

6-2002

The Family and Political Dimension of Social Cohesion: Analysing the Link Using the 2000 National Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating

Zenaida R. Ravanera

University of Western Ontario, ravanera@uwo.ca

Roderic Beaujot

University of Western Ontario, rbeaujot@uwo.ca

Rajulton Fernando

University of Western Ontario, fernando@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

Recommended Citation

Ravanera, Zenaida R.; Beaujot, Roderic; and Fernando, Rajulton (2002) "The Family and Political Dimension of Social Cohesion: Analysing the Link Using the 2000 National Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 16 : Iss. 7 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol16/iss7/1>

**The Family and Political Dimension of Social Cohesion:
Analysing the Link using the 2000 National Survey
on Giving, Volunteering and Participating**

by
Zenaida R. Ravanera
Roderic Beaujot
Fernando Rajulton

Discussion Paper no. 02-07

June 2002

On the web in PDF format: <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/sociology/popstudies/dp/dp02-07.pdf>

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Population Society,
Toronto, 2002 May 30-June 1

**Population Studies Centre
University of Western Ontario
London CANADA N6A 5C2**

Abstract

This study examines the effects of family on patterns of civic engagement (through giving, volunteering and membership in organizations) of Canadian men and women. Data are from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP), which collected information on personal and family variables such as age, sex, household size, marital status, and presence of children. The study finds that changes in families could have opposite effects on civic participation depending on the indicator. Children, for example, have positive impact on volunteering, but negative on association membership of men. And, full employment of women hinders volunteering but encourages participation in associations. In contrast, social capital has unequivocal effect - whether measured as length of stay in community or as influences when the respondents were young, social capital increases all forms of civic involvement.

Introduction

In his frequently cited book, "Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community", Robert Putnam (2000) notes that civic engagement in the United States has declined over the past 30 years. He estimates that the greatest contributing factor, accounting for about half of the decline, is the generational change; that is, the replacement of the civic generation (those born between 1910 and 1940) by less civic-minded generations (their children or the baby boomers, and their grand children). The other factors that Putnam (2000:283) cites are the (a) changes in work, in particular, the "pressures of time and money", (b) the changes in residential patterns including "suburbanization, commuting; and sprawl", and (c) the "effect of electronic entertainment - above all television". Putnam roughly estimates that these four factors account for about 80% of the decline in civic engagement. The simplicity of these generalizations is appealing as they lead to specific recommendations on how to increase civic engagement, which Putnam proceeds to do in the last chapter of his book.

Could Putnam's conclusions apply to Canada as well? More importantly, are the trends in civic engagements in Canada similar to those in the United States? Is it possible that the simple and appealing generalizations mask greater complexities that underlie the relationships among the factors contributing to civic participation? This study will not provide adequate answers to these questions as they would require more extensive study using time series data over a period of 30 or more years that are not available for Canada. However, a Canadian National Survey on Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (NSGVP) gathered data that are useful for understanding trends in civic participation that may be helpful in providing some answers to these questions. NSGVP is particularly useful in exploring the links between civic engagement and the family. In addition to data on volunteering, donating, and joining in associations, the survey has information on family-related variables, and on the experiences of civic engagement and influences of parents and significant others on the respondents when they were young. The latter could be used to measure social capital (see below), the creation or re-creation of which, according to Putnam (2000:401-14), would reverse the trend of declining civic engagement.

Family, Social Cohesion, and Political Participation

Underlying the concern about civic engagement is the issue of social cohesion, a term which is hard to define but which is generally known to be a multi-dimensional concept involving economic (inclusion and equality), political (legitimacy and participation), and socio-cultural (recognition and belonging) dimensions (Jenson, 1998; Bernard, 1999). Social cohesion and families are intertwined. Over the past four decades families have been transformed by high rates of separation and divorce leading to greater proportion of lone parents, increasing popularity of cohabitation, later ages at marriage, and low levels of fertility. Several factors have brought about these transformations including social and economic changes that have transpired over the same period. But, political changes may also have had an influence on the transformation of families. Fukuyama (1992), for example, proposes that the near universal adoption of the values of liberty and equality have threatened the “associational life” not only of communities but also of families. He thinks that members who approach their associational contracts in strictly liberal terms would readily abrogate them when the obligations are more than what they bargained for.

Changes that have loosened the entries and exits into families have impact on social cohesion by way of decreasing social capital invested on children (Coleman, 1990; MacLanahan and Sandefur, 1994). The decline in social capital is a factor contributing to the decline of civic engagement (Putnam, 2000). In addition, the re-negotiation of division of labour between men and women opens the possibility of no one in the family doing the unpaid tasks of volunteering and participating in community activities. And, the rise in dual-earner families could leave little time for civic engagement. These considerations link family changes and political participation with issues relating to age, children, work, and gender.

One of Putnam’s strongest assertion is that civic engagement in America declined because of cohort replacement (Putnam, 2000). Ideally, this could be tested with data over the past 30 to 40 years. Without these time series data, however, one could examine civic participation by **age groups** with the expectation that those aged 60 and older (that is, cohorts born in 1940 and earlier) would have the highest proportion engaged in civic activities. A shortcoming of a cross-sectional data is that there is no way of dis-aggregating cohort and age effect. Thus, while age difference in civic participation could reflect the cohort effect, it could also signal a family life cycle or life course effect. One’s level of participation and motivation for political engagement when young could change as one goes through adulthood with steady work and while raising a family, and change yet again as one enters old age with retirement from work and reaching the empty nest stage.

Children affect the parents’ civic participation in two opposite ways. Their demand on parental time diminishes the time available for competing activities including social and political engagements. This is particularly true for parents with children aged less than 6 years old. But, children’s needs and interests provide opportunities for parents to become involved in neighbourhood and communities, schools, sports, and for some, the church. Parental involvement are more likely when children are of school age. Typically, children-motivated civic participation

declines when the children become more independent, about the time when children reach their late teens.

In the past four decades, women entered the paid **labour force** in great proportion and in so doing affected the functioning of families and communities (Beaujot and Ravanera, 2001). In a nostalgia-coloured picture of a family in the 1950s, husbands went to work while wives tended to the needs of the households and the communities. Women did volunteer work in schools, organized neighbourhood events, did solicitation for charitable groups, and lent helping hands to the needy. Cross-sectional data collected at one point in time will tell us little about past activities or the subsequent changes, but differences in civic engagement by labour force status could provide a glimpse of how paid work, particularly of women, influence political participation.

Gender difference is implied in family changes and civic participation. This is because men and women differ in their family roles and in their motivations.

In addition to examining the links between family and political participation in terms of age, children, work, and gender, this study also examines the effect of social capital. Like social cohesion, **social capital** is a concept that takes on several meanings and may be measured in many ways. Coleman (1990), for example, refers to social capital as social relations facilitating achievement of certain goals, taking a number of forms including social organization, norms and sanctions, and authority relations. Glaeser (2001) sees social capital as social skills, while Astone et al. (1999) define it as resources emerging from social ties measurable as attributes of individuals. While there are debates about the definition of social capital and its many forms, there does not seem to be much doubt as to its positive contribution to children's development (Coleman, 1990, MacLanahan and Sandefur, 1994) and their subsequent positive effect on civic engagement (Putnam, 2000). In this study, social capital takes on two forms: as a network of social relationships, and as an internalized resource accumulated from previous social ties.

