

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly

<http://nvs.sagepub.com>

Do Occupational Group Members Vary in Volunteering Activity?

Natalie J. Webb and Rikki Abzug

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 2008; 37; 689 originally published online

Mar 7, 2008;

DOI: 10.1177/0899764008314809

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://nvs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/37/4/689>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action](#)

Additional services and information for *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://nvs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://nvs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://nvs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/37/4/689>

Do Occupational Group Members Vary in Volunteering Activity?

Natalie J. Webb

Naval Postgraduate School

Rikki Abzug

Ramapo College of New Jersey

The goal of our study is to explore how employees in different occupations report volunteering activities. Starting from the literatures on occupational subcultures and professional norms, the authors hypothesize that both structural constraints and norms of occupations may have an impact on extraorganizational behavior. Analyzing Center on Philanthropy Panel Study data linked with the Institute for Social Research's Panel Study on Income Dynamics, the authors find evidence that individuals in professional, managerial, and military occupations are more likely to volunteer than are individuals in other occupational categories. Controlling for individual demographic and cultural variables, they affirm the explanatory power of occupation on individual volunteering behavior.

Keywords: *occupations; volunteering; professional norms*

Numerous organizational studies have explored the notion that people who share similar work roles may also share similar norms and behaviors. Past sociological research on the topic has been organized around "occupational subcultures" (Trice, 1993; Trice & Beyer, 1992), "communities of practice" (Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2004; Wenger & Snyder, 2000), and even a "spillover effect" (Wilson & Musick, 1997). Research on "professional norms" (Etzioni, 1969; H. Wilensky, 1964; Witz, 1992) has looked at how professional occupations (often, though controversially, defined by specialized knowledge) affect or are affected by shared norms. Yet despite periodic outbreaks of related literature (including pioneering work by van Maanen and Barley [1984] and Birnbaum and Somers [1986], the classic work of Trice and Beyer [1992] and Trice [1993], and recent incarnations of specific occupational subculture, including Bloor and Dawson [1994], Rigakos [1995], Fonne and Myhre [1996], and Ames and Rebhun [1996]), there has not been much sustained attention to the topic that would also extend its reach beyond organizational

Note: The authors would like to thank James S. Airola, Kent D. Wall, and three anonymous referees.

boundaries. It is our goal here to build on the work of those who posited real behavioral outcomes of occupational norms by exploring the possible reach of those norms outside of employing organizations. For this, we are specifically indebted to (a) the work of Crawford, Olson, and Deckman (2001), who moved the locus of inquiry from (professional) normative pressures on organizational “behavior” to (professional) normative pressures on individual action, and (b) the groundbreaking work of Wilson and Musick (1997) and Wilson (2000), who, almost a decade ago, first posited that jobs might influence out-of-job volunteer behavior. In revisiting Wilson and Musick’s original queries, we contribute to the literature on the impact (or limits thereof) of professions and occupations on individual (as opposed to, or beyond, organizational) action—how occupation or field influences individual volunteering behavior. To do this, we first trace the prehistory of thought on the role of occupation in shaping norms and then follow that up to more recent literature. We pull out professions as a distinct subcategory of occupations based on census classification and a long sociological history attributing fields of specialized knowledge and norm-dense codes of conducts to professions (e.g., Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Collins, 1979; Etzioni, 1969; Friedson, 1986; MacDonald & Ritzer, 1988; H. Wilensky, 1964). Noting that volunteering behavior has rarely been studied within the literature on occupation norms (with the exception of Wilson & Musick, 1997), we turn to a discussion of cultures of volunteering, introducing the notion of an occupational culture of volunteering. This allows us to develop testable hypotheses about the ways in which occupation or profession may correlate to volunteering behavior. Finally, we describe our method, analysis, and findings and offer our conclusions.

Occupational or Professional Norms and Practices

How does occupational or professional membership influence individual attitudes and behaviors both inside and outside of employee organizations? To understand the impact that work may have on individual “behavior, aspirations, and identity” (Schultz, 2000, p. 1890), we follow Rosabeth Moss Kanter’s (1977) lead. She pointed back to the work of Adam Smith (1776/1904), who, in 1776, wrote, “But the understanding of the greater part of men are necessarily formed by their ordinary employments” (p. 197). Echoing this theme almost a century later, Karl Marx (1859/1978), in a prescient summation of much of his thinking, wrote, “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness” (p. 4). Kanter (1977) stressed the significance of these quotations by saying,

The most distinguished advocate and the most distinguished critic of modern capitalism agreed on one essential point: the job makes the person. Smith and Marx both recognized the extent to which people’s attitudes and behaviors take shape out of the experiences they have in their work. (p. 3)

For many social economists of the 18th and 19th centuries, work was life defining.

Indeed, we can see the power of this argument in the original works of Durkheim (1897/1951) on solidarity and suicide. Perhaps most useful for our purposes, Durkheim may have been one of the first social scientists to posit that the social cohesion inherent (or not) in occupational groupings could lead to particular extra-organizational actions—in his case suicide (in our case, the more other-regarding activity of volunteering). Since Durkheim's studies, there has been speculation in the relevant social sciences as to the extent to which occupational groups nurture and bestow such norms and cultures versus the extent to which these same occupational groupings are themselves the repositories of the aggregations of such norms and characteristics as bestowed on them by individual adherents. In 1981, looking at the interrelations between work experience and psychological involvement, Lorence and Mortimer first posited the occupational "socialization" versus occupational "selection" conundrum. More recently, Kwantes and Boglarsky (2004) used the work of Holland (1985, 1997), Tokar, Fischer, and Subich, (1998), and J. Martin (1992) to argue that research in vocational choice suggests that certain occupations appeal to certain personalities and that it is this self-selection that accounts for the homogeneity in value sets and practices that we see emerge from occupational membership. According to Kwantes and Boglarsky, research suggests that both personality characteristics (Costa, McCrae, & Holland, 1984; Gottfredson, Tones, & Holland, 1993; Huntley & Davis, 1983) and individual values of members (Fonne & Myhre, 1996; Haase, 1979) attracted to occupational groupings aggregate up to occupational normative beliefs and values.

