

ACTING ON OUR VALUES: DO HUMAN SERVICE PROFESSIONALS VOLUNTEER?

Margaret Gibelman
Professor and Director, Doctoral Program
Yeshiva University
Wurzweiler School of Social Work
2495 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, NY 10033
(212) 960-0820 (phone)
(212) 960-0822 (fax)
gibelman@yu.edu (E-mail)

Jay Sweifach, DSW
Assistant Professor
Yeshiva University
Wurzweiler School of Social Work
2495 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, NY 10033
(212) 960-0128 (phone)
(212) 960-0822 (fax)
sweifach@yu.edu (E-mail)

ACTING ON OUR VALUES: DO HUMAN SERVICE PROFESSIONALS VOLUNTEER?

The notion of volunteerism as a key component of civil society has been widely accepted and is consistent with democratic principles and religious precepts (Brooks, 2002; Etzioni, 1994; Salamon, 1999). Herman and Renz (1999) proposed that knowledge-building about nonprofits can be facilitated by exploring the views of various organizational stakeholders, among which a relatively under-studied group are human service professionals themselves. The social work *Code of Ethics* (NASW, 1999) articulates a responsibility to contribute time and professional expertise to activities which promote the general welfare of society. Yet anecdotal evidence suggests that human service professionals are not, compared to other professional and community groups, major contributors of volunteer time (or charitable contributions), based on the premise that giving of self on the job diminishes or negates obligations to give of oneself in a volunteer capacity.

This paper reports on a study which explores patterns of volunteer activity among human service professionals. Specific focus is on the extent, level and type of such activities and the factors which influence decisions to volunteer. The volunteer behavior of a national sample of social workers is then compared to data on giving and volunteering among the U.S. population (Boraas, 2003; Independent Sector and Urban Institute, 2004; U.S. Department of Labor, 2003).

BACKGROUND

Volunteer participation has long been the subject of empirical and theoretical inquiry and discourse, the themes of which include contextual and comparative perspectives, organizational attributes, social issues (e.g., the volunteer role in organizations serving people with HIV/AIDS, the homeless, school-aged children, etc.), volunteer characteristics, motivation, expectations and experience, and levels of civic engagement (see, for example, Caputo, 1997; Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998; Murphy, 1996; Rotolo, 1999; Stewart & Weinstein, 1997). We know, through studies

conducted by AARP, that the majority of older adults (45 years and older) spend some time volunteering and regularly donate to charitable causes, and that demographic characteristics influence the types of organizations supported (AARP, 2003). Snapshots of philanthropic giving and volunteering are provided periodically through analyses of the U.S. Population Survey and the Independent Sector's *Giving and Volunteering in the U.S.* However, none of these data sources has focused on "giving and doing" in regard to professional groups, including human service professionals who constitute a significant portion of the nonprofit labor force.

The Independent Sector's Giving and Volunteering Research Clearinghouse categorizes its 400 archived studies by locale (state, country), populations and demographics (seniors, families, youth, race/ethnicity, religion corporations), and motivations/values involved in giving and volunteering (Independent Sector, 2004a). Missing from this categorization, however, are studies about occupational behavior in regard to giving and volunteering. We know, for example, that 55% of the adult population volunteers (Independent Sector, 2004b). But is the proportion of volunteering higher among some segments of the adult population? Do, for example, attorneys, physicians, psychologists, social workers, nurses, and other professionals have different patterns of charitable behavior than other occupational groups? Do the codes of ethics of these professions influence the volunteer beliefs and practices of their respective labor forces?

Information about giving and volunteering among different occupational groups potentially allows for targeting volunteer recruitment strategies. President Bush argues that "a culture of service" should be a permanent part of American life (CBS News, 2004). At least theoretically, most Americans agree and act upon their beliefs. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2002) data show that volunteerism rates were up as much as 27.4% from 2001 to 2002. Little is known, however, about where helping professionals fall on the continuum of givers and volunteers. Key issues about specific occupational groups and patterns of giving and volunteering remain poorly research and understood (Billitteri, 1997).

Nonprofits have identified the need for assistance from various professional groups. Montuori (2004), for example, cites the need for pro bono help for charities from accountants. The anticipated findings will add to our knowledge of the demographic, professional, and attitudinal factors associated with volunteer activity on the part of human service professionals. Implications are discussed in regard to professional and organizational education, role socialization, and adherence to ethical codes.