Data and Methodology

The 2000 National Survey on Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (NSGVP) gathered information from 14,700 Canadians aged 15 and over. This study uses the following indicators of civic engagement: whether or not the respondent has, in the past twelve months, (a) volunteered with an organization, (b) donated money or other resources, or (c) is a member of or participated in activities of an association. To gauge the overall level of engagement, a political participation score is assigned to each respondent as follows:

- 0 - the person is not a volunteer, donor, or member;
- 1 - he/she is either a volunteer, a donor, or a member;
- 2 - he/she is either volunteer and donor, volunteer and member, or donor and member;
- 3 - he/she is a volunteer, donor, and member

The amount of time spent volunteering, the amount of donations, and the number and types of organizations to which the respondent belongs are not considered in the present analysis.

Each indicator of civic engagement - (a) volunteering, (b) giving, (c) association membership, and (d) political participation - is examined in relation to family and social capital variables. The family-related variables used in the analysis are age, sex, marital status, presence of children under 18, and labour force participation. Socio-economic and other variables are used in the analysis as controls including respondent's education, immigration status, household income, region, religious attendance, health status, and general life satisfaction. These are variables shown in previous studies to have effects on civic engagement (Devlin, 2001, Reed and Selbee, 2001, Jones, 2001, Hall et al., 1998, Ravanera *et al.*, 2001, Ravanera and Rajulton, 2001). As can be seen in all the tables (Tables 1 to 4), these variables are measured as categories available in the NSGVP public use file that provided mainly broad categories in order to protect data confidentiality.

The age categories roughly correspond to life course stages of early life (15-34), mid-life (35-54) and late life (55 and older). A marital status category combines the married with common-law, which is unfortunate as those in common-law unions do not necessarily behave similarly as those who are married. The presence of children variable is categorized as with or without children less than 18 years old. While this is useful, it would have been better had there been a separate category for those with children less than 6 years old.

We use two indicators of social capital: the length of stay in the community and a derived social capital score. The length of stay is a proxy for the respondent's social network in the community – we assume that the longer the stay, the wider and denser the networks. The social capital score is the sum of positive answers to questions relating to the respondents' civic involvement in their youth, and the influences of parents and others when they were young¹.

Percentage distributions of volunteers, donors, and members by family-related and social capital variables provide a general picture of the trends in civic participation. We also calculated the average social capital scores by categories of dependent variables, for instance, among those who are volunteers and those who are not. Both the percentage distributions and mean social capital scores are indicators of **gross effects** of the various explanatory variables. To obtain the **net effects**, a binary logistic regression is done using a form of civic participation (whether a volunteer, donor, or member) as a dependent variable and family-related, social capital, and controls as independent variables. A similar 2-step method is followed for the overall indicator of political participation, using the scores as dependent variable in a multinomial logistic regression analysis.

¹The questions asked were: Did you do any of the following things when you were in grade school or high school? (a) Did you participate in an organized team sport? (b) Did you belong to a youth group? (c) Did you do some kind of volunteer work? (d) Did you personally see someone you admired helping others? (e) Did you go door-to-door to raise money for a cause or organization? (f) Were you helped in the past by others? (g) Were you active in student government? (h) Were you active in a religious organization? (i) Did one or both of your parents do volunteer work in the community?

Results of Analysis: Volunteering, Giving, and Participating in Associations

Men Tend to Network, Women To Volunteer and Give

In general, the level of volunteering is the lowest, giving is the highest, and membership in association is mid-way between volunteering and giving (Table 1). This could be an indication that it is easier to share material resources than to spend time and effort for civic causes. It may also be that the lower the demand for long-term commitment (say, in giving as against volunteering), the more likely the civic engagement.

Men are more likely to join organizations whereas women tend to volunteer and donate. Fifty-three percent of men are members of organizations, compared to 48% of women (Table 1). When it comes to volunteering, more women do so (28% vs. 25%) than men. Donating seems to be a preferred mode of civic engagement for women as well, with 81% of women giving as against 75% of men. This gender difference persists and remain statistically significant even after controlling for all variables included in the analysis. Compared to women, men have 1.3 times more probability of being members of associations; women have a 1.1 greater probability of volunteering and 1.7 probability of giving compared to men.²

This difference in the manner of political participation between men and women may still be capturing the traditional gender division of labour. As labour force participation is controlled in the analysis, one would assume that women have as much opportunities as men for all three means of civic participation. However, differential socialization may still have the effect of men being more comfortable joining associations, doing networking, and being in the forefront, while women stay in the background volunteering and also networking but in more informal ways with relatives, friends and neighbours.

Of the three forms of civic engagement, the biggest gender difference is in giving. A partial explanation could be in the reporting; that is, women may be better at remembering incidences of giving. Other possible explanations are the greater accessibility of women - women may be in the home more often than men and thus more likely to be there for door-to-door solicitation and in answering the phone, which would be particularly true for traditional families. When both couples do paid work, it is possible that men's earnings are allocated for basic needs whereas women's are budgeted for the 'extra's' including donations. It could also be that women's caring responsibilities condition them to be more inclined to give.

² These are obtained from binary logistics regression of volunteering, giving, or being a member for all respondents together. The results of this regression is not presented here as we show results of regressions done for males and females separately. We would be happy to provide the results of the combined regression to anyone interested.

Age Differential: Cohort Effect or Family Life Cycle Effect?

Volunteering, giving, and being members of associations peak at mid-life for both men and women. For example, 28% of men at mid-life (35-54 years old) did volunteer work, compared to 24% of those in early life (15-34) and 23% of men at late life (55 and older) (Table 1). Among women, 32% of those at mid-life volunteered, while only 28% and 22% did so among those at early life and late life, respectively. The same trend holds for giving and association membership although at much higher levels at all three stages.

This trend does not necessarily negate Putnam's assertion that civic engagement has declined and that the decline is mainly due to cohort replacement. However, the fact that all three forms of civic participation peak at mid-life indicates that there are other determinants besides cohort differentials.

Controlling for other factors, two ways of civic engagements increase with age; that is, everything else being equal, those aged 55 and older (that is, the cohorts born earlier than 1945) have the highest probabilities of giving and joining associations (Tables 2A and 2B). This provides some credence to Putnam's thesis that those born between 1910 to 1940 are more civic-minded than those born later. As for volunteering, the age differential is not statistically significant, except among women aged 15-34 who have significantly lower probabilities of volunteering than the older women.