Alternatively (or perhaps supplementally), many sociologists and organizational scientists have argued that occupational characteristics as independent variables may affect such outcomes as employee attitudes (Wallace & Leicht, 2004), anger (Sloan, 2004), and loyalty or behavior (Hoff, 1999; McDuff & Mueller, 2000). Kwantes and Boglarsky (2004), for instance, suggested that the normative beliefs operating in occupational groupings may come not only from the aggregation of personality characteristics and individual values hinted at above but also from particular occupational socialization experiences that are (to use Durkheim's terminology) *sui generis*. The literature on occupation norms suggests that these have power over, for instance, individuals' commitments to work, accountability, and reciprocity (Osnowitz, 2006), their attitudes toward smoking cessation (Sorensen, Pechacek, & Pallonen, 1986), expectations for "masculine" behavior (Statham, Miller, & Mauksch, 1987), and even political neutrality (Reeser & Epstein, 1990).

Yet it is not just the cultural norms of occupations that may influence individual behavior but also the more obvious structural dimensions (and expectations) of such. A special issue of *Work and Occupations* in 2001, on time and the sociology of work (Epstein & Kalleberg, 2001), underscored the point that time interacts with professional roles to affect the work experience. Epstein and Kalleberg (2001) cited classic studies (e.g., Lipset, Trow, & Coleman, 1962) that demonstrated that time spent on

work (as categorized by occupation) could affect individual behaviors including political orientation and collegiality. Epstein and Kalleberg reminded us of Coser's (1974) notion of (time) "greedy institutions" such as military and medical occupations or professions that demand occupants to be on call 24-7.

Given the interest in the impact of occupational norms and structures on individual behavior, little research has addressed the issue of volunteering behavior and its occupational or professional antecedents. A striking exception is the work by sociologist John Wilson (see Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1997), which, in explicating the independent variable of the "long arm of the job," focused on the dependent variable of volunteering behavior. This research provided a model for predicting the impact of occupational characteristics on volunteer behavior, on which we draw. However, we add to the Wilson and Musick (1997) model the neo-institutional idea that occupations exert a normative or "cultural" influence on potential volunteers in much the same way that religious training might. It is to the literature on other cultural preconditions for volunteering that we now turn.

Motivations for and Constraints on Volunteering

The literature on motivations for volunteering is large and growing, yet there is a distinct subfield that deals with issues of the impact of "cultural" variables on such helping behavior. A fruitful avenue of this research has dealt with different cultural predispositions to volunteering across national borders. Hwang, Grabb, and Curtis (2005) compared motivators for volunteering across the United States and Canada, finding that Americans are more likely to claim altruism whereas Canadians are more likely to claim personal reasons for volunteering. Hustinx and Lammertyn (2004) compared the cultural bases of volunteering that differentiated service patterns across Finnish Red Cross volunteers, and Sherer (2004) noted the importance of the influence of parents and friends in predicting national service in Israel. Haddad (2004) looked at community determinates of volunteer participation in Japan, concluding that individual characteristics were not nearly as predictive as were the practices of governmental and social institutions. Comparing voluntary association membership across 33 countries, Curtis, Baer, and Grabb (2001) delineated "(1) multidominational Christian or predominantly Protestant religious compositions, (2) prolonged and continuous experience with democratic institutions, (3) social democratic or liberal democratic political systems, and (4) high levels of economic development" (p. 783) as predictors of cross-national variation. In the United Kingdom, Davis Smith (1999) found an impact of employment status on youthful volunteering such that youth volunteers working part-time were more likely to volunteer than were either their full-time working or their nonworking peers. Given that research has suggested that motivation for volunteering may contain cultural components and that occupational

identities can act as subcultures within organizations, we can proceed with hypothesis generation around the themes of occupational cultural antecedents of volunteering, revisiting the models of occupational impact posited by Wilson and Musick (1997).

Hypotheses

Based on our review of the literature suggesting that occupations both self-select for bundles of attitudes and behaviors and help shape attitudes and behaviors through culture and norm dissemination and through structural constraints, we expect that occupation will affect an employee's after-hours volunteering activity.

Proposition: Likelihood of volunteering will vary across different occupational and professional groups.

If we are to take at face value the literature that posits distinct structuration of professional versus nonprofessional occupational groups, we might also expect that employees in professional occupations will have different ethics, approaches to work (Forsyth & Danisiewicz, 1985), and sense making (Bloor & Dawson, 1994) that may carry through to after-work activities. Furthermore, the structure of professional work—particularly that which demands allegiance to professional associations (Bloor & Dawson, 1994) and other extraorganizational norms and conformance with organizational norms and culture—may constrain both volunteering choices and hours. These are more recent riffs on classic works of sociology (e.g., Hochschild, 1975, 1989; Kanter, 1977; N. H. Martin & Strauss, 1968; Van Maanen, 1976) that have showed that success in both professional and managerial occupations required “excessive investment of time and effort” (Lorence & Mortimer, 1981, p. 302). Indeed, more recent work by Seron and Ferris (1995) on the time demands of professional tasks suggested that the reward of professional autonomy may come at the cost of time for private obligations.

