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ABSTRACT

It is important to learn why workers choose to enter the nonprofit workforce over the public or private sectors. Doing so will allow nonprofit organizations to better target potential populations of candidates in their recruitment efforts, which will ensure that an adequate number of nonprofit professionals are being trained to fulfill future positions of nonprofit leadership. This dissertation will outline ways to understand the backgrounds of those who work in the nonprofit sector. The leadership deficit in nonprofit organizations is growing nearer. Over the next decade, a significant number of new nonprofit managers will be needed in the nonprofit sector to cover the retirement of the baby boomers, as well as the overall increase in number of nonprofits. Knowing key populations for recruitment will allow nonprofits to more effectively and efficiently address their impending staffing needs.

This research will utilize cross-sectional research approach to address what particular experiences nonprofit employees had prior to their entry into the sector that may have led to
their entry into the nonprofit workforce. Research participants are from the membership of a national nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting individuals new to careers in the nonprofit sector. Research questions include whether nonprofit careers tend to be the product of intentional choice, or a matter of “right place, right time”, and whether various levels of engagement in service learning, socialization to the sector, and volunteering activities contribute to eventual employment in the nonprofit sector by allowing that population to see the sector as one that provides a viable career in their field.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

It is important to learn what factors contribute to individuals’ selection to enter the nonprofit workforce instead of the governmental or for-profit sectors. Individuals interact with nonprofit organizations in a variety of ways throughout their lives. These interactions may lead to a heightened awareness of nonprofit work, and help promote awareness of careers in the nonprofit sector. This project is the first step in understanding how individuals learn about nonprofit careers. Knowing the impacts of early exposure to nonprofit organizations will allow researchers to later develop career decision-making theory specific to the nonprofit sector.

Size and Scope of the U.S. Nonprofit Sector

The nonprofit sector, using a broad definition, is comprised of incorporated private entities that are tax-exempt, self-governed, and are prohibited by law from distributing its profits to those who control the assets\(^1\) (Anheier, 2005; Frumkin, 2002; Hansmann, 1980). Nonprofits are organized for public purposes and as such, must re-invest their surplus toward mission fulfillment (Anheier, 2005; Boris & Steuerle, 2006; Frumkin, 2002). The non-distribution issue thus makes nonprofits distinct from for-profit entities. For-profit entities, although also incorporated and private, are able to distribute profits to shareholders or other entities that hold ownership of the corporation. Additionally, the owners or shareholders are those responsible for enforcing accountability.

\(^1\) This definition of the nonprofit sector is intentionally simplified, as entire dissertations could be devoted to this topic. The references listed provide a good, and in-depth, discussion of the sectoral differences, as well as the changing dynamics of and inter-connectedness between the three sectors.
The governmental sector is responsible for producing public goods, like police and prison services, and often provides grants and contracts to both for-profit and non-profit entities. Nonprofit organizations are distinct from government entities in that they cannot coerce participation via volunteering or charitable donations, although they should benefit from voluntary participation (Anheier, 2005; Frumkin, 2002). Additionally, accountability for governmental agencies is, in theory, enforced by the electorate. However, while self-governing, nonprofit organizations are also beholden to a multitude of stakeholders: donors, the community, service-recipients, the staff, and board members, to name a few. Although the government, for-profit and nonprofit sectors intertwine, they are shown to be distinct when it comes to workforce motivations and needs, as outlined below.

To the layperson, “nonprofit” can mean small budgets and all-volunteer-run organizations. However, nonprofit organizations can be any size, and can serve a multitude of purposes. Nonprofits can be large and complex hospitals and universities; they can also be small community gardens and neighborhood associations. The most common type of nonprofit is the public charity, or 501(3) organization, which serves the public, and relies on support primarily from the public or from government (Blackwood, Roeger & Pettijohn, 2012). The majority of reporting public charities\(^2\) (45.3 percent) are small in size, with under $100,000 in expenses; however, 29 percent have expenses between $100,000 and $499,999, and 19.2 percent of reporting public charities have between $500,000 and $4.99 million in expenses (Blackwood et al., 2012). Nonprofits can also serve a variety of mission types. Human service organizations comprise over one-third of reporting public charities, which can encompass activities like youth development, soup kitchens, and disaster relief (Blackwood

\(^2\) Reporting public charities has been defined as those registered with the IRS, and required to file US Form 990, Form 990-EZ, or Form 990-PF (Blackwood, Roeger & Pettijohn, 2012)
et al., 2012). Education-oriented nonprofits (18.24 percent), followed by health-oriented (12.05 percent) and public and societal benefit (11.98 percent) are the next three most common mission categories of reporting public charities (Blackwood et al., 2012).

The nonprofit sector is a large and important contributor to the American and global economy (Rose-Ackerman, 1996). Between 1998 and 2010, the United States has seen a 38 percent increase – from 1.16 million to 1.6 million – in the number of nonprofit organizations registered with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) (Blackwood et al., 2012; Wing, Roeger & Pollack, 2010). Further, those organizations considered public charities (those falling under section 501(c)(3) of the federal tax code) grew an impressive 64 percent during that time – from 597,236 to 979,901 in number (Blackwood et al., 2012; Wing et al., 2010). Salamon (2010) finds that the average growth of the nonprofit sector in America between 1997 and 2006 was 15 percent greater than growth of the total American economy.

In 2010, nonprofit organizations earned $2.06 trillion in revenues, $1.51 trillion of which was directed to public charities (Blackwood et al., 2012). In the same year, nonprofit organizations also held $4.49 trillion in assets, and had $1.94 trillion in expenses ($2.71 trillion and $1.45 trillion, respectively, for public charities) (Blackwood et al., 2012). With widely varying budget sizes, the bulk of these revenues and assets are held in larger organizations like health care organizations and institutions of higher education (Wing et al., 2010). However, nearly three-fourths of nonprofit organizations have budget sizes less than $500,000 (Blackwood et al., 2012; Wing et al., 2010). These numbers are consistent in other countries as well. Salamon (2010) looked at the nonprofit financial data of 40 countries, and found that globally, nonprofit organizations have $2.2 trillion in operating expenditures. This is equivalent to the seventh largest GDP in the world.
Size of the Nonprofit Workforce

The economic scope of nonprofit organizations can be outlined in several ways. Although financial data, like earned revenues and budget sizes, are an important indicator of the size of the nonprofit sector, data on human capital provide an additional insight into the size of the sector. In 2010, nearly 13.7 million people were employed in the nonprofit workforce, with a 17 percent increase in employment between 2000 and 2010, and were paid $587.7 billion in wages (Blackwood et al., 2012). Salamon’s 2010 study looked at the nonprofit workforces of 42 countries, and found that the paid nonprofit workforce is on average 5.6 percent of the working population, to include nearly 56 million full-time equivalent workers around the globe. In 2010, the nonprofit sector was the nation’s third-largest paid employer (Salamon, Sokolowski & Geller, 2012). This number is second only to retail trade and manufacturing (Salamon et al., 2012), and greater than the percentage of the workforce employed in construction, finance, utilities, and wholesale trade industries (Salamon & Sokolowski, 2006). When considering only real wages paid, America’s nonprofit sector would be the sixteenth largest economy in the world (World Bank, 2006). Recent data have indicated a growth in the percentage of Americans working in the nonprofit sector from 9.2 percent (Salamon, 2010) to 10.1 percent (Salamon et al., 2012) of the total workforce.