The high levels of volunteering, giving, and association membership of men and women aged 35 to 54 and the reversal of this differential after controlling for other variables means that explanations for the differential by age groups could be found among the independent variables. Education, household income, and labour force participation have the biggest impact in the reversal of giving and association membership. This means that the higher education and income, and being employed give those aged 35-54 an advantage over those who are older than them. As for volunteering, in addition to education, income, and labour force participation, the presence of children contributes to the high levels of volunteering at mid-life, particularly among women. These point to a life course effect because income generally peaks at mid-life and declines at late life after retirement from the work force, and children are generally in the households at early and mid-life and absent at late life.

Marital Status: Does It Matter?

To find out whether marital status matters to civic participation, it may be good to view the categories of marital status as a 'synthetic family life cycle stages'. Thus, never married men and women start from a low level of volunteering, giving, and association membership. These levels increase when they get married, but decrease once again when the marriage is terminated by separation and divorce or by spouse's death. In general, this seems to be a fitting description of the levels of volunteering, giving, and association membership of women and fit those of men as well, with the exception of separated and divorced men's level of volunteering that is slightly higher

than that of married men (Table 1).

Controlling for other variables, the net effects of marital status differ considerably for men and women (Tables 2A and 2B). As noted in Table 1, separated and divorced men have higher than expected level of volunteering and this persists even after controlling for all the other variables. The higher probabilities of volunteering of divorced men may be a continuation of a pattern of volunteering engaged in when they were married, and a means of compensating for the absence of children and cessation of family-related activities.

The difference by marital status in the probability of being association members is not significant and the control for other variables does not alter this. But, the higher level of giving by married men (compared to separated and divorced men) is reduced to insignificance when the various independent variables are controlled. An exploration into the effects of variables shows that married men's higher propensity to give are mostly due to their higher income, their having children, and their more frequent attendance in religious services compared to separated or divorced men.

The higher level of volunteering among married women compared to those separated and divorced could be explained by the variables included in the analysis, in particular, household income and presence of children. But, the included variables do not adequately explain the differential probabilities of giving and joining associations, which remain higher for married compared to separated or divorced women. Certainly, the higher household income contribute to married women's higher probability of giving and joining associations but, they seem to be enjoying other advantages that are not available to separated and divorced women. These advantages could include greater sense of security that partners / husbands provide leading to greater propensity to give, and possibly greater time availability and opportunities to join organizations.

One other marital status effect that distinguishes women from men is the civic participation of widows and widowers. The significantly lower levels of civic participation among widowed men and women is expected from a family life cycle perspective – they may no longer be living with children, and their household income may be lower. From a cohort perspective, the widowed are older and do not have as high an education as the younger cohorts. Controlling for all these variables still leaves a significant negative effect on volunteering not accounted for by the included variables, and furthermore, leads to higher probabilities of giving and association membership among widows. Factors that influence widows to disengage from volunteering but impel them to give and join association need to be looked into more closely, possibly with qualitative data.

Children Both Promote and Hinder Civic Engagement

Children do contribute to parental involvement but mainly for volunteering and giving. Table 1 shows that, compared to those without children, men and women with children under 18 years old have higher levels of volunteering and giving. Thirty percent of men with children volunteer while only 23% without children do so; the corresponding figures for women are 34% and 26%. Eighty-four percent of men with children and 71% of those without children are donors, with the

corresponding figures for women being 87% and 78% respectively. The gap for membership in associations is only about 2% for both men and women.

Controlling for other variables shows that the impact of children on civic participation differs by gender and by type of civic engagement. For volunteering, children have the same positive impact on men and women - those with children are 1.3 times more likely to volunteer than those without (Tables 2A and 2B). Women with children in the household are 1.4 times more likely to give than women without children even after controlling for variables such as household income and education, while children's presence does not have an impact on men's giving that are not already accounted for by the control variables. The presence of children decreases the probability of men's and women's participation in associations but the effect is not significant for women, while it is highly significant for men.

The opposite effects of presence of children on volunteering and association membership is an indication of different types of activities. In most instances, volunteering probably engages parents in children-centered activities, whereas activities of associations may be more adult-oriented. As for the positive effect of children on women's giving, the most likely explanation is that mothers are more involved in children's affairs, which in many instances require some form of giving.

Employment Effect: Balancing Time, Resources, and Opportunities

The trade-off seems clear: those who are employed do not have the time to volunteer but they do have the resources to give and the opportunities to participate in associations. This is supported to a certain extent by the figures in Table 1. The level of giving and participating in associations are higher among those who are employed. But, those employed part-time have higher level of volunteering compared to those employed full-time, which points to availability of time as essential to volunteering.

Controlling for the effects of other variables provides an evidence that indeed full time employment reduces the probability of volunteering but increases the probability of giving and participation in associations for those who are working (Tables 2A and 2B). This is particularly true for women. The seemingly high levels of volunteering among employed men and women is reversed when other variables are controlled. In particular, at the same level of household income, education, and social capital, those who are not fully employed are more likely to volunteer, which points to time availability as essential to volunteering. But, employment does provide resources and opportunities such that women employed have about 1.5 to 2.0 times higher probabilities of giving or participating in associations.

Men fully employed have higher probabilities of giving as well, but men's association membership does not vary greatly with labour force participation. This is possibly because men who are no longer in the labour force were once employed and, although retired, may still have the connections and opportunities to be members of associations, not entirely unlike those available to employed men.

The Impact of Social Capital

Social capital as measured by length of stay in community has positive impact on all three means of political engagement of both men and women. But, the pattern of effects differ somewhat by type of engagement and by gender. For both men and women, a short stay of 3 years increases volunteering while the effect on association membership is exhibited only after 5 years of stay in communities (Table 1). As for giving, it takes 3 years for men and 5 years for women for the stay in the community to have a positive impact. Controlling for other variables essentially reveals the same pattern (Tables 2A and 2B).

As expected, civic participation is positively affected by social capital, indicated by youth civic involvement and influences when the respondent was young. The average social capital scores of volunteers, donors, and members are all higher than those who are not (Table 1). These effects persist even after controlling for all other variables - a one point increase in score is associated with about 1.2 to 1.4 higher likelihood of civic participation for both men and women, everything else being equal (Tables 2A and 2B).

Length of stay in community and youth social capital score are indicators of different forms of social capital. Length of stay in community is a proxy for social network that reflects the current relationships of the respondent. The youth social capital score is essentially an accumulation of previous influences by parents and significant others, and of previous experiences in civic participation. The results presented in Tables 2A and 2B show that each of these types of social capital have independent effects on civic engagement.

Results of Analysis: Overall Patterns of Civic Participation

Who are the Disengaged?

In order obtain a general picture that combines all three forms of civic engagement (volunteering, giving, and participating in associations), we derived a participation index ranging from 0 to 3 indicating disengagement on one end and full participation on the other. Table 3 shows that the percentage distributions among the 4 scores for men and are roughly normal – that is, about 13-15% are disengaged (0 score), some 33-35% have low engagement (1), another 32-34% are moderately engaged (2), and about 18-20% are fully engaged (3).