The notion that professionals may exhibit differential behavioral patterns specifically in volunteering was explored with British and Australian data by McEachern (2003). Using time use data, McEachern was able to conclude that typical patterns of volunteering over the life course differ for managers and professionals, with professionals' volunteering rates showing an uptick in the 30 to 45 age bracket, compared to the managers' uptick occurring after retirement age. These British and Australian results lead us to question whether we will see such occupational volunteering discrepancies in cross-sectional U.S. data. That managers or executives may have distinctive volunteering patterns was suggested by Reiss (1989), who noted that more than 60% of managers and executives serve as volunteers at the same time that corporate volunteer councils are growing. Past research suggesting distinct volunteering potential for professionals on one hand, and managers on the other, leads us in

two directions. The time-greedy profession literature suggests lower levels of volunteering among these groups. However, British and Australian empirical research, plus the foundational work by Wilson and Musick (1997), has underscored the prevalence of volunteering among managers and professionals. Wilson and Musick, using 1986 to 1989 American's Changing Lives data, found that occupational sectors such as professions and management, characterized by greater self-direction, increase volunteering through the civic skills they provide. For Wilson and Musick (1997), then, self-direction in occupation at the turn of the past century trumped time greediness to account for higher levels of volunteering in managerial and professional occupations. Given the international and earlier U.S. data, we suggest,

Hypothesis 1: Employees in professional occupational groups will demonstrate greater likelihood of volunteering than employees in nonprofessional occupational groups.

Hypothesis 2: Employees in managerial occupational groups will demonstrate greater likelihood of volunteering than employees in nonmanagerial occupational groups.

Yet as we have noted, management and the professions are not the only time "greedy" occupations. We pull out military occupations because of the high involvement work that characterizes them. Time greediness here may well be predictive, as Wilson and Musick's (1997) self-direction theory also counseled against high levels of volunteering in an occupation characterized by tight hierarchy and chain of command. This leads us to our next hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Military personnel will demonstrate lower likelihoods of volunteering than their civilian counterparts.

Studying how occupations differ in member organizational cultural preferences, Kwantes and Boglarsky (2004) invoked Holland's (1985, 1997) theory that people are drawn to occupations that match their own orientations. We wondered then, following research in human resource development (e.g., Wilensky & Hansen, 2001), whether those drawn to societal benefit occupations (in community and social service) might have orientations that led to propensities to volunteer, over and above their service work. Alternatively, it is possible that the "busman's holiday" rule applies and such occupational adherents already "gave at the office" and would be less likely to volunteer.

Hypothesis 4: Employees in community and social service occupations will have lower likelihoods of volunteering than other occupational members.

In exploring the impact of occupational cultural forces on volunteering, we need to be attentive to both the individual demographic variables and the other cultural variables suggested by the extant literature of motivations for volunteering. Our

hypotheses afford us an opportunity to sort out cultural versus demographic predictors of volunteer behavior. It is to a modeling of such predictors of volunteering that we now turn.

Data and Method

In large part because of the availability of the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study (COPPS) data, we have been learning a great deal about the determinants of giving and volunteering within and across families and generations. Most of the extant literature coming from the COPPS data has focused on family lifecycle, changing economic circumstances, health, and wealth as determinants of giving and volunteering patterns. However, given that COPPS data are part of the Institute for Social Research's Panel Study on Income Dynamics (PSID), we can begin teasing out the effect of variables not traditionally studied by researchers of giving and volunteering. In particular, we explore the role of occupation or profession in explaining varying volunteering rates of individuals (as opposed to households).

For purposes of this study, we use 2003 data to study volunteering behavior (see Wilhelm, Brown, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2003).¹ The 2003 study elicits volunteering data based on a survey question: "Now think about last year, January through December of 2002. Did you do any volunteer activity through organizations?" When individuals reported volunteering for at least 10 hours, we classified them as volunteers.

Analysis and Findings

Volunteering and occupation. We used individuals from the 2003 survey who were heads of household ("heads") or wives or partners ("wives"; couples hereinafter are referred to as "married" only if their marital status is reported as married).² Excluding only those observations for which the volunteering questions were not asked and those who could not answer them, we created individual records and proceeded with 11,520 (weighted) observations.³

To begin to analyze our hypotheses, we first examined volunteering rates by occupation code. The PSID uses occupation codes based on the 2000 Census of Population and Housing. Guided by Wilson and Musick (1997), we classify individuals using the following occupation categories: managerial; professional; community and social service; service; sales and office; farming, fishing, and forestry; construction, extraction, and maintenance; production, transportation, and material moving; military; and "did not work for money in 2002." In Table 1, we examine volunteering rates by occupation categories.

Individuals in community and social services (49.1%), military service (47.2%), management (44.6%), and professional (42.5%) occupations reported higher rates of volunteering. Individuals in farming, fisheries, and forestry reported the lowest rates of volunteering (19.6%), followed by production, transportation, and materials moving (21.5%), construction, extraction, and installation, maintenance and repair workers (25.6%), and those in service occupations (25.8%). Individuals not working reported a volunteering rate of 26.3%. In the subcategories reported, the spectrum of volunteering rates ranged from 11.3% for those in food preparation and serving occupations to 53.9% for those in legal occupations. Overall, 31.6% of the (weighted) sample members reported volunteering. Using a test for pairwise comparison of means, we can show that volunteering rates did vary by occupation.⁴

Table 2 shows mean volunteer hours reported by occupation category. Individuals in community and social service occupations reported an average of 69.1 hours of volunteering, followed by those in military occupations (48.4), management (40.2), and professional occupations (39.3). Those in service (23.7), construction, extraction, and other blue-collar occupations (22.7), and production, transportation, and materials mining (19.8) reported the least annual volunteer hours.⁵

Table 3 shows that nearly 15.0% of individuals were managers, and nearly the same percentage fall into the category of professional occupations. Just 1.2% of individuals worked in community and social service occupations, whereas less than 1.0% worked in military occupations.⁶ About 20.0% of individuals either did not work or could not specify an occupation.

To examine the impact that occupation has on volunteering, we next control for other variables affecting volunteering behavior. Table 3 also shows important demographic and cultural variables in the COPPS data set. We discuss each of these variables below.

