

# **People and their Diverse Linkages to Nonprofits: An Exploratory Study**

Rebecca Nesbit  
University of North Carolina—Charlotte  
Department of Political Science  
440 Fretwell  
9201 University City Boulevard  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28223  
Tel: (704) 687-6821  
Fax: (704) 687-3497  
Email: [beckynesbit@uncc.edu](mailto:beckynesbit@uncc.edu)

Dr. Kirsten A. Gronbjerg  
School of Public and Environmental Affairs  
Indiana University  
1315 E. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Room 419  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405  
Tel: (812) 855-5971  
Fax: (812) 855-7802  
Email: [kgronbj@indiana.edu](mailto:kgronbj@indiana.edu)

Paper prepared for presentation at the 10<sup>th</sup> National Public Management Research Conference,  
October 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 at Columbus, Ohio

## **Abstract**

This paper investigates that constellation of different types of relationships between people and nonprofits. Organizational involvement can be synergistic; people who work for a nonprofit or attend religious services at a congregation might be more likely to volunteer or attend meetings of community organizations. The primary data used in this paper come from a telephone survey of 526 Indiana residents conducted in Spring 2001. Using these data, we map the distributions of the types of relationships with nonprofits (employee, religious attendee, meeting attendee, or volunteer) across individuals with different demographic profiles.

## **Keywords:**

Volunteering, church attendance, nonprofit organizations, associations,

## **Introduction**

Individuals have many different relationships with organizations; they can be employees, members, attendees, clients, donors and a host of other possibilities. Indeed, in many instances, an individual can have more than one type of relationship with an organization, such as when a member of a church congregation is also employed by the church. In this paper, we are interested in exploring the relationships between individuals and nonprofit organizations. While much research has been conducted about a variety of relationships that people can have with nonprofit organizations, such as attending religious services, attending meetings or volunteering, very little of this research focuses on looking at the range of organizations and relationships that individuals have with nonprofit organizations. Most research focuses solely on either a specific type of organization, such as religious congregations, or on specific types of relationships with nonprofits, such as volunteering. However, there is much that scholars can learn about how nonprofit organizations involve individuals and impact their lives by taking a broader approach and focusing on an individual's entire range of affiliations with nonprofit organizations.

In this paper, we look at the distributions of the types of relationships with nonprofits across individuals with different demographic profiles. Specifically, we want to identify several patterns of involvement with nonprofit organizations and use demographic and organizational information to try to predict which individuals will fall into each of these patterns of involvement. We commence the paper with a discussion of potential synergies of organizational affiliations with nonprofits and how those affiliations often yield other connections to nonprofit organizations. The next section of the paper introduces a variety of individual and family characteristics and how we expect them to be related to different types of relationships with nonprofit organizations. Following that, we present the methodology, data

and results of a hypernetwork survey of Indiana residents and conclude with a discussion of the results and their implications for the study of nonprofit affiliations.

### **Synergies in Organizational Involvement**

The nonprofit sector levers many individual prosocial behaviors to promote the goals of the sector. Without individual donations, volunteers, and people who are willing to join and support associations, much of the nonprofit sector would not exist. Many people are associated with a variety of nonprofit organizations and perform a variety of roles in supporting them. Throughout this paper, we focus on four main types of relationships that individuals can have with nonprofit organizations: (1) employees, (2) attendees at religious services, (3) attendees at meetings or special events, or (4) volunteering. Although we recognize that individuals can have other relationships with nonprofits, such as being clients, we focus on these four because they encompass the vast majority of individual affiliations with nonprofit organizations. There can be synergies when a person is involved with multiple organizations in multiple ways. This section of the paper discusses each of these four types of relationships with nonprofit organizations and how they are associated with other relationships with either the same or different nonprofits. This provides background for exploring different distributions of relationships that people have with nonprofit organizations.

### *Nonprofit Employment*

The nonprofit sector employed almost 12 million workers in 2001, which represented approximately 9 percent of the total employment in that year (Independent Sector, 2004). This represents a doubling in nonprofit employment over the past 25 years, and employment in the

nonprofit sector is expected to grow to 15 million people in 2010 (Independent Sector, 2004). In some areas, nonprofit employment has increased by as much as 30 percent in just 10 years (Salamon and Sokolowski, 2005). The evidence is irrefutable that employment by nonprofits is an increasingly important part of employment in the United States and affects a considerable number of people.

What makes this particularly interesting, however, is the fact that in some ways nonprofit employment differs from employment in the private or public sectors. Not only is nonprofit employment an increasingly important piece of employment overall, but nonprofit employment is a particularly important form of employment for women. The preponderance of nonprofit employees are women (Johnston and Rudney, 1987). Some of the forces drawing women into employment in the nonprofit sector are the greater wage equality between men and women in the sector and greater opportunities for women to develop workplace skills (Preston, 1990). In particular, Black women are particularly likely to work in nonprofit organizations; in 1990, almost half of all Black women participating in the labor force were working in the nonprofit or public sector (Burbridge, 1994). The nonprofit sector provides work opportunities for women that they don't find elsewhere in the market.

Another difference between employment in the nonprofit sector and the private sector is issues of compensation. Although the conventional wisdom indicates that wages in the nonprofit sector are lower overall than wages in the for-profit sector, research has shown that these differentials only hold up for certain industries and sub-categories of employment. Researchers argue that wages in nonprofits are generally competitive and comparable to similar private-sector jobs, but that many nonprofit jobs are found in low-paying industries, such as those aimed at helping children or those who are ill (Leete, 2001; Ruhm and Borkoski, 2003). Still, despite the

fact that many nonprofit jobs are available in low-paying industries, they still attract workers, perhaps because people are willing to accept a lower wage in order to provide a service that has a positive externality (Preston, 1989). The nonprofit sector also relies very heavily on intrinsically motivated employees that identify highly with the service mission and goals of the nonprofit organization (Leete, 2000). Many nonprofit jobs are not highly-paid jobs, although they are comparable to similar jobs in the private sector.