In terms of human capital and its economic impact, we can look not only to the paid staff, but also to the volunteer staff that contributes to the work of nonprofits. In 2011, over 64 million people, or 26.8 percent of the adult population, volunteered for a charity (Blackwood et al., 2012). This number had increased by approximately 1.5 million
individuals since 2010 alone. In 2011, volunteers gave approximately 15.2 billion hours of their time to helping nonprofit organizations, a number equivalent to the work of nearly 8.9 million full-time employees (Blackwood et al., 2012). The data from Salamon and Sokolowski’s 2006 study indicate that the nonprofit sector, when considering both paid and volunteer staff, has a GDP roughly equivalent to that of the entire country of Australia.

**Impact of the Current Economic Climate**

Although the nonprofit workforce is a considerable portion of the greater American workforce, it is important to consider the potential for a further increase in participation as a result of the significant amount of funding that is currently being filtered through the sector. Salamon and associates (2010) note that the nonprofit workforce tends to be counter-cyclical, in that nonprofits tend to add staff in times of economic recession. The 2009-2010 Listening Post Project Sounding indicated as much. Of the 423 responses received, 23 percent of organizations reported an increase in positions, and 46 percent reported no loss. Further, while nearly all industries are experiencing job losses, respondents to one survey indicate an overall gain of 0.4 percent in employment in the nonprofit sector (Salamon et al., 2010). A 2012 study utilizing the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics shows the nonprofit sector grew an average of 1.9 percent during the 2007-2009 recession, while for-profit entities had a negative growth of -3.7 percent (Salamon et al., 2012). Similarly, applications for AmeriCorps positions tripled between 2008 and 2010, and Teach for America applications increased 32 percent in 2010 (Rampell, 2011). Programs like these tend to provide participants with the equivalent of entry-level positions within the nonprofit workforce.
The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act has provided an increase in government contracts with nonprofits with its $787.2 billion spending plan. Large portions of that plan are directed toward communities and populations traditionally served by nonprofit organizations. Roughly $13 billion was allocated to housing and community development projects, $2.1 billion designated to Head Start and Early Head Start, $2.5 billion to health centers, and $87 billion to Medicaid (National Council of Nonprofits, 2009). These contracts allowed for additional staff to accommodate expanded programmatic offerings and the introduction of new programs.

The Serve America Act is also funding efforts to increase service and investment in nonprofit organizations. This influx of federal attention and funding will allow, if not force, nonprofit organizations to hire additional staff as they increase capacity. Grantees for the Social Innovation Fund have promised to increase service provision, create new programs, and venture into new communities with already-established program models. Much of this activity involves intermediary funding that creates new programs within sub-grantee organizations, which can result in the creation of new program-specific positions. However, a few of the grantees’ funded projects specifically drive workers, typically those who have significant barriers to employment, into the nonprofit workforce through job-creation programs. Consequently, the sector is becoming a larger source of employment for job-seekers of all education levels, ages, and career tracks.

3 A listing of 2010 SIF grantees and corresponding projects can be found here: http://www.nationalservice.gov/about/serveamerica/innovation_grantees_2010.asp
Changes in Workforce Demographics

Approximately 80 million Americans belong to the Baby Boom generation, those born between 1946 and 1964\(^4\). This group is the largest generation in the history of the United States, and with the youngest members of that generation hovering around the age of 50 in 2010, a wave of retirements is upon us – what some are calling the “silver tsunami” because of its impact on all facets of the economy. The Annie E. Casey Foundation funded a 2004 study that found that nearly 73 percent of current nonprofit leaders belong to the Boomer generation, with 55 percent over the age of fifty. Respondents to their survey noted that the generation will transition out of the sector in two waves – one that will end in 2010 (although the survey respondents could not have been aware of the impending economic crisis), and another peaking in 2020 as the last half of the generation reaches traditional retirement age (Hull Teegarden, 2004).

Even if the economic impact slows the retirement of the Baby Boomers, they will still leave their nonprofit positions at some point. This exodus, fast or slow, will leave thousands of positions at all organizational levels unfilled. As such, nonprofit organizations will need to recruit staff to compensate for the workforce shortage.

Implications of Sector Growth on the Workforce

The growth of the nonprofit sector, combined with the impending retirement of the Boomer generation, will create a need for better (and more deliberate) nonprofit recruiting strategies. Significant workforce shortages will occur in the nonprofit sector, and staff will be needed in the nonprofit sector to cover the retirement of the Baby Boomers, the increase in

\(^4\) Demographic data provided by the US Census, and can be found at: http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/age/2006%20Baby%20Boomers.pdf
capacity due to the recent pieces of federal legislation, as well as the overall increase in the number of nonprofits that occurs each year (Casner-Lotto, 2007; Kunreuther & Corvington, 2007; Tierney, 2006).

Although the shortages Tierney (2006) and his colleagues (Kunreuther & Corvington, 2007) discuss reflect the impacts on executive-level staff, and not those occurring at the entry-level, it is not unreasonable to assume at least a portion of the managers will be promoted either internally or from other nonprofit organizations, creating a chain of vacancies. Internal promotions would create an upward cascade, opening positions at the entry-level. This is the case when positions are filled internally or externally, as the chain of vacancies is created in another organization by the employee leaving his or her position (White, 1970). Further, it is remiss to assume that older employees work only in the executive function. The need for qualified staff will be felt in all organizations, at all levels.

As such, it becomes important to learn what factors contribute to individuals’ selection to enter the nonprofit workforce instead of the governmental or for-profit sectors. Doing so will allow nonprofit organizations to better target potential populations of individuals in their recruitment efforts, which will ensure that an adequate number of nonprofit professionals are being hired and trained to fulfill future positions of nonprofit leadership.

**Contribution of this Research**

**Scholarship.**

The implications of this research will be to fill a significant gap in the nonprofit management literature. To date, the topic of nonprofit career awareness has not been
empirically explored. Although the nonprofit management literature has seen an increase in scope and quantity of topics studied, the nonprofit workforce itself is still seldom a topic of empirical inquiry. Relevant literature on the nonprofit workforce has covered the leadership deficit only through research conducted by foundations like CompassPoint Nonprofit Services, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, nonprofit infrastructure organizations like Young Nonprofit Professionals Network and the Bridgespan Group, and through anecdotal articles in the popular press like the Chronicle of Philanthropy. No research has applied career theory to careers in the nonprofit sector. As such, empirical exploration is a necessary next step in evaluating this topic, and it is an urgent next step, as the nonprofit sector continues to grow and recruit members of its workforce.

This research will define important predictors of nonprofit sector career awareness, and build on theory surrounding career decision-making. This research will apply both psychological and sociological theoretical frameworks of career choice to careers in the nonprofit sector, specifically. This question sits at the nexus of two theoretical perspectives, and will build each in a new direction with their application to the nonprofit workforce. This will allow scholars to determine whether the work on career choice done in other fields is also applicable in the nonprofit literature. Doing so will not only add to the literature of career decision-making in other fields, it will also contribute to a greater understanding of antecedents to careers in the nonprofit sector specifically, as well as the perhaps unintentional nature of nonprofit career selection.

It is important to note that the idea of public service motivation has been explored, but only as it pertains to public sector workforce motivations (see James Perry’s research portfolio). Perry and his colleagues’ research findings will be outlined in later chapters. In
addition, this project will utilize questions from his standardized survey instrument, potentially demonstrating its applicability to nonprofit sector employees. This project will not only fill a gap in literature specific to nonprofit organizations, but also provide a complement to the work done on the public sector workforce. This research also has implications for those studying student outcomes of higher education, as will add to the literature of the impacts of service-learning participation in college students.