Marital status, sex, and children. Approximately 67.0% (7,802) of individuals were married, 13.2% (1,515) were single women, and 19.1% (2,203) were single men. In total, 52.9% of the observations were men.

More than 37.0% of individuals had children under the age of 17 living in the home, 30.7% were married with children, and 6.7% were single with children. Of the remaining individuals (62.6% of the sample), 36.2% were married with no children and 26.4% were single with no children.

The average number of children in the home for those individuals with children was 1.87. The average age of the youngest child at home, for those with children, was 7.3. These numbers did not vary significantly by sex or marital status of the head.

Race/ethnicity. Nearly 11.0% of individuals in the sample were African American (more than half of them were single), and 7.8% were Hispanic (less than 25.0% are single).

Education. About 31.0% of individuals had only a high school degree, 22.2% attended some college, 16.0% had a college degree, and 10.6% did at least some postgraduate work. (Just more than 21.0% did not finish high school.) More single men had a high school degree only (34.9%) than any other category (31.5% for married men, 28.0% for married women, and 29.8% for single women). A higher percentage of married women had college degrees (19.5% vs. 16.3%, 11.6%, and 13.3% for married men, single men, and single women, respectively) and postgraduate work (12.7% vs. 10.4%, 7.0%, and 10.8% for married men, single men, and single women, respectively).

Annual hours worked. We included all respondents, even those whose occupation code is "not working." We then used total hours worked as one measure of available time, rather than the occupation code of "not working," because even those whose occupation is "not working" often reported working for pay. Individuals in occupations other than "not working" reported working 1,786 hours ($n = 9,756$), on average, in 2002. Married men in other than "not working" occupations reported an average of 2,174 ($n = 3,423$); similarly, single women reported an average of 2,001 ($n = 1,306$), single men reported an average of 1,791 ($n = 1,636$), and married women reported an average of 1,299 ($n = 3,391$).

Income and wealth. Married people reported significantly higher income and family wealth. (Wealth includes the value of the family home.) Reported mean family income for all individuals was \$69,423 ($n = 11,520$); for married individuals it was \$85,155 ($n = 7,802$), for single men it was \$32,360 ($n = 2,203$), and for single women it was \$45,008 ($n = 1,515$). Similarly, mean wealth for all individuals was \$307,507 ($n = 11,520$), for married heads it was \$390,497 ($n = 7,802$), for single men it was \$123,923 ($n = 2,203$), and for single women it was \$161,985 ($n = 1,515$). We know that wealth and income are likely to be at least somewhat related; however, Schervish and Havens (2001) noted that people of varying wealth levels and varying income levels can (and do) make different decisions about whether to donate to charities and in what amounts. They found that people of higher wealth give disproportionately in any income class. Whether this behavior carries over into volunteer activity is not known, but we include both variables to account for that possibility.

Age. Mean age for individuals was 48 years, with the mean age for men slightly higher (48.6) than that for women (47.3). The average age for single men was 51, and the average age for single women was 42.

Religious attendance. Average religious attendance was about 30 times per year for all individuals. Married men reported attending an average of 35 times per year, whereas married women reported 29.8, single men reported 29.5, and single women reported 18.1.

Table 1
Volunteering by Occupation, 2003 Weighted Center on
Philanthropy Panel Study Data

Occupation Category	Percentage Volunteering	Observations
Managers	44.6	1,416
Management	46.3	1,120
Business operations specialists	45.3	122
Financial specialists	34.2	174
Professionals	42.5	1,433
Computer and mathematical	43.9	235
Architecture and engineering	42.9	249
Life, physical, and social science	31.5	99
Legal	53.9	86
Education, training, and library	47.9	344
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media	32.8	149
Health care practitioners and technical	38.5	271
Community and social services	49.1	137
Service	25.8	1,341
Health care support	30.3	147
Protective service	39.3	330
Food preparation and serving	11.3	298
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance	23.3	389
Personal care and service	24.6	177
Sales and office	30.9	1,746
Sales	29.1	891
Office and administrative support	32.9	855
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	19.6	171
Construction, extraction, installation, maintenance, and repair	25.6	1,395
Construction trades	23.8	723
Extraction workers	26.7	15
Installation, maintenance, and repair workers	27.5	657
Production, transportation, material moving	21.5	1,900
Production	22.9	1,013
Transportation and material moving	19.6	887
Military specific	47.2	115
Not applicable, don't know, or wild code	28.5	102
Did not work for money in 2002	26.3	1,764
All individuals	31.6	11,520

Regression analyses. We used logit choice models to estimate the probability that an individual volunteered. We chose the logit formulation because we can assume a nonlinear relationship, in which we use the independent variables to build a model of the probability of choice.⁷ Table 4 shows results of the logit estimation with the

Table 2
Average Hours of Volunteering Reported, by Occupation Category, 2003
Weighted Center On Philanthropy Panel Study Data

Occupation Category	Average Hours Reported	Subpopulation
Management	40.2	1,416
Professional	39.3	1,433
Community and social service	69.1	137
Service	23.7	1,341
Farming, fishing, and forestry	31.7	1,746
Sales and office administration	44.0	171
Construction, extraction, installation, maintenance, and repair	22.7	1,395
Production, transportation, and material moving	19.8	1,900
Military	48.4	115
A nonapplicable occupation (don't know, unknown)	14.2	102
Not working	29.3	1,764

dependent variable being whether the individual volunteered at least 10 hours to charitable organizations (including churches) in 2002.

Table 5 shows a variation of the independent variables to include interaction variables. To test the robustness of our occupation findings, we modified our model to include interactions between marital status and children in the home, sex and occupation, and marital status and occupation.⁸ These analyses provided only slightly more information than our initial analyses, which are discussed below.

