive levels of self-absorption" (Oman et al 1999:303). A number of recent studies, all using longitudinal data, show that volunteers subsequently enjoy better physical health in old age (Stephan 1991), score higher on measures of functional ability (Moen et al 1992:1628) and, most striking of all, are at lower risk of mortality (Musick et al 1999, Oman et al 1999, Rogers 1996, Sabin 1993). Most of the health benefits accrue to those who volunteer in moderation and who volunteer in connection with a church. The panel design of these studies deals with some of the problems of causal attribution in this area, although possible problems of selection bias remain. However, causal effects and selection effects can be mutually reinforcing as well as mutually exclusive. Volunteering improves health, but it is also most likely that healthier people are more likely to volunteer. Good health is preserved by volunteering; it keeps healthy volunteers healthy.

Mental Health

Volunteering is a way for people to become integrated into their community, and it is well-established that social integration yields positive mental health effects (House et al 1988:302). Quite apart from its integrative role, volunteering is a way of providing help to others, which can be a self-validating experience (Krause et al 1992:P300). It can also convince people they can make a difference in the world, and this feeling is known to buffer people from depression (Mirowsky & Ross 1989). The data confirm that volunteering boosts self-esteem and self-confidence and increases overall life satisfaction (Harlow & Cantor 1996:1241). Volunteering assumes an especially important role among the elderly because it can "inoculate, or protect, [them] . . . from hazards of retirement, physical decline and inactivity" (Fischer & Schaffer 1993:9). In a meta-analysis by Wheeler et al (1998) of thirty-seven studies of the effects of volunteering on elderly populations, a significant positive relation between volunteering and life satisfaction was found, even after adjustments for socioeconomic status and physical health. Because most of the studies reviewed were cross-sectional, they cannot answer the question whether volunteering increases well-being over time. There is also some suggestion that the mental health consequences of volunteering are moderated by race, gender, and the nature of the volunteer work (McIntosh & Danigelis 1995).

Socioeconomic Achievement

Nearly a quarter of the volunteers in the 1995 *Independent Sector Survey of Giving and Volunteering* mentioned they were volunteering to "make new contacts that might help my business or career" (Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1996:4–112). However, reliable social science evidence to support the idea that volunteering actually helps people find jobs, or improves the quality of those jobs, is scarce.

One pathway from volunteering to occupational achievement is through education. Adolescents who volunteer have higher educational aspirations, higher grade point averages, higher academic self-esteem, and a stronger intrinsic motivation

toward school work (Johnson et al 1998). Undergraduates who volunteer are more likely to earn postgraduate degrees (Astin et al 1998). College students who choose to participate in service learning projects are more likely to see an improvement in their grade point average; and, although all college students tend to lower their expectations about pursuing an advanced degree over the course of their college career, the decline is less steep for volunteers (Sax & Astin 1997).

Statham & Rhoton's (1986) unpublished paper provides one of the few analyses of the effects of volunteering on occupational achievement. Using data from the Mature Women's Module of the *National Longitudinal Survey,* they find that, among women who were working for pay in 1981, those who had reported volunteering in 1974 had higher occupational prestige, net of occupational prestige in 1974. It is not clear why volunteering should have these positive effects. Since it is known that volunteers have more social contacts, e.g. with neighbors and local government officials (Wuthnow 1998:235), they could be using these social ties to get better jobs.

CONCLUSION

The last quarter century has seen tremendous advances in the study of volunteering, prompted by more determined efforts to assess all forms of productive inputs to the public household, whether paid or not, by growing concern about how to provide social services in a time of government retrenchment, and by the debate over the future of the public sphere in an age of increasing materialism and individualism. In using sociological methods to address these concerns, social scientists, prodded and encouraged by an active and vocal community of practitioners in the nonprofit sector who are anxious to apply the insights of social science to advance their work, are able to draw on a deep bedrock of disciplinary interest in the explanation of altruistic behavior and collective action.