We expect that employment in the nonprofit sector will be related to other relationships with nonprofits, especially volunteering. Prior research has shown that people who work for nonprofit organizations are more likely to volunteer in the broader community than those who work for other types of private organizations (Rotolo & Wilson, 2006). One reason for this difference can be that people working in the public and nonprofit sectors have a public service motivation, meaning a desire to do work that serves the general interests of the community (Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999). This finding is not unique to the United States; worldwide volunteering levels are generally correlated with the level of employment in the country's nonprofit sector (Salamon, 2002). Public sector employees are also more likely to volunteer than private sector employees or the self-employed (Wilson and Musick, 1997). Additionally, people tend to volunteer for the organizations that employ them, as evidenced by the fact that many volunteer management handbooks encourage managers to have policies regarding employees volunteering (Connors, 1995; McCurley and Lynch, 1996). Therefore, we would expect nonprofit employees to be involved with volunteering either at the organization they work for or for different organizations.

### *Religious Attendance*

A great body of research has shown that religious affiliation and attendance are positively related to other forms of positive voluntary action, such as joining associations or volunteering (e.g. Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995). Affiliation with any religion is positively associated with increased participation with voluntary associations through memberships or volunteering (Lam, 2002). Smidt (1999) found that this relationship also held in Canada, although Americans tended to be more likely to be members of social organizations and more like to volunteer for those organizations.

Participation in religious organizations affects other voluntary behaviors through two primary mechanisms. First, by participating in religious organizations, people have the opportunity to learn, use and further develop the skills necessary to function in other aspects of civic life, such as volunteering. These organizations provide opportunities for individuals to develop the requisite skills for political functioning, such as the ability to write a letter, give a speech or conduct a meeting (Verba et al., 1995). Second, participation in a church expands a person's social networks, which increases their chances of being asked to volunteer or knowing other people who volunteer. For instance, commitment to a religious organization is associated with increased attachment and involvement in the broader community often because the religious organization encourages values of community service and reaching out to others (Becker & Dhringra, 2001; Liu, Ryan, Aurbach, & Besser, 1998). Religious organizations expand and solidify a person's social networks—another common correlate of volunteering and associational membership (Park and Smith, 2000). Religious organizations can serve as seedbeds for other prosocial voluntary behaviors.

Past research has also shown that when looking at differences in the social behaviors of people who attend religious services, it is wise to look at different religious denominations separately. Different religious denominations have varied impact on the attitudes and behaviors of their congregants. Protestant religions in particular have been found to be associated with higher participation in voluntary groups (Smith, 1975; Smith, 1994). Lam's (2002) research shows that Protestants are more likely than Catholics and Jews to be members of voluntary associations. Researchers caution that religious interpretations of the meaning of volunteering and the importance and role of church attendance in a person's life will vary among different religions and can impact the relationship between religious affiliation and volunteering (Wilson and Janoski, 1995).

Another factor that influences the relationship between religious involvement and other forms of involvement is the level of commitment a person shows to their religious organizations. This is typically measured by how often the person attends religious services. Lam (2002) found that people who attended religious services more frequently or volunteered for their religious organization were slightly less likely to volunteer for or join secular organizations than people who affiliated with a religion but did not attend services as often. This is evidence that for active religious people, voluntary associations might compete with the religious organization for people's time (Becker and Dhingra, 2001; Wuthnow, 1999). Therefore, although being part of a religion might increase the likelihood that a person will volunteer, it might also decrease the amount of time that person spends on volunteering activities.

Thus we expect religious involvement to be correlated with attendance at meetings and volunteering. We expect that this effect will be greater for those who are more heavily involved in their religious group. We also expect that this effect will be greater for certain denominations,

such as Protestants, than others, such as Catholics. Finally, we anticipate that churchgoers will also be likely to volunteer for their church. We would also expect a certain percentage of nonprofit employees to be church members who work for their congregation given the propensity of many American churches to hire lay members to assist the clergy in running the church.

### *Meeting Attendance*

The United States has always been a culture built on associations. Although membership in voluntary organizations declined for a period of time, since the mid-1980s memberships have increased (Rotolo, 1999). And the number of voluntary associations is growing as well. For instance, the number of independent veterans associations almost tripled during the years 1980 and 1997, although membership in individual organizations declined somewhat (Putnam, 2000). Associations are still an important part of American life. Joining and participating in voluntary associations is associated with other positive voluntary behaviors, such as increasing civic engagement overall (Flanagan et al., 1998; Youniss et al., 2002). In particular, membership in voluntary associations is strongly linked with volunteering (Hodgkinson, Nelson, & Sivak, 2002). Therefore we would expect people who are strongly affiliated with voluntary associations to be volunteers as well.

Attending meetings at nonprofit associations and organizations can impact volunteering by acting in a similar way to churches—they expand people’s social networks. Indeed, most volunteers are found through networks of religious and associational memberships (Putnam, 2000). A significant proportion of volunteers indicate that they volunteer because they were asked by someone they know to do so. Being asked to volunteer is strongly associated with

the likelihood of a person volunteering (Sundeen & Raskoff, 2000; Wymer, 1997). People are much more likely to volunteer if they know someone in an organization or know someone who benefits from that organization (Becker & Dhingra, 2001; Nichols & King, 1998; Wymer, 1997). Social networks have important consequences for volunteering.