In the occupation categories, we find that professionals, managers, and military personnel had greater odds of volunteering than did other categories (second column of results in Table 4). The odds of volunteering among those in military occupations were more than 2.2 times higher than the odds of volunteering among individuals in blue-collar occupations (the reference category, defined here as construction, extraction and installation, maintenance, and repair workers). The third column of Table 4 shows estimated marginal effects of the explanatory variables. These values indicate how the probability of volunteering changes relative to a particular explanatory variable for individuals with mean values of all the other explanatory variables. For example, being in a military occupation increased the probability of volunteering by 18.9 percentage points, all other things equal. The odds of volunteering among managers were more than 1.5 times higher, and about 1.3 times higher for professionals, than the odds of volunteering among individuals in blue-collar occupations. From the marginal effects, being in a professional occupation increased the probability of volunteering by 5.5 percentage points and in a managerial occupation by 9.7 percentage points, again all other things equal. At the opposite end, the odds of volunteering among those in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations were about 0.73 times the odds of volunteering by those in blue-collar occupations. Being in

Table 3
Summary Statistics for 2003 Weighted Center
on Philanthropy Panel Study Data

Volunteering and Demographic Data (2003, Weighted)

<i>Percentages</i>	
Reporting volunteering > 10 hrs	31.6
Management occupations	14.6
Professional occupations	14.5
Community and social service occupations	1.2
Service occupations	9.3
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	1.4
Sales and office administration occupations	9.8
Construction, extraction, installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	15.0
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	12.5
Military occupations	0.8
A nonapplicable occupation (don't know, unknown)	0.8
Not working	19.3
Males	52.9
Married	66.9
Individuals with children younger than 17 living at home	37.4
Individuals who are married with children	30.7
Individuals who are married with no children	36.2
Individuals who are single with children	6.7
Individuals who are single with no children	26.4
African American	10.8
Hispanic	7.8
Highest education attained is high school degree	30.8
Highest education attained is some college	22.2
Highest education attained is college degree	16.0
Highest education attained is postgraduate work	10.6
<i>Averages</i>	
Annual hours worked	1,471
Family income	\$69,423
Wealth including home	\$307,507
Age	48.0
Hours attended religious services	29.9
Number of children younger than 17 at home	0.7
Number of children at home for those with children under 17	1.87
Age of youngest child at home	2.7
Age of youngest child at home for those with children at home	7.3

Note: *N* = 11,520. Values are percentages unless otherwise noted.

farming, fishing, and forestry occupations decreased the probability of volunteering by 6.2 percentage points, all other things equal.

Men were slightly more likely to volunteer than women were. From Table 4, the odds of men volunteering were 1.2 times higher than those of women. The odds were

also 1.2 to 1 that individuals with children would volunteer, relative to those without. Being male increased the probability of volunteering by 3.7 percentage points, and for every additional child at home the probability of volunteering increased by 3.1 percentage points, all other things equal. The age of the youngest child also influenced volunteering behavior. The odds are just greater than 1 that an increase in the age of the youngest child increased the odds of volunteering, or the probability of volunteering increased by 0.5% with every year of age from 0 to 17. (Thus, the probability of volunteering for an individual with a 17-year-old at home increased by 8.5 percentage points, all other things equal.)

Married individuals with children were also much more likely to volunteer; the odds were 1.65 to 1 (Table 4). And being married with children increased the probability of volunteering by 10.8 percentage points, again all other things equal.

Education also was a strong predictor of volunteering behavior. The odds of volunteering rose with education: The odds of an individual with a high school degree reporting volunteering were 1.3 times higher than those for individuals with no high school degree. The odds of volunteering for some college, college degree, and postgraduate work were 2.0, 2.6, and 3.3 times higher, respectively, than were the odds for those with no high school degree. These translate to increasing probabilities of volunteering: For high school education, the probability of volunteering increased by 4.9 percentage points; for some college, college, and postgraduate work, the increases were 15.6, 21.6, and 28.1 percentage points, respectively.

African Americans and Hispanics were less likely to volunteer. The odds of an African American individual volunteering were just 0.51 times than those of someone White or non-African American and non-Hispanic, and the odds of a Hispanic volunteering were even lower, at 0.32 to 1. The marginal effects reveal that being African American decreased the probability of volunteering by 12.6 percentage points, whereas being Hispanic decreased the probability by 19 percentage points, all other things equal.

Age may also be a factor in volunteering behavior; those who are older may tend to volunteer more. Age was positive and weakly significant (at 10%), with a very small marginal effect. Finally, attendance at religious services was positively related to volunteering. The odds ratio is just over 1, and the marginal effect is 0.03 percentage points. This means that for an increase of 1 hour in religious attendance, the probability of volunteering increases by 0.3 percentage points. (For a person who reports going to a 1-hour service every week, the probability of volunteering increases by 15.6 percentage points, all other things equal.)

Table 5 shows results of tests of robustness of our findings. We ran three other regressions, each adding explanatory dummy variables. The first column repeats the coefficients on occupation code from Table 4, in the second column we take the original equation and add variables capturing the interaction between marital status and the presence or absence of children in the home, in the third column we take the original equation and add variables capturing the interaction between marital status and

Table 4
Effects of Selected Individual Characteristics
on the Probability of Volunteering