Much more is now known about the distribution and social correlates of volunteering, the variations in amounts and types of volunteering between major demographic groups, the pathways that lead to volunteer work, and the reasons why people detach themselves from it. We also now know much more about the mechanisms that link factors such as education, occupation, income, and group memberships to volunteer work. In the process, we have learned more about the difficulties of measuring volunteer work, the complexities of gathering accurate data in this area, and the importance of supplementing survey data with richer ethnographic understandings of the volunteer.

Despite these and other advances much work remains. One problem is that the generic term "volunteering" embraces a vast array of quite disparate activities. It is probably not fruitful to try to explain all activities with the same theory nor to treat all activities as if they were the same with respect to consequences. The taxonomies of volunteering that are used to disaggregate volunteer work are folk categories (e.g. school-related, helping the elderly), and there is little reason to believe these

categorizations are sociologically useful. Second, panel data are only now beginning to make possible longitudinal analysis of volunteering. Until more such data are available, many of the associations between volunteering and background factors remain just that, correlations, and we are in no position to make causal statements. Nor is it possible to form a picture of the "career" of the volunteer as he or she moves in and out of the volunteer labor force. Third, much of the survey data analysis of volunteering ignores the household as the unit of analysis, thus underplaying the role of family interactions—and the interplay of these interactions with extra-family constraints such as work. Fourth, while much has been achieved in gaining a clearer understanding of the role of social resources in facilitating volunteer work, the concept is poorly developed and usually badly measured. It tends to be ego-centered, providing some information on the individual's social ties, but no information on the ties that might exist among his or her social contacts, or whether or not those contacts are also volunteers. Nor has the problem been solved of deciding in advance what is to count as a social resource. Fifth, the study of the consequences of volunteering has only just begun. Recently, a body of research has begun to accumulate findings on the contribution of volunteering to citizenship in a number of countries. The problem with this research is its rather narrow definition of citizenship, which is largely supportive of the status quo. It fails to consider the role of community organizations, for example in fostering new ideas of democratic politics and citizenship. The research on the consequences of volunteering for subjective well-being is full of promise, but it has largely been confined to the elderly population, among whom, it might be surmised, this kind of activity has most salience. More studies are needed for younger age groups, and more attention needs to be paid to how beneficial effects are contingent on such factors as freedom of choice of task and working hours.

Visit the Annual Reviews home page at www.AnnualReviews.org

LITERATURE CITED

Allen JP, Kuperminc G, Philliber S, Herre K. 1994. Programmatic prevention of adolescent behavior problems: the role of autonomy, relatedness, and volunteer service in Teen Outreach programs. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 22:617–38

Amato P, Booth A. 1997. *A Generation at Risk: Growing up in an Era of Family Upheaval.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Anderson C. 1996. Political action and social integration. *Am. Polit. Q.* 24:105–25

Ascoli U, Cnaan R. 1997. Volunteers for human service provisions: lessons from Italy and the USA. *Soc. Ind. Res.* 40:299–327

Astin A. 1993. *What Matters in College?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Astin A, Sax L, Avalos J. 1998. Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Rev. Higher Educ.* 22:187–202

Banks E. 1997. The social capital of self-help mutual aid groups. *Soc. Policy* 28:30–39

Barkan S, Cohn S, Whitaker W. 1995. Beyond recruitment: predictors of differential participation in a national anti-hunger organization. *Sociol. Forum* 10:113–34

Brady H, Verba S, Schlozman KL. 1995.