Looking only at family-related and social capital variables, the disengaged are the young, the never married men or separated/divorced women, those without children, the unemployed, those who have stayed in community for 2 years or less, and those with lowest social capital score (see column '0' in Table 3). On the other extreme are those engaged in all forms of civic participation (column '3') who are those at mid-life (aged 35-54), married and separated/divorced men, married women, persons with children, full-time employed men or part-time employed women, have stayed longer than 5 years in communities, and have the highest social capital score.

To find out whether the same profile holds when all variables are taken together, that is, when other variables are held constant, we did a multinomial regression of participation scores using all the explanatory variables used in the previous analysis (see above). In Tables 4A and 4B, the coefficients (and its exponentials) serve a dual comparison — with the variable's reference category and with those fully engaged, the omitted participation category (score 3) . For example, in comparison to the oldest age group, young men aged 15-34 are 3 times more likely to have a score of 0 (or be disengaged) than to have a score of 3 (or be fully engaged), everything else being equal (Table 4A). Similarly, those in the youngest age group, in comparison to those in the oldest age group, are 1.6 times more likely to have a score of 1 (or be involved in one form of civic activity) than a score of 3 (or be fully engaged).

As with the previous analysis done separately for each form of civic engagement, the results of the multinomial regression reveals a gender difference. All the gross effects remain essentially the same for women but not for men. Thus, for women (Table 4B), the young, the separated or divorced, those without children, the unemployed or those not in the labour force are all more likely to have a score of 0 than to have a score of 3. Specifically, for example, married women have only about half the likelihood of the separated or divorced women (0.45) to be disengaged. Women with shortest stay in the community are twice as likely to be disengaged than women who have stayed longest; and the lower the social capital score, the more likely the disengagement.

For men, everything else being equal, the young, the unmarried and widowed, the short-term residents, and those with low social capital score have all higher probabilities of falling into the disengaged rather than the fully engaged category (Table 4A). However, the presence of children and labour force status no longer shows statistically significant effects, indicating that other included variables, most likely, household income and education, could account for the gross effect earlier detected. For men, absence of children in the household and unemployment do not contribute to disengagement when income and education are held constant.

Conclusion: Implications of Family Changes on Civic Engagement

To create a scenario of civic engagement in Canada for say, the next 20 years, one would need to take into account family-related variables that were included in this analysis. In particular, the following would need to be considered:

- **Cohort replacement.** Like the Americans, Canadians born before 1945 may be more civic minded than the cohorts born later. At first glance, this does not seem to be the case as the boomers seem to have higher levels of participation than the preceding cohorts (aged 55 and older, in our analysis). But, the boomers' dominance is mainly accounted for by their higher education and higher household income. Everything else being equal, men and women in the oldest age group do seem to be more likely to give and to participate in associations.

- **Low fertility.** Children increase the probability of volunteering by both men and women. Thus, low fertility, especially higher childlessness, would most likely reduce the already low levels of

volunteering. Small numbers of children could also reduce the level of giving as presence of children has positive impact on donating, especially by women. However, childlessness and lower fertility would increase association membership.

- **Employment of women.** Full time employment of both men and women reduces the probability of volunteering. But employment, whether full-time or part-time, increases the giving and, in the case of women, participating in associations. Thus, over-all civic engagement may benefit from women's employment.

- **Residential mobility.** All forms of civic engagement increase with length of stay in community. Post-modern economy characterized by greater mobility of workers would most likely lead to erosion of civic participation.

- **Loose entries and exits from families.** Parental civic involvement, influences of significant others, and participation during one's youth all lead to increases in the probabilities of volunteering, giving, and participating in adulthood. Thus, any change that reduces a family's investment of social capital on children could lead to an overall decrease in civic engagement. This might happen in instances of separation or divorce that leaves only one parent investing in children, or in cases of cohabitation with low commitment to long-term relationship.

- **Delay in family formation.** The tendency among the young to delay marriage and child-bearing to later ages in favour of longer period of human capital accumulation (through higher education, for example) could lead to greater investment in social capital on children, and hopefully to increased civic engagement.

In addition to family-related and social capital variables, the control variables used in the analysis should be considered as well. Education and health, for example, have significant positive impact on civic engagement, which could contribute towards the maintenance of current levels or to increases in civic participation in the future. The young are most likely to obtain as much as or even higher education than their parents and grandparents. And, advances in health and medicine augur well for longer life expectancy and more years of healthy living. Higher education and income, and better health among the future retirees could lead to greater number of volunteers, donors, and association members (Ravanera and Rajulton, 2001).

While we have identified several factors influencing civic engagement, we have certainly not identified all of them. The resolve of citizens and efforts by public and private sectors such as the Voluntary Sector Initiative, a joint programme of the Canadian government and the voluntary sector, might engender enthusiasm that could counter some of the negative factors uncovered by this analysis.

References:

- Astone, N.M., C.A. Nathanson, R. Schoen, and Y. J. Kim.(1999). Family Demography, Social Theory, and Investment in Social Capital. *Population and Development Review* 25(1):1-31.
- Beaujot, R. and Z. R. Ravanera. 2001. An Interpretation of Family Change, With Implications for Social Cohesion. University of Western Ontario, Population Studies Center Discussion Paper 01-1.
- Bernard, P. 1999. Social Cohesion: A Critique. CPRN Discussion Paper No. F-09.
- Coleman, J.S.1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Devlin, R.A. 2001. Volunteers and the Paid Labour Market. *Isuma* 2(3): 62- 68.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press.
- Glaeser, E. L. 2001. The Formation of Social Capital. *Isuma*, 2(1): 34-40. Glaeser (2001)
- Hall, M., T. Knighton, P. Reed, P. Bussière, D. McRae, P. Bowen. 1998. Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 71-542-XIE. Ottawa.
- Jenson, J. 1998. Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Network: Study No. F-03. 48Pp.
- Jones, F. 2001. Volunteering Parents: Who Vlonteers and How are Their Lives Affected. *Isuma* 2(3):69-74.
- McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. (1994). *Growing Up With a Single Parent: What Helps, What Hurts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling Alone : The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York : Simon & Schuster.
- Ravanera, Z. and F. Rajulton. 2001. Integration at Late Life: Inclusion, Participation, and Belonging among the Elderly. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Federation of Canadian Demographers, Ottawa, December 14-15, 2001. PSC Discussion Paper 01-16, available through <http://www.sscl.uwo.ca/sociology/ftsc>.
- Ravanera, Z.R., F. Rajulton, and P. Turcotte. 2001. Youth Integration, Social Cohesion, and Social Capital: An Analysis of the General Social Surveys on Time Use. Paper presented at the Canadian Population Society Annual Meeting, Quebec City, May 26-28, 2001. PSC Discussion Paper 01-10,

available through <http://www.sscl.uwo.ca/sociology/ftsc>.

Reed, P. and L. K. Selbee. 2001. Canada's Civic Core: On the Disproportionality of Charitable Giving, Volunteering and Civic Participation. *Isuma* 2(3): 28-33.