**Field of Practice.**

Because nonprofit management is an applied discipline, it is important to note the practical application of this research in the field. This study will hopefully provide nonprofit organizations, career counselors, and others with information to help better target recruiting efforts. With the impending workforce shortage, nonprofits will need to be more deliberate in their recruitment efforts, using what resources they do have as effectively as possible. This research will help nonprofit organizations in that capacity by outlining the potential key populations to target for job recruitment, based on impacts of earlier interactions with nonprofit organizations.

This research can also impact the academic field in a practical manner, as nonprofit academic programs are dependent on the successful identification and recruitment of students with an interest in nonprofit leadership and management. This research will help identify key populations to target in student recruitment, either at the undergraduate or graduate level. Stated simply, if we are to have a well-prepared and motivated nonprofit workforce, academic institutions should recruit individuals and have an instrumental role in ensuring that future employees are properly prepared for careers in the nonprofit sector.
Research Questions

This research will address the paths individuals follow prior to entry in the nonprofit workforce. Knowing how people view and interact with the nonprofit sector early in life will help in recruiting not only those familiar with the sector, but also those who may be interested, yet unaware of, paid employment in the nonprofit sector.

Questions to be addressed include how individuals initially learn about the nonprofit sector as a place of employment, and whether there is a significant difference between younger and more seasoned sector employees in nonprofit career awareness. The researcher posits that there will be a difference between those who belong to the Millennial generation and those who belong to older generations in how they became familiar with the nonprofit sector as a potential career option. Further, the researcher suggests that various levels of engagement in service-learning, socialization to the sector, and volunteering allow current employees in the sector to see nonprofit organizations as a viable career option. The result of investigating these questions will also suggest whether there are more or less effective means of recruiting future generations of nonprofit sector employees.

Service-learning is thought to be a predictor of nonprofit sector employment because of the interactions between student and nonprofit, as well as the curricular element of reflection, which allows students to digest their experiences and make meaning of their interactions with the organization. Rather than conducting a simple service project at a nonprofit agency, service-learning projects, when conducted correctly, provide the student with an opportunity to see his or her career interest at play in a nonprofit organization. For example, accounting students may work on financial statements for a nonprofit, and see that those organizations can offer work as a staff accountant or, in larger organizations, perhaps a
Chief Financial Officer. Architecture students may work with Habitat for Humanity in designing a home, and see how their skills and professional interests may be utilized in a not-for-profit setting.

Volunteering in a nonprofit organization can also provide meaningful exposure to the nonprofit sector. When volunteers are given meaningful assignments, or assignments that are seen as relevant to that individual’s career interests, he or she may see the nonprofit sector as offering viable career options. As such, volunteerism is considered a potential predictor of employment in a nonprofit organization.

Socialization is another component of career choice that will be tested in this project. Individuals are exposed to the nonprofit sector through the interactions of parents, mentors, and role models. Does having a parent or role model who works in the nonprofit sector, sits on a nonprofit board, or volunteers regularly contribute in part to how an individual views the sector in terms of career possibilities? This, and other variables, will be discussed in later chapters.

**Approach**

This study will utilize a cross-sectional survey research design. The cross-sectional survey participants will be current employees of nonprofit organizations, or individuals seeking employment in the nonprofit sector. The researcher plans to survey a sample of current members of Young Nonprofit Professionals Network (YNPN), a national membership organization of over 30,000 members, and chapters in 37 cities around the country. The membership of YNPN tends to range in age from 20-40, encompassing both the Millennial generation and Generation X. This age range will allow for a comparison of two
groups – those who have been in the nonprofit sector for several years (which can include individuals between the ages of 30-40), and those who are new or relatively new to the nonprofit workforce (both those under the age of 30, and those who have switched careers).

Employees will be asked questions regarding past volunteer experience, past service-learning experience, past socialization to the nonprofit sector, and general questions about perceptions of employment in the nonprofit sector, volunteerism, and philanthropy. The researcher utilized questions and constructs from previously validated instruments to create the survey. These instruments included the Perry (1997) instrument measuring public service motivation, Clary and Snyder’s (1999) Volunteer Functions Inventory, Fenzel and Peyrot’s (2005) and Payne’s (2000) measures of service-learning course quality, and Bright, Pryor, Wilkenfield and Earl’s (2005) measure of unplanned events impacting career choice. A full discussion of these instruments is presented in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Nonprofit Career Awareness

With a looming employment shortage, scholars of nonprofit studies have begun to take notice of entry and employment into the nonprofit workforce. Previous research, as outlined below, has shown several mechanisms and patterns that serve as an introduction to the nonprofit sector for individuals, to include volunteerism, service-learning, and factors like socialization and role modeling. Each of these elements has the ability to impact awareness of careers in the nonprofit sector, and perhaps professional entry into the sector, as well. This research connects those mechanisms through the overarching framework of Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making, which outlines various means by which individuals select careers. Specifically, this review of literature looks at nonprofit career awareness through key means of socialization to the nonprofit sector: parental and role model socialization to voluntary and philanthropic behavior, and continued engagement through both through volunteering and service-learning. Figure 1 shows the interconnectedness of those various elements that might lead to awareness of nonprofit careers, as viewed through the overarching theory of Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making (SLTCDM).
Although these lines of inquiry are independently developed, no researcher has analyzed the interconnectedness and effects of these experiences on nonprofit career awareness or career decision-making, nor have they evaluated the impacts of these experiences on the eventual choice of a nonprofit sector career as a primary research focus. Additionally, literature about career decision-making has not focused on the nonprofit sector specifically. Thus, there is a lack of scholarship that identifies the impact of early-life experiences on career awareness, or knowledge of paid employment opportunities, in the nonprofit sector.

This review of literature intends to first provide a demographic depiction of the “typical” nonprofit employee, with an emphasis on education, volunteer activity, service-learning, and social factors. This portion of the literature review will explore the types of
people who seek employment in the nonprofit sector, as well as their rationale for choosing a job in the nonprofit sector over a job in the private or public sector. Next, the researcher will discuss the theoretical foundations of career choice through both sociological and psychological frameworks, using social cognitive career theory and the social learning theory of career decision-making. Then, the researcher will identify traits and characteristics of volunteers, as well as service-learning participants. Finally, commonalities among the nonprofit workforce, volunteers, and service-learning participants will be identified and tied into the socialization aspects of career choice.

About the Nonprofit Workforce

Demographics

Several researchers have found a majority of those employed in the nonprofit sector, or who demonstrate public service motivation, to be female (Benz, 2005; Hansen, Huggins & Ban, 2003; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Lewis, 2010; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Onyx & Maclean, 1996; Preston, 1989; Ruhm & Borkoski, 2003; Word & Park, 2009). Hansen et al. (2003) attribute this to the self-selection into professions that are traditionally considered “caring” professions, which are generally in the nonprofit field (p. 13). Additionally, a large proportion of those employed in the nonprofit sector are either Caucasian or African American (Hansen et al., 2003; Leete, 2006; Ruhm & Borkoski, 2003; Hull Teegarden, 2004). Not surprisingly, most executives working in the nonprofit sector are over the age of 40 (Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Hull Teegarden, 2004).
Nonprofit sector employees also have a relatively high level of education. A high percentage of employees within the nonprofit sector possess a post-graduate degree (Hansen et al., 2003; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; McGinnis, 2010; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Ruhm & Borkoski, 2003; Hull Teegarden, 2004), and researchers discovered that the most typical graduate programs are in public administration, nonprofit management, psychology, and social work, and that the most typical graduate degrees are MPA, MA, Ph.D., and Ed.D.