Another way that voluntary associations affect people's other relationships with nonprofits is through organizational identification. In this theory, positive perceptions of nonprofit organizations and what they stand for can affect people's connections to those organizations. People can identify with organizations when they define themselves by the same attributes that they believe define the organization (Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, 1994). In this way, membership in organizations affects how people view and conceive of themselves. Dutton et. al. postulate that when an individual identifies with an organization, he or she will be more likely to increase contact with the organization (possibly through attending more meetings and events or volunteering) and will exhibit more organizational citizenship behaviors. So being attached to an association that has a positive identity or is tied to the cause that the person supports can cause that person to be more involved with the organization.

However, the consequences that voluntary associations have for other forms of involvement with nonprofits vary across people's demographic characteristics. People with higher-status, such as more education and higher incomes, join voluntary associations at higher rates and tend to stay in voluntary associations longer (McPherson, 1981). Voluntary association membership also vary over the life cycle with middle-aged people having the most memberships (Knoke and Thomson, 1977). Additionally, joining membership associations and participation in meetings might be gendered. In the last 30 years, women's participation rates in the labor force have increased dramatically and the resulting time pressures have decreased women's

involvement in membership associations (Skocpol, 2003; Putnam, 2000). In the United States, women's associational activity has been steadily decreasing (Andersen, Curtis and Grabb, 2006). Therefore it is reasonable to expect some gender differences in the distribution of voluntary association relationships.

### *Volunteering*

Volunteering typically represents a greater organizational commitment than attending meetings or special events. Regular volunteers commit a certain number of hours in a given week or month to a nonprofit organization. Thus, it might be easier for people to attend meetings at nonprofits rather than to volunteer their time at a nonprofit. Yet many people both attend meetings and volunteer for a variety of organizations.

In terms of global attitudes and attributes, volunteering is connected to a variety of prosocial attitudes and behaviors. Volunteering has been shown to be associated with higher levels of trust and compassion, whereas other forms of social interaction, such as participation in groups or working have not led to increased trust and compassion (Brown, 1999). Volunteering is also thought to increase social capital by facilitating coordination and cooperation among individuals trying to meet some collective goal (Campbell, 2000). Researchers have also found a link between volunteering and other forms of participation, especially political participation (Gordon & Babchuk, 1959; Hanks & Eckland, 1978; Olsen, 1972).

Beyond being associated with other forms of civic engagement, volunteering is associated with other relationships with nonprofits. Volunteers attend church more frequently and attend more association meetings than nonvolunteers (Wilson and Musick 1998). Volunteering can also yield occupational benefits. Volunteering can give people skills and

training and build their human capital in ways that benefit them in the marketplace, volunteering can also expand people's social networks which can also be instrumental in job advancement (Wilson and Musick, 2003). In a study of American women's volunteer experiences in early life, Wilson and Musick (2003) found that volunteering was associated with women having higher status occupations later in life. Students often volunteer and do community service because they can use it to pad their resumes for getting into college or getting better jobs (Friedland & Morimoto, 2005). Volunteering experiences would be particularly attractive if a person is seeking a job at another nonprofit organization.

It is evident that we can expect one type of relationship with nonprofit organizations to occur with other relationships with either the same or different nonprofit organizations. However, this also brings up many unanswered questions. How are volunteering and attending meetings related? Which churchgoers are also heavily engaged in community organizations through attending meetings or volunteering? What do some of the typical patterns of involvement look like? The next section of the paper begins to address some of these questions by reviewing the data, methodology and results of this study.

## **Data and Methodology**

Our primary dataset is based on a telephone survey of 526 Indiana residents conducted by the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University Bloomington in Spring 2001. The purpose of the survey was to gather information about respondents' personal affiliations with Indiana nonprofits. Affiliations fell into four types: (1) employed at a nonprofit, (2) attended religious services at a church, (3) attended a meeting or special event at a nonprofit, and (4) volunteered at

a nonprofit. Respondents could indicate up to two different nonprofits that they were currently employed by. For religious services, respondents indicated what church they attended, the denomination of the church and how often they attended. Meeting attendance covered 21 different types of organizations (sports clubs, labor unions, homeowners associations, etc.) and respondents could indicate up to five organizations of each type where they attended meetings. The volunteering questions were structured around 10 volunteer activities, such as raising funds, providing direct services, or office and clerical work, and respondents could indicate up to five organizations where they performed each volunteer activity. For each affiliation, respondents were asked to provide the name and address of the nonprofit organization that they were affiliated with. In addition to the nonprofit affiliation questions, respondents were asked a variety of demographic questions about themselves and their families. The response rate for the survey was 42 percent (when phone numbers of unknown validity are excluded from the base). The 517 individuals in the survey yielded 1,779 unique linkages to nonprofit organizations. Table 1 shows a frequency distribution of the involvement of the 517 individuals in the dataset.

*Insert Table 1 about here*

As seen in Table 1, 41 people are employed by nonprofits and 385 attend religious services. Of the 21 different types of meetings attended, the most frequently attended were fraternal/service organizations (12%), professional groups (14%), school support groups (12%), health groups (9%), dance/performance groups (8%), social clubs (8%) and neighborhood associations (8%). The most common volunteering activities are fundraising (29%), assisting with religious services (14%), leading/managing (13%), providing direct services (12%), and other (12%).