Table 1: Percent Volunteers, Donors and Association Members By Family-Related Variables and Sex and Mean Social Capital Score, 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating

| | Males | | | | | | Females | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------------|------|-------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | Formal Volunteers | | Donors | | Members of Associations | | Formal Volunteers | | Donors | | Members of Associations | |
| | Total N | % | Total N | % | Total N | % | Total N | % | Total N | % | Total N | % |
| Total | 7235 | 25.3 | 7234 | 75.1 | 6879 | 53.1 | 7489 | 28.1 | 7490 | 80.9 | 7140 | 48.1 |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-34 | 2560 | 24.2 | 2560 | 66.1 | 2478 | 50.5 | 2496 | 28.4 | 2497 | 75.3 | 2407 | 45.4 |
| 35-54 | 2887 | 27.7 | 2887 | 82.7 | 2749 | 55.9 | 2903 | 32.1 | 2904 | 86.0 | 2776 | 51.1 |
| 55 and older | 1787 | 22.7 | 1786 | 75.9 | 1652 | 52.2 | 2091 | 22.3 | 2091 | 80.5 | 1956 | 47.2 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Married/Common-law | 4596 | 26.4 | 4596 | 81.4 | 4382 | 54.2 | 4504 | 30.1 | 4503 | 86.3 | 4293 | 50.8 |
| Never Married | 2159 | 23.3 | 2158 | 62.9 | 2061 | 50.8 | 1716 | 28.4 | 1716 | 70.6 | 1627 | 44.0 |
| Widowed | 163 | 15.3 | 163 | 69.3 | 142 | 53.5 | 618 | 17.3 | 618 | 79.4 | 590 | 45.9 |
| Separated/Divorced | 316 | 26.9 | 316 | 71.2 | 293 | 51.5 | 653 | 23.9 | 653 | 72.3 | 630 | 42.2 |
| Presence of Children | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| With Children < 18 | 2168 | 30.1 | 2168 | 83.9 | 2084 | 54.3 | 2197 | 34.2 | 2198 | 87.0 | 2120 | 49.8 |
| Without Children < 18 | 5066 | 23.2 | 5065 | 71.4 | 4795 | 52.5 | 5293 | 25.6 | 5293 | 78.3 | 5019 | 47.4 |
| Labour Force Status | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-Time Employed | 4412 | 25.5 | 4412 | 80.0 | 4230 | 54.8 | 3015 | 29.3 | 3015 | 87.4 | 2908 | 54.1 |
| Part-Time Employed | 630 | 27.9 | 630 | 67.0 | 599 | 58.6 | 1204 | 36.3 | 1204 | 80.6 | 1172 | 51.8 |
| Unemployed | 314 | 19.7 | 313 | 59.1 | 303 | 35.0 | 283 | 30.4 | 283 | 71.7 | 279 | 38.7 |
| Not in the Labour Force | 1879 | 24.7 | 1879 | 69.2 | 1747 | 50.0 | 2987 | 23.5 | 2988 | 75.3 | 2781 | 41.2 |
| Length of Stay | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Years or Less | 907 | 20.5 | 906 | 68.3 | 906 | 50.0 | 1003 | 23.5 | 1003 | 78.6 | 1003 | 43.8 |
| 3 to 5 Years | 837 | 24.3 | 836 | 76.8 | 836 | 50.7 | 864 | 29.6 | 864 | 78.7 | 865 | 44.3 |
| 6 or More Years | 5027 | 27.0 | 5028 | 78.9 | 5019 | 54.7 | 5170 | 30.2 | 5170 | 83.8 | 5151 | 49.5 |
| Mean Social Capital Score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volunteer/Donor/Member | 1692 | 4.9 | 4959 | 4.3 | 3425 | 4.6 | 1968 | 5.1 | 5557 | 4.3 | 3231 | 4.8 |
| Non Volunteer/Donor/Member | 4769 | 3.6 | 1503 | 2.6 | 3035 | 3.2 | 4771 | 3.5 | 1182 | 2.4 | 3493 | 3.2 |
| Total | 6461 | 3.9 | 6461 | 3.9 | 6460 | 3.9 | 6739 | 4.0 | 6739 | 4.0 | 6724 | 4.0 |

Table 2A: Coefficients of Binary Logistic Regression of Volunteering, Giving, and Association Membership, Canadian Men Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP

| | Volunteering | | Giving | | Membership | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|--------|
| | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) |
| Family-Related Variables | | | | | | |
| Age Groups | | | | | | |
| 15-34 | -0.03 | 0.97 | -1.05 *** | 0.35 | -0.25 ** | 0.78 |
| 35-54 | 0.08 | 1.09 | -0.44 *** | 0.64 | -0.05 | 0.95 |
| 55 and older (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Married or Common-Law | -0.31 ** | 0.73 | 0.24 | 1.27 | -0.12 | 0.89 |
| Never Married | -0.32 * | 0.72 | -0.28 | 0.75 | -0.06 | 0.94 |
| Widowed | -0.92 *** | 0.40 | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.06 | 1.06 |
| Separated/Divorced (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Presence of Children in HH | | | | | | |
| With Child/Children < 18 Yrs. | 0.28 *** | 1.32 | 0.01 | 1.01 | -0.26 *** | 0.77 |
| No Children (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Labour Force Participation | | | | | | |
| Employed Full Time | -0.49 *** | 0.61 | 0.54 *** | 1.71 | 0.05 | 1.05 |
| Employed Part Time | -0.13 | 0.88 | 0.16 | 1.17 | 0.18 | 1.20 |
| Unemployed | -0.25 | 0.78 | 0.37 ** | 1.45 | -0.29 * | 0.74 |
| Not in Labour Force (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Variables | | | | | | |
| Length of Stay in Community | | | | | | |
| 2 Years or Less | -0.43 *** | 0.65 | -0.45 *** | 0.63 | -0.05 | 0.95 |
| 3 to 5 Years | -0.18 * | 0.84 | -0.12 | 0.88 | -0.23 *** | 0.79 |
| 6 or More Years (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Score | 0.20 *** | 1.22 | 0.32 *** | 1.37 | 0.21 *** | 1.24 |

Table 2A (Cont'd): Coefficients of Binary Logistic Regression of Volunteering, Giving, and Association Membership, Canadian Men Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP

Socio-Economic and Other Controls

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
| Respondent's Education | | | | | | |
| Some High School or lower | -0.75 *** | 0.47 | -0.87 *** | 0.42 | -0.54 *** | 0.58 |
| High School Graduate | -0.61 *** | 0.54 | -0.30 ** | 0.74 | -0.47 *** | 0.63 |
| Some College | -0.36 *** | 0.70 | -0.34 *** | 0.71 | -0.39 *** | 0.68 |
| College/University Graduate (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Immigration Status | | | | | | |
| Born in Canada | 0.59 *** | 1.81 | 0.61 *** | 1.85 | 0.54 *** | 1.71 |
| Born Outside Canada (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Household Income | | | | | | |
| Less than \$20000 | -0.56 *** | 0.57 | -1.11 *** | 0.33 | -0.93 *** | 0.39 |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | -0.48 *** | 0.62 | -0.45 *** | 0.64 | -0.59 *** | 0.56 |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | -0.23 *** | 0.80 | -0.40 *** | 0.67 | -0.23 *** | 0.80 |
| \$60,000 and over | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Region | | | | | | |
| Atlantic | 0.13 | 1.13 | 0.56 *** | 1.75 | -0.30 ** | 0.74 |
| Quebec | -0.03 | 0.97 | 0.09 | 1.10 | -0.71 *** | 0.49 |
| Ontario | -0.08 | 0.92 | 0.34 *** | 1.40 | -0.34 *** | 0.71 |
| Prairies | 0.61 *** | 1.84 | 0.67 *** | 1.95 | -0.07 | 0.93 |
| British Columbia (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Religious Attendance | | | | | | |
| At Least Once a Week | 0.63 *** | 1.88 | 0.98 *** | 2.67 | 0.90 *** | 2.45 |
| At Least Once a Month | 0.33 *** | 1.39 | 0.84 *** | 2.32 | 0.84 *** | 2.32 |
| Once or A Few Times a Year | -0.11 | 0.89 | 0.67 *** | 1.96 | 0.43 *** | 1.53 |
| Not at All | -0.41 *** | 0.67 | 0.27 | 1.31 | 0.26 *** | 1.30 |
| No Religion | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Health Status | | | | | | |
| Poor or Fair | -0.29 *** | 0.75 | 0.14 | 1.15 | -0.43 *** | 0.65 |
| Good | -0.19 *** | 0.82 | 0.10 | 1.10 | -0.14 ** | 0.87 |
| Very Good or Excellent (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| General Life Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| Dissatisfied | -0.38 ** | 0.68 | -0.20 | 0.82 | -0.32 ** | 0.73 |
| Somewhat Satisfied | -0.13 ** | 0.88 | -0.25 *** | 0.78 | -0.11 * | 0.89 |
| Very Satisfied (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Constant | -1.11 *** | 0.33 | 0.13 | 1.14 | -0.05 | 0.95 |
| Number of Weighted Cases | 6319 | | 6319 | | 6372 | |
| Nagelkerke R Squared | 18.7% | | 30.2% | | 20.7% | |

Levels of Significance: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

Table 2B: Coefficients of Binary Logistic Regression of Volunteering, Giving, and Association Membership, Canadian Women Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP

| | Volunteering | | Giving | | Membership | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|--------|
| | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) |
| Family-Related Variables | | | | | | |
| Age Groups | | | | | | |
| 15-34 | -0.32 ** | 0.73 | -1.05 *** | 0.35 | -0.67 *** | 0.51 |
| 35-54 | 0.08 | 1.08 | -0.35 *** | 0.70 | -0.33 *** | 0.72 |
| 55 and older (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Married or Common-Law | 0.05 | 1.05 | 0.70 *** | 2.01 | 0.18 * | 1.20 |
| Never Married | 0.24 * | 1.27 | 0.13 | 1.14 | -0.01 | 0.99 |
| Widowed | -0.28 * | 0.75 | 0.71 *** | 2.03 | 0.38 *** | 1.46 |
| Separated/Divorced (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Presence of Children in HH | | | | | | |
| With Child/Children < 18 Yrs. | 0.27 *** | 1.32 | 0.35 *** | 1.42 | -0.09 | 0.91 |
| No Children (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Labour Force Participation | | | | | | |
| Employed Full Time | -0.36 *** | 0.69 | 0.73 *** | 2.07 | 0.43 *** | 1.54 |
| Employed Part Time | 0.14 | 1.15 | 0.44 *** | 1.56 | 0.52 *** | 1.68 |
| Unemployed | 0.18 | 1.20 | -0.03 | 0.97 | 0.21 | 1.23 |
| Not in Labour Force (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Variables | | | | | | |
| Length of Stay in Community | | | | | | |
| 2 Years or Less | -0.32 *** | 0.73 | -0.36 *** | 0.70 | -0.29 *** | 0.75 |
| 3 to 5 Years | -0.15 | 0.86 | -0.39 *** | 0.67 | -0.34 *** | 0.72 |
| 6 or More Years (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Score | 0.21 *** | 1.24 | 0.34 *** | 1.40 | 0.23 *** | 1.25 |

Table 2B (Cont'd): Coefficients of Binary Logistic Regression of Volunteering, Giving, and Association Membership, Canadian Women Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP

Socio-Economic and Other Controls

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
| Respondent's Education | | | | | | |
| Some High School or lower | -0.55 *** | 0.58 | -0.15 | 0.86 | -0.94 *** | 0.39 |
| High School Graduate | -0.61 *** | 0.54 | 0.28 ** | 1.33 | -0.72 *** | 0.49 |
| Some College | -0.35 *** | 0.70 | 0.26 ** | 1.30 | -0.62 *** | 0.54 |
| College/University Graduate (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Immigration Status | | | | | | |
| Born in Canada | 0.34 *** | 1.41 | -0.07 | 0.93 | 0.05 | 1.05 |
| Born Outside Canada (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Household Income | | | | | | |
| Less than \$20000 | -0.56 *** | 0.57 | -1.14 *** | 0.32 | -0.60 *** | 0.55 |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | -0.34 *** | 0.71 | -0.59 *** | 0.55 | -0.33 *** | 0.72 |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | -0.23 *** | 0.79 | -0.41 *** | 0.66 | -0.04 | 0.96 |
| \$60,000 and over | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Region | | | | | | |
| Atlantic | -0.17 | 0.84 | -0.04 | 0.96 | -0.51 *** | 0.60 |
| Quebec | -0.61 *** | 0.54 | -0.43 *** | 0.65 | -0.67 *** | 0.51 |
| Ontario | -0.32 *** | 0.73 | -0.45 *** | 0.64 | -0.63 *** | 0.53 |
| Prairies | 0.22 ** | 1.25 | -0.18 | 0.84 | -0.18 * | 0.83 |
| British Columbia (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Religious Attendance | | | | | | |
| At Least Once a Week | 0.85 *** | 2.33 | 1.40 *** | 4.04 | 1.04 *** | 2.82 |
| At Least Once a Month | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.47 *** | 1.59 | 0.11 | 1.11 |
| Once or A Few Times a Year | 0.05 | 1.05 | 0.52 *** | 1.69 | 0.06 | 1.06 |
| Not at All | -0.26 ** | 0.77 | -0.10 | 0.90 | -0.21 ** | 0.81 |
| No Religion | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Health Status | | | | | | |
| Poor or Fair | -0.81 *** | 0.44 | 0.17 | 1.19 | -0.52 *** | 0.59 |
| Good | -0.23 *** | 0.80 | 0.30 *** | 1.36 | -0.34 *** | 0.71 |
| Very Good or Excellent (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| General Life Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| Dissatisfied | -0.21 | 0.81 | -0.23 * | 0.79 | 0.06 | 1.06 |
| Somewhat Satisfied | -0.18 *** | 0.83 | -0.36 *** | 0.69 | -0.13 ** | 0.87 |
| Very Satisfied (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Constant | -1.01 *** | 0.36 | 0.74 *** | 2.10 | 0.37 * | 1.45 |
| Number of Weighted Cases | 6618 | | 6618 | | 6605 | |
| Nagelkerke R Squared | 23.2% | | 30.9% | | 25.6% | |