There is no single and universal definition of a volunteer or voluntary participation. Hall (1997) specifies that voluntary is generally used to mean “uncoerced” and “unremunerated”. Distinctions have been made between “voluntary” (uncoerced) and “volunteer” (not compensated), but exceptions can be found, such as the volunteer army (“What is the legal definition of ‘volunteer’”, 1998). For purposes of this study, “volunteerism” is defined as giving of one’s talent, time and energy to individuals, groups, community, or organizations without compensation.

Social Workers and Volunteerism

The specific focus here is on the volunteer activity of social workers, Phase 1 of the study focused specifically on social workers, as the numerically largest human services professional group (BLS, 2003) and one in which the largest proportion of the labor force works in the voluntary sector (Gibelman & Schervish, 1997).

The social work profession's *Code of Ethics* (NASW, 1999) summarizes broad ethical principles that reflect the profession's core values and establishes a set of specific ethical standards that should be used to guide social work practice. Among these broad ethical principles is that of service: Social workers' primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems.

This ethical principle involves the private lives of social workers as well as their employment responsibilities. The Code articulates that: Social workers elevate service to others above self-interest. Social workers draw on their knowledge, values, and skills to help people in need and to address social problems. Social workers are encouraged to volunteer some portion of their

professional skills with no expectation of significant financial return (pro bono service).

Wilson and Musick (1997), in their effort to construct an integrated theory of formal and informal volunteer work, suggest the importance of social networks, such as professional associations and other organizational memberships, to encourage voluntary action. Such associations supply members with information, foster trust and shared values, provide support, set guidelines and create obligations. Volunteerism becomes more likely when norms of generalized reciprocity are fostered and accepted. Wilson and Musick (1997) further postulate that volunteerism has as its core an ethical imperative, mobilized by moral incentives, to give of oneself to others. Motivations for volunteer behavior, in this view, are rooted in social networks and exchanges that provide a foundation of values that account for behavior.

A *social worker* is a graduate of a social work education program at the bachelor's or master's degree level who uses his/her knowledge and skills to provide social services for clients. These clients may be individuals, families, groups, communities, organizations, or society in general (Barker, 2003). Social workers are not a homogeneous group. Although they share in common a belief in and commitment to the principles of the profession's *Code of Ethics*, their personal beliefs and values are as varied as the population as a whole. Many social workers are politically liberal, but there are also politically conservative social workers. Some social workers identify with the socialist tradition while others have strong convictions about the merits of free enterprise (Gibelman, 1999). Given this diversity within the profession, it can be expected that commitment and behavior related to giving and volunteering will vary considerably even within this subset. Nevertheless, adherence to the *Code of Ethics* should distinguish social workers from other professional groups in regard to compatibility of beliefs and actions between professional and personal behaviors.

The key question explored in this descriptive-exploratory study is: to what extent do human service professionals engage in volunteer activities and what factors influence their decision to volunteer and the type of activity in which they engage? Volunteerism is defined as giving of one's

talent, time and energy to individuals, groups, communities, or organizations without compensation. Human services are defined as those services oriented toward the prevention, amelioration, or resolution of health, mental health, social or environmental problems which afflict individuals, families, specific groups, or communities (Gibelman, 1995). Barker (2003, p.224) further delineates the human services as those “programs and activities designed to enhance people's development and well-being, including providing economic and social assistance for those unable to provide for their own needs”. Included is the planning, developing, and administering of programs for and providing direct services to people unable to provide for their own needs. The term "human services" has been used synonymously with "social services" and "welfare services". However, the term "human services" is more encompassing in that it includes the full range of professions involved in the delivery of health, economic and social services (Barker, 2003).

METHODOLOGY

Drawing from the accumulating literature on motivations to and rates of volunteering (e.g., Clary, Synder, Ridge, Copeland, et. al., 1998; Clary & Synder, 2002; Independent Sector, 2001), a survey instrument was constructed to tap known aspects of giving and volunteering and professional characteristics. Questions include: demographic, professional (type of employment, setting of employment, job classification), past volunteer experience, current volunteer involvement, types of organizations for which respondents have volunteered, nature of the volunteer activity, motivating factors for and attitudes about volunteering, time commitments, reasons for ceasing volunteer activity, as applicable, level of financial commitment to the organization, and importance placed on contributing financially to charity. Several open-ended questions were included to gain information in regard to factors that inhibit or encourage volunteer participation.