*Variables*

*Independent Variables.* We divide up the independent variables in this paper into three groups—individual characteristics, family characteristics and religious characteristics. The first variable we include is a dummy variable for gender (1 = female, 0 = male). Many nonprofit relationships are gendered. For example, more women volunteer than men (Boraas, 2003). Changes in voluntary association memberships are also gendered with women’s involvement declining more than men’s involvement (Andersen et. al., 2006). The second individual characteristic is age. Involvement in nonprofit organizations tends to shift over a person’s life cycle with middle-aged people being members of more associations than older or younger people (Knoke and Thomson, 1977). This same pattern holds true for volunteering (Boraas, 2003), although we are starting to see increases in volunteering among youth and the elderly. One of the reasons that middle-aged people are more likely to have these associations with nonprofits is because they are more likely to be married and to have children—two other correlates of volunteering and association participation (Boraas, 2003; Wilson and Musick, 1998). Although race is generally a predictor of voluntary behaviors, we exclude race in this case because the vast majority of our sample is white. We also include a dummy variable for whether the person is registered to vote. To measure education, we include a series of dummy variables for the amount of education the person has received. Specifically, we focus on three categories—no high school diploma, those with a bachelors degree, and those with a masters degree. The final individual characteristic is a dummy variable indicating whether the person is employed fulltime.

The first family characteristic that we include is a dummy variable for whether the person is married. We also include the number of children living in the home. We include the household income in the models. Because household income was asked in categories, we

recoded each category as the dollar value of the midpoint of that category. Finally, we include a dummy variable for whether the person owns their own home.

The religious characteristics have to do with a person's religious affiliation and how often they attend religious services. The religious affiliation is measured by five dummy variables—Catholic, Protestant, other Christian religion, other religion, and no religious affiliation. The attendance variables are also dummy variables that capture whether the person attends church weekly (or more), monthly (2-3 times a month), sometimes (once or less per month) or never.

Because we are interested in identifying patterns of involvement, we use cluster analysis to determine whether people fall into recognizable involvement constellations. The purpose behind cluster analysis is to group similar observations into clusters for further analysis (see Beckstead, 2002). We used a hierarchical cluster analysis in STATA using the Jaccard measure for binary variables (since all of our determining variables are binary) and the Calinski stopping rule. The variables that we used to create the clusters were most of the involvement variables, excluding some of the least-used categories. In the end, we included employment at a nonprofit, attending religious services, attending meetings (excluding literary groups, farm organizations, environmental groups, self-help groups, groups for older people, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups), and seven measures of volunteering (excluding influencing public opinion, providing office assistance, and influencing policy makers). The cluster analysis yielded 15 clusters, or 15 distinct patterns of involvement.

## **Results**

Table 2 shows the ANOVA results for the involvement variables and the fifteen clusters that they yielded.

*Insert Table 2 about here*

The table shows the average number of links for each cluster as well as the percentage of people in each cluster who participating in the different types of linkages. The table also shows the ANOVA F-value. Cluster 1 (n=48) is the no involvement group. None of these 48 individuals has any indicated linkages with nonprofit organizations. Cluster 2 (n=31) are the church community volunteers. In this group, 77 percent attend religious services. Very few of these individuals volunteer at their church (13%), but they all do some other type of volunteering. A few individuals in this group attend a meeting, but their involvement is low. Cluster 3 (n=12) is comprised of the strictly church volunteers. They all attend religious services and volunteer as helpers with religious services but have no other activity. Cluster 4 (n=13) are the professional churchgoers. They all attend religious services and meetings for a professional organizations. Approximately one-third (31%) of them also volunteer for their church. Cluster 5 (n=59) is the moderately high involvement group—the sporty churchgoers. Seventy-eight percent of this group attends religious services and 92 percent participate in some kind of sports or recreational group. The other most distinguishing feature of this group is that about one-third (37%) of them volunteer by doing fundraising. This group also has other relationships with nonprofits, but no other strong patterns emerge.

Cluster 6 (n=21) are the nonprofit employees. Fully 86 percent of this group is employed by a nonprofit organization, and 71 percent of them attend church. One-third of them do fundraising volunteering activities, but no other volunteering. About one-fifth (19%) of the individuals in this group attend a veterans meeting or social club meeting, but other meeting

attendance is not high. Cluster 7 (n=14) are the fundraising veterans. Fully 71 percent of this group attends meetings for veterans organizations and 71 percent participate in fundraising activities. This group does a small amount of other volunteering activity, but very little meeting attending. Cluster 8 (n=78) is the moderate involvement group. The average number of linkages for this group is 7.5 and their activities run the entire gamut. Seventy-eight percent attend church. These individuals tend to attend health meetings, attend hobby groups, attend neighborhood association meetings, and attend youth organization meetings. They volunteer by doing fundraising, providing direct service and doing facilities maintenance. Cluster 9 (n=79) is the high involvement group. On average these individuals have 13.1 linkages to nonprofits. Again, 78 percent of this group attends church. They prefer meetings of professional groups (32%), social groups (20%), service/fraternal groups (25%), and youth groups (22%). They volunteer by doing fundraising (62%), providing direct services (43%), and leading and managing nonprofits (61%).

Cluster 10 (n=21) are the laborers. Eighty-one percent of them attend church and 95 percent attend meetings of labor unions and organizations. Twenty-four percent attend meetings for professional groups. Other volunteering and meeting attendance is minimal for this group. Cluster 11 (n=10) are the service group. Seventy percent of this group attends church and they all attend meetings of service organizations, but they have no other activity. Cluster 12 (n=14) are the social churchgoers. The entire group attends religious services and attends meetings of social groups. Thirty-six percent volunteer as fundraisers and 21 percent help with religious services, but they do no other volunteering. Forty-three percent attend meetings of neighborhood associations, but other meeting attendance is very minimal.