Beyond SES: a resource model of political participation. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 89:269–95

Brady H, Schlozman KL, Verba S. 1999. Prospecting for participants: rational expectations and the recruitment of political activists. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 93:153–69

Broadbridge A, Horne S. 1996. Volunteers in charity retailing: recruitment and training. *Nonprofit Manage. Leadership* 6:255–70

Brudney J. 1990. *Fostering Volunteer Programs in the Public Sector.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Cable S. 1992. Women's social movement involvement: the role of structural availability in recruitment and participation processes. *Sociol. Q.* 33:35–51

Calhoun-Brown A. 1996. African-American churches and political mobilization. *J. Polit.* 58:935–54

Caputo R. 1997. Women as volunteers. *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 26:156–74

Caro F, Bass S. 1995. Increasing volunteering among older people. In *Older and Active: How Americans Over 55 Are Contributing to Society,* ed. S Bass, pp. 71–96. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

Caro F, Bass S. 1997. Receptivity to volunteering in the immediate post-retirement period. *J. Appl. Gerontol.* 16:427–42

Chambre S. 1987. *Good Deeds in Old Age.* Lexington, MA: DC Heath

Chambre S. 1991. The volunteer response to the AIDS epidemic in New York City: implications for research on voluntarism. *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 20:267–87

Chambre S. 1993. Volunteerism by elders: past trends and future prospects. *Gerontologist* 33:221–28

Chambre S. 1995. Being needful: family, love, and prayer among AIDS volunteers. *Res. Sociol. Health Care* 12:113–39

Chavis D, Wandersman A. 1990. Sense of community in the urban environment. *Am. J. Commun. Psychol.* 8:55–82

Clary E, Snyder M, Stukas A. 1996. Volunteers' motivations: findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 25:485–505

Cnaan R, Amrofell L. 1994. Mapping volunteer activity. *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 23:335–54

Cnaan R, Goldberg-Glen R. 1991. Measuring motivation to volunteer in human services. *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.* 27:269–285

Cnaan R, Kasternakis A, Wineburg R. 1993. Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human services: is there a link? *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 22:33–52

Cnaan R, Handy F, Wadsworth M. 1996. Defining who is a volunteer: conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 25:364–83

Conway M, Damico S, Damico J. 1996. Democratic socialization in the schools. In *Democracy, Socialization and Conflicting Loyalties in East and West,* ed. R Farnen, H Dekker, R Meyenberg, D German, pp. 421–42. New York: St Martin's

Cutler S, Danigelis N. 1993. Organizational contexts of activity. In *Activity and Aging,* ed. J Kelly, pp. 146–63. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Damico A, Damico S, Conway M. 1998. The democratic education of women: high school and beyond. *Women Polit.* 19:1–31

Daniels A. 1988. *Invisible Careers: Women Civic Leaders from the Volunteer World.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Deckker P, Koopmans R, van den Broek A. 1997. Voluntary associations, social movements and individual political behavior in Western Europe. In *Private Groups and Public Life,* ed. J van Deth, pp. 220–39. London: Routledge

Eliasoph N. 1998. *Avoiding Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

Ferree G, Barry J, Manno B. 1998. *The National Survey of Philanthropy and Civic Renewal.* Washington, DC: Natl. Comm. Philanthropy and Civic Renewal

Field D, Johnson I. 1993. Satisfaction and change: a survey of volunteers in hospice organization. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 36:1625–34

Fischer K, Rapkin B, Rappaport J. 1991. Gender and work history in the placement and

perception of elder community volunteers. *Psychol. Women Q.* 15:261–279

Fischer L, Schaffer K. 1993. *Older Volunteers.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Flanagan C, Bowes J, Jonsson B, Csapo B, Sheblanova E. 1998. Ties that bind: correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *J. Soc. Issues* 54:457–75

Flanagan C, Jonsson B, Botcheva B, Csapo B, Bowes J, Macek P, Averina I, Sheblanova E. 1999. Adolescents and the Social Contract: developmental roots of citizenship in seven countries. In *Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth,* eds. M. Yates J. Youniss, pp. 135–55. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

Fogelman E. 1997. What motivates the rescuers? In *Resisters, Rescuers and Refugees,* ed. J. Michalczyk, pp. 147–54. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward

Franz C, McClelland D. 1994. Lives of women and men active in the social protests of the 1960s: a longitudinal study. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 66:196–205

Freeman R. 1997. Working for nothing: the supply of volunteer labor. *J. Labor Econ.* 15:140–67

Gallagher S. 1994a. Doing their share: comparing patterns of help given by older and younger adults. *J. Marriage Fam.* 56:567–78

Gallagher S. 1994b. *Older People Giving Care: Helping People and Community.* Westport, CT: Auburn House

Gaskin K, Smith J. 1997. *A New Civic Europe? A Study of the Extent and Role of Volunteering.* London: Natl. Cent. for Volun.

Gerstel N, Gallagher S. 1994 Caring for kith and kin: gender, employment, and the privatization of care. *Soc. Probl.* 41:519–39

Glass T, Seeman T, Herzog A, Kahn R, Berkman L. 1995. Change in productive activities in late adulthood. *J. Gerontol* 50B:S565–S76

Gora J, Nemerowicz G. 1985. *Emergency Squad Volunteers: Professionalism in Unpaid Work.* New York: Praeger

Greeley A. 1999. Who are the traditional Catholics? *Natl. Catholic Rep.* 35:20–21

Hall M, Knighton T, Reed P, Bussiere P, Macrae D, Bowen P. 1998. *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians.* Ottawa: Statist. Canada

Hamilton S, Fenzel M. 1988. The Impact of volunteer experience on adolescent social development: evidence of program effects. *J. Adolescent Res.* 3:65–80

Harlow R, Cantor N. 1996. Still participating after all these years. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 71:1235–49

Harris M. 1996. An inner group of willing people: volunteers in a religious context. *Soc. Policy Admin.* 30:54–68

Hart D, Atkins R, Ford D. 1996. Urban America as a context for the development of moral identity in adolescence. *J. Soc. Issues* 54:513–530

Herzog A, Kahn R, Morgan J. 1989. Age differences in productive activity. *J. Gerontol.* 4:S129–S138.

Herzog A, Morgan J. 1993. Formal volunteer work among older Americans. In *Achieving a Productive Aging Society,* ed. S. Bass, F. Caro, Y. Chen, pp. 119–142. Westport CT: Auburn House

Hodgkinson V. 1995. Key factors influencing caring, involvement, and community. In *Care and Community in Modern Society,* eds. P. Schervish, V. Hodgkinson, M. Gates, pp. 21–50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Hodgkinson V, Weitzman M. 1996. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States.* Washington, D.C: Independent Sector

Hoge D. Zech C, McNamara P, Donahue M. 1998. The value of volunteers as resources for congregations. *J. Sci. Stud. Relig.* 37:470–81

Holden D. 1997. "On equal ground": sustaining virtue among volunteers in a homeless shelter. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 26:117–45 [n]

House J. 1981. *Work Stress and Social Support.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley

House J, Landis K, Umberson D. 1988 Social Relationships and Health. *Science* 241:540–45

Jackson E. Bachmeier M, Wood J, Craft E. 1995. Volunteering and charitable giving: do religious and associational ties promote helping behavior? *Nonprofit Volun. Sector Q.* 24:59–78

Janoski T, Wilson J. 1995. Pathways to voluntarism. *Soc. Forces.* 74:271–92

Janoski T. Musick M, Wilson J. 1998. Being volunteered?: The impact of social participation and pro-social attitudes on volunteering. *Sociol. Forum* 13:495–520

Jaspers J. 1997 *The Art of Moral Protest.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Jirovec R, Hyduk C. 1999. Type of volunteer experience and health among older volunteers. *J. Gerontol. Soc. Work* 30:29–42

Johnson M, Beebe T, Mortimer J, Snyder M. 1998. Volunteerism in adolescence: a process perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence.* 8:301–332

Kincade J, Rabiner D, Shulamit B, Woomert A. 1996. Older adults as a community resource: results from the National Survey of Self-Care and Aging. *Gerontologist* 36:474–82