Variable	Coeff.		Odds Ratio		Marginal Effect ^a	
Occupation						
Managerial	0.437	(0.112)	1.548	(0.174)	0.097	(0.026)***
Professional	0.254	(0.116)	1.289	(0.150)	0.055	(0.026)**
Community and social service	0.439	(0.287)	1.552	(0.445)	0.099	(0.069)
Service	0.061	(0.129)	1.063	(0.137)	0.013	(0.028)
Farming, fishing, and forestry	-0.318	(0.321)	0.728	(0.233)	-0.062	(0.058)
Sales and office	0.005	(0.112)	1.005	(0.113)	0.001	(0.024)
Production, transportation, and materials moving	-0.205	(0.115)	0.814	(0.094)	-0.042	(0.023)*
Military	0.804	(0.264)	2.234	(0.591)	0.189	(0.066)***
Not working	-0.180	(0.136)	0.835	(0.114)	-0.037	(0.027)
Sex	0.175	(0.063)	1.192	(0.075)	0.037	(0.013)***
Married	0.092	(0.076)	1.096	(0.083)	0.019	(0.016)
Number of children	0.147	(0.031)	1.159	(0.036)	0.031	(0.007)***
Age of youngest child	0.022	(0.006)	1.022	(0.006)	0.005	(0.001)***
African American	-0.680	(0.100)	0.507	(0.051)	-0.126	(0.016)***
Hispanic	-1.154	(0.146)	0.316	(0.046)	-0.190	(0.017)***
Education						
High school graduate	0.229	(0.097)	1.258	(0.122)	0.049	(0.021)**
Some college	0.700	(0.101)	2.014	(0.204)	0.156	(0.023)***
College graduate	0.942	(0.109)	2.564	(0.279)	0.216	(0.026)***
Postgraduate work	1.197	(0.123)	3.312	(0.407)	0.281	(0.030)***
Total hours worked	0.000	(0.000)	1.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Family income	0.000	(0.000)	1.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Wealth including home	0.000	(0.000)	1.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Age	0.005	(0.003)	1.005	(0.003)	0.001	(0.001)*
Religious attendance, hours	0.012	(0.001)	1.012	(0.001)	0.003	(0.000)***
Constant	-2.162	(0.193)				
F(24, 10548)	28.06					

Note: Sample is from 2003 Center on Philanthropy Panel Study data, $N = 11,520$. Standard errors are in parentheses.

a. Change in volunteering probability with a discrete change (from 0 to 1 or an addition of 1) in each of the explanatory variables, with all other variables set to their mean values.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

occupation, and in the fourth column we take the original equation and add variables capturing the interaction between gender and occupation.⁹

Our occupation findings are unchanged; managers, professionals, and those in military occupations were more likely to volunteer than were those in other occupations. In the regression testing the interaction between marital status and occupation, we also found that individuals in service occupations were more likely to volunteer than were others.

To recap, our research has found support for our proposition that the likelihood of volunteering varies across different occupational and professional categories. The empirical analysis supports Hypotheses 1 and 2, refutes Hypothesis 3, and neither supports nor refutes Hypothesis 4. We find that individuals in different occupations have different volunteering behavior, and those in professional, managerial, and military occupations show evidence of higher levels of volunteering compared with individuals in other occupations. Our finding that managers and professionals have higher levels of volunteering is consistent with Wilson and Musick's (1997) "spillover" theory, suggesting that the self-direction inherent in these occupations results in the provision of civic skills. However, we also learned that although position in the managerial and professional ranks was related to higher likelihood to volunteer, so was being in the military. Although we have found no published research suggesting that those in the military are more likely to volunteer (indeed, we hypothesized the opposite based on the time greediness of the career), anecdotal evidence is not inconsistent with this finding. As joining the military is often an expression of genuine and generous commitment to the public good (e.g., Moskos, 1977), perhaps we should not be surprised by finding a "spillover effect" to civilian voluntary service. Hypothesis 4 was neither supported nor disconfirmed given the nonsignificance of our findings—itself likely because of the low n for this subgroup. Of interest, though, the nonsignificant findings point to the possibility that those in community and social service may indeed be giving of twice their time—once in the office and once as volunteers.

Our demographic findings indicate that men and individuals with children are more likely to volunteer; that as education, hours of attendance at religious services, and age of the youngest child at home increase, the likelihood of volunteering also increases. We find weak evidence that as age increases the probability of volunteering increases. Finally, African Americans and Hispanics are less likely to volunteer.

Conclusions

Based on our logit models using COPPS and PSID data, we suggest support for the idea that occupational cultures may predict individual volunteering behavior. We examined the impact that occupation has on volunteering controlling for other demographic and cultural variables affecting volunteering behavior. Specifically, we have learned that professionals, managers, and those in the military are more likely to volunteer than are their nonprofessional, nonmanagerial, and nonmilitary counterparts—this despite the time "greedy" nature of these very professions. Individuals in community and social service occupations were nonsignificantly more likely to volunteer. Our findings, then, may be a reflection of particular occupational ethical codes or norms and certainly suggest further exploration perhaps of the qualitative variety. Our descriptive findings suggest that further study might decompose a

Table 5
Effects of Interaction Terms on the Probability of Volunteering

Variable	No Interaction Terms Included (Table 4)		Interaction Between Marital Status and Children in the Home		Interaction Between Marital Status and Occupation		Interaction Between Gender and Occupation	
	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
<i>Occupation</i>								
Managerial	0.400	(0.136)***	0.443	(0.113)***	0.426	(0.117)***	0.508	(0.153)***
Professional	0.206	(0.139)**	0.257	(0.116)**	0.292	(0.324)**	0.312	(0.153)**
Community and social service	0.402	(0.294)	0.442	(0.287)	0.570	(0.345)*	0.766	(0.405)*
Service	0.043	(0.149)	0.075	(0.129)	0.294	(0.147)**	-0.058	(0.173)
Farming, fishing, and forestry	-0.331	(0.332)	0.018	(0.113)	-0.047	(0.124)	0.075	(0.150)
Sales and office	-0.034	(0.136)	-0.324	(0.321)	-0.066	(0.306)	-0.546	(0.467)
Production, transportation, and materials moving	-0.185	(0.131)	-0.204	(0.115)*	-0.120	(0.122)	-0.147	(0.158)
Military	0.739	(0.279)**	0.798	(0.264)***	0.864	(0.279)***	0.843	(0.388)***
Not working	-0.238	(0.156)	-0.171	(0.137)	-0.172	(0.145)	-0.148	(0.163)

Note: Sample is from 2003 Center on Philanthropy Panel Study data, $N = 11,520$. Standard errors are in parentheses.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

dichotomous volunteering dependent variable into either a continuous variable of actual time volunteered or a categorical variable exploring types of volunteering reported. These further explorations of the dependent variable of volunteering would add nuance to the occupational culture variable while helping nonprofit organizations to target their volunteer recruiting.