Volunteering

When assessing voluntarism among private, public, and nonprofit workers, Rotolo and Wilson (2006) find that those working in nonprofit organizations contribute the most volunteer hours in a one-year period. Additionally, when measuring volunteer habits across various classifications within the nonprofit sector, nonprofit employees tend to volunteer the most in religious organizations (97.12 percent), followed by cultural and arts organizations (57.21 percent) and social and community organizations (56.55 percent) (Rotolo & Wilson, 2006). Perhaps the significant majority of volunteer time is congruent with the general notion that third sector employees are more idealistic and altruistic than their for-profit counterparts, striving to create a better world for others. Another study found that while 36 and 20 percent of government and for-profit employees, respectively, volunteered in the 12 months prior to the survey, half of the nonprofit employees surveyed had volunteered (Wuthnow, 1994). This finding is consistent with other research on nonprofit workers (Hansen et al., 2003; Lee, 2012; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Light, 2002; Park & Word, 2009; Word & Carpenter, 2010).
Leadership

Mirvis and Hackett (1983) indicate nonprofit organizations have a strong need for leadership ability in the workplace. Their study found workers to have more influence and autonomy than their government and for-profit counterparts. Many nonprofit organizations have smaller staffs, and perhaps flatter organizations leading to greater responsibility. There is a fit between the experiences nonprofit organizations offer their staff, and what those employees are looking for in their day-to-day work, as nonprofit workers prefer positions with higher levels of responsibility and more variety in their daily tasks (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Onyx & Maclean, 1996; Rawls, Ullrich & Nelson, 1975). As a result, nonprofit workers find their positions challenging and rewarding. Professionals entering or reentering the sector score high on items related to responsibility, flexibility, and helpfulness, and tend to embrace change both in their organizations, and in their community (Rawls et al., 1975).

Public Service Motivation

Perry and Wise (1990), as well as Perry (1996; 2000) have devised a theoretical model for public service motivation, or “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry, 1996, p. 6). Perry (1996) argues that rational choice theories aren’t entirely adequate in explaining much of the behavior we see, and includes room for both normative and affective motives as well. This theory utilizes three motives to identify four dimensions that define motivation for public sector careers: a personal interest in public policy, a sense of compassion, a commitment to civic duty or public interest, and a sense of self-sacrifice. These four
dimensions define a model or process of Public Sector Motivation (PSM), that include the impacts of socialization, individual motivations (including the impact of institutions), and individual characteristics, on the final behavior (Perry, 2000). Perry’s (1997) additional work on uncovering the antecedents of public service motivation found parental involvement and socialization experiences as key to predicting public service motivation.

In its various iterations (Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry, 1996; Perry 2000), the PSM model was intended for use specifically in the public sector, and scholars have noted that although the motivations for entry into their respective sectors is similar, nonprofit and public sector motivations are not identical (Lee, 2009; Lyons, Duxbury & Higgins, 2006; Park & Word, 2009). Park and Word (2009) contend that the basis for the differentiation between PSM and nonprofit sector work motivation lies within the introduction of New Public Management, its lessened emphasis on direct service provision, and increasing reliance on contracting out (frequently to the nonprofit sector). Public service looks different than it did when PSM was first conceptualized. As such, scholars have subsequently evaluated the idea of NonProfit Sector Motivation (NPSM), and found significant differences between government and nonprofit employees. Specifically researchers have indicated the primary differences between nonprofit sector employees and their public sector peers is in the value nonprofit workers place on work that makes a contribution to society (Light, 2002; Lyons et al., 2006), and also on the value placed on job security, salary, and advancement opportunities (Park & Word, 2009; Word & Carpenter, 2010; Word & Park, 2009).
Nonprofit Sector Motivation

Mirvis and Hackett suggest the role of a job “serves as a selector and socializer, attracting particular segments of the work force and motivating and satisfying them with particular rewards” (1983, p. 3). So why do certain workers choose to join the nonprofit sector? Nonprofit employees do not place a high value on economic wealth (Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Rawls, et al., 1975). Instead, nonprofit employees have a distinct set of motivations that encourage them to choose employment in that particular sector over others. Several scholars note that nonprofit managers are more motivated by ideology than by profit (Drucker, 1990; Flanigan, 2010; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jeavons, 1992; Light, 2002; Mize Smith, Arendt, Bezek Lahman, Settle, & Duff, 2006; Rose-Ackerman, 1996; Word & Carpenter, 2010). Hansen, et al., (2003) found that respondents to their study were most motivated by the prospect of an interesting or challenging job, followed closely by a chance to help others.

Mirvis and Hackett (1983) compare nonprofit, for-profit, and public sector employee responses to a survey of workforce characteristics. Their results show that on the whole, nonprofit employees seek to fulfill intrinsic needs, rather than monetary needs when searching for jobs. Nonprofit employees enter the workforce because of their commitment to service, and because of the opportunity it gives them to give back to the community. Nonprofit employees indicated a sense of “meaningfulness” from their positions in organizations (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Mirvis, 1992; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Onyx & Maclean, 1996; Preston, 1990). Similarly, in a recent study by the Brookings Institution, nonprofit workers were more likely to feel able to accomplish something worthwhile in their job (Light, 2003).
Researchers have found many nonprofit employees are in their first job out of school (18.4 percent), or have transitioned from one nonprofit to another (12.1 percent), demonstrating a consistency within the field, and a relatively high retention rate (Hansen et al., 2003; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983). When looking for a new job, nonprofit employees were more likely to search for and select a job within the sector than they were in the private or public sector. A 2004 study by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and TransitionGuides shows that 73 percent of nonprofit executives have been in the sector for at least 10 years, most reporting that they had been employed in the sector for over 25 years (Hull Teegarden, 2004). These data show a consistent pattern of behavior – those employed in the nonprofit sector are there for quite a bit of time. When combined with the specific motivations of nonprofit sector employees, there seems to be a pattern of “fit” in the field of nonprofit careers. Employees’ motivational needs are fulfilled in nonprofit work, and so they tend to be retained longer in the nonprofit workforce.

The Theoretical Lens: Career Paths Defined

Social Learning Theory of Career Decision-Making

Several psychological theories point to the importance of socialization on eventual career selection. Albert Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, which asserts that individual action is explained by the interaction of personal and environmental determinants, has been translated into a Social Learning Theory of Career Decision-Making (SLTCDM). Krumboltz, Mitchell and Jones (1976), as well as Mitchell, Jones and Krumboltz (1979) propose that four particular categories of factors influence an individual’s job decision: genetic endowment
and special abilities, environmental conditions and events, learning experiences, and task approach skills. Their framework has been tested and expanded upon by several scholars.

The first category, genetic endowment, may limit an individual’s occupational aspirations and choices for a variety of reasons (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Betz, 1986; Datti, 2009; Krumboltz et al., 1976). The term “genetic endowment” describes qualities like gender, age or generation, and race or ethnicity. People are inclined or disinclined to enter particular career fields because of attractive options available to them. Women, for example, might be more likely to seek or obtain employment in the “caring” professions because they feel more capable in that work (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Betz, 1986). In contrast, a female high school student might be interested in automotive technology, but not be encouraged to learn more about that line of work or accepted in that classroom environment by other students or teachers, and not pursue further coursework due to the socialized perception of barriers to entry and/or the negative experiences in the classroom. When discussing the issues of age or generation through this lens, we see that someone from the Silent Generation would have been unlikely to seek a career as a web developer when they were younger, nor would someone from the Millennial Generation seek a career as a switchboard operator, simply because those jobs didn’t exist when they were entering the workforce.