Levels of Significance: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

Table 3: Percent Distribution of Participation Index By Family-Related Variables and Sex, and Mean Social Capital Score, 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating

| | Males | | | | | Females | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Total N | Score | | | | Total N | Score | | | |
| | | 0 % | 1 % | 2 % | 3 % | | 0 % | 1 % | 2 % | 3 % |
| Total | 6879 | 14.9 | 33.3 | 33.5 | 18.2 | 7139 | 12.6 | 35.4 | 32.3 | 19.7 |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-34 | 2477 | 18.4 | 36.3 | 30.9 | 14.5 | 2407 | 15.6 | 35.9 | 31.0 | 17.4 |
| 35-54 | 2750 | 11.3 | 31.1 | 35.8 | 21.8 | 2776 | 8.6 | 35.4 | 31.9 | 24.1 |
| 55-64 | 1652 | 15.6 | 32.8 | 33.7 | 18.0 | 1956 | 14.7 | 34.7 | 34.4 | 16.2 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | | | | |
| Married/Common-law | 4382 | 12.6 | 31.9 | 34.8 | 20.7 | 4292 | 8.9 | 35.0 | 34.2 | 21.8 |
| Never Married | 2062 | 19.6 | 36.1 | 31.2 | 13.1 | 1627 | 17.7 | 37.0 | 26.8 | 18.5 |
| Widowed | 143 | 16.1 | 35.7 | 36.4 | 11.9 | 589 | 16.6 | 34.8 | 36.7 | 11.9 |
| Separated/Divorced | 292 | 16.4 | 33.9 | 29.5 | 20.2 | 631 | 21.1 | 33.8 | 29.2 | 16.0 |
| Presence of Children | | | | | | | | | | |
| With Children < 18 | 2083 | 11.2 | 32.2 | 32.4 | 24.2 | 2120 | 9.3 | 34.3 | 31.8 | 24.5 |
| Without Children < 18 | 4794 | 16.5 | 33.9 | 34.0 | 15.6 | 5018 | 14.0 | 35.8 | 32.4 | 17.7 |
| Labour Force Status | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-Time Employed | 4230 | 12.9 | 32.3 | 35.2 | 19.7 | 2907 | 7.5 | 34.5 | 36.2 | 21.9 |
| Part-Time Employed | 599 | 10.9 | 38.6 | 34.1 | 16.5 | 1172 | 12.5 | 31.5 | 29.6 | 26.5 |
| Unemployed | 303 | 30.0 | 35.6 | 23.1 | 11.2 | 279 | 19.7 | 35.1 | 29.4 | 15.8 |
| Not in the Labour Force | 1747 | 18.5 | 33.7 | 31.3 | 16.6 | 2781 | 17.4 | 37.9 | 29.6 | 15.0 |
| Length of Stay | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Years or Less | 906 | 21.1 | 32.6 | 32.7 | 13.7 | 1002 | 16.3 | 37.0 | 31.3 | 15.4 |
| 3 to 5 Years | 837 | 14.7 | 36.4 | 31.3 | 17.6 | 866 | 15.2 | 36.7 | 28.3 | 19.7 |
| 6 or More Years | 5018 | 12.7 | 33.4 | 34.5 | 19.4 | 5152 | 11.2 | 34.7 | 33.1 | 20.9 |
| Social Capital Score | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean Social Capital Score | 3.9 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 5.6 |
| N | 6460 | 946 | 2160 | 2148 | 1206 | 6724 | 836 | 2370 | 2172 | 1346 |

**Table 4A: Coefficients of Multinomial Logistic Regression of Participation Index
Canadian Men Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP**

| | Score: 0 | | Score: 1 | | Score: 2 | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) |
| Family-Related Variables | | | | | | |
| Age Groups | | | | | | |
| 15-34 | 1.14 *** | 3.12 | 0.47 *** | 1.59 | 0.25 * | 1.28 |
| 35-54 | 0.43 ** | 1.53 | 0.09 | 1.09 | 0.16 | 1.17 |
| 55 and older (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Married or Common-Law | 0.29 | 1.33 | 0.16 | 1.17 | 0.22 | 1.24 |
| Never Married | 0.62 ** | 1.86 | 0.39 * | 1.48 | 0.32 | 1.37 |
| Widowed | 0.93 ** | 2.53 | 0.68 * | 1.97 | 0.98 *** | 2.67 |
| Separated/Divorced (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Presence of Children in HH | | | | | | |
| With Child/Children < 18 Yrs. | -0.05 | 0.95 | -0.18 | 0.83 | -0.53 *** | 0.59 |
| No Children (R) | | | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Labour Force Participation | | | | | | |
| Employed Full Time | -0.05 | 0.95 | 0.22 * | 1.24 | 0.27 ** | 1.31 |
| Employed Part Time | -0.35 | 0.70 | 0.27 | 1.31 | 0.19 | 1.21 |
| Unemployed | 0.12 | 1.13 | 0.19 | 1.21 | 0.12 | 1.13 |
| Not in Labour Force (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Variables | | | | | | |
| Length of Stay in Community | | | | | | |
| 2 Years or Less | 0.86 *** | 2.36 | 0.42 *** | 1.52 | 0.45 *** | 1.56 |
| 3 to 5 Years | 0.39 ** | 1.47 | 0.28 ** | 1.32 | 0.09 | 1.09 |
| 6 or More Years (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Index | -0.65 *** | 0.52 | -0.30 *** | 0.74 | -0.18 *** | 0.83 |

**Table 4A(Cont'd): Coefficients of Multinomial Logistic Regression of Participation Index
Canadian Men Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP**