Cluster 13 (n=36) are the churchgoing fundraisers. All the people in this group attend church and 97 percent volunteer doing fundraising. Thirty-six percent attend meetings for school support organizations. Other meeting attendance and volunteering is minimal. Cluster 14 (n=11) are the PTA parents. They all attend school support meetings, but no other meetings or volunteering. Sixty-four percent also attend church. Finally, cluster 15 (n=68) are the strictly church attenders. They all attend church but have no other links to nonprofits. Table 3 summarizes the relationships that we found in these 15 clusters.

*Insert Table 3 about here*

Table 4 shows the ANOVA results for a demographic comparison for the fifteen clusters using the independent variables that we discussed earlier. The means for each of the variables are reported in the table, but for the binary variables the mean represents the percentage of people who fall into that category.

*Insert Table 4 about here*

Only a few of the individual characteristics varied significantly across clusters. The youngest group is cluster 10, the laborers, with an average age of 39. Cluster 14, the PTA Parents is also fairly young (40 years). The oldest cluster is cluster 2, the Churchgoing Community Volunteers, at age 57. Three other groups are somewhat older—cluster 3, the Strictly Church Volunteers, cluster 7, the Fundraising Veterans, and cluster 11, the Service Group. Interesting, these older and younger groups tend to be less involved overall. Being registered to vote is also related to the involvement clusters. In the No Involvement group, cluster 1, only 58 percent is registered to vote. In cluster 11, the Service Group (another low involvement group) only 60 percent are registered to vote. The two highest involvement groups, clusters 8 and 9 have fairly high

registration rates along with cluster 7, the Fundraising Veterans. Having a graduate degree is marginally related to these clusters. Specifically, 22 percent of cluster 9, the High Involvement group, have a graduate degree. Finally, being employed fulltime is also related to our clustering. Not surprising, 90 percent of the Laborers are employed fulltime. The two high involvement clusters (8 and 9) are only employed fulltime at rates of 58 and 59 percent, respectively. This might explain why they have the time to be involved in more activities. Cluster 12, the Social Churchgoers, are only employed fulltime at a rate of 36 percent.

A couple family characteristics, number of children and household income, are significantly related to clustering. The PTA Parents, cluster 11, have 2 children on average—much higher than any of the other groups. Nonprofit Employees, cluster 6, have 1 child on average. The Professional Churchgoers (cluster 4) are the wealthiest group. The clusters with the lowest incomes are cluster 1, the No Involvement group and cluster 15, the Strictly Church Attenders. Cluster 5, the Sporty Churchgoers, and Cluster 9, the High Involvement Group, also have fairly high incomes.

Religious characteristics are strongly related to clustering. The only religious affiliation variable related to the clusters is having no affiliation. Forty-seven percent of the No Involvement cluster (cluster 1) have no religious affiliation. Thirty-six percent of the PTA Parents, cluster 14, also have no religious affiliation. Thirty-one percent of the Fundraising Veterans, cluster 7, indicate no religious affiliation as well. In cluster 3, the Strictly Church Volunteers, 75 percent attend church weekly. In cluster 9, the High Involvement group, 51 percent attend church weekly. Also, 50 percent of the Churchgoing Fundraisers, cluster 13, attend church every week. Ninety-six percent of the No Involvement group, don't ever attend religious services. Eighty-five percent of the Fundraising Veterans, cluster 7, also do not ever

attend religious services. Interestingly 36 percent of the PTA Parents, cluster 13, never attend religious services, but another 36 percent attend religious services weekly.

## **Discussion**

This study has is a very step toward identifying broad patterns of involvement with nonprofit organizations. This study revealed several interesting categories of involvement, from those who are not involved at all to those who are involved in a wide range of activities.

Nonprofit employment in our study was associated with a few other forms of involvement, but not many. Most nonprofit employees also attend religious services. In fact a portion of this group was actually employed by their church. Working at a nonprofit was also associated with fundraising activities, but not strongly associated with other types of volunteering or attending other meetings.

This paper also addresses the continuing question of how participation in religious congregations shapes and influences civic engagement (Wuthnow, 1999). In our clusters we see several patterns of involvement around religion. Some people are involved strictly in their church by attending religious services and possibly volunteering at their church as well. Many of the clusters were populated by churchgoers, but the No Involvement group (cluster 1) and the Fundraising Veterans (cluster 7) are generally not church-attending groups. In our study, we did not find that religious affiliation is related to involvement, other than the fact that people who claim no religious affiliation are generally in the clusters with fewer connections to nonprofits. Unlike other studies, we did not find a difference in involvement between different denominations, such as Catholics and Protestants. Similar to other studies, we find that the extent of religious participation is also related to civic involvement with nonprofit organizations

(Lam, 2002). We find that, in general, religious attendance is related to participation and people who attend religious services weekly tend to be more involved with more organizations. People who attend religious services weekly are also more likely to volunteer for their religious organization.

The patterns with which people attended meetings of nonprofits varied greatly. Two clusters had no meeting attendance at all, and four clusters had their entire meeting attendance focused around just one or two types of organization, such as veterans organizations or professional organizations. It is interesting that cluster 5 was focused on sport and recreation organizations and cluster 10 is focused on labor unions/groups. Although people in these clusters did attend other meetings, their primary focus seemed to be in one area.

Most of our clusters were not associated with a lot of volunteering. Clusters 8 and 9, the two groups with the most involvement overall, have the highest proportions of people volunteering in the widest range of activities. In cluster 9, it is likely that people are volunteering in more than one capacity. Volunteering is probably less common than attending meetings because it requires a greater commitment of time and resources.

### **Next Steps**

The next steps for this research include digging into these clusters in more detail. We know what organizations people volunteered for, so we can identify if they are volunteering for the same organizations where they work, attend religious services, or attend meetings. Furthermore, we have some basic organizational information about all of the organizations in the sample and more detailed organizational information for a portion of them. We can use this organizational information to further explore these clusters.