The 27-item survey instrument was pilot tested using a representative sample of the target population to test face validity and reliability of the questions and clarity of the instructions and modifications were made according to feedback.

Mailing lists were procured or accessed from state licensing boards representing at least two states in each of the ten federal regions. Random sampling was then used to proportionally sample five percent of approximately 77,000 licensed social workers. The sample pool was 3,850 licensed social workers. Bad addresses resulted in 120 undeliverable surveys. Responses from a first mailing of the survey were received from 750 respondents, for a 20% response rate. The response rate of 20% suggests the operation of a self-selection bias and limits generalizability. A follow-up is presently underway.

The Statistical Package for Social Services (SPSS 10.0) was used for data analysis. A significance level of .05 was used for all inferential statistics. To establish the significance between variables, both nonparametric (chi squares) and parametric (t-tests, ANOVAs, and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients) tests were conducted. The Bonferoni Post Hoc Test was used in conjunction with the ANOVA for further specificity. In addition to multiple choice and likert-scale response items, the instrument included a 10 point scale (1=no influence; 10=significant influence) to determine the reasons respondents ceased specific volunteer activities. Analyses were conducted to compare the following demographic sub-groups in terms of their pattern of volunteer activity: gender, dependents living at home, age, employment status, marital status, and number of years in the field.

FINDINGS

Demographics:

At the time of analysis, 750 of those surveyed (20%) had returned usable questionnaires. Of the 747 respondents who indicated their gender, 88.8% were female and 11.2% were male; this ratio is consistent with other data on the human services labor force which reflects a growing trend of feminization (BLS, 2001; Gibelman & Schervish, 1997). Of the 734 respondents who answered the question about religion, 38.1% indicated that they were Protestant, 27% Catholic, 16.3% Jewish, and 18.5% "other". The proportion of Jewish respondents is significantly higher than their percentage

in the U.S. population (2.3%) (Jewish Student Online Research Center, 2004).

In regard to highest degree obtained, 83.5% of respondents answered this question (n=749). Of these, 11.5% hold the BSW as their highest degree, 76.1% the MSW, 4.8% a PhD or DSW, and 7.6% other. Other includes law degrees, doctoral studies in progress, MBA, MPA, and Ed.D.

The vast majority of respondents self-identified as White, 5.2% African-American, 3.1 Latino, and 3.6% other. In regard to marital status, 65.8% of respondents indicated they were married, 3.9% were widowed, 8.7% were divorced or separated, 15.8% were single, and 5.9% were living with a partner. The majority of respondents did not have children living at home with them; only 34.2% responded yes to this question. Of the 260 respondents who reported having children at home, 44.6% had one child, 43.1% had two children, and 11.9 had three or more children. The vast majority of respondents, at 93.4%, did not have other dependents living in the home.

The majority of respondents, 53%, reported that they lived in a suburban area, 27.7% in an urban area, and 19.4% in a rural area. Respondents also provided their state of residence, which were then coded into the ten federal regions used for census purposes. For purposes of analysis, the ten federal regions were then re-coded into five regions: Northeast; South; Mid and Southwest; Central and North Central, and West. Table 1 shows the geographic distribution of respondents.

Table 1. Geographic Distribution of Respondents

Re-Coded Region	Sample Representation
Region I and II = Northeast	41.8% (n = 312)
Region III and IV = South	25.4% (n = 190)
Region V and VI = Mid and Southwest	6.2% (n = 46)

Region VII and VIII = Central and North Central	19.3% (n = 144)
Region IX and X = West	7.4% (n = 6.1)

Professional Characteristics

Respondents are an experienced group of human service professionals. The vast majority (72.9%) reported having ten or more years of work experience in the human services. Only 9.8% reported having 1-5 years of experience. Those with 10-20 years of experience accounted for 44.3% of the sample, and 45.6% had 20 or more years of experience. Fifty-eight percent reported that their primary function is direct service. An additional 20.1% of respondents indicated that their primary function is in private practice, the majority of whom provide direct services. Only 5.6% of respondents reported working in executive (senior) management and another 10.1% reported their primary function to be middle management. Managerial personnel thus account for the employment functions of about 15.7% of respondents. . “Other” functions included 1% in higher education, and (at less than one percent each), research, consultant, and unemployment/retired. Such findings mirror those of other labor force studies of social workers (see, for example, Gibelman & Schervish, 1997)