Our results have also helped us to rethink the stereotypes of time “greedy” occupations. Certainly, organizations interested in recruiting volunteers can make use of these findings by concentrating their efforts on managerial, professional, and military occupations, expecting some spillover of civic skills. Of course, it is possible that occupants of the other occupations (including service; sales and office; farming, fishing, and forestry; construction, extraction, and maintenance; production, transportation, and material moving) may demonstrate lower levels of volunteering because (as is often the case with African American respondents) they just are not asked as much. This, too, might have organizational implications. Perhaps if members of these occupations were more specifically targeted, new pools of volunteer labor would be opened up.

Despite mixed results for one of our hypotheses, we remain optimistic that we have lent support to those who would argue for the influence of occupation on individual (outside-of-work) behavior. Whether driven by occupational norms, structural constraints, ethics, or self-selection, a relationship seems to exist between workers’ “ordinary employments” and their extraordinary acts of altruism.

Notes

1. The authors originally intended to compare 2001 and 2003 data; however, the 2003 survey questions elicited more accurate levels of volunteering (Rooney, Steinberg, & Schervish, 2004), volunteer hours are not necessarily comparable between the 2001 and 2003 surveys, and the 2001 data used occupation categories from the 1970 Census of Population, which are not directly comparable to the 2003 data occupation categories taken from the 2000 Census of Population and Housing.

Nancy Mathiowetz (1992) examined company employees’ reports of their occupation compared against company records. She stated, “Respondents were selected from the personnel records of an established manufacturing company with several thousand employees. Interviews were conducted by telephone using a questionnaire similar to that used in the PSID, with 78.3% of the respondents participating” (p. 352). Mathiowetz then explained that to determine whether occupants could accurately report on their own jobs, experienced industry and occupation coders made a direct comparison of the company record and interview report. According to Mathiowetz, “It [was] evident from the direct comparison that a significant percent of the respondents (13%) cannot describe their occupations sufficiently so as to be recognized by an experienced coder as the same position as the one described by company records” (p. 353). Indeed, “almost half of occupation codes based on household interview reports [did] not accurately represent the individual’s true occupation (as described by company records)” (p. 354).

2. Heads of household can be male or female, but wives are not always female; an occasional male is categorized as a “wife” if his spouse is the head of household.

3. We separated wives’ records from their husbands’ and made each individual a separate observation. Regular statistical software (that is not designed for survey data) analyzes data as if the data were collected using simple random sampling. The Center on Philanthropy Panel Study data, however, were not collected as a simple random sample. This required us to use survey data analysis software to take into account

the differences between the design that was used and simple random sampling. Not doing so would have affected the calculation of the standard errors of the estimates.

4. Results of a Tukey test of pairwise comparisons of means show that different occupational groups have (statistically) different volunteering rates.

5. Individuals in the small subpopulation of "don't know, not applicable" occupations report a lower number, 14.2 hours of volunteering, on average.

6. The small sample size of those in community and social service, and in military occupations, may not provide enough information to support the analytical findings reported in this article.

7. Note that we have survey data, weighted by a family weight, and ran logistics regressions using a survey procedure in Stata.

8. We also attempted to include an interaction term to look at the interaction among sex, marital status, and occupation. This resulted in multicollinearity issues, arising in general because there were so many variables, some of them having very few observations. We chose not to report these findings here.