The second component in SLTCDM speaks to the influence of environmental conditions. Germane to this piece of research is the idea that family, the educational system, and community are significant influencers of career choice, which has been supported not only by SLTCDM scholars, but others from various fields as well (Biggerstaff, 2000; Bright et al., 2005; Brown & Mann, 1991; Krumboltz et al., 1976; Niles & Harris-Bowlsbey, 2002; Palladino Schultheiss, Palma & Manzi, 2005; Scherer, Brodzinski, & Wiebe, 1991). A
family’s values communicate a certain set of preferences to a child. Heavy parental engagement in the local community should communicate a desire to help others and participate in the betterment of society. Biggerstaff (2000) found those entering the field of social work did so, in part, because of personal and family experiences. In addition, her participants indicated that those exposed to the social work profession early in life expressed values closely aligned with a career in the field.

Community, both in terms of geography and in terms of ethos, has an important role in one’s environment as well. Community is an important factor in not only showing a young person the careers available to him or her, but also in accounting for the important impact role models outside the family can have in decision-making (Aronson, 1999; Erikson, 1968; Hackett et al., 1989; Kelman, 1961). If a youngster is raised in a community that has an active culture of service, that individual is more likely to have been afforded experiences with nonprofit organizations. Similarly, if a city has very few active nonprofit organizations, there is less opportunity to volunteer and engage with the nonprofit sector. An educational system that incorporates service-learning, required service hours, and the like, can also instill the value of civic engagement in students.

The third component of the SLTCDM model is learning experiences, both through instrumental learning and associative learning (Krumboltz et al., 1976). Instrumental learning experiences echo operant conditioning principles: an individual acts within his or her environment to produce a positive response. Associative learning gives credence to the idea that external sources will lead to positive or negative attitudes about occupations (Palladino Schultheiss et al., 2005). For example, if a parent is employed or regularly volunteers in the nonprofit sector and talks about the impact his or her work is having in the community, the
child will associate work in the nonprofit sector with positive imagery. The converse can be true: complaints about the work, or a distrust of the nonprofit sector, can yield negative associations (Taylor et al., 2004).

The final component of the model is a composite of the first three components, self-efficacy – as an individual processes these learning experiences they are able to make generalizations about how they perform at tasks in comparison to others (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Niles & Harris-Bowlsbey, 2002). Individuals form predictions about the future work based on self-observation and the world around them, and then acquire skills or engage in activities that lead toward career entry. The model of self-efficacy suggests that individuals will select careers that match what they believe to be areas of personal achievement, reflective of their personal values and experiences (Krumboltz et al., 1976).

**The role of happenstance.**

As the SLTCDM theory progressed and evolved, several researchers noted the importance of chance in life’s changes. Researchers have utilized various terms to capture this concept: happenstance (Bandura, 1982; Hirschi, 2010; Krumboltz, 2009; Krumboltz & Levin, 2010; Miller, 1983), chance (Bright, Pryor & Harpham, 2005a; Bright, Pryor, Wilkenfeld & Earl, 2005b; Roe & Baruch, 1967), serendipity (Betsworth & Hanson, 1996; Hodkinson & Sparkes, 1997; Krumboltz, 1998), and synchronicity (Guindon & Hanna, 2002), to name a few. All refer to the basic idea that there are “unplanned, accidental, or otherwise situational, unpredictable, or unintentional events or encounters that have an impact on career development and behavior” (Rojewski, 1999, p. 269). Krumboltz (2009) and Krumboltz and Levin (2010), in their research on the Happenstance Learning Theory, offer the following as influences on career decisions, which echo those of SLTCDM: genetic
influences, learning experiences, instrumental learning experiences (or learning the consequences of actions), associative learning experiences (or learning the consequences of actions from observing others), and environmental conditions. While these elements have distinct roots in SLTCDM, the learning experiences, in particular, nod to the idea that chance certainly impacts our perceptions.

Several researchers have discovered chance events or environmental factors as having an impact on eventual career decisions (Betsworth & Hanson, 1996; Bright et al., 2005a; Bright et al., 2005b; Roe & Baruch, 1967). Bright, Pryor and Harpham (2005), suggest that people view their career choices as less intentional or rational, and are more a product of external factors. Rather than acting in a manner that produces a specific career goal, people tend to treat their career path as a product of external forces. Individuals with an external locus of control, or those who believe that external and uncontrollable factors influence their life, tend to credit chance events for their career decisions (Bright et al., 2005a; Hirschi, 2010). In essence, the propositions of SLTCDM include an inherent assumption that people are subject to unpredictable environmental events that shape not only our opportunities, but the way we perceive and react to situations (Mitchell et al., 1979).

**Theoretical propositions of SLTCDM.**

Krumboltz, Mitchell and Jones (1976) use this theoretical model to assert that individuals are more likely to take an interest in a particular occupation if he or she has observed a role model gaining positive feedback from engaging in that occupation. Further, an individual will be more likely to take an interest in an occupation or field of study if a role model provides positive feedback to the individual for their work in that area, or is exposed to positive imagery associated with that occupation. However, the converse can be true as
well. If an individual associates negative experiences and imagery with a particular field or occupation, they are less likely to pursue that career option. Finally, Krumboltz suggests that those with experience or exposure to a particular field prior to entry in the workforce are more likely to enter that particular field, and those with particular educational experience will enter an occupation that matches their learned skills.

Happenstance or chance has also been empirically tested as a piece of the SLTCDM. Krumboltz writes that human behavior is the result of learning experiences that are created in both planned and unplanned situations (2009, p. 135) Unplanned events like barriers to prior career plans, personal relationships, prior work or social experiences, or unintended exposure to a type of work that was appealing have an impact on career choice (Bright et al., 2005a). Further, as an individual’s locus of control becomes more external – or as a person feels less in control of events that affect them – the impact of chance events on decisions increases (Bright et al., 2005a).

Social Cognitive Career Theory

Several psychological theories point to the importance of socialization on eventual career selection. Lent (2005) asserts that social cognitive career theory (SCCT) is an attempt at integrating pieces of several career theories to form a holistic picture of career decision making. Rooted in Bandura’s (1986) general social cognitive theory, SCCT acknowledges the importance of social learning experiences, genetics, the environment in which an individual lives. SCCT is unique in that it is one of the first theories to utilize a constructivist approach, and incorporate personal agency into career choice (Lent, 2005; Lent & Brown, 1996, 2002; Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994, 1996, 2002; Lent & Hackett, 1994).
Lent, Brown and Hackett (1996) note that there are several factors that can impact the type and number of career choices available to an individual. In consensus with scholars of the social learning theory of career decision-making, these factors range from genetic (disability and health status) to environmental (culture, gender, and socioeconomic/socio-structural) in nature. However, this theory differs from SLTCDM in that it asserts that an individual’s environment and genetics interact with learning experiences and social cognitive variables (beliefs of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals) to drive behavior and career choice (Lent, 2005). Stated differently, if a person believes that they are particularly adept at a given activity, they will continue to do that activity because they are successful at it, and because of other rewards they receive from that activity. Also, that person will set goals to do what they feel adept to do, directing their behavior and choices. These three social cognitive variables (self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals) lead to an individual’s self-regulation and choice of behavior through interests, career choice, and eventual career performance (Lent & Hackett, 1994; Lent, 2005).

In order to gain an interest in a particular activity, an individual needs to not only find value in doing an activity, but also believe that they are successful at that particular activity (Lent & Brown, 1996). Social constructs like gender and ethnicity can impact the range of opportunities available to an individual, and/or how adept they feel at a particular activity (Betz & Hackett, 1981). Returning to the example posed earlier in this chapter, a female high school student might be interested in automotive technology, but not be accepted in that classroom environment by other students or teachers. As a result, her opportunities and efforts to learn more about that area of interest, and to eventually seek that particular career path, may be truncated (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, career interests tend to stabilize over
time. While a younger child might offer a different career goal each week, as that individual progresses toward adulthood, their idea of realistic and appealing choices becomes more defined and congruent with interests, capabilities, and values (Hansen, 2005; Lent, 2005).