Volunteer Behaviors

The vast majority, at 91.8%, indicated that they have volunteered in some capacity at some time during their adult life. Six of the 60 respondents (10%) who indicated that they had not volunteered cited too many time demands as the reason. Similarly, 51 respondents (85%) indicated that they did not volunteer because they had a “full plate”. Four of the 60 non-volunteers indicated that they could not find suitable volunteer activities. A sizable proportion of respondents (46.7%) who had never volunteered indicated that their professional life involved sufficient service. A few of the comments provided in regard to “other reasons” for not volunteering include: “I believe people

should get paid for what they do”; “Salary low as trauma specialist; I am volunteering at work”.

Respondents were asked about the types of organizations for which they have volunteered. Findings appear in Table 2. Since respondents could respond in more than one category, the frequency cited pertains only to that category.

Table 2. Types of Organizations in which Respondents Volunteer

Religious (i.e., Church, Synagogue)	n = 409
Educational (i.e., PTA)	n = 300
Non-Secular Human Services (i.e., Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Habitat for Humanity)	n = 298
Civic/Community (i.e., YMCA, Community Watch)	n = 280
Professional Association	n = 227
Advocacy/Political/Social Action	n = 197
Athletic/Recreational (i.e., Little League)	n = 154
Cultural (i.e., museums, libraries, orchestras)	n = 136
Sectarian Human Services (i.e., Catholic Charities)	n = 109
Environmental (i.e., Nature Conservancy)	n = 97
Service Clubs (i.e., Knights of Columbus)	n = 59
International Causes (i.e., UNICEF)	n = 35

There were 762 responses in the “other” category, including a significant proportion of people who provided the specific names of the organizations for which they volunteered. In most instances, these fill-in responses actually were appropriate to the categories listed. For example, responses include National Association for Mental Illness, AIDS Action, Red Cross, Children’s Advocacy Center for Victims of Sexual/Physical Abuse, and Meals on Wheels; these could be classified as Non-secular human services. In fact, some respondents may have answered affirmatively within the fixed-choice category, but listed the name of the human service organization under “other”.

Two themes were also notable within the “other” category: volunteer service for health-

related causes, such as the Juvenile Diabetes Foundations, American Cancer Society, National Kidney Foundation, and local hospitals, and volunteer service for animal-related organizations, such as animal shelters and animal rescue groups, and organizations which train dogs to work with people with disabilities.

Reasons for Volunteering

Respondents were asked to identify reasons why they chose to volunteer; multiple responses were entered by the majority of those who answered this question. Table 3 illustrates those areas identified by the respondents as being “very important” in regard to their reasons for volunteering by 40% or more of respondents in that category. Table 4 highlights areas considered not very or not at all important by 40% or more of those who responded in that particular category.

Table 3. Reasons for Volunteering in “Very Important” Category

Reason	Within Category Percentage and Number
To Help Others	88% (n = 606)
Aid a Cause in Which I Believe	81.4% (n = 555)
Encourage an Action	51.3% (n = 347)
Sense of Belonging to Community	43.6 (n = 291)
A Professional Commitment to Serve	42.6% (n = 289)

Table 4. Not Very or Not At All Important Reasons for Volunteering

To Fulfill a Community Service Requirement	87.3% (n = 567)
Improve/Update Skills	52.4% (n = 351)
To Help My Career/Job	51.2% (n = 347)

The reasons for volunteering were then divided into three primary motivational groupings: professionally-oriented, personally oriented, and community-oriented, as follows:

- C Professionally oriented = a professional commitment to serve; improve/update skills
- C Personally oriented = to help my career/job; to fulfill a community service requirement; a religious belief; to meet other people/network; help family member/friend
- C Community oriented = to help others; aid a cause in which I believe; encourage an action; sense of belonging to community.

The “very important” reasons for volunteering primarily fell into the category of community oriented. The least important reasons for volunteering were personally or professionally oriented.

“Other reasons” for volunteering elicited 857 different responses (including multiple responses by some individuals) which were classified into the following broad areas:

- C Role model (“Serve as a role model for next generation”; “to role model community service for my son”)
- C Social (“Gives me a role other than spouse, mother, or professional; “it’s just fun - good to be with folks of like minds”; something my family can do together”)
- C Political (“Vehicle to express outrage at what my elected officials are doing in Washington”)
- C Religious (“Mostly serve where God wants me”; “spiritual belief”)

The majority of respondents (65.8%) reported that their level of volunteer activity two years ago and currently was about the same. Fifty-eight (8.5%) of respondents indicated that their current level of participation was much greater than two years ago. Conversely, 169 (24.7%) indicated that their current level of participation was much less than two years ago.