Knoke D. 1990. Networks of political action: toward theory construction. *Soc. Forces* 68:1041–65

Kohut A. 1998. *Trust and Citizen Engagement in Metropolitan Philadelphia.* Washington, DC: Pew Res. Center

Krause N, Herzog A, Baker E. 1992. Providing support for others and well-being in later life. *J. Gerontol.* 47:P300–P311

Ladd E. 1999. *The Ladd Report.* New York: Free Press

Latting J. 1990. Motivational differences between Black and White volunteers. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sector Q.* 19:121–36

Leighley J. 1996. Group membership and the mobilization of political participation. *J. Polit.* 58:447–64

Little J. 1997. Constructions of rural women's voluntary work. *Gender, Place Culture.* 4:197–209

Lynn P, Smith J. 1991. *National Survey of Voluntary Activity in the UK.* Berkhampsted, UK: Volunteer Cent. UK.

Markham W, Bonjean C. 1995. Community orientations of higher-status women volunteers. *Soc. Forces* 73:1553–72

Markham W, Bonjean C. 1996. Employment status and the attitudes and behavior of higher status women volunteers, 1975 and 1992. *Sex Roles* 34:695–717

Marwell G, Oliver P. 1993. *The Critical Mass in Collective Action.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

McAdam D, Paulsen R. 1993. Specifying the relationship between social ties and activism. *Am. J. Sociol.* 99:640–67

McIntosh B, Danigelis N. 1995. Race, gender and the relevance of productive activities for elders' affect. *J. Gerontol.* 50:229–40

McPherson J. 1981. A dynamic model of voluntary affiliation. *Soc. Forces* 59:705–23

McPherson J, Poplielarz P, Drobnic S. 1992. Social networks and organizational dynamics. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 57:153–70

McPherson J, Rotolo T. 1996. Diversity and change in voluntary groups. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 61:179–202

Menchik P, Weisbrod B. 1987. Volunteer labor supply. *J. Publ. Econ.* 32:159–83

Midlarsky E, Kahana E. 1994. *Altruism in Later Life.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Mirowsky J, Ross C. 1989. *Social Causes of Psychological Distress.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter

Moen P, Dempster-McClain D, Williams R. 1992. Successful aging: a life course perspective on women's multiple roles and health. *Am. J. Sociol.* 97:1612–38

Murnighan J, Kim J, Metzger A. 1993. The volunteer dilemma. *Admin. Sci. Q.* 38:515–39

Musick M, Herzog A, House J. 1999. Volunteering and mortality among older adults: findings from a national sample. *J. Gerontol.* 54B:S173–S180

Musick, M, Wilson, J Bynum W. 2000. Race and formal volunteering: the differential effects of class and religion. *Soc. Forces.* In press

National Association of Secretaries of State. 1999. *New Millenium Project—Phase 1: a*

Nationwide Study of 15–24 Year Old Youth. Washington, DC: Natl. Assoc. Secretaries of State

Negrey C. 1993. *Gender, Time and Reduced Work.* Albany: State Univ. NY Press

Okun M. 1994. Predictors of volunteer status in a retirement community. *Int. J. Aging Hum. Devel.* 36:57–74

Okun M, Eisenberg N. 1992. A comparison of office and adult day-care center older volunteers. *Int. J. Aging Hum. Devel.* 35:219–33

Okun M, Barr A, Herzog A. 1998. Motivation to volunteer by older adults: a test of competing measurement models. *Psychol. Aging* 13:608–17

Oliver P. 1984. If you don't do it, nobody else will: active and token contributors to local collective action. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 49:601–10

Oman D, Thoreson C, McMahon K. 1999. Volunteerism and mortality among community-dwelling elderly. *J. Health Psychol.* 4:301–16