The eventual choice of a career, according to the SCCT model, is a product of interests orienting people toward activities that support them (Lent et al., 1996). Self-efficacy and outcome expectations determine interests, which lead to goals, which then lead to actions that support those goals (Lent, 2005). Those activities also impact future career choices, as an individual can learn from unsuccessful activities and revise their self-efficacy in that area (Lent, 2005). However, the environment an individual lives within can either support or not support an individual’s development toward that career. There are a variety of factors that can influence development, like the opportunity for skill development in an area, role models in that field, culture, gender, and also more tangible factors like the availability of a job in that career area. Further, career choices won’t always reflect interests, as the position in a field of interest may not be viable socially or financially, or available at the time of a search (Betz, 1989; Lent, 2005).

**Theoretical propositions of SCCT.**

SCCT posits that self-efficacy and outcome expectations work together to predict an individual’s eventual occupational interests. Further, the relationship between ability and interest is mediated through self-efficacy (Lent et al., 1994). If an individual has ability in a particular field, and has felt successful at tasks related to that field, they will likely form an interest in doing things related to that career area. Interests, skills, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations are predictors of career choice (Lent, 2005; Lent et al., 1994). People set a goal to enter a specific field, take actions to implement that goal through training or education,
and then make future choices based on their experiences and whether or not they felt successful. As such, career choice becomes the result of a succession of choices and set goals.

**Comparison and Selection of Theoretical Model**

Both Social Learning Theory of Career Decision-Making (SLTCDM) and Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) have meaningful application and testability within the career choice research arena. SCCT and SLTCDM both have roots in social learning theory, with a firm acknowledgement of the importance of culture and environment in the development of career choice. Where the two theories deviate is in their basis on behaviorist (SLTCDM) and constructivist (SCCT) approaches. As indicated earlier, SLTCDM credits the environment in which a person is raised, which SCCT readily acknowledges. However, SCCT adds the importance of personal agency – intentional choices – to its framework, which helps lead an individual to their eventual career.

SCCT has developed farther than SLTCDM within the career development literature, as that field has tended toward constructivist approaches to career and away from those models that are rooted in the behaviorist approach. The behavioral approach focuses on the impacts of an individual’s environment. People are shaped by their experiences and individuals around them, and do not necessarily make intentional choices based on rational information. In the constructivist model, the individual makes choices to obtain certain results. For example, someone learns she enjoys science at an early age, continues to take science classes through high school, and then chooses to attend medical school because she wants to become a physician. Each decision is made with a specific self-directed goal in
mind. The individual believes she can control events within her world by pursuing a particular course of action.

The behaviorist approach, by contrast, indicates that people react to learned behaviors, and have less of a sense of personal agency in their career path. In the case of SLTCDM, the individual is shaped by experiences, but is less intentional about pursuing particular career options. For example, genetic endowment, one of the first components of SLTCDM, indicates that people tend to enter particular careers because their genetic makeup provides them with exposure to one set of career opportunities instead of another (Krumboltz et al., 1976). Learning experiences allow an individual to view parents or role models in a career that they like or dislike, and then the individual responds to that experience by either forming or not forming an interest in that particular career. In addition, the scholarship of SLTCDM has progressed to acknowledge the importance of chance events in one’s career choice through the Happenstance Learning Theory. This element of chance also removes an element of personal agency from the individual’s decision to pursue a particular career, as careers are less an intentional choice, and more a product of external factors shaping the array of options available to the career-seeker (Bright et al., 2005a; Hirschi, 2010; Krumboltz 2009; Krumboltz and Levin, 2010).

Although this researcher appreciates the development of the constructivist (SCCT) line of inquiry, this research project will focus on the behavioral approach, utilizing social learning theory of career decision-making. The study of the nonprofit career, as well as the “professionalization” of the nonprofit sector is relatively young. We know anecdotally that many individuals working in the nonprofit sector did not intentionally seek careers in the nonprofit sector – people rarely hear the phrase, “I want to be a program officer when I grow
up”, largely because career opportunities in the nonprofit sector are yet unknown. As such, it is argued that the issue of human agency might not be present among this particular population. Careers in the nonprofit sector, at this point, seem less an intentional decision, and more a chance occurrence, suggesting SLTCDM and its segue into Happenstance Learning Theory would be a more appropriate theoretical framework to examine employee entry into the nonprofit sector.

This theoretical framework will provide a way in which to view how people familiarize themselves and interact with the nonprofit sector prior to careers in the nonprofit workforce. In particular we will examine the impact that service through volunteering and service-learning experiences, as well as socialization into the sector from role models, have on eventual nonprofit careers. These elements of SLTCDM lead to the following hypotheses:

H₁: Those whose parents and role models demonstrated service and philanthropic behaviors were more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector.

H₂: Those whose parents and role models were employed in the nonprofit sector are more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector.

H₃: Those with less exposure to the nonprofit sector through socialization, volunteering, and service-learning will be more likely to indicate that their career choice was influenced by a serendipitous event.

H₄: There will be a difference among generations in whether they were aware of nonprofit careers at a young age.
The Evolution of Service

Today’s young adult has had a very different experience with volunteerism than their more “seasoned” peers. There has been substantial growth in service activity, and there has been an increased emphasis on service in the public sphere. The push for increased engagement began in earnest in the 1980s, with the introduction of programs and offices like Campus Outreach Opportunity League, Campus Compact, the Office of National Service, and The Corporation for National and Community Service (Titlebaum, Williamson, Daprano, Baser & Brahler, 2004). Universities were encouraged to provide experiences to their students that increased participation in community service and general civic engagement (Astin, Keup, & Lindholm, 2002). As these programs took hold, the number and type of opportunities to participate civically increased as well (Jacoby, 2009). Not only were students offered traditional opportunities to volunteer, service-learning became an important tool on college campuses to facilitate community engagement. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE) notes that the Millennial generation (those born after 1985, in this case) is more engaged than previous generations (Lopez & Marcelo, 2007). Younger adults have had early and frequent volunteer experiences (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Pryor, Hurtado, Saenz, Santos, & Korn, 2008; Toppe, Kirsch & Michel, 2001), and rather than performing clerical work or other less mission-related tasks, prefer to offer direct service in their activities, as they feel their impact is greater (Kiesa, Orlowski, Levine, Both, Kirby, Lopez & Marcelo, 2007). Further, these experiences may lead students to view nonprofit organizations as favored employers (Universum Global, 2010). In the sections below, we will examine the impacts of various forms of engagement, as well as their impacts on the various generations.
The Impact of Volunteering

Volunteering serves as a socializer and selector into the nonprofit sector. As outlined below, community engagement and service is a learned behavior. Individuals begin to volunteer because those around them do. Individuals continue volunteering because it becomes part of their identity. These interactions with nonprofit organizations, when correctly facilitated, may provide a “job preview” of sorts – the opportunity for individuals to engage in career-oriented activities within a nonprofit organization. Further, core volunteers describe their desire to volunteer in a way that is strikingly similar to how those working in the nonprofit sector describe their work. Do volunteer experiences lead individuals to seek a career in the nonprofit sector? In the next section, the first relationship presented will be that of socialization and volunteering, as illustrated in Figure 2.
Scholars have used several theories to explain the process of socialization into the world of voluntary activity. The functionalist approach (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Musick & Wilson, 2008; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; among others) examines the reasons behind volunteering, outlining a series of motivations based on personal needs fulfillment. However, the functionalist approach does not speak to the differences between those who serve sporadically and who serve regularly. Social participation theory (Selznick, 1992) describes that transition from occasional to regular voluntary behavior. The theories, outlined below, can be used to explain the continuum of service, from early initial engagement to an eventual segue into a pattern of continued service. Early engagement is a learned behavior,
encouraged by role models and other influencers of young people. A pattern of voluntary behavior is created once volunteering is internalized as part of who that individual is.