Respondents were queried about the nature of their volunteer activities now and in the past. Table 5 provides a summary of the responses.

Table 5 . Major Volunteer Activities

Activity	Present	Past
Serve on a Committee of a Nonprofit	40.5% (n=277)	43.3% (n=296)
Provide “Hands-on” Assistance	32%(n=219)	52.3(n=358)
Help Market or Promote an Organization	24.6% (n=164)	33.4% (n=223)
Help Design or Implement a Program	24.3% (n=162)	41.8% (n=279)
Recruit Other Professionals to Serve as Volunteers	23.1% (n=156)	39.6% (n=268)
Serve on Board of Directors	22.2% (n=150)	32.3% (n=219)
Serve as a Mentor	19.6%(n=120)	40.4% (n=247)
Provide Emergency/Free Professional Services	18.5% (n=124)	34.9% (n=234)
Help Identify/Develop Financial Resources	18.2% (n=120)	28.4%(n=187)
Help Conduct Research/Evaluation	9% (n=59)	27.2% (n=179)

Forty percent or more of respondents to each query in this category indicated that they do not now nor did they in the past volunteer in the capacities of: serving on a board of directors, helping conduct research/evaluations; helping market or promote an organization; provide emergency free professional services; help identify/develop financial resources; and, serve as a mentor. Some of the areas of non-involvement are of interest, given the expertise of social workers. For example, 64% of respondents to the question of whether they now or in the past helped conduct research or evaluations indicated that they had not. Similarly, about 53% of respondents to the question of whether they now or in the past helped to identify/develop financial resources indicated that they had not. Yet fund development and research and evaluation are areas of knowledge and skill held by many social workers. It may be that nonprofits view research and evaluation as internal or outsourced functions and not among normative volunteer activities, but lack of involvement in fund development is less easily explainable since this is a key area of volunteer activity in many nonprofits.

There were 846 responses (including multiple responses from individuals) to “other” in regard

to volunteer activities. Here, again, respondents seem to indicate specific information about activities covered in the list of categories. For example, in regard to provision of pro bono emergency services, one respondent noted that after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on New York, he or she volunteered “a great deal” by providing counseling services related to post traumatic stress disorder. Another indicated that he or she serves on a state licensing board. It is assumed that this individual noted participation in the category of “serve as a board member”. A few of the activities listed in “other” did not overlap the fixed-choice categories. These included serving in elected office, working on a media campaign, training volunteers, tutoring, and organizing conferences and other special events.

Respondents were also asked whether they had volunteered in the past, but decided not to continue to volunteer. Of the 690 respondents to this question, 401 (58.1%) answered affirmatively - they had volunteered but are no longer volunteering. Additional information was sought on the reasons why and respondents provided multiple answers, as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Reasons for Discontinuing Volunteer Activity

Rank	Reason	r	p
1	Perception that organization was mismanaged	.6799	.000
2	Didn't like the personality or style of other volunteers	.6664	.000
3	Didn't like the personality or style of key staff	.6613	.000
4	Service not acknowledged/appreciated	.6552	.000
5	Tasks were not clearly defined	.6488	.000
6	Organization failed to make use of your talents	.6379	.000
7	Organization no longer represented beliefs/convictions	.5275	.000
8	Lack of identification with the cause	.4905	.000
9	Difficulty fulfilling expected function	.3833	.000
10	Family asked you to cut down	.3006	.000
11	No longer live in the area	.2101	.000

12	Term was up and it was time to move on	.1821	.000
13	Salaried job became more time consuming	.0578	.000

The categories ranked highest in terms of reasons for discontinuing volunteer activity may differ from those of the general populace. For example, “perceptions that the organization was mismanaged” was ranked first, followed by “dislike of personality/style of other volunteers” and, third, “dislike of personality/style of key staff”. Here, social workers may have a broader frame of reference than the general volunteer public, as they work for and are attuned to managerial issues within their own human services workplace. They may also be more sensitive about interpersonal relationships given their involvement with volunteers in the course of paid employment (perhaps in a supervisory capacity). Further, negative opinions about staff may also lead social workers to disaffiliate in a volunteer capacity, perhaps because of their need to deal with difficult colleagues in their work situations.