Omoto A, Snyder M. 1993. Volunteers and their motivations: theoretical issues and practical concerns. *Nonprofit Mgmt. Leadership* 4:157–76

Omoto A, Snyder M. 1995. Sustained helping without obligation: motivation, longevity of service and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *J. Personal Soc. Psychol.* 68:671–86

Pancer S, Pratt M. 1999. Social and family determinants of community service involvement in Canadian youth. In *Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth,* ed. M. Yates, J. Youniss, pp. 32–55. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

Payne B, Bull C. 1985. The older volunteer: the case for interdependence. In *Social Bonds in Later Life: Aging and Interdependence*, ed. W. Peterson, J. Quadagno, pp. 251–72. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Penner L, Finkelstein M. 1998. Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 74:525–537

Perkins D, Brown B, Taylor R. 1996. The ecology of empowerment: predicting participation in community. *J. Soc. Issues* 52:85–111

Perkins K. 1987. Volunteer fire departments: community integration, autonomy and survival. *Hum. Org.* 46:342–48

Perkins K. 1990. Volunteer fire and rescue departments: structure, process and survival. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sector Q.* 19:359–70

Portney K, Berry J. 1997. Mobilizing minority communities: social capital and participation in urban neighborhoods. *Am. Behav. Sci.* 40:632–44

Raskoff S, Sundeen R. 1995. *Trends in volunteering: an analysis of a decade.* Paper presented at the annu. meet. Assoc. Res. on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Assoc., Cleveland, Ohio

Robison J, Moen P, Dempster-McClain D. 1995. Women's caregiving: changing profiles and pathways. *J. Gerontol. B*50:S362–73

Rochon T. 1998. *Culture Moves: Ideas, Activism and Changing Values.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Rogers R. 1996. The effects of family composition, health, and social support linkages on mortality. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 37:326–38

Romero C. 1987. Retirement and older Americans' participation in volunteer activities. In *The Problem Isn't Age: Work and Older Americans,* ed. S Sandell, pp. 218–27. New York: Praeger

Rosenthal S, Feiring C, Lewis M. 1998. Political volunteering from late adolescence to young adulthood: patterns and predictions. *J. Soc. Issues* 54:471–493

Sabin EP. 1993 Social relationships and mortality among the elderly. *J. Appl. Gerontol.* 12:44–60

Sax LJ, Astin A. 1997 The benefits of service: evidence from undergraduates. *Educ. Record* 78:25–32

Schaubroeck J, Ganster D. 1991. Beyond the call of duty. *Hum. Relat.* 44:13:569–82

Schervish P, Havens J. 1997. Social

participation and charitable giving: a multivariate analysis. *Voluntas* 8:235–60

Schlozman K, Burns N, Verba S. 1994. Gender and the pathways to participation: the role of resources. *J. Polit.* 56:963–90

Schoenberg S. 1980. Some trends in the community participation of women in their neighborhoods. *Signs* 5:S261–68

Segal L. 1993. *Four essays on the supply of volunteer labor and econometrics.* Unpublished doc. diss. Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill.

Serow R, Dreyden J. 1990. Community service among college and university students: individual and institutional relationships. *Adolescence* 25:553–66

Smith C. 1998. *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Smith D. 1982. Altruism, volunteers, and volunteerism. In *Volunteerism in the Eighties,* ed. J Harman, pp. 23–44. Washington, DC: Univ. Press Am.

Smith D. 1994. Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* 23:243–63

Smith D. 1997. The rest of the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* 26:114–31

Snyder M, Omoto A. 1992. Who helps and why? The psychology of AIDS volunteerism. In *Helping and Being Helped,* ed. S Spacapan, S Oskamp, pp. 213–39. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Snyder M, Omoto A, Crain L. 1999. Punished for their good deeds: stigmatization of AIDS volunteers. *Am. Behav. Sci.* 42:1175–

Sokolowski S. 1996. Show me the way to the next worthy deed. *Voluntas* 7:259–76

Statham A, Rhoton P. 1986. *Mature and Young Women's Volunteer Work, 1974–1981.* Columbus: Cent. Hum. Resour. Res., The Ohio State Univ.