**Early volunteering: socialization.**

Research has found the act of volunteering to be a socialized activity, initiated by peers, educational institutions, and family (Bekkers, 2007; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Finkelstein, Penner & Brannick, 2005; Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo & Sheblanova, 1998; Grimm, Dietz, Spring, Arey, Foster-Bey, 2005; Hall, McKeown & Roberts., 2001; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996; Hofer, 1999; Hustinx, Cnaan & Handy, 2010; Janoski, Musick & Wilson, 1998; Nolin, Chaney, Chapman & Chandler, 1997; Riker, Player & Colemna, 1999; Rosenthal, Feiring & Lewis, 1998; Sundeen & Raskoff, 1994; Wilson & Musick, 1999; Wuthnow, 1995, Yates & Youniss, 1998; Youniss, McLellan, Su & Yates, 1999). Volunteer action is not entirely a function of parental resources like wealth, education, and religiosity, but is instead the product of modeling and socialization. Bandura’s Social Learning Theory helps explain how parents and other role models convey the importance of service, as well as facilitate early engagement among young people (Janoski et al., 1998; Janoski & Wilson, 1995). Bandura (1977) argues that prosocial behavior is transmitted through approval and internalization. Parents or other social institutions can model behavior and then reward children with approval for their civic engagement (Bekkers, 2004, 2007), but the behavior is more likely to last in the child when they internalize the need to help others as something that is important to them, and part of who they are as an individual (Bekkers, 2004; Clary & Miller, 1986; Macoby & Martin, 1983; Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). For volunteers who have internalized the desire to help others, the reward is not in the approval of others, but in the ability to make a difference.
Institutions like nonprofit organizations allow youth to determine and define the world around them, give context to social issues, and define their individual values (Erikson, 1968; Larson, 1994; Yates & Youniss, 1996; Youniss, McLellan & Yates, 1997). This tendency to volunteer and actively participate in the community is possibly indicative of a similarity in ideals and commitment to serving others in need. Students and young people who volunteer note that civic engagement becomes a part of who they are (Isley, 1990). Those who have been socialized into service, and, most importantly, who have internalized the concept of service, see the value in promoting the “greater good”, and the “greater good” is the only incentive needed to serve others (Bekkers, 2004). These activities help expose an individual to the norms and values of that particular community, and reflect on and build their individual identity (Avrahami & Dar, 1993; Youniss et al., 1999). It is the internalization of service that leads an individual to build their personal identity around a life of service.

**Continued engagement: internalization.**

Selznik’s (1992) theory of social participation posits that the retention of voluntary behavior is determined by the way in which individuals volunteer. Those who volunteer in a segmented manner are motivated by personal interests, which is in concert with Bekkers’ (2004) structural interpretation of Durkheim’s (1897) norm conformity. In this case, the individual is volunteering solely to receive praise or approval. However, Selznik (1992) also notes that volunteers who engage on a core basis – those who are regular volunteers at particular organizations – are motivated not by rewards, but instead, are motivated by their individual values and beliefs, including empathy and helpfulness, echoing the importance of value internalization (Bekkers, 2004; Finkelstein et al., 2005). An individual’s tendency
toward either segmented or core volunteering is determined by early socialization into volunteering and civic engagement. Those with higher levels of engagement tend to have early socialization into community participation, a sense of belonging within their community, and an orientation toward social responsibility (Marks & Jones, 2004; Rosenthal et al., 1998). The implications of early socialization and internalization are evident. Those who begin volunteering at a later age are less likely to continue in service (Marks & Jones, 2004), as it has not become part of the individual’s identity. Further, those who feel that service is a defining piece of who they are, tend to volunteer more regularly.

A contrasting theory posits that rather than the internalized desire to help and do good, repeated voluntary behavior is organization-dependent. Researchers find that volunteers keep volunteering when they are able to internalize helping through hands-on experience (Rosenthal et al., 1998), or when they believe that their actions and roles contribute to an organization’s overall success (Callero, Howard & Piliavin, 1987, Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Piliavin & Callero, 1991). Individuals volunteer initially because it is important to them, but volunteer with individual organizations consistently because they feel their work within that organization makes a difference. Although this theory is helpful in explaining fidelity to a particular organization, it does not fully speak to an individual’s desire to volunteer in general.

Most importantly, perhaps, are the ideological similarities between those who work in the nonprofit sector, and core volunteers, or those who have internalized the need to volunteer. As stated previously in this chapter, those employed in the nonprofit sector tend to place less value on material components of careers like high income than they do on other more intrinsic needs, like enacting personal ideology or fulfilling a commitment to helping
others and doing good (Drucker, 1990; Flanigan, 2010; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jeavons, 1992; Light, 2002, among others), and a desire for a meaningful career (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Mirvis, 1992; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; among others). That volunteering becomes part of an individual’s identity as they mature is very important to the nonprofit sector, as nonprofit employees typically express similar sentiments when asked about their choice of sector employment (Rose-Ackerman 1996). Their career in the nonprofit sector is part of who the nonprofit employee is.

**Context and content matter.**

Aligned with Selznik’s (1992) idea of segmented volunteers, compulsory volunteer experiences have little lasting impact on the individual’s identification with service. Researchers find that mandated volunteer experiences make individuals less likely to volunteer in the future, as individuals will not associate positive feelings with engagement, and will not internalize helping behaviors (Sobus, 1995; Stukas et al., 1999; Warburton & Smith, 2003). The element of choice is key to internalizing favorable opinions of volunteering. This is an important feature that distinguishes volunteering from service-learning (discussed later), as service-learning can, at times, be a compulsory experience, while volunteering is often truly voluntary.

Further, individuals who engage in volunteer activities not deemed as “meaningful” are less likely to internalize helping behaviors (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Hidalgo & Moreno, 2009) or stay volunteers with a particular organization (Grube & Piliavin, 2000). Those who feel as though their volunteer activity is relevant to the organization’s mission are more likely to continue volunteering. However, younger volunteers typically report feeling underutilized and “devalued” in their contributions, and note that their tasks are typically menial in nature.
(Rubin, 1996). There are several implications for volunteers who do not find meaning in their tasks, or who do not feel valued by the organizations they serve. First, younger people who do not feel valued will likely not exhibit fidelity in volunteering for that organization. Further, the perception of underutilization and menial nature of volunteers’ work may be a barrier for potential volunteers. This may ultimately prevent youngsters from internalizing the desire to help, engage, and volunteer.

**Volunteering and the nonprofit workforce.**

The importance of civic engagement and volunteering extends beyond giving and continued engagement as individuals age; these experiences provide people with insight into the working world of nonprofit organizations, and give them valuable hands-on experience. Volunteers help carry out key tasks of programming, fundraising, and administration. Volunteers provide valuable services to a nonprofit, and are vital to the operations of the organization. Edwards and his colleagues (2001) note that such a large influx of younger, specifically student, volunteers allow nonprofit organizations to provide programs and services that they may not otherwise have the capacity to offer.