## References

- Anderson, Robert, James Curtis, and Edward Grabb. (2006). "Trends in Civic Association Activity in Four Democracies: The Special Case of Women in the United States." *American Sociological Review*, 71(3): 276-400.
- Becker, Penny Edgell and Dhingra, Pawan H. (2001). Religious Involvement and Volunteering: Implications for Civil Society. *Sociology of Religion*, 62(3), 315-335.
- Beckstead, J. W. (2002). Using hierarchical cluster analysis in nursing research. *Western Journal of Nursing*, 24(3), 307-319
- Brown, E. (1999). The Scope of Volunteer Activity and Public Service. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 17-42.
- Boraas, S. (2003). Volunteerism in the United States. *Monthly Labor Review*, 3-11.
- Burbridge, Lynn C. (1994). "The Reliance of African-American Women on Government and Third-Sector Employment" *The American Economic Review*, 84(2): 103-107.
- Campbell, D. E. (2000). Social Capital and Service Learning. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 33(3), 641-645.
- Connors, Tracy Daniel (1995). *The Volunteer Management Handbook*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dutton, Jane E., Janet M. Dukerich, and Celia V. Harquail. (1994). "Organizational Images and Member Identification" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2): 239-263.
- Flanagan, C. A., B. Jonsson, L. Botcheva, B. Csapo, J. Bowes, P. Macek, et al. (1998b). Adolescents and the 'Social Contract': Developmental Roots of Citizenship in Seven Countries. In M. Yates & J. Youniss (Eds.), *Community Service and Civic Engagement in Youth: International Perspectives* (pp. 135-155). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedland, L. A., & S. Morimoto. (2005). *The Changing Lifeworld of Young People: Risk, Resume-Padding, and Civic Engagement* (Working Paper 40): Center of Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Gordon, C. W., & N. Babchuk. (1959). A Typology of Voluntary Associations. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 22-29.
- Hanks, M., & B. K. Eckland. (1978). Adult Voluntary Associations and Adolescent Socialization. *Sociological Quarterly*, 19, 481-490.
- Hodgkinson, V. A., Nelson, K. E., & Sivak, E. D. (2002). Individual Giving and Volunteering In L. M. Salamon (Ed.), *The State of Nonprofit America* (pp. 387-420). Washington, DC Brookings Institutions Press.
- Independent Sector. (2004) "Nonprofit Sector Employment Growth Outpaces Business, Government" Washington, DC, May 25, 2004, <http://www.independentsector.org/media/npemploymentPR.html> (accessed September 14, 2009)
- Johnston, Denis and Gabriel Rudney, (1987). "Characteristics of Workers in Nonprofit Organizations" *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1987, pp. 28-33.
- Knoke, David and Randall Thomson. (1977). "Voluntary Association Membership Trends and the Family Life Cycle." *Social Forces*, 56(1): 48-65.
- Lam, Pui-Yan. (2002). "As the Flocks Gather: How Religion Affects Voluntary Association Participation." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(3): 405-422.
- Leete, Laura. (2001). "Whither the Nonprofit Wage Differential? Estimates from the 1990 Census" *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(1): 136-170.

- Leete, Laura. (2000). "Wage Equity and Employee Motivation in Nonprofit and For-Profit Organizations" *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 43(2000): 423-446.
- Liu, Q. A., Ryan, V., Aurbach, H., & Besser, T. (1998). The Influence of Local Church Participation on Rural Community Attachment. *Rural Sociology* 63(3), 432-451.
- McCurley, Steve & Lynch, Rick (1996). *Volunteer Management: Mobilizing All the Resources of the Community*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)
- McPherson, J. M. (1981). A Dynamic Model of Voluntary Affiliation. *Social Forces*, 59(3), 705-728.
- Nichols, G., & L. King. (1998). Volunteers in the Guide Association: Problems and Solutions *Voluntary Action*, 1(1), 21-32.
- Olsen, M. E. (1972). Social Participation and Voting Turnout: A Multivariate Analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 317-333.
- Park, J. and C. Smith (2000). "'To Whom Has Much Been Given...': Religious Capital and Community Voluntarism among Churchgoing Protestants" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 39: 272-286.
- Popielarz & McPherson (2000). "On the Edge or In Between: Niche Position....", pp. 258-66 in Ott, J. Stephen, *The Nature of the Nonprofit Sector*.
- Preston, Anne E. (1990). "Women in the White-Collar Nonprofit Sector: The Best Option or the Only Option?" *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 72(4): 560-568.
- Preston, Anne E. (1989). "The Nonprofit Worker in a For-Profit World" *Journal of Labor Economics*, 7(4): 438-463.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rainey, H., & P. Steinbauer. (1999). Galloping Elephants: Development Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9, 1-32.
- Rotolo, Thomas. (1999). "Trends in Voluntary Association Participation." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 28: 199-212.
- Rotolo, T., & Wilson, J. (2006). Employment Sector and Volunteering: The Contribution of Nonprofit and Public Sector Workers to the Volunteer Labor Force. *The Sociological Quarterly* 47, 21-40.
- Ruhm, Christopher J. and Carey Borkoski. (2003). "Compensation in the Nonprofit Sector" *The Journal of Human Resources*, 38(4): 992-1021.
- Salamon, Lester. (2002). "Social Engagement" *Foreign Policy*, 130 (May-June, 2002): pp. 30-31.
- Salamon, Lester and S. Wojciech Sokolowski. (2005). "Nonprofit Organizations: New Insights from QCEW Data" *Monthly Labor Review*, September 2005, pp. 19-26.
- Skocpol, Theda. (2003) *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Smidt, Corwin. (1999). "Religion and Civic Engagement: A Comparative Analysis" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 565: 176-192.
- Smith, D. H. 1975. Voluntary action and voluntary groups. *Annual Review of Sociology* 1:247-70. .1994. Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 3(3):243-63.
- Smith, D. H. 1994. Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 3(3):243-63.