Stephan P. 1991. Relationships among market work, work aspirations and volunteering: the case of retired women. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* 20:225–36

Stolle D. 1998. Bowling together, bowling alone: the development of generalized trust in voluntary associations. *Polit. Psychol.* 19:497–525

Straub E. 1997. The psychology of rescue: perpetrators, bystanders and heroic helpers. In *Resisters Rescuers and Refugees,* ed. J Michalczyk pp. 137–46. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward

Stubbings P, Humble S. 1984. Voluntary work, unemployment and the labour market in Britain. In *Voluntary Work and Unemployment Study in the Countries of the European Communities*, pp. 1–63. London: Policy Stud. Inst.

Sundeen R. 1990. Family life course status and volunteer behavior: implications for the single parent. *Sociol. Perspect.* 33:483–500

Sundeen R. 1992. Differences in personal goals and attitudes among volunteers. *Nonprofit Volun. Sect. Q.* 21:271–91

Sundeen R, Raskoff S. 1994. Volunteering among teenagers in the United States. *Nonprofit Volun. Sect. Q.* 23:383–403

Sundeen R, Raskoff S. 1995. Teenage volunteers and their values. *Nonprofit Volun. Sect. Q.* 24:337–57

Szinovacz M. 1992. Social activities and retirement adaptation. In *Families and Retirement,* ed. M Szinovacz, D Ekerdt, B Vinick, pp. 236–53. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Thompson A. 1993a. Volunteers and their communities: a comparative analysis of firefighters. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* 22:155–66

Thompson A. 1993b. Rural emergency volunteers and their communities: a demographic comparison. *J. Community Health* 18:379–93

Thompson A. 1995. The sexual division of leadership in volunteer emergency medical service squads. *Nonprofit Manage. Leadersh.* 6:55–66

Uggen C, Janikula J. 1999. Volunteerism and arrest in the transition to adulthood. *Soc. Forces* 78:331–62

Verba S, Schlozman K, Brady H. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press

Walsh E. 1988. *Democracy in the Shadows:*

Citizen Mobilization in the Wake of the Accident at Three Mile Island. New York: Greenwood

Wharton C. 1991. "Why can't we be friends?" Expectations versus experience in the volunteer role. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 20:79–107

Wheeler J, Gorey K, Greenblatt B. 1998. The beneficial effects of volunteering for older adults and the people they serve. *Int. J. Aging Hum. Dev.* 47:69–80

Wilson J, Janoski T. 1995. The contribution of religion to volunteer work. *Sociol. Relig.* 56:137–52

Wilson J, Musick M. 1997a. Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 62:694–713

Wilson J, Musick M. 1997b. Work and volunteering: the long arm of the job. *Soc. Forces* 76:251–72

Wilson J, Musick M. 1998. The contribution of social resources to volunteering. *Soc. Sci. Q.* 79:799–814

Wilson J, Musick M. 1999. Attachment to volunteering. *Sociol. Forum* 14:243–72

Wiltfang G, McAdam D. 1991. The costs and risks of social activism: a study of sanctuary movement activists. *Soc. Forces* 69:987–1011

Wolff N, Weisbrod B, Bird E. 1993. The supply of volunteer labor: the case of hospitals. *Nonprofit Manage. Leadersh.* 4:23–45

Wood R. 1997. Social capital and political culture: God meets politics in the inner city. *Am. Behav. Sci.* 40:595–606

Woodard M. 1987. Voluntary association membership among Black Americans. *Sociol. Q.* 28:285–301

Wuthnow R. 1991. *Acts of Compassion.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press

Wuthnow R. 1995. *Learning to Care.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Wuthnow R. 1998. *Loose Connections: Joining Together in America's Fragmented Communities.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press