Volunteering can be a prelude to professional activity (Lubove, 1965). Musick and Wilson (2008) note that volunteering might increase chances of getting a job by giving them better credentials, giving them on-the-job training, and broadening that person’s network of professional contacts. Similarly, Clary and Snyder (1999) note that younger volunteers are more likely to volunteer in order to increase career prospects. Younger individuals see volunteering with an organization as a way to get their foot in the door, to get to know the organization, and to potentially make professional contacts.
The activities volunteers engage in while working with nonprofit organizations also provide a training ground for future nonprofit leaders. Organizations have an opportunity to “pre-screen” potential job candidates’ work. Edwards, Mooney & Heald (2001) suggest that volunteers can be an outlet to train or evaluate future staff, without the resource commitment needed to hire someone who may not be an appropriate organizational fit. Similarly, volunteers are able to see how their skill sets and knowledge can contribute to a nonprofit’s service delivery. Research has confirmed that some volunteers do seek employment in the nonprofit sector after meaningful and successful volunteer experiences (Houston, 2006; Lee, 2009). However, if volunteers are to see their volunteer experience as an introduction to employment opportunities in the nonprofit sector, those experiences must be relevant and meaningful, and allow volunteers to contribute to the overall organizational mission in some capacity.

Thomas Rotolo and John Wilson (2006) write that volunteer work is determined by an individual’s career path and professional occupation. What an individual does for a living determines whether they volunteer. Perhaps the motivations of those working in the nonprofit sector lead to higher volunteer rates. Nonprofit employees place a high value on helping others in their daily lives (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Mirvis, 1992; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Onyx & Maclean, 1996; Preston, 1990), and although they are able to act upon their desire to help in their professional lives, it seems as though the underlying altruistic motivations carry forward in their personal lives as well. Interestingly, the nonprofit sector provides more volunteers to organizations than any other sector (Houston, 2006; Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Wuthnow, 1994). Perhaps “helping”, for those employed in the nonprofit sector isn’t simply a career choice, but instead a lifestyle. Those studying volunteer contributions by sector of
employment found that nonprofit employees volunteered a great degree more over a twelve-month span than their peers. However, is the converse true? Does volunteering lead a person to awareness of careers in the nonprofit sector?

**SLTCDM and volunteering.**

SLTCDM’s influence on familial socialization and volunteering, and subsequent role in nonprofit career awareness, can be viewed through the various components of the theory (Krumboltz et al., 1976). Young people are initially socialized into volunteering, either through their family, role models, schools, or other influential individuals (Bekkers, 2007; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hustinx et al., 2010; among others). Their community and family’s values help communicate and instill a set of values congruent with serving others. Additionally, younger generations are volunteering more (Lopez & Marcelo, 2007), which may contribute to increased awareness of the nonprofit sector. As individuals have good or bad experiences volunteering, or as they see role models volunteering, they are able to determine whether they enjoy that activity, and whether they would like to continue pursuing it. If a volunteer works closely with nonprofit staff, or has another family member or role model already working in the nonprofit sector, they are then able to make judgments about whether that particular career is one that might be of interest. Happenstance Learning Theory (Krumboltz, 2009; Krumboltz & Levin, 2010) might also describe the relationship between volunteers and nonprofit career awareness, as volunteers may suddenly see that paid employment in the nonprofit sector is a viable career opportunity.

The research outlined above, regarding the relationships between socialization, volunteering, and career choice, has led to the following hypotheses:
H₅: Those who were encouraged to volunteer frequently at a young age are more likely to have expressed interest in a “helping” career from a young age.

H₆: Those who begin volunteering at an earlier age are more likely to have been aware of nonprofit careers at a young age.

H₇: There will be generational differences in the impact of volunteering on nonprofit career awareness.

The Impact of Service-Learning

Service-learning, or the incorporation of community service into the classroom, provides young people with yet another opportunity to interact with nonprofit organizations in a professional capacity. Unlike volunteering, which can be less organized and not directly tied to practical skill-building, service-learning allows college and high school students to utilize and implement classroom concepts in a nonprofit setting. For example, an architecture class might incorporate a service-learning component into its curriculum, where the students work on architectural renderings for a local chapter of Habitat for Humanity. The students are directly applying concepts from their coursework and reflecting on their impact in the community, and helping a nonprofit accomplish its work in the process. Does this type of interaction with nonprofit organizations lead a group of people who might not otherwise be aware of career opportunities in the nonprofit sector into relevant positions in nonprofits? Further, what are the ramifications of high-quality versus lesser-quality implementation of service-learning courses on awareness of nonprofit careers?

Not only is service-learning a relatively new concept, with wide implementation starting in the 1990s (Titlebaum et al., 2004), it is a relatively new topic in nonprofit
scholarship, especially outside the confines of service-learning as a pedagogical tool. Nonetheless, scholars have determined the type of students participating in service-learning courses, as well as various characteristics about them. Of note, the characteristics and interests of service-learning participants tend to mirror those of employees in the nonprofit sector, as outlined below. Perhaps these students utilize their classroom experiences and knowledge gained to understand the possibility of nonprofit sector careers, and to help make future career decisions.

**Demographics.**

Although service-learning is a growing phenomenon, research has been conducted to determine various pieces of information about this population: the types of participants in service-learning activities; whether they actively choose to participate in service-learning classes, or are required to participate for degree completion; and how participation shapes their lives in terms of personal characteristics. There are many similarities demographically between those who are employed in the nonprofit workforce and those who choose to participate in service-learning coursework. As outlined earlier in this chapter, nonprofit workers tend to be female, tend to prefer responsibility and leadership in their work, tend to volunteer regularly, and look for careers with meaning and impact.

Service-learning students are also most likely to be Caucasian and middle-class (Coles, 1999; Moely, McFarland, Miron, Mercer & Ilustre, 2002), under the age of 26, and attending institutions that are not research universities (Moely et al., 2002; Gray, Ondaatje, Fricker & Geschwind, 2000). Women are more likely to participate in service-learning than men (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray et al., 2000). One study notes that among those surveyed, women were “less nervous then men” when contemplating whether to
engage in a service-learning project (McCarthy & Tucker, 1999). Additionally, McCarthy and Tucker found that women are more likely to actively seek out a service-learning course (1999, p. 563). Female students surveyed were also more likely to agree that they would personally benefit from service-learning than their male counterparts (McCarthy & Tucker, 1999). These key demographics (gender, and choice to engage) mirror trends in the nonprofit workforce, as the majority of nonprofit workers are female, with a motivation to serve (Hansen et al., 2003; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; among others).

The most common majors for service-learning participants seem to lie within the social sciences, arts and humanities, and psychology (Moely et al., 2002), which could provide an avenue to what might be called the “caring professions”, those involving service to others. Further, most of the students participating in service-learning are upperclassmen, in their junior and senior years (Moely et al., 2002; Gray et al., 2000). These service-learning experiences then play a key role in the academic, and eventual career, choices of these students, as they are undertaken at critical points in a student’s career selection process. Perhaps engaging with a nonprofit organization in a way that ties course concepts to relevant actual practice, at a time of key career decision-making, provides young men and women with an unforeseen choice – work in the nonprofit sector.

**Education.**

Astin et al.’s (2000) study found that the degree of interest in the subject matter relates positively to the service-learning experience. In effect, the more interest a student has in the subject matter, the more beneficial the service-learning program will be for them. Similarly, if students believe that the service-learning program provides a benefit to them upon graduation, perhaps in the form of skill development or resume enhancement, they are
more likely to find a greater benefit in the experience (McCarthy & Tucker, 1999). This idea of benefit is related to the quality of curricular delivery. If the theoretical components of the course are not related to the service project, or if the forms of reflection aren’t adequate, the connection between the service experience and course materials suffers (Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005). The potential impact of this finding on the nonprofit sector is significant: if nonprofit organizations work with the university or faculty to create practical educational experiences for the students, the students will value their time spent with the nonprofit organization more. Additionally, service-learning participants will see that like