- Sundeen, R. A., & S. A. Raskoff. (2000). Ports of Entry and Obstacles: Teenagers' Access to Volunteer Activities. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 11(2), 179-197.
- Wilson, John and Janoski, Thomas. (1995). "The Contribution of Religion to Volunteer Work" *Sociology of Religion*, 56(2): 137-152.
- Wilson, John and Mark A. Musick (2003). "Doing Well by Doing Good: Volunteering and Occupational Achievement among American Women" *The Sociological Quarterly*, 44(3): 433-450.
- Wilson, John and Mark A. Musick. (1997). "Work and Volunteering: The Long Arm of the Job" *Social Forces*, 76(1): 251-272.
- Wilson, John and Mark A. Musick. (1998). "Social Resources and Volunteering." *Social Science Quarterly* 79:799-815.
- Wuthnow, R. (1999). Mobilizing Civic Engagement: The Changing Impact of Religious Involvement. In T. Skocpol & M. P. Fiorina (Eds.), *Civic Engagement in American Democracy* (pp. 331-363). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Verba, S., K. L. Schlozman, and H. E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wymer, W. W. (1997). Segmenting Volunteering Using Values, Self-Esteem, Empathy and Facilitation as Determinant Variables. *Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 5(2), 3-28.
- Youniss, J., S. Bales, V. Christmas-Best, M. Diversi, M. McLaughlin, & R. Silbereisen. (2002). Youth Civic Engagement in the 21st Century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12, 121-148.

<b>Table 1: Involvement Frequency Distribution</b>		
	N	Percent
Employed at nonprofit	41	8%
Attend religious services	385	74%
Attend meeting or event at...		
Professional Group	74	14%
Fraternal or Service Organization	64	12%
School Support Group	63	12%
Health Issues/Diseases	46	9%
Labor Union/Workers Association	45	9%
Dance Club or Amateur Performance Group	41	8%
Social Club/Fraternity or Sorority	41	8%
Other Civic or Community Organization	40	8%
Neighborhood or Homeowners Association	40	8%
Youth Organization	36	7%
Veterans Organization	31	6%
Hobby Club	26	5%
Health, Sports, Athletic or Country Club	71	5%
Literary, Art or Discussion Group	22	4%
Environmental/Animal Protection	23	4%
Support or Self-Help Group	22	4%
Organization for Older People	19	4%
Farm Organization	18	3%
Political Organization	15	3%
Advocacy/Political Action Group	10	2%
Ethnic/Nationality/ Civil Right Group	7	1%
Volunteered doing....		
Raising Funds or Support	149	29%
Assisting with Religious Services	73	14%
Leading or Managing	65	13%
Providing Direct Services	61	12%
Other	62	12%
Maintain or Construct Facilities	35	7%
Helping with Communication	31	6%
Educate or Influence Public Opinion	15	3%
Office or Clerical Assistance	17	3%
Influence Policy Makers	18	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2: Cluster Descriptions and ANOVA Results for Involvement Patterns**

	Clus1 n=48	Clus2 n=31	Clus3 n=12	Clus4 n=13	Clus5 n=59	Clus6 n=21	Clus7 n=14	Clus8 n=78	Clus9 n=79	Clus10 n=21	Clus11 n=10	Clus12 n=14	Clus13 n=36	Clus14 n=11	Clus15 n=68	F
Number of Links	0	5	3	3.9	9.7	4	4.6	7.5	13.1	5.2	3.5	5.7	6.2	3.1	1.5	30.30***
Employed	0	0	0	0	.19	.86	0	.04	.09	.10	0	0	0	0	0	27.70***
Attend church	0	.77	1	1	.78	.71	.07	.78	.78	.81	.70	1	1	.64	1	26.94***
<b>Attending Meetings</b>																
Labor Group	0	0	0	0	.12	0	0	.09	.06	.95	0	.07	.14	0	0	15.07***
Professional Group	0	.16	0	1	.32	.05	0	.04	.32	.24	0	0	.08	0	0	3.69***
Health Group	0	.03	0	0	.15	.05	.07	.23	.16	.10	0	0	.03	0	0	25.47***
Social	0	0	0	0	0	.19	0	.08	.20	0	0	1	0	0	0	73.59***
Sports and Recreation	0	0	0	0	.92	0	0	.06	.10	0	0	0	.11	0	0	7.21***
Hobby Group	0	0	0	0	.02	0	0	.25	.06	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.61***
Performance	0	.10	0	0	.14	0	0	.08	.16	.14	0	.07	.19	0	0	11.62***
Veterans	0	.03	0	0	.07	.19	.71	.08	.03	.05	0	0	.08	0	0	4.10***
Neighborhood	0	.13	0	0	.14	0	0	.24	.08	.10	0	0	.03	0	0	11.86***
Service/Fraternal	0	.13	0	0	.22	.05	0	.06	.25	.14	1	.43	.06	0	0	17.55***
School Support	0	0	0	0	.10	.10	0	.05	.34	0	0	0	.36	1	0	4.65***
Youth	0	0	0	0	.03	.05	0	.22	.18	.05	0	0	.03	0	0	8.88***
Other Group	0	0	0	0	.12	0	0	.06	.34	0	0	.07	0	0	0	27.89***
<b>Volunteering</b>																
Fundraising	0	0	0	0	.37	.33	.71	.27	.62	0	0	.36	.97	0	0	27.89***
Communications	0	0	0	0	.08	0	.07	.01	.29	.05	0	0	0	0	0	8.10***
Direct service	0	0	0	0	.07	0	.21	.26	.43	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.91***
Facilities	0	0	0	0	.07	0	.14	.23	.13	.05	0	0	0	0	0	4.49***
Leading	0	0	0	0	.15	0	.14	.06	.61	0	0	0	.03	0	0	24.25***
Religious help	0	.13	1	.31	.14	0	0	.15	.23	.10	0	.21	.25	0	0	10.24***
Other help	0	1	0	0	.15	0	0	.10	.10	.05	0	0	.11	0	0	36.75***