Write-in (“other”) responses elicited 823 comments, representing a few key themes: burnout; meeting commitments through paid work; child care responsibilities; and, health concerns/problems (self or family). Comments concerning professional work meeting volunteer commitments included:

- C A part of me thinks that my job is volunteer work; I am underpaid
- C Burn-out since I do so much “social service” type things
- C I feel I do charity work for the managed care companies; fees are so low
- C Unethical behavior of staff and board members.

Hours of Volunteer Time

In regard to quantifying volunteer time, respondents were asked how many hours per month they engage in volunteer activities. Eighteen percent (n=124) of respondents indicated that they do not volunteer any hours on a consistent monthly basis, while 45.9% (n=316) responded that they

volunteer from 1 to 5 hours per month and 25.7% (n=177) volunteer from 6 to 15 hours per month. Monthly hours of volunteering for 10.4% of respondents (n=71) was at the rate of 16 or more. The findings (χ^2 , $p = .006$) demonstrate a statistically significant relationship between years of experience in the social service field and number of hours of volunteer activity per month. Sixty-one percent of respondents with 16 years or more of experience in the field had the greatest number of volunteer hours, while only 3% of respondents with zero to three years in the field engaged in volunteer activity. This finding may relate to the need of newer social workers to acclimate to their profession and jobs and to “move ahead” in their career advancement.

Number of children was also significantly related to hours of volunteer activity. In general, respondents with no children at home engaged in more volunteer hours than those with children ($\chi^2 = 13.531$, $p = .009$). For example, of the 45% of respondents who volunteer one to five hours per month, those without children devote twice the number of hours to volunteering than those with children (15% with children; 30% without children).

GIVING

Answers to the question of how much respondents contribute to charitable causes numbered 666. This relatively low response rate may be due to general discomfort about indicating dollar amounts. Table 7 provides a synopsis of levels of giving by dollar amount. The majority (57.5%) donated under \$1,000 per year.

Table 7. Level of Contributions

Amount Donated	n	%
\$1.00 - \$99.00	50	7.5
\$100.00 - \$250.00	135	20

\$251.00 - \$499.00	89	13
\$500.00 - \$999.00	114	17
\$1,000.00 - \$2,499.00	139	21
\$2,500.00 - \$4,999.00	71	11
\$5,000.00 - \$7,499.00	44	7
\$7,500.00 - \$9,999.00	10	1.5
\$10,000+	14	2

Respondents were also asked about the number of organizations to which they contribute, as illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8. Number of Organizations to Which Respondents Contribute

Number of Organizations	Percent of Respondents
1-3	36.7% (n=329)
4-7	28.8% (n=28.8)
8-10	7.7% (n=69)
11-20	3.3% (n=30)
20+	2.0% (n=18)

These data suggest that giving on the part of the sample population tends to be confined to a few organizations. As illustrated in Table 9, the largest proportion of respondents give to religious/faith-related causes. It is assumed that these religious groups are composed largely of places of worship. Only 24.5% of respondents indicated that they donated to sectarian (religious-based) charities. Service club were the charities of choice for the fewest people. Civic, athletic/recreational, and international organizations were also rated relatively low as the

beneficiaries of the sample population's giving.

Table 9. Types of Organizations to Which Respondents Contributed

Religious/Faith-Based	65.9% (n=473)
Health/Mental Health	51.4% (n=367)
Social Welfare	47.6% (n=342)
Educational	38.8% (n=278)
Professional Associations	35.7% (n=256)
Cultural	31.9% (n=229)
Environmental	31% (n=222)
Advocacy/political action	29.4% (n=211)
Sectarian Organizations	24.5% (n=176)
Community/Social Action	23.7% (n=170)
Athletic/Recreational	23.6% (n=169)
Civic	23.1% (n=166)
International	21.7% (n=156)
Service Clubs	7.8% (n=56)

The types of organizations to which respondents make charitable contributions are quite consistent with the types of organizations to which they volunteer. Referencing back to Table 2, it can be seen that religious, educational, and social service organizations - the top three in regard to volunteer activity, overlap the organizational-types to which respondents make donations. Similarly, international causes, service clubs, and environmental organizations rated low as beneficiaries' choice for volunteering or giving.

Within the "other" category, responses in regard to donations were also similar to those for volunteering. Health-related causes figured prominently, as well as charitable contributions to animal-related organizations, such as animal shelters and animal rescue groups.

Only one variable -- marital status - was found to be significantly and positively related to contributing. Married respondents contribute more than others ($\chi^2 = 9.550$. $P = .008$).

Why Respondents Contribute Financially

Respondents were asked to indicate, on an influence scale of from 1 to 10, their reason for giving in each of several designated categories. Table 10 illustrates the ranking, in order of importance, for each category.

Table 10. Reasons for Contributing

Rank	Reason	r	p
1	It's a cause in which I believe	.0065	.000
2	To help others	.0010	.000
3	My personal convictions/values	.0028	.000
4	To address a specific problem within society	.0819	.035
5	It makes me feel good	.1034	.000
6	It's the right thing to do	.1132	.000
7	To support a change in policy	.1342	.001
8	Out of gratitude to an organization	.1522	.008
9	My religious principles	.1888	.000
10	It gives me a sense of belonging to the community	.2566	.004
11	To maintain my reputation of giving	.3563	.000
12	Out of a professional commitment	.3568	.000
13	As part of an obligation (board, staff)	1.00	.000

The reasons for contributing were, similar to reasons for volunteering, divided into three primary motivational categories: professionally-oriented, personally oriented, and community-oriented. Here, personally-oriented reasons were, in general, ranked highest (i.e., it's a cause in which I believe; my personal convictions/values; it makes me feel good), followed by community-oriented reasons (i.e., to help others; to address a specific problem within society).

There were 878 “other” responses to this question. Again, themes are consistent. “Other” reasons for giving included: giving to health-related causes that have personally affected the family; giving as a memorial contribution; and, giving to receive a tax break. Also under “other”, a number of respondents offered reasons why they do not contribute. Examples include: “Having a big impact on my behavior is that I am paid so little that I feel like my job is “volunteering”; “My employer strong-armed us into giving to United Way”; “When you live paycheck to paycheck on a social work salary, what’s left to give?”; “No holiday pay, no sick pay, no benefits at all. No compensation when clients cancel”; and, “Working under these conditions at a mental health center is virtually a volunteer job. Yet nobody volunteers to help us. We signed up to help the poor, not to be poor”. These reasons are similar to those cited for reasons why some social workers do not volunteer.

CONCLUSION

Americans believe that volunteering is important (Dundjerski & Hall, 1998) Apparently, social workers share this belief in that the vast majority of the sample population has volunteered in the past or is now volunteering in some capacity. Most Americans also believe that volunteerism plays an important role in society, but that people should give and volunteer substantially more than they do (Dundjerski & Hall, 1998). A larger proportion of the sample population of social workers volunteer than is the case in the general U.S. population. The Independent Sector (2004a) found that 44% of adults over the age of 21 volunteered with a formal organization in 2000. The question asked of social workers was somewhat different, but responses suggest that the overwhelming majority, at 91.8%, have volunteered in some capacity at some time during their adult life.

A small, but notable proportion of the sample population in this study believe that other people should give and volunteer, but that their personal contribution is carried out through the paid workforce. Nevertheless, the majority of this sample of social workers maintain a consistent level of giving and volunteering. Although not statistically significant, the responses of some social workers that their giving and volunteering was in the form of poorly paid jobs and poor working conditions are

of concern. The very professionals who might serve as community role models might have the reverse influence in regard to promoting volunteerism.

Why did so many social workers (401) indicate that they volunteered in the past but no longer choose to do so? One answer may lie in the context of the times. As noted in many open-ended “other” comments, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 spurred many social workers (and many Americans) to volunteer. The role of social workers in disaster relief was never so apparent as in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. Social workers were in the forefront in responding to the attacks, many in a volunteer capacity (Social workers heed the call to volunteer” (1999). Since 1997, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) has had a formal agreement with the American Red Cross for close cooperation in the delivery of mental health services to victims of disaster, rescue workers, military personnel and their families, and refugees (O’Neill, 2001). More specifically, the agreement called for NASW to assist in the development of a national network of Red Cross-trained, licensed, or certified social workers to be mobilized in times of disaster.

However, among those who have been affected by the terrorist attacks on September 11th are the relief workers, themselves. The overwhelming desire to volunteer and give following September 11th may have led to a cumulative “burnout” - a desire to regroup and retrench and focus inward (U.S. DHHS, 2001).

The profile of “giving” among social workers is rendered more complicated by the high non-response rate. Further research, perhaps re-wording questions to ensure that they do not put potential respondents in a defensive posture, is needed on the extent of financial contributions made.

The findings add to our knowledge of the demographic, professional, and attitudinal factors associated with volunteer activity on the part of human service professionals. The validated survey instrument can be used by researchers in other countries, thus enabling cross-cultural comparisons. Implications are identified in regard to professional and organizational education, role socialization,

and adherence to ethical codes. Human service professions have an important role to play in encouraging, training and utilizing volunteers, but perhaps can do so best if they role-model these behaviors.

REFERENCES

- AARP. (2003). *Time and money: An in-depth look at 45+ volunteers and donors*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Barker, R.L. (2003). *The social work dictionary*, 5th ed. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Billitteri, T.J. (1997, November 27). Research on charities falls short: Leaders of nonprofit groups point to work they can't use," *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, Vol. X (4), pp. 31-35
- Boraas, S. (2003, August). Volunteerism in the United States. *Monthly Labor Review*, 3-11.
- Brooks, A.C. (2002). Does civil society stop the downward spiral of bad government or speed it up? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1), 140-144.
- Caputo, R.K. (1997). Women as volunteers and activists. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26(2), 156-174.
- CBS News (2002, June 14). *Bush renews call for volunteerism*. Retrieved March 19, 2004, from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/06/14/politics/printable512265.html>
- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A.A. (1998). *Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey*. Washington,DC: Aspen Institute, Working Paper Series
- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Copeland, J., et. al. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1516-1531.
- Dundjerski, M., & Hall, H. (1998, April 23). Poll show Americans say volunteering is important. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Retrieved March 29, 2003, from

- http://philanthropy.com/search97cgi/s97_cgi?action=View&vdkVgwKey=%2Fdata%2Fht
- Etzioni, A. (1994). *Rights and the common good: The communitarian perspective*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Gibelman, M. (1995). *What social workers do*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Gibelman, M. (1999). The search for identity: Defining social work, past, present, future. *Social Work, 44*(4) 298-310.
- Gibelman, M., & Schervish, P. (1997). *Who we are: A second look*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Greene, S.G. (1998, June 4). Volunteering varies widely by country. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, p. A8.
- Herman, R.D., & Renz, D.O. (1999). Theses on nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 28*(2), 107-126.
- Independent Sector (2004a). The Giving and Volunteering Research Clearinghouse. Retrieved June 26, 2004, from <http://www.independentsector.org/members/gvclearinghouse.html>.
- Independent Sector and the Urban Institute (2004b). *The new nonprofit almanac and desk reference*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Jewish Student Online Research Center. (2004). *Approximate Jewish population in the United States*. Retrieved June 27, 2004, from <http://www.US-israel.org/jsource/US-Israel/USjewpopl.html>.
- Montuori, T. (2004, April 15). Calling all professionals: Seeking pro bono help for charities. *Nonprofit Times*, p. 12.
- Murphy, K.R. (Ed.). (1996). *Individual differences and behavior in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Association of Social Workers. (1999). *Code of ethics* (rev.). Washington, DC: Author.
- O'Neill, J.V. (2001d, November). Red Cross, NASW have pact. *NASW News*, pp. 8.
- Rotolo, T. (1999). Trends in voluntary association participation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*

- Quarterly*, 28, 199-212.
- Salamon, L. M. (1999). *America's nonprofit sector: A primer, rev. ed.*. New York: Foundation Center.
- "Social workers heed the call to volunteer". (1999, January). *NASW News*, p. 4.
- Stewart, E., & Weinstein, R.S. (1997). Volunteer participation in context: Motivations and political efficacy within three AIDS organizations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 25, 809-837.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2001, September 13). Press release: *HHS initiates immediate and long-term steps to address emotional and mental health consequences of terrorist air attacks*. Washington, DC: Author. Available: <http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2001/pres/20010913.html>.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2001). *Tabulations from the Current Population Survey, 2000 annual averages*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2003). *Tabulations from the Current Population Survey, 2002 annual averages*. Washington, DC: Author.
- "What is the legal definition of 'volunteer'?" (1998). Retrieved June 8, 2004, from <http://www.nonprofits.org/npofaq/04/09.html>.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, 62(5), 694-713.