Socio-Economic and Other Controls

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
| Respondent's Education | | | | | | |
| Some High School or lower | 1.60 *** | 4.93 | 1.25 *** | 3.48 | 0.75 *** | 2.11 |
| High School Graduate | 1.08 *** | 2.95 | 0.81 *** | 2.24 | 0.57 *** | 1.77 |
| Some College | 0.72 *** | 2.05 | 0.72 *** | 2.06 | 0.46 *** | 1.59 |
| College/University Graduate (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Immigration Status | | | | | | |
| Born in Canada | -1.46 *** | 0.23 | -1.06 *** | 0.35 | -0.67 *** | 0.51 |
| Born Outside Canada (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Household Income | | | | | | |
| Less than \$20000 | 2.04 *** | 7.65 | 0.53 *** | 1.70 | -0.04 | 0.96 |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | 1.22 *** | 3.39 | 0.73 *** | 2.07 | 0.22 * | 1.24 |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | 0.66 *** | 1.94 | 0.32 *** | 1.37 | 0.04 | 1.04 |
| \$60,000 and over | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Region | | | | | | |
| Atlantic | -0.64 *** | 0.53 | 0.16 | 1.17 | -0.34 ** | 0.71 |
| Quebec | 0.33 * | 1.39 | 0.61 *** | 1.84 | -0.06 | 0.94 |
| Ontario | -0.25 | 0.78 | 0.44 *** | 1.55 | -0.14 | 0.87 |
| Prairies | -1.05 *** | 0.35 | -0.51 *** | 0.60 | -0.63 | 0.53 |
| British Columbia (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Religious Attendance | | | | | | |
| At Least Once a Week | -2.27 *** | 0.10 | -1.04 *** | 0.35 | -0.52 *** | 0.59 |
| At Least Once a Month | -1.44 *** | 0.24 | -0.92 *** | 0.40 | -0.14 | 0.87 |
| Once or A Few Times a Year | -0.88 *** | 0.41 | -0.06 | 0.94 | 0.21 * | 1.24 |
| Not at All | -0.11 | 0.89 | 0.25 * | 1.29 | 0.41 *** | 1.51 |
| No Religion | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Health Status | | | | | | |
| Poor or Fair | 0.46 *** | 1.59 | 0.47 *** | 1.60 | 0.21 | 1.23 |
| Good | 0.05 | 1.05 | 0.36 *** | 1.44 | 0.15 | 1.16 |
| Very Good or Excellent (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| General Life Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| Dissatisfied | 0.60 ** | 1.83 | 0.60 *** | 1.83 | -0.06 | 0.94 |
| Somewhat Satisfied | 0.46 *** | 1.58 | 0.05 | 1.05 | -0.08 | 0.92 |
| Very Satisfied (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Constant | 1.12 *** | | 1.09 *** | | 1.31 *** | |
| Number of Weighted Cases | 6318 | | | | | |
| Nagelkerke R Squared | 34.5% | | | | | |

Levels of Significance: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

**Table 4B: Coefficients of Multinomial Logistic Regression of Participation Index
Canadian Women Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP**

| | Score: 0 | | Score: 1 | | Score: 2 | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) | B Coeff | Exp(B) |
| Family-Related Variables | | | | | | |
| Age Groups | | | | | | |
| 15-34 | 1.62 *** | 5.08 | 0.96 *** | 2.61 | 0.52 *** | 1.68 |
| 35-54 | 0.32 * | 1.38 | 0.35 *** | 1.42 | -0.03 | 0.97 |
| 55 and older (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Married or Common-Law | -0.79 *** | 0.45 | -0.17 | 0.84 | -0.05 | 0.95 |
| Never Married | -0.49 ** | 0.61 | -0.02 | 0.98 | 0.37 * | 1.44 |
| Widowed | -0.45 * | 0.64 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Separated/Divorced (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Presence of Children in HH | | | | | | |
| With Child/Children < 18 Yrs. | -0.41 *** | 0.67 | -0.28 *** | 0.75 | -0.35 *** | 0.70 |
| No Children (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Labour Force Participation | | | | | | |
| Employed Full Time | -0.69 *** | 0.50 | -0.08 | 0.93 | 0.16 | 1.17 |
| Employed Part Time | -0.89 *** | 0.41 | -0.62 *** | 0.54 | -0.33 *** | 0.72 |
| Unemployed | -0.17 | 0.84 | -0.26 | 0.77 | 0.04 | 1.04 |
| Not in Labour Force (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Variables | | | | | | |
| Length of Stay in Community | | | | | | |
| 2 Years or Less | 0.77 *** | 2.16 | 0.44 *** | 1.55 | 0.15 | 1.16 |
| 3 to 5 Years | 0.65 *** | 1.91 | 0.36 *** | 1.43 | -0.01 | 0.99 |
| 6 or More Years (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Social Capital Index | -0.65 *** | 0.52 | -0.33 *** | 0.72 | -0.18 *** | 0.84 |

**Table 4B(Cont'd): Coefficients of Multinomial Logistic Regression of Participation Index
Canadian Women Aged 15 and Older, 2000 NSGVP**

Socio-Economic and Other Controls

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
| Respondent's Education | | | | | | |
| Some High School or lower | 0.87 *** | 2.38 | 1.38 *** | 3.96 | 0.29 ** | 1.33 |
| High School Graduate | 0.54 *** | 1.71 | 1.31 *** | 3.71 | 0.55 *** | 1.74 |
| Some College | 0.27 | 1.31 | 0.93 *** | 2.54 | 0.23 ** | 1.26 |
| College/University Graduate (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Immigration Status | | | | | | |
| Born in Canada | -0.11 | 0.89 | -0.47 *** | 0.63 | -0.35 *** | 0.71 |
| Born Outside Canada (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Household Income | | | | | | |
| Less than \$20000 | 1.79 *** | 6.01 | 0.75 *** | 2.12 | 0.30 ** | 1.35 |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | 1.04 *** | 2.83 | 0.44 *** | 1.56 | 0.17 | 1.19 |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | 0.42 *** | 1.52 | 0.37 *** | 1.44 | 0.24 *** | 1.28 |
| \$60,000 and over | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Region | | | | | | |
| Atlantic | 0.84 *** | 2.31 | 0.40 ** | 1.49 | 0.27 * | 1.31 |
| Quebec | 1.57 *** | 4.79 | 1.17 *** | 3.21 | 0.74 *** | 2.09 |
| Ontario | 1.13 *** | 3.09 | 0.71 *** | 2.03 | 0.15 | 1.16 |
| Prairies | 0.36 * | 1.43 | -0.15 | 0.86 | -0.14 | 0.87 |
| British Columbia (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Religious Attendance | | | | | | |
| At Least Once a Week | -2.78 *** | 0.06 | -1.39 *** | 0.25 | -0.80 *** | 0.45 |
| At Least Once a Month | -0.54 *** | 0.58 | -0.06 | 0.94 | -0.14 | 0.87 |
| Once or A Few Times a Year | -0.54 *** | 0.58 | 0.13 | 1.14 | 0.15 | 1.16 |
| Not at All | 0.37 ** | 1.45 | 0.58 *** | 1.79 | 0.24 * | 1.28 |
| No Religion | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Health Status | | | | | | |
| Poor or Fair | 0.82 *** | 2.26 | 1.18 *** | 3.26 | 0.64 *** | 1.90 |
| Good | 0.05 | 1.05 | 0.51 *** | 1.66 | 0.14 | 1.15 |
| Very Good or Excellent (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| General Life Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| Dissatisfied | 0.45 ** | 1.56 | -0.11 | 0.89 | 0.04 | 1.04 |
| Somewhat Satisfied | 0.62 *** | 1.86 | 0.19 ** | 1.21 | 0.13 | 1.14 |
| Very Satisfied (R) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Constant | 0.21 | | 0.30 | | 1.14 *** | |
| Number of Weighted Cases | 6606 | | | | | |
| Nagelkerke R Squared | 38.7% | | | | | |

Levels of Significance: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%