**Table 3: Summary of Clusters**

<b>Cluster Number</b>	<b>Cluster Name</b>	<b>Distinguishing Characteristics</b>
1	No Involvement	No involvement
2	Churchgoing Community Volunteers	All volunteer Most attend religious services Little meeting attendance
3	Strictly Church Volunteers	All attend religious services All volunteer at church No other involvement
4	Professional Churchgoers	All attend religious services All attend professional group meetings One-third volunteer at church No other involvement
5	Sporty Churchgoers (Moderately High Involvement)	Most attend religious services Almost all attend sport or recreation group One-third do fundraising
6	Nonprofit Employees	Most employed by nonprofit Most attend religious services One-third do fundraising
7	Fundraising Veterans	Most attend veterans meeting Most do fundraising
8	Moderate Involvement	Most attend church Gravitate toward health, hobby groups, neighborhood, and youth group meetings Volunteer doing fundraising, providing direct service and doing facilities maintenance Activities run the gamut
9	High Involvement	Most attend church Attend meetings at professional, service, social and youth groups Volunteer by doing fundraising, direct service and leading/managing Activities run the gamut
10	Laborers	Attend labor union meetings One-fourth attend professional meetings Most attend church
11	Service Group	All attend service organization meeting Most attend religious services No other involvement
12	Social Churchgoers	All attend religious services All attend meetings of social organizations One-third do fundraising Almost half attend neighborhood association meetings
13	Churchgoing Fundraisers	All attend religious services Almost all do fundraising Some other meeting and volunteer activity
14	PTA Parents	Attend school support meetings Attend church No other involvement
15	Strictly Church Attending	Attend religious services No other involvement



**Table 4: ANOVA Results for Demographic Comparisons**

	Clus1 n=48	Clus2 n=31	Clus3 n=12	Clus4 n=13	Clus5 n=59	Clus6 n=21	Clus7 n=14	Clus8 n=78	Clus9 n=79	Clus10 n=21	Clus11 n=10	Clus12 n=14	Clus13 n=36	Clus14 n=11	Clus15 n=68	F
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>																
Male %	.44	.39	.33	.62	.44	.38	.57	.50	.41	.71	.30	.57	.36	.45	.41	1.04
Age	47	57	54	44	48	46	53	47	45	39	55	44	47	40	47	1.74*
Registered to vote %	.58	.84	1	.85	.80	.67	.93	.88	.94	.90	.60	.71	.86	.72	.72	3.32***
No HS diploma %	.29	.06	.25	0	.02	.14	.14	.05	.05	.05	.10	0	.05	0	.13	3.20***
Bachelors degree %	.10	.13	.08	.31	.20	.10	.14	.15	.18	.10	0	.14	.19	.18	.07	.088
Graduate degree %	.04	.10	0	.15	.15	.10	0	.09	.22	.14	0	.07	.19	0	.07	1.62†
Employed fulltime %	.48	.52	.33	.85	.49	.62	.43	.58	.59	.90	.60	.36	.58	.82	.53	1.98*
<b>Family Characteristics</b>																
Married %	.40	.58	.50	.54	.53	.43	.36	.49	.58	.48	.50	.15	.56	.64	.54	1.05
Number of children	.8	.5	.7	.9	.8	1	.2	.8	.9	.8	.3	.3	.6	2	.8	2.03*
Own home %	.71	.77	.55	.69	.78	.81	.57	.83	.75	.65	.80	.71	.75	.82	.66	0.92
Household income	34,602	44,483	57,000	69,038	61,792	41,375	36,071	52,923	61,597	58,971	53,333	44,643	47,721	54,955	39,795	3.36***
<b>Religious Characteristics</b>																
Catholic %	.02	.13	.17	.15	.29	.14	.08	.17	.18	.15	.11	.21	.25	.18	.28	1.46
Protestant %	.28	.52	.58	.31	.39	.38	.38	.40	.36	.30	.33	.57	.33	.09	.32	1.08
Other Christian %	.13	.23	.17	.38	.22	.19	.23	.27	.32	.40	.22	.14	.31	.36	.32	1.01
Other religion %	.11	.06	.08	.15	.07	.14	0	.09	.06	.05	.11	.07	.11	0	.07	0.42
No religion %	.47	.06	0	0	.03	.14	.31	.06	.06	.10	.22	0	0	.36	0	9.54***
Attends weekly %	.02	.42	.75	.46	.29	.43	0	.36	.51	.25	.44	.36	.50	.36	.47	4.30***
Attends monthly %	0	.13	.25	.38	.29	.14	.08	.22	.23	.35	0	.21	.31	.27	.22	2.03*
Attends sometimes %	.02	.23	0	.15	.25	.19	.08	.25	.10	.25	.33	.43	.19	0	.31	2.59***
Never attends %	.96	.23	0	0	.17	.24	.85	.17	.16	.15	.22	0	0	.36	0	27.88***