9. Full analyses are available from the authors on request.

References

- Ames, G. M., & Rebhun, L. A. (1996). Women, alcohol and work: Interactions of gender, ethnicity and occupational culture. *Social Science & Medicine*, *43*, 1649-1663.
- Birnbaum, D., & Somers, M. (1986). The influence of occupational image subculture on job attitudes, job performance, and the job attitude-job performance relationship. *Human Relations*, *39*(7), 661-672.
- Bloor, G., & Dawson, P. (1994). Understanding professional culture in organizational context. *Organization Studies*, *15*(2), 275-295.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Collins, R. (1979). *The credential society: An historical sociology of education and stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- Coser, L. A. (1974). *Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Holland, J. L. (1984). Personality and vocational interests in an adult sample. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*, 390-400.
- Crawford, S. E. S., Olson, L. R., & Deckman, M. M. (2001). Understanding the mobilization of professionals. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *30*, 321-350.
- Curtis, J. E., Baer, D. E., & Grabb, E. G. (2001). Nation of joiners: Explaining voluntary association membership in democratic societies. *American Sociological Review*, *66*(6), 783-805.
- Davis Smith, J. (1999). Poor marketing or the decline of altruism? Young people and volunteering in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *4*(4), 372-377.
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology* (J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson, Trans.). New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1897)
- Epstein, C. F., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2001). Time and the sociology of work: Issues and implications. *Work and Occupations*, *28*, 5-16.
- Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969). *The semi-professions and their organization*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Fonne, V., & Myhre, G. (1996). The effect of occupational cultures on coordination of emergency medical service aircrew. *Aviation, Space, & Environmental Medicine*, *67*, 525-529.
- Forsyth, P. B., & Danisiewicz, T. J. (1985). Toward a theory of professionalism. *Work and Organizations*, *12*(1), 59-76.
- Friedson, E. (1986). *Professional powers: A study of the institutionalization of formal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Gottfredson, G. D., Tones, E. M., & Holland, J. L. (1993). Personality and vocational interests: The relation of Holland's six interest dimensions to five robust dimensions of personality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 518-524.
- Haase, R. E. (1979). Two computer programs for vocational exploration and assessment employing occupational aspiration. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 39*, 223-227.
- Haddad, M. A. (2004). Community determinates of volunteer participation and the promotion of civic health. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*(S3), 8S-31S.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1975). Inside the clockwork of the male career. In F. Howe (Ed.), *Women and the power to change* (pp. 47-80). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hochschild, A. R. (with Machung, A.). (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Viking-Penguin.
- Hoff, T. J. (1999). The social organization of physician-managers in a changing HMO. *Work and Occupations, 26*, 324-351.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Huntley, G. W., & Davis, F. (1983). Undergraduate study of value scores as predictors of occupation 25 years later. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 45*, 1148-1155.
- Hustinx, L., & Lammertyn, F. (2004). The cultural bases of volunteering: Understanding and predicting attitudinal differences between Flemish Red Cross volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*, 548-584.
- Hwang, M., Grabb, E., & Curtis, J. (2005). Why get involved? Reasons for voluntary association activity among Americans and Canadians. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 34*, 387-403.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kwantes, C. T., & Boglarsky, C. A. (2004). Do occupational groups vary in expressed organizational culture preferences? A study of six occupations in the United States. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 4*, 335-354.
- Lipset, S. M., Trow, M., & Coleman, J. S. (1962). *Union democracy: The internal politics of the international typographical union*. New York: Free Press.
- Lorence, J., & Mortimer, J. T. (1981). Work experience and work involvement. *Work and Occupations, 8*, 297-326.
- Macdonald, K. M., & Ritzer, G. (1988). The sociology of the professions: Dead or alive? *Work and Occupations, 153*, 251-272.
- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, N. H., & Strauss, A. L. (1968). Patterns of mobility within industrial organizations. In B. G. Glaser (Ed.), *Organizational careers* (pp. 203-213). Chicago: Aldine.
- Marx, K. (1978). Preface. A contribution to the critique of political economy. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels reader* (pp. 3-6). New York: Norton. (Original work published 1859)
- Mathiowetz, N. A. (1992). Errors in reports of occupation. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 56*, 352-355.
- McDuff, E. M., & Mueller, C. W. (2000). The ministry as an occupational labor market: Intentions to leave an employer (church) versus intentions to leave a profession (ministry). *Work and Occupations, 27*, 89-116.
- McEachern, S. (2003). Volunteering, occupations and careers across the life course. *Management Research News, 26*, 9, 35-37.
- Moskos, C. C., Jr. (1977). The all-volunteer military: Calling, profession or occupation? *Parameters, 7*, 2-9.
- Osnowitz, D. (2006). Occupational networking as normative control: Collegial exchange among contract professionals. *Work and Occupations, 33*, 12-41.
- Reeser, L. C., & Epstein, I. (1990). *Professionalization and activism in social work*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Reiss, A. H. (1989). Executive volunteers: The hidden workforce. *Management Review, 78*(11), 55-56.

- Rigakos, G. S. (1995). Constructing the symbolic complainant: Police subculture and the nonenforcement of protection orders for battered women. *Violence and Victims, 10*, 227-246.
- Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. S., & Schervish, P. G. (2004). Methodology is destiny: The effect of survey prompts on reported levels of giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*, 628-654.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2001). Wealth and the commonwealth: New findings on wherewithal and philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 30*, 5-25.
- Schultz, V. (2000). Life's work. *Columbia Law Review, 100*(7), 1881-1964.
- Seron, C., & Ferris, K. (1995). Negotiating professionalism: The gendered social capital of flexible time. *Work and Occupations, 22*, 22-47.
- Sherer, M. (2004). National service in Israel: Motivations, volunteer characteristics, and levels of content. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*, 94-108.
- Sloan, M. M. (2004). The effects of occupational characteristics on the experience and expression of anger in the workplace. *Work and Occupations, 31*, 38-72.
- Smith, A. (1904). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. London: Methuen and Co. (Original work published 1776)
- Sorensen, G., Pechacek, T., & Pallonen, U. (1986). Occupational and worksite norms and attitudes about smoking cessation. *American Journal of Public Health, 76*, 544-549.
- Statham, A., Miller, E. M., & Mauksch, H. O. (1987). *The worth of women's work: A qualitative synthesis*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Tokar, D. M., Fischer, A. R., & Subich, L. M. (1998). Personality and vocational behavior: A selective review of the literature, 1993-1997. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 53*, 115-153.
- Trice, H. M. (1993). *Occupational subcultures in the workplace*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1992). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking-in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization, and society* (pp. 67-130). Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.
- Van Maanen, J., & Barley, S. R. (1984). Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 6*, 287-365.
- Wallace, M., & Leicht, K. T. (2004). Culture wars in the workplace? Cultural antecedents of worker's job entitlement. *Work and Occupations, 31*, 3-37.
- Wenger, E., & Snyder, W. (2000). Communities of practice: The organizational frontier. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(1), 139-146.
- Wilensky, A., & Hansen, C. D. (2001). Understanding the work beliefs of nonprofit executives through organizational stories. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(3), 223-239.
- Wilensky, H. (1964). The professionalization of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology, 70*, 142-146.
- Wilhelm, M. O., Brown, E., Rooney, P., & Steinberg, R. (2003). *The Center on Philanthropy Panel Study* [Data file]. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 215-240.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. A. (1997). Work and volunteering: The long arm of the job. *Social Forces, 76*(1), 251-272.
- Witz, A. (1992). *Professions and patriarchy*. London: Routledge.

Natalie J. Webb is an associate professor at the Defense Resources Management Institute at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. She writes on applied economics topics including nonprofit organizations, NGO-government relations, volunteering, health, public management and budgeting, and defense-related topics.

Rikki Abzug is an associate professor of management at the Anisfield School of Business, Ramapo College of New Jersey. Her research interests include nonprofit human resources and labor issues, governance, and sector theory.