Voluntas (2012) 23:213–235
DOI 10.1007/s11266-011-9188-2

ORIGINAL PAPER

Good Jobs, Good Deeds: The Gender-Specific Influences of Job Characteristics on Volunteering

Gul Aldikacti Marshall · Hiromi Taniguchi

Published online: 31 March 2011

Abstract While research has shown that having a "good" job significantly promotes formal volunteering, we have limited knowledge of how this paid work-to-volunteer work relationship may differ between men and women. Based on the gender-identification spillover theory, we hypothesize that because of the societal expectations that women should be caring, giving and communal, positive job traits such as authority and autonomy promote women's volunteering more than men's. Our analysis of data from the National Survey of Midlife in the United States shows that women who exercise supervisory authority on the job volunteer significantly more hours than women who do not, whereas job authority makes no difference in the number of hours volunteered for men. Meanwhile, job autonomy promotes men's volunteering, but not women's. Implications of these and related findings for future research on gender and volunteering are discussed.

Resume Si la recherche a mis en évidence que le fait d'avoir un "bon" travail contribue sensiblement au bénévolat actif, nous disposons de connaissances limitées quant à la manière dont cette relation entre travail rémunéré et travail bénévole peut différer entre hommes et femmes. Nous basant sur la théorie du débordement en matière d'identification des genres, notre postulat est qu'en raison des attentes sociétales impliquant que les femmes doivent faire preuve de compassion, de générosité et d'un esprit collectif, des caractéristiques professionnelles positives tels que l'autorité et l'autonomie favorisent le bénévolat des femmes plus que celui des

G. A. Marshall · H. Taniguchi
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA

H. Taniguchi (✉)
Sociology Department, University of Louisville, 103 Lutz Hall, Louisville, KY 40292, USA
e-mail: h0tani01@louisville.edu

hommes. Notre analyse des données issues de l'enquête *National Survey of Midlife* aux États-Unis indique que les femmes exerçant un pouvoir de direction dans leur activité professionnelle consacrent beaucoup plus d'heures de bénévolat que les femmes qui n'en sont pas dotées, alors que l'autorité professionnelle n'implique aucune différence quant au nombre d'heures bénévoles effectuées par les hommes. Par contraste, l'autonomie professionnelle favorise le bénévolat des hommes mais pas celui des femmes. Les implications de ces éléments ainsi que des constatations connexes pour une recherche future sur le genre et le bénévolat font l'objet d'une discussion.

Zusammenfassung Zwar haben Forschungen gezeigt, dass der Umstand, einen "guten Job" zu haben, formale ehrenamtliche Tätigkeiten bedeutend fördert, doch haben wir nur begrenzte Kenntnisse darüber, wie das Verhältnis zwischen bezahlter und ehrenamtlicher Arbeit bei Männern und Frauen unter Umständen unterschiedlich ist. Beruhend auf der geschlechtsidentifizierenden Spillover-Theorie stellen wir die Hypothese auf, dass aufgrund der gesellschaftlichen Erwartung, dass Frauen fürsorglich, gebend und auf die Gemeinschaft bedacht sein sollten, positive berufliche Eigenschaften, wie Autorität und Autonomie, Frauen eher als Männer zur ehrenamtlichen Arbeit motivieren. Unsere Analyse der Studiendaten der National Survey of Midlife in den Vereinigten Staaten zeigt, dass Frauen, die in ihrem Beruf eine leitende Funktion haben, wesentlich mehr Zeit für ehrenamtliche Arbeit aufbringen als Frauen ohne leitende Funktion in ihrem Beruf. Dahingegen macht die berufliche Autorität bei Männern keinen Unterschied was die in ehrenamtliche Tätigkeiten investierte Zeit angeht. Auf der anderen Seite fördert die berufliche Autonomität die ehrenamtliche Tätigkeit der Männer, nicht jedoch der Frauen. Es werden die Auswirkungen dieser und damit verbundener Ergebnisse für zukünftige Studien zum Verhältnis zwischen der Geschlechtszugehörigkeit und ehrenamtlicher Tätigkeit diskutiert.

Resumen Pese a que los estudios han demostrado que tener un buen trabajo fomenta considerablemente la práctica del voluntariado formal, tenemos escasos conocimientos de cómo la relación entre el trabajo remunerado y el voluntario difiere entre hombres y mujeres. Basándonos en la teoría del « desbordamiento » sobre identificación de sexos, nuestra hipótesis es que, debido a las expectativas sociales de que las mujeres deben ser afectuosas y generosas y tener espíritu comunitario, circunstancias laborales positivas como la autoridad y la autonomía fomentan más el voluntariado entre las mujeres que entre los hombres. Según nuestro análisis de los datos de la Encuesta Nacional entre Personas de Mediana Edad de Estados Unidos, las mujeres que ocupan puestos de autoridad o supervisión en su trabajo prestan muchas más horas de voluntariado que las mujeres que no los ocupan, aunque la autoridad laboral no supone ninguna diferencia en el número de horas de voluntariado de los hombres. Por otro lado, la autonomía laboral fomenta el voluntariado entre los hombres, pero no entre las mujeres. Se debaten las implicaciones de estos y otros hallazgos de cara a futuros estudios sobre sexo y voluntariado.

Keywords Volunteering · Job authority · Job autonomy · Skill requirements · Gender-identification spillover

There is a consistent pattern of gender segregation in the labor market that negatively affects women's job opportunities and earnings in the U.S. (Reskin 2006; Reskin and Roos 1990; England and McCreary 1987). Still women who are now a perpetual part of the labor force increasingly work their way into traditionally men-dominated positions in the job hierarchy (Bergmann 2005; Schein 2007). More women are found in high-skilled/high-paid jobs and occupy supervisory positions although many congregate at the entry and mid-level managerial positions, hitting the structural barrier of the glass ceiling at the top (Eagly and Karau 2002; Ragins et al. 2006).

Spillover theory suggests that positive job attributes carry over to active community lives (Wilson and Musick 1997). Beyond economic security, "good" jobs may provide easy access to charity and volunteer organizations, which may in turn facilitate civic engagement (Wilensky 1961). In this study, we examine the effects of job characteristics such as authority, autonomy, and skill requirements on formal volunteering with a focus on gender differences. Formal volunteering is defined as contribution of unpaid work to the activities of formal organizations (Reed and Shelbee 2000) that are charitable, social, or political.[1] Research has found that working long hours at one's job does not always reduce the probability and level of volunteering (Becker and Hofmeister 2000; Freeman 1997; Gomez and Gunderson 2003) while the trade-offs between time for paid work and volunteer work may still exist, especially among women (Gomez and Gunderson 2003; Lewis and Noguchi 2006). Our knowledge is limited on the effects of job characteristics beyond hours employed on men's and women's volunteer work. Using gender-identification spillover theory, we examine the effects of "good" job characteristics on women's and men's volunteering.

Gender, Paid Work, and Formal Volunteering

A growing body of research on the determinants of volunteering has demonstrated that the relationship between the time spent on paid work and volunteer work does not always reflect the trade-offs implied in a zero-sum game. Long hours at paid work tend to have little effect on the level of formal volunteer work (Freeman 1997; Becker and Hofmeister, 2000). Likewise, multiple job holders, who typically work long hours, volunteer more, not less, hours (Freeman 1997), presumably because they are part of a wider social network. In short, gainful employment is not an obstacle but a facilitator of active volunteering.

However, gender differences exist in the relationship between hours employed and hours volunteered. Among women, part-time workers are likely to volunteer

[1] Women also engage in informal volunteering to serve their communities, while this work is largely taken for granted and unacknowledged (Abrahams 1996).

more hours than full-time workers, while among men there is no such difference (Taniguchi 2006). Similarly, women, but not men, tend to volunteer for community organizations with greater frequency when they switch from full-time to part-time work (Lewis and Noguchi 2006). The gender difference in the effect of multiple job-holding on the level of volunteering is not as clear-cut, but men with multiple jobs appear to be more active volunteers than their women counterparts (Taniguchi 2006). These gender differences suggest that women face more pressure than men to balance paid work and volunteer work when they are employed full time.

Research is scarce on the effects of job characteristics beyond hours employed (Wilson 2000), especially the kind that considers possible gender differences. However, persons who are employed the same number of hours are likely to volunteer at different levels of involvement depending on the kind of jobs they have. To the extent to which "the job makes the person" (Kanter 1977, p. 3), the kind of jobs that promote certain traits, such as leadership, self-direction, and personal efficacy, may affect us beyond the workplace and shape the way we engage ourselves as volunteers (Webb and Abzug, 2008; Wilson and Musick 1997). Moreover, occupants of certain "high status" job positions may be encouraged or even pressured by others to volunteer (Wilson 2000). To put it at a more conceptual level, job characteristics that are valued attain dominant statuses. Individuals who occupy valued positions in a given social category are more likely to engage in formal volunteering than those who occupy less valued positions (Lemon et al. 1972; Smith 1975; Wilson et al. 2001).

Gender-Identification Spillover

We recognize the spillover theory of Wilensky (1961, p. 522), which calls for attention to job characteristics in promoting volunteer work. This theory states that an "orderly and pleasant" experience in the workplace can provide "motive and opportunity" for volunteering. Thus, "good" job characteristics, such as authority, autonomy, and high skill requirements should promote volunteering. Nevertheless, the studies about the effects of gender in multiple spheres of life prompt us to argue that gender-based normative expectations permeate into that spillover effect.

Gender-role spillover theory posits that gender-based expectations and behavior in one life arena are carried over onto another. Feminist scholars who study leadership styles of men and women in the workplace have examined how gender-based expectations extend to the workplace creating different organizational role expectations between men and women (Eagly and Johnson 1990; Eagly and Karau 2002; Gutek and Morasch 1982; Ridgeway 1997).[2] Like these scholars, we find the

[2] Past studies posit the spillover of gender-based expectations as a major reason behind sexual and other harassment of women in nontraditional positions (Gutek and Morasch Gutek and Morasch 1982). They have argued that gender-role spillover occurs especially when the gender ratio of a group is heavily skewed, making members of the minority gender more noticeable and subject to unfair scrutiny (Powell and Graves 2003). Women in men-dominated groups (or men in women-dominated groups) are perceived differently from members of the dominant gender and thus treated differently. The differential treatment is likely to further influence the way members of the minority gender view their own positions.

spillover effect as a useful theoretical tool to analyze the relationship between gender and work. However, we prefer to use the term "gender identification" rather than "gender role" because as Lopata and Thorne (1978) have stated, gender is much "deeper" and "less changeable" than the term role implies. Individuals' gender identifications permeate into their social roles, affecting their performance in gender specific ways (Lopata and Thorne 1978, p. 719). Furthermore, the term gender role does not allow us to account for power differences and inequality between men and women (Connell 2002; Lopata and Thorne 1978). Following Lopata and Thorne (1978), we define gender identification as a set of characteristics that emerge from "culturally patterned relations," which define rights and duties of women and men (Lopata and Thorne 1978, p. 720).

In this perspective, the workplace is seen as an institutional setting where individuals interact with each other according to gender-based expectations (Acker 1990; Orser and Dyke 2009), even though such expectations can be irrelevant or inappropriate to the conduct of specific job tasks (Powell and Graves 2003). Selection of and assignment to occupational roles are affected by the culturally constructed gendered rights and duties (Lopata and Thorne 1978). Even in those settings where institutional identities are in the foreground for organizational actors as in the case of leadership (van Engen et al. 2001), gender provides "an effectively salient background identity" that operates with more salient foreground identities to deliver gendered behavior (Ridgeway 1997, p.221). In other words, gender becomes a "coordinating behavior" that interacts with and shapes the institutional behavior (Ridgeway 2009, p. 148).

We use the concept of gender-identification spillover to investigate whether and how the "carried-over" gender identifications embedded in occupational roles feed themselves into volunteer roles. Specifically, we examine gender differences in the effects of job authority, autonomy, and skill requirements on hours volunteered.

Authority

A number of studies have emphasized that many women in leadership roles view and use power differently from men (Claes 2006; Eagley and Karau 2002; van Engen et al. 2001; Grant 1988; Hartsock 1983; Helgesen 1990; Kirkpatrick 1975). Rather than seeing power as dominance over others, women tend to view power in the context of interdependence (Grant 1988). Moreover, women are more likely to identify power with giving and caring while men tend to associate power with aggression and assertion (Grant 1988, p. 60).

More recent research suggests the persistence of gender differences in the perception of managerial roles (Lyness and Heilman 2006; Byron 2007; Eagly 2007). Women are more likely to perceive managers to possess both agentic and communal qualities, whereas most men associate managerial positions with masculine attributes (Schein 2001; Eagly 2007). Consistent with this perceptual difference by gender, some studies find that women managers receive more

favorable evaluations if they adhere to communal roles (Carpenter 2001; Eagley and Karau 2002: Eagly 2007). Women managers are more negatively evaluated if they only display a stereotypical masculine leadership style (Eagley and Karau 2002; Eagly 2007). A meta-analysis of laboratory studies of evaluations of leaders also suggests that while women leaders are in general evaluated less favorably than men leaders, this tendency is pronounced when women adopt an exclusively masculine leadership style (Powell and Graves 2003; Eagly 2007). Hence, woman leaders face a "double bind." They are expected to be communal with traits such as empathy, giving, caring, and relationality; yet, at the same time, show agentic characteristics, such as aggressiveness and confidence, because these are considered intrinsic to leadership (Eagly 2007, p. 4).

Since women and men managers receive better evaluations when their leadership role is in line with gender-based expectations, we hypothesize that women who exercise supervisory authority on the job will volunteer more than women who do not, whereas job authority will make less of a difference in volunteering for men. For women supervisors, volunteering may serve as a means by which to demonstrate a continuing commitment to communal roles that are expected of them. In other words, women supervisors' increased involvement in volunteering reinforces the patriarchal connection between femininity and communal involvement.

Autonomy

Closely related to the concept of job authority is that of job autonomy. Job autonomy is often defined as the degree to which individuals control the schedules and procedures of job tasks (Brady et al. 1990; Breaugh 1985; Hackman and Oldham 1976; Spector 1986). In addition to the freedom in deciding when and how to do their job tasks, autonomous jobs may also give individuals choices as to how their job performance is to be evaluated (Brady et al. 1990; Breaugh 1985). Individuals with more extensive job autonomy are likely to have greater flexibility to balance their job and other pursuits, including volunteer work. Moreover, job autonomy may foster intrinsic motivation (Hackman and Oldham 1976), which is in turn positively associated with hours volunteered (Finkelstein 2009). Wilson and Musick (1997) also found that individuals who have jobs that promote self direction or agentic qualities tend to volunteer more.

Similar to the prediction of a gender difference in the effect of job authority on hours volunteered, we expect that the level of job autonomy is more strongly and positively associated with women's volunteering than men's. Women who have job autonomy are more likely to use the flexibility toward volunteering because of the societal expectations that women should be caring, giving and communal. Alternatively, men and women may utilize the flexibility that comes with an autonomous job in different life arenas. Since women continue to take on the majority of domestic responsibilities, it is possible that women may use the flexibility to maximize time to take care of their family. If this is the case, job autonomy may not promote volunteering for women as much as it does for men.

Skill Requirements

Individuals with jobs that require high level skills are likely to be given more authority and autonomy on their jobs and thus may volunteer more hours. However, having a job requiring high level skills may more directly promote volunteer work to the extent to which the skills are perceived to be useful outside the workplace. The belief that one can make a positive difference in the society—a significant attitudinal correlate of volunteering (Rossi 2001)—also tends to be stronger among those with jobs requiring high-level skills. While organizations do not usually require prospective volunteers to have any specific skill, people with jobs requiring high level skills are sought after (Musick and Wilson 2008).

Studies have shown that men often perceive their job skill levels to be higher than women, especially when technological skills are concerned (Hargittai and Shafer 2006). It is unclear whether the level of skill requirements affects men's and women's volunteering differently. Peterson (2004) finds that in case of corporate volunteering women employees feel more strongly than men employees that they can move up on the job skill ladder by working as a volunteer. He argues that women may have greater needs to be acknowledged for doing more than what their jobs require. Volunteering may be a convenient tool for earning that acknowledgement because it is likely to be less threatening for those who are otherwise threatened by women's advancement at the workplace. This suggests that the aforementioned positive link between the levels of job skill requirements and volunteering may be stronger for women than men.

Methods

Data and Sample

We use data from the main sample of the National Survey of Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) (ICPSR 1995–1996, ICPSR 2004–2006). MIDUS asked about time spent on formal volunteering in four domains (see below). It also asked respondents about their jobs, such as whether they supervise others. MIDUS was first administered in 1995–1996 by phone and mail to a sample of "non-institutionalized, English-speaking adults aged 25 to 74, selected from working telephone banks in the coterminous United States" (Research Network on Successful Midlife Development 1999, p.1). The first wave of MIDUS had the response rate of 61% (Research Network on Successful Midlife Development 1999). In 2004–2006, a follow-up survey (MIDUS II) was conducted. Of the 3,034 individuals in the original sample, 1,805 were contacted and participated in this follow-up survey. For the main analysis, we use all available data, i.e., pooling the two waves of data. Due to the high attrition rate between the waves, we also conduct an analysis solely using data from the first wave. After selecting employed respondents and deleting cases with missing values, we are left with a final sample (for the main analysis) of 1,566 men and 1,470 women respondents.

The mean age of respondents in our sample is about 42 years for both men and women. Women volunteer more hours than men, while this difference is borderline significant. Men are employed for significantly longer hours. A significantly higher percent of men hold managerial, professional and manual occupations, while significantly more women hold technical, sales, clerical, and service occupations. A significantly higher proportion of women are found in helping occupations (see p. 9 for its definition). The levels of "good job characteristics," the variables of our focus, also significantly differ by gender. (See pp. 10–11 for the definitions of the good job characteristics.) That is, men enjoy significantly higher levels of job authority and autonomy than women. The level of requirements of skills is also significantly higher among men. (A complete summary of descriptive statistics by gender are found in Appendix A).

Dependent Variables

MIDUS respondents were asked on average how many hours they volunteered each month for (a) a hospital, nursing home, or any other similar facility, (b) a school or any other youth-oriented facility, (c) a political organization, and (d) any other organization. Their responses are aggregated across the domains of volunteering to compute the total hours volunteered. A score of zero was assigned to non-volunteers.

Independent Variables

Given our focus on the influences of paid work on hours spent on formal volunteer work, the independent variables include individuals' employment status, occupational positions, and job characteristics such as job authority, job autonomy, and skill requirements. Communal and agentic qualities are also considered as they may mediate the effects of job authority and autonomy on hours spent on volunteer work in a gender specific way. As noted earlier, because of the societal expectation about gender roles, job authority and autonomy may encourage women to balance agentic with communal orientation, whereas these job characteristics may more exclusively enhance agentic qualities among men. While both communal and agentic qualities are potential facilitators of volunteering, given the "helping" nature of volunteering, communal qualities may more strongly predict volunteering, and as a result, the influence of job authority and autonomy may encourage women's volunteering more than men's.

Employment status is measured by the usual hours worked each week. It is also measured by multiple job holder status (1 = have more than one job, 0 = otherwise). Major occupations are coded as "managerial and professional" (referent), "technical, clerical, sales, and service," and "skilled and unskilled manual." In addition, we consider whether or not the respondent holds a "helping occupation" (e.g. health care workers, teachers, social workers). Specifically, a helping occupation is linked to any one of the following 1980 Census Occupation Codes (3 digit): 84–165; 174–177.

Job authority is a single-item binary variable coded 1 if the respondent plays a supervisor role and 0 otherwise. In contrast, job autonomy is tapped with five questions where the respondents were asked how often they (a) initiate things, such as coming up with their own ideas, or figuring out on their own what needs to be done, (b) have a choice in deciding how they do their tasks at work,(c) have a choice in deciding what tasks they do at work, (d) have a say in decisions about their work, and (e) control the amount of time they spend on tasks. Original scores ranging from 1 (all of the time) to 5 (never) are reversed so that higher scores indicate more job autonomy. Scale reliability coefficient (alpha) is 0.85.

Skill requirement is based on a question where the respondents were asked how often their paid work demands a high level of skill or expertise. Responses to this question are coded on a 5-point scale, with higher scores indicating greater frequency.

Agentic orientation is an index variable based on three statements: I can do just about anything I really set my mind to; when I really want to do something, I usually find a way to succeed at it; and whether or not I am able to get what I want is in my own hands. Respondents reported their level of agreement/disagreement on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (agree strongly) to 7 (disagree strongly). Communal orientation is also an index variable and measured by the extent (1 = a lot, 2 = some, 3 = a little, and 4 = not at all) to which respondents thought that they were (a) caring, (b) giving, and (c) sympathetic. For both variables, the original codes are reversed so that higher scores indicate stronger agentic and communal orientations. Scale reliability coefficients (alphas) for agentic and communal orientation are 0.68 and 0.71, respectively.

Education, marital status, and the presence of children are included as controls because they are known to be associated with volunteering and at least one of the job-related variables in similar manners. Individuals with more education tend to volunteer more (Staub 1995; Wilson and Musick 1997), while they also tend to have more authority and autonomy on their job, and be in a position requiring higher skill (Schieman and Plickert 2008). Married people are known to volunteer more actively (Rossi 2001). At the same time, it has been noted that married people are more likely to seek job autonomy (Sharpe et al. 2002). Research has shown that the presence of children, especially, school-aged children, promotes volunteering (Caputo 1997; Park and Smith 2000; Rossi 2001). It may be that the socialization of children into civic activities such as volunteering at school also encourages their parents to volunteer. Meanwhile, parenthood is known to influence the level of labor force attachment, although the direction of this influence is likely to be different by gender. Specifically, fatherhood is associated with strong labor force attachment (e.g., Friedman and Greenhaus 2000; Lundberg and Rose 2002) that may be measured by hours employed and/or multiple job holding. The pattern is the opposite for women. That is, mothers of young or school-aged children tend to be employed fewer hours than other women (Bianchi and Wight 2010). Education is coded with three categories (1 = less than high school degree, 2 = high school graduate, and 3 = college degree and beyond). Marital status is a variable with four categories: 1 = married (referent), 2 = separated/divorced, 3 = widowed, and 4 = never married. The presence of preschoolers (0–5 years old), school aged

children (6–12 years old), and older children (12–19 years old) are dichotomous variables.

Models

Similar to earlier studies, the majority of respondents (61% of men and 56% of women) are found not to volunteer any time at all. No significant gender difference is in the level or likelihood of volunteering. Moreover, many values on hours volunteered are clustered near zero. Because of our censored data on hours volunteered, the OLS regression is not a suitable procedure and produces biased estimates (Segal and Weisbrod 2002). To address data censoring, we use the tobit model to estimate how many hours respondents would have volunteered had they engaged in any volunteer work (see Musick et al. (2000) for an application of tobit regression to volunteering research).

Since data for the main analysis are pooled, the observations there are likely to be independent across, but not within, individuals. To address the interdependence of observations from one individual (resulting in biased standard errors of parameter estimates) and obtain robust standard errors, Stata's cluster function was used (Stata 2007).

Findings

Table 1 shows the weighted means or frequencies of our independent variables at Wave 1 by volunteer status and gender. For continuous variables, their standard deviations and ranges are also presented. Between-group comparisons (e.g., male vs. female volunteers) of means are made with the *t*-tests, while between-group comparisons of frequencies are made with the chi-square test.

Men who volunteer are employed significantly more hours than men who do not, while the pattern is reversed for women. Regardless of volunteering status, women are employed significantly less hours. For both genders, higher proportions of volunteers are multiple job holders, and these differences between volunteers and non-volunteers are statistically significant. Meanwhile, regardless of volunteering status, higher proportions of men than women hold multiple jobs although these gender differences are statistically insignificant. Regardless of gender, volunteers are significantly more likely to be found in managerial/professional positions. Meanwhile, both male and female volunteers are significantly less likely to hold manual positions. Slightly more male volunteers hold technical/sales/clerical/service positions than male non-volunteers, while for women the pattern is reverse. Neither of these differences by volunteer status is significant. Among both volunteers and non-volunteers, higher proportions of men are in managerial/professional and manual occupations, and higher proportions of women are employed in technical/sales/clerical/service occupations. These gender differences, except for the one in the proportion of managers/professionals among non-volunteers, are statistically significant. For both genders, significantly higher proportions of volunteers than non-volunteers hold helping occupations. Regardless

Table 1 Descriptive statistics by volunteering status and gender

	Men				Women			
	Volunteers $n = 414$		Non-volunteers $n = 658$		Volunteers		Non-volunteers $n = 539$	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Employment/job-related variables								
Hours worked per week [1,100]	49.844	15.981	47.124[a]	14.765	37.073[c]	14.962	40.360[b,d]	11.699
Multiple job holding (%)	23.7		13.5[a]		19.0		10.3[b]	
Major occupation (%)								
Managerial/professional	46.9		28.3[a]		38.3[c]		25.0[b]	
Technical/sales/clerical/service	24.8		23.4		53.0[c]		59.4[d]	
Manual	28.2		48.3[a]		8.7[c]		15.6[b,d]	
"Helping" occupation (%)	10.3		2.8[a]		19.0[c]		9.9[b,d]	
Supervisory role (%)	57.7		49.2[a]		40.5[c]		32.7[b,d]	
Job autonomy [1,5]	3.953	.734	3.751[a]	.804	3.651[c]	.766	3.569[d]	.726
Skill requirement [1,5]	3.955	.909	3.813[a]	.988	3.691[c]	.969	3.456[b,d]	.976
Agentic qualities [1,7]	5.998	1.013	5.928	.983	5.730[c]	1.045	5.718[d]	1.047
Communal qualities [1,4]	3.308	.621	3.240	.636	3.622[c]	.438	3.486[bd]	.491
Control variables								
Education (%)								
Less than high school	3.8		14.7[a]		5.5		13.4[b]	
High school graduate	47.4		57.1[a]		52.6		63.3[b]	
College graduate	48.7		28.2[a]		41.9		23.3[b,d]	
Married (%)	78.6		72.5[a]		68.6_c		58.9[b,d]	
Parental status (%)								
Preschoolers	17.9		19.3		15.2		16.2	
School-aged children	38.1		25.2[a]		33.3		20.2[b]	
Older children	35.6		22.7[a]		31.9		28.9[d]	

Significant difference between [a] men volunteers & men non-volunteers, [b] women volunteers & women non-volunteers, [c] men volunteers & women volunteers, and [d] men non-volunteers & women non-volunteers

of volunteering status, women are significantly more likely to hold a helping occupation.

Regardless of gender, volunteers are significantly more likely than non-volunteers to supervise others on the job. Both among volunteers and non-volunteers, significantly higher proportions of men than women are in supervisory capacities. For both genders, volunteers report higher job autonomy and skill requirements. All but the difference in women's level of job autonomy by volunteering status are significant. Regardless of volunteering status, the levels of job autonomy and skill requirements are significantly greater among men than women. For both genders, the level of agentic qualities does not vary by

volunteering status. Only among women, the level of communal qualities is significantly higher among volunteers than among non-volunteers. Both among volunteers and non-volunteers, women reveal a significantly lower (higher) level of agentic (communal) qualities than men.

Table 2 presents estimates from the tobit models of hours volunteered by gender. (In Appendix B, we include marginal effects of the censored expected values that indicate how the observed values of the dependent variable changes with regard to the values on the independent variables.) The first set of estimates are from the pooled data analysis (Models 1 to 4), and the second set of estimates are from the analysis of Wave 1 data (Models 5 to 8). The two sets of analyses produced similar results, and here we focus on estimates from the pooled analysis while noting some differences that emerge from comparing the pooled and single-sample analyses.

In Models 1 and 2, we include the key employment/job related variables along with the controls. In Models 3 and 4, agentic and communal qualities are added to see whether gender differences, if any, in the effects of "good" job characteristics on hours volunteered might be explained by gender differences in the levels of agentic and communal qualities.

Our findings on the effects of employment status and occupational position are mostly consistent with previous studies. Hours employed have a significant adverse effect on hours volunteered among women but not among men. This gender difference is significant at the .001 level. Controlling for hours employed, multiple job-holding significantly increases volunteering for both genders while the effect is larger for women. This gender difference is borderline significant. Meanwhile, only among men do we see the influence of occupational position on volunteering. Men in manual occupations volunteer significantly less time, either compared to men in managerial/professional occupations or to men in technical/service/clerical/service occupations. (The significance of the difference from the latter occupational group is not tabled.) No comparable pattern exists for women, while this gender difference is statistically insignificant. Interestingly, only among men, holing a helping occupation significantly increases hours volunteered. This gender difference is borderline significant.

Net of employment status and occupational position, job characteristics such as the levels of authority, autonomy, and skill requirements have varying influences on formal volunteering. As seen in the descriptive analysis, women are less likely than men to be a supervisor, but as expected, women who exercise supervisory authority on the job volunteer significantly more hours than women who do not. However, job authority makes no difference in how much time men volunteer. The gender difference in the effect of job authority is significant at the .05 level. The effect of job authority on women's volunteering is virtually the same, though slightly attenuated, when agentic and communal qualities are included. We also ran our model with an alternative measure of authority, the number of supervisees, but this did not shed any further light on the effect of job authority on volunteering for either gender.

Inconsistent with our prediction, we find no evidence that job autonomy increases hours volunteered to a greater extent for women than for men. The baseline models (Models 1 and 2) suggest that job autonomy significantly increases hours of

Table 2 Tobit models predicting hours volunteered by gender

	Pooled data				1995–1996 Data only			
	Model 1 Men Mean SE	Model 2 Women Mean (SE)	Model 3 Men Mean (SE)	Model 4 Women Mean (SE)	Model 5 Men Mean (SE)	Model 6 Women Mean (SE)	Model 7 Men Mean (SE)	Model 8 Women Mean (SE)
Employment/job-related variables								
Hours worked per week	−.060	−.300***[a]	−.052	−.288***[a]	.046	−.435***[a]	.054	−.412***[a]
	(.045)	(.044)	(.044)	(.044)	(.061)	(.072)	(.061)	(.070)
Multiple job holding	4.689**	8.922***	4.351**	8.530***	6.419**	14.473***	6.249**	13.061***
	(1.678)	(1.665)	(1.669)	(1.653)	(2.222)	(2.560)	(2.218)	(2.526)
Occupation								
Managerial/professional	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Technical/sales/clerical/ service	−1.777	−.201	−2.061	−.940	.164	−1.951	.044	−2.599
	(1.695)	(1.616)	(1.688)	(1.607)	(2.297)	(2.589)	(2.295)	(2.549)
Manual	−5.749**	−2.128	−5.844***	−2.867	−5.453*	−5.071	−5.383*	−6.196†
	(1.681)	(2.533)	(1.672)	(2.521)	(2.310)	(3.725)	(2.305)	(3.690)
"Helping" occupation	7.500**	2.114	7.168**	1.227	6.565†	-3.213[a]	5.931†	-3.773[a]
	(2.300)	(1.825)	(2.290)	(1.816)	(3.385)	(3.154)	(3.395)	(3.105)
Supervisory role	.206	4.048**[a]	.009	3.842**[a]	−1.701	4.893*[a]	−1.771	4.643*[a]
	(1.342)	(1.290)	(1.334)	(1.278)	(1.782)	(1.981)	(1.778)	(1.949)
Job autonomy	2.207*	1.257	1.709†	.797	4.019**	−2.540*	3.742**	−3.142*[a]
	(.953)	(.832)	(.961)	(.833)	(1.241)	(1.232)	(1.255)	(1.227)
Skill requirement	.640	1.920**	.540	1.711**	.769	2.556**	.780	2.203*
	(.771)	(.649)	(.767)	(.645)	(.995)	(.965)	(.995)	(.956)
Agentic qualities			.298	.349			−.011	−.066
			(.671)	(.551)			(.894)	(.851)
Communal qualities			3.983***	5.946***			2.739†	10.622***[a]
			(1.025)	(1.225)			(1.406)	(1.959)

Table 2 continued

	Pooled data				1995–1996 Data only			
	Model 1 Men Mean SE	Model 2 Women Mean (SE)	Model 3 Men Mean (SE)	Model 4 Women Mean (SE)	Model 5 Men Mean (SE)	Model 6 Women Mean (SE)	Model 7 Men Mean (SE)	Model 8 Women Mean (SE)
Control variables								
Education								
High school graduate	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Less than high school	−6.529*	−6.034*	−6.309*	−6.153*	−8.013*	−12.011**	−7.947*	−12.577***
	(2.999)	(2.807)	(2.979)	(2.782)	(3.318)	(3.520)	(3.307)	(3.499)
College graduate	4.385**	5.673***	4.677**	5.685***	5.241**	7.184**	5.576**	7.172**
	(1.672)	(1.601)	(1.665)	(1.586)	(1.944)	(2.259)	(1.949)	(2.220)
Married	4.205**	.630	4.035**	.809	2.691	2.484	2.661	2.202
	(1.472)	(1.209)	(1.462)	(1.200)	(1.978)	(1.901)	(1.973)	(1.875)
Parental status								
Preschoolers	−2.751	−2.538	−2.660	−2.017	−1.305	−.234	−1.154	.139
	(1.906)	(2.095)	(1.894)	(2.081)	(2.178)	(2.555)	(2.173)	(2.520)
School-aged children	5.671***	5.856***	5.901***	6.354***	5.399**	6.517**	5.520**	7.905***
	(1.498)	(1.516)	(1.490)	(1.507)	(1.813)	(2.058)	(1.810)	(2.049)
Older children	4.043**	2.101	4.109**	2.566†	5.742**	2.39(1.986)	5.849**	2.619
	(1.448)	(1.334)	(1.437)	(1.326)	(1.850)	3	(1.845)	(1.961)
Second wave	12.348***	9.468**	12.798***	10.077***				
	(2.960)	(2.763)	(2.944)	(2.742)				
LR χ^2	146.90	160.77	163.92	188.16	108.51	121.60	112.44	153.66
Number of observations	1566	1470	1566	1470	1072	964	1072	964

Note: † $P < .1$ * $P < .05$ ** $P < .01$ *** $P < .001$ two tailed

[a] Significant gender difference

volunteering among men but not among women. (The gender difference is insignificant, however.) But when other variables such as communal qualities are included in our analysis (Models 3 and 4), the effect of job autonomy becomes borderline significant for men.[3]

Interestingly, our findings from the single sample analysis (see Models 5 to 8) are also unexpected, and yet are somewhat in line with our alternative prediction. That is, having more autonomy on the job significantly increases time volunteered for men (Models 5 and 7) and reduces it for women (Models 6 and 8). These gender differences are significant at the .05 level. As discussed earlier, while the flexibility that comes with an autonomous job may promote helping behavior (Friedman and Greenhaus 2000), in which life arenas (e.g., family or community) this flexibility is utilized may vary by gender. In an additional analysis (not tabled), we found that only among men is the level of job autonomy significantly and positively associated with the level of job intensity. This suggests a possibility that job autonomy may be promoting corporate volunteering exclusively among men. To the extent to which corporate volunteering takes place in closer proximity to the workplace, hours spent on this type of volunteer work may add to the perceived job intensity just like hours spent on paid work. Certainly, this is only our speculation, but is consistent with a study by MacPhail and Bowles (2009) that shows that corporations are more willing to assist their men employees with volunteer work through the provision of flexible working arrangements.[4]

The level of skill requirement is significantly and positively associated with hours volunteered among women but not among men. This is consistent with Peterson's (2004) finding that women tend to see volunteering as an effective way to upgrade job skills more than men. However, the gender difference in the effect of skill requirement in our study does not reach statistical significance.

Agentic qualities have no effect on hours volunteered for either gender. Meanwhile, communal orientation promotes volunteering among both men and women. This effect is much larger for women, while this difference is statistically insignificant. Interestingly, in the single sample analysis, the positive effect of communal qualities is borderline significant for men, and statistically significant at the .001 level for women. This gender difference is significant at the .05 level. Based on both the pooled and single sample analyses, it appears that communal qualities increase women's volunteering time to a greater extent than men's.

For the most part, our control variables have expected effects. Compared with high school graduates, those with "less than high school" volunteer significantly less, and those with "college degrees" volunteer significantly more. The effect of marital status is not as clear-cut as expected, but we see that married men are likely to volunteer more than unmarried men. Marital status has no explanatory power in

[3] Where men are concerned, communal qualities appear to mediate the relationship between job autonomy and time volunteered. An additional analysis (not shown) suggested that job autonomy can also play an intervening role between communal qualities and volunteering hours.

[4] In an additional analysis (not tabled), we ran the two parameter ordinal item response model where job autonomy is measured as a latent variable using Stata's Generalized Linear Latent and Mixed Models (gllamm) (Rabe-Hesketh et al. 2004). Using the alternative measure of job autonomy did not change the original results in any significant way.

the single sample analysis. More volunteering time is also predicted by the presence of school aged children (for both genders) and of teenagers (for men).

Discussion

In this study, we have examined the effects of job characteristics such as authority, autonomy, and skill requirements on the level of volunteering with an emphasis on gender differences. Our closer look into the gender dimension of paid work-to-volunteer work relationship reveals some differences between women and men in the extent to which certain "good" job characteristics increase volunteering. This is especially the case with job authority. Although women are less likely than men to supervise others, being a supervisor promotes women's volunteering but not men's. This finding supports the argument that gender-based expectations extend to the workplace and influence the ways in which job authority is exercised. Since women are expected to be communal, women who exercise supervisory authority may volunteer more than women who do not, while job authority does not seem to matter as much for men's volunteering decisions. Volunteering may be a way for women supervisors to receive positive evaluations since it allows them to balance masculine agentic traits with feminine communal traits, and appear less threatening and more acceptable. As shown in the extended model, the significant positive effect of job authority among women (and the significant gender difference in this effect) remained virtually unaffected, though slightly attenuated, by the inclusion of communal qualities. This suggests that women supervisors volunteer more hours than other women not only because they are more communal, but because these women perceive a higher expectation to translate their communal qualities and beyond into volunteering decisions.

Contrary to our expectation, job autonomy promotes volunteering only for men. In retrospect, gender-identification spillover theory may be used to argue that women are expected to prioritize helping family members and other close social contacts over helping others in the broader community,[5] and thus they are more likely to take advantage of job autonomy by using the flexibility that comes with an autonomous job toward fulfilling domestic obligations. Moreover, guided by the cultural notions of gender ideology, employers may be more willing to encourage their male employees to volunteer through the provision of flexible work arrangements (Mac Phail and Bowles 2009). This second argument is indirectly supported by our single sample analysis.

Consistent with our prediction, the significant and positive relationship between the levels of skill requirements and volunteering is evidenced only for women but not for men. As women move up on the job skill ladder, they continue to face significant barriers based on attitudinal/organizational bias that keep them from advancing to executive positions (Eagly and Karau 2002; Ragins et al. 2006).

[5] Job autonomy and communal orientation are significantly and positively associated for both genders, although the association is stronger for men.

Women, and especially those with jobs that require high level skills, may see volunteering as a good strategy for pursuing career advancement. As mentioned earlier, this strategy is likely to be more acceptable for those who are otherwise unsupportive of women's advancement at the workplace.

Our findings prompt us to think that job authority is a significant factor that enables women to be a larger part of the public sphere that includes both paid work and volunteer work. Women who hold supervisory positions may engage in helping behavior above and beyond engaging in informal family and community settings. The question for future research then becomes whether and to what extent the gendered relationship between "good" job characteristics and volunteer activities contributes to the gender segregation of volunteer workforce. Thus far the research shows that women are more likely to volunteer in expressive associations (Babchuk and Gordon 1962) with "accommodative and nurturant" characteristics (Booth 1972, p. 188). These include educational, religious, health, and recreational associations rather than political, economic, or military associations (Booth 1972). Women volunteers are often found in positions with little authority and constitute those who are secretaries (Prouteau and Tabariés 2010) as well as those who serve food, raise money, and engage in activities such as hosting and greeting (Rotolo and Wilson 2007; Petrzelka and Mannon 2006). Yet one may expect that women who exercise supervisory authority on the job are more likely to use their managerial skills to occupy leadership positions in the voluntary sector. Recent research shows that more women than men hold voluntary officer positions in health, social, and human services (Prouteau and Tabariés 2010). This, coupled with the fact that volunteering expands social network, may enhance women's career options and skills, though perhaps limited to their sectors, and at the same time allow them to be highly visible in the civic realm.

Our study contributes to a growing literature on the relationship between job characteristics and volunteering, especially the gendered link between occupational supervisory status and volunteering. However, the study has some limitations. First, since our volunteering measure is an aggregate one, we are likely to under- or overestimate the influences of job characteristics on hours volunteered. To precisely capture those influences, we will need information on specific tasks performed as a volunteer. Information on whether one volunteers in a "corporate setting" would have also benefited our study. Moreover, because some professionals are required to volunteer in their respective communities, future research on the relationship between paid work and volunteer work need to address how "voluntary" one's volunteering is. Second, due to the (pooled) cross-sectional nature of the analysis, we cannot fully examine causal relationships between "good" job characteristics and hours volunteered. While positive job traits may promote active volunteer activities, the causal relationship may also be in the opposite direction. High quality longitudinal data are needed to examine how career transitions (e.g., promotion to a supervisor) are related to changes in volunteer involvement. Third, we measure job authority with a single-item question of whether or not a respondent supervises others on the job. Needless to say, job authority is a multidimensional construct. More specific measures of job authority that address exactly in what capacity one supervises are desirable.

Conflict of interest This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Appendix A

See Table 3.

Table 3 Descriptive statistics by gender

	Men		Women		Gender difference[1]
	$n = 1072$		$n = 964$		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Hours volunteered					
	4.654	10.807	5.865	13.177	−1.65†
Employment/job-related variables					
Hours worked per week [1,100]	48.102	15.266	38.993	13.180	12.61***
Multiple job holding (%)	0.172		0.139		4.19†
Major occupation (%)					
Managerial/professional	0.350		0.305		4.65*
Technical/sales/clerical/service	0.239		0.568		232.30***
Manual	0.410		0.127		216.97***
"Helping" occupation (%)	0.055		0.137		40.01***
Supervisory role (%)	0.522		0.359		54.97***
Job autonomy [1,5]	3.824	.789	3.603	.744	5.46***
Skill requirement [1,5]	3.864	.966	3.553	.981	5.99***
Agentic qualities [1,7]	5.953	.995	5.723	1.048	4.31***
Communal qualities [1,4]	3.264	.633	3.542	.476	−9.88***
Control variables					
Education (%)					
Less than high school	0.108		0.101		0.24
High school graduate	0.537		0.588		5.57*
College graduate	0.356		0.311		4.68*
Married (%)	0.747		0.629		32.87***
Parental status (%)					
Preschoolers	0.188		0.158		3.31
School-aged children	0.298		0.256		4.43†
Older children	0.273		0.301		1.94
Age	42.074	11.662	41.944	10.648	0.22

Note: † $P < .1$, * $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$, *** $P < .001$ two tailed

Appendix B

See Table 4.

Table 4 Tobit models predicting hours volunteered: marginal effects by gender

	Pooled data				1995–1996 Data only			
	Model 1 Men dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 2 Women dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 3 Men dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 4 Women dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 5 Men dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 6 Women dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 7 Men dy/d*x* (SE)	Model 8 Women dy/d*x* (SE)
Employment/job-related variables								
Hours worked per week	−.023	−.127***	−.020	−.122***	.015	−.158***	.017	−.148***
	(.017)	(.019)	(.017)	(.019)	(.020)	(.026)	(.020)	(.025)
Multiple job holding	1.908**	4.376***	1.760*	4.155***	2.320**	6.476***	2.252*	5.709***
	(.731)	(.925)	(.720)	(.910)	(.887)	(1.357)	(.881)	(1.299)
Occupation								
Managerial/professional	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Technical/sales/clerical/ service	−.655	−.085	−.756	−.398	.053	−.713	.014	−.942
	(.611)	(.686)	(.602)	(.681)	(.746)	(.951)	(.743)	(.932)
Manual	−2.070***	−.866	−2.099***	−1.145	−1.721*	−1.696	−1.698*	−2.010†
	(.576)	(.986)	(.571)	(.947)	(.710)	(1.142)	(.709)	(1.071)
"Helping" occupation	3.289**	.926	3.123**	.529	2.470†	−1.109	2.200	−1.277
	(1.151)	(.823)	(1.134)	(.797)	(1.458)	(1.034)	(1.426)	(.986)
Supervisory role	.078	1.758**	.003	1.662**	−.551	1.830*	−.574	1.719*
	(.506)	(.572)	(.503)	(.565)	(.579)	(.762)	(.578)	(.741)
Job autonomy	.833*	.533	.644†	.337	1.300**	−.923*	1.210**	−1.130*
	(.360)	(.353)	(.362)	(.352)	(.400)	(.448)	(.404)	(.442)
Skill requirement	.242	.814**	.203	.724**	.249	.928**	.252	.793*
	(.291)	(.275)	(.289)	(.273)	(.322)	(.350)	(.322)	(.343)
Agentic qualities			.112	.148			−.004	−.024
			(.253)	(.233)			(.289)	(.306)
Communal qualities			1.501***(.386)	2.515***			.886†	3.821***
				(.517)			(.455)	(.701)

Table 4 continued

	Pooled data				1995–1996 Data only			
	Model 1 Men dy/dx (SE)	Model 2 Women dy/dx (SE)	Model 3 Men dy/dx (SE)	Model 4 Women dy/dx (SE)	Model 5 Men dy/dx (SE)	Model 6 Women dy/dx (SE)	Model 7 Men dy/dx (SE)	Model 8 Women dy/dx (SE)
Control variables								
Education								
High school graduate	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Less than high school	−2.357*	−2.469*	−2.277*	−2.507*	–2.181**	−3.527***	−2.164**	−3.600***
	(1.033)	(1.107)	(1.026)	(1.091)	(.739)	(.809)	(.738)	(.767)
College graduate	1.724*	2.561**	1.842**	2.561**	1.767*	2.765**	1.884**	2.738**
	(.683)	(.765)	(.683)	(.757)	(.681)	(.917)	(.686)	(.895)
Married	1.511**	.267	1.451**	.341	.840	.890	.830	.782
	(.503)	(.510)	(.501)	(.504)	(.595)	(.671)	(.594)	(.658)
Parental status								
Preschoolers	−.988	−1.024	−.956	−.819	−.413	−.085	−.366	.050
	(.650)	(.801)	(.647)	(.810)	(.674)	(.921)	(.676)	(.910)
School aged children	2.304***	2.704***	2.402***	2.950***	1.852**	2.531**	1.896**	3.091***
	(.650)	(.755)	(.650)	(.759)	(.656)	(.848)	(.657)	(.861)
Older children	1.604**	.913	1.630**	1.118†	1.992**	.887	2.031**	.964
	(.602)	(.593)	(.598)	(.594)	(.683)	(.751)	(.682)	(.738)
Second wave	5.206***	4.307**	5.414***	4.595**				
	(1.371)	(1.340)	(1.373)	(1.339)				

Note: † $P < .1$, * $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$, *** $P < .001$ two tailed

References

Abrahams, N. (1996). Negotiating power, identity, family, and community: Women's community participation. *Gender & Society, 10*(6), 768–796.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organization. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139–158.

Babchuk, N., & Gordon, C. W. (1962). *The voluntary association in the slum*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Becker, P. E., & Hofmeister, H. (2000). Work hours and community involvement of dual-earner couples: Building social capital or competing for time? Bronfenbrenner Life Course Center Working Paper #00-04. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Careers Institute.

Bergman, B. (2005). *The economic emergence of women*. New York: Palgrave Mac Millan.

Bianchi, S. M., & Wight, V. R. (2010). The long reach of the job: employment and time for family life. In K. Christensen & B. L. Schneider (Eds.), *Workplace flexibility: realigning 20th-century jobs for a 21st-century workforce* (pp. 17–42). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Booth, A. (1972). Sex and social participation. *American Sociological Review, 37*(2), 183–192.

Brady, G. F., Judd, B. B., & Javian, S. (1990). The dimensionality of work autonomy revisited. *Human Relations, 43*(12), 1219–1228.

Breaugh, J. A. (1985). The measurement of work autonomy. *Human Relations, 38*(6), 551–570.

Byron, K. (2007). Male and female managers' ability to 'read' emotions: Relationships with supervisor's performance ratings and subordinates' satisfaction ratings. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 80*(4), 713–733.

Caputo, R. K. (1997). Women as volunteers and activists. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 26*(2), 156–174.

Carpenter, S. J (2001). Implicit gender attitudes. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B. The Science and Engineering*, *61* (10-B), 5619.

Claes, M. (2006). Women, men, and management styles. In P. J. Dubeck & D. Dunn (Eds.), *Workplace/ women's place* (pp. 83–87). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Connell, R. W. (2002). *Gender*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(1), 1–12.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233–256.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573–598.

England, P., & Mc Creary, L. (1987). Gender inequality in paid employment. In H. Hess & M. Ferree (Eds.), *Analyzing gender* (pp. 286–320). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2009). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*(5/6), 653–658.

Freeman, R. (1997). Working for nothing: The supply of volunteer labor. *Journal of Labor Economics, 15*(1), 140–167.

Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and family—allies or enemies?: What happens when business professionals confront life choices*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gomez, R., & Gunderson, M. (2003). Volunteer activity and the demands of work and family. *Industrial Relations, 58*(4), 573–588.

Grant, J. (1988). Women as managers: What they can offer to organizations. *Organizational Dynamics, 16*(1), 56–63.

Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spill over, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 55–74.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250–279.

Hargittai, E., & Shafer, S. (2006). Differences in actual and perceived online skills: The role of gender. *Social Science Quarterly*, *87*(2), 432–448.

Hartsock, N. (1983). *Money, sex, and power: Toward a feminist historical materialism*. New York: Longman.

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.

ICPSR. (1995–1996). National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].
ICPSR. (2004–2006). Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS II). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].
Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Man and women of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Kirkpatrick, J. (1975). *Political women*. New York: Basic Books.
Lemon, M., Palisi, B. J., & Jacobson, P. E. (1972). Dominant statuses and involvement in formal voluntary associations. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 1*(2), 30–42.
Lewis, M. A., & Noguchi, E. (2006). The female corp of volunteers: How gender and labor supply interact to affect civic participation. *Race. Gender & Class, 13*(3), 255–267.
Lopata, H., & Thorne, B. (1978). On the term "sex roles". *Signs, 3*(3), 718–721.
Lundberg, S., & Rose, E. (2002). The effects of sons and daughters on men's labor supply and wages. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 84*(2), 251–268.
Lyness, K. S., & Heilman, M. E. (2006). When fit is fundamental: Performance evaluations and promotions of upper-level female and male managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 777–785.
MacPhail, F., & Bowles, P. (2009). Corporate social responsibility as a support for employee volunteers: Impacts, gender puzzles, and policy implications in Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics, 84*(3), 405–416.
Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
Musick, M. A., Wilson, J., & Bynum, W. B., Jr. (2000). Race and formal volunteering: The differential effects of class and religion. *Social Forces, 78*(4), 1539–1570.
Orser, B., & Dyke, L. (2009). The influence of gender and occupational-role on entrepreneurs' and corporate managers' success criteria. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 22*(3), 1–25.
Park, J. Z., & Smith, C. (2000). To whom much has been given: Religious capital and community voluntarism among churchgoing Protestants. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 39*(3), 272–286.
Peterson, D. K. (2004). Benefits of participation in corporate volunteer programs: Employees' perceptions. *Personnel Review, 33*(6), 615–627.
Petrzelka, P., & Mannon, S. E. (2006). Keepin' this little town going: Gender and volunteerism in rural America. *Gender & Society, 20*(2), 236–258.
Powell, G. N., & Graves, L. M. (2003). *Women and men in management* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Prouteau, L., & Tabariés, M. (2010). Female leadership in French voluntary associations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 21*(4), 497–524.
Rabe-Hesketh, S., Skrondal, A., & Pickles, A. (2004). GLLAMM manual. U.C. Berkeley Division of Biostatistics Working Paper Series, Paper 160.
Ragins, B. R., Townsend, B., & Mattis, M. (2006). Gender gap in the executive suit. In P. J. Dubeck & D. Dunn (Eds.), *Workplace/women's place* (pp. 95–109). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
Reed, P. B., & Shelbee, L. K. (2000). Distinguishing characteristics of active volunteers in Canada. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(4), 571–592.
Research Network on Successful Midlife Development. (1999). Technical report on the methodology of the MIDUS Survey. Retrieved November 5, 2003, from http://midmac.med.harvard.edu./tech.html.
Reskin, B. (2006). Sex segregation in the workplace. In P. J. Dubeck & D. Dunn (Eds.), *Workplace/women's place* (pp. 73–76). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
Reskin, B. F., & Roos, P. A. (1990). *Job queues, gender queues*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Ridgeway, C. L. (1997). Interaction and conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review, 62*(2), 218–235.
Ridgeway, C. L. (2009). Framed before we know it: How gender shapes social relations. *Gender & Society, 23*(2), 145–160.
Rossi, A. S. (2001). Domains and dimensions of social responsibility: A sociodemographic profile. In A. S. Rossi (Ed.), *Caring and doing for others: Social responsibility in the domains of family, work, and community* (pp. 97–134). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Rotolo, T., & Wilson, J. (2007). Sex segregation in volunteer work. *The Sociological Quarterly, 48*(3), 559–585.

Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 675–688.
Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: Reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review, 22*(1), 6–18.
Schieman, S., & Plickert, G. (2008). How knowledge is power: Education and the sense of control. *Social Forces, 87*(1), 153–183.
Segal, L. M., & Weisbrod, B. A. (2002). Volunteer labor sorting across industries. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 21*(3), 427–447.
Sharpe, D. L., Hermsen, J. M., & Billings, J. (2002). Factors associated with having flextime: A focus on married workers. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 23*(1), 51–72.
Smith, D. H. (1975). Voluntary action and voluntary groups. *Annual Review of Sociology, 1*, 247–270.
Spector, P. E. (1986). Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work. *Human Relations, 39*(11), 1005–1016.
Stata. (2007). *Stata User's Guide. Release 10*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
Staub, E. (1995). How people learn to care. In P. G. Schervish, V. A. Hodgkinson, & M. Gates (Eds.), *Care and community in modern society: Passing on the tradition of service to future generations* (pp. 51–68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Taniguchi, H. (2006). Men's and women's volunteering: Gender differences in the effects of employment and family characteristics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*(1), 83–101.
Van Engen, M. L., van der Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context, and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*(5), 581–598.
Webb, N. J., & Abzug, R. (2008). Do occupational group members vary in volunteering activity? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 37*(4), 689–708.
Wilensky, H. L. (1961). Orderly careers and social participation: The impact of work history on social integration in the Middle Mass. *American Sociological Review, 26*(4), 521–539.
Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 215–240.
Wilson, C., Hendricks, A. K., & Smithies, R. (2001). "Lady bountiful" and the "virtual volunteers": The changing face of social service volunteering. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 17*, 124–146.
Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Work and volunteering: The long arm of the job. *Social Forces, 76*(1), 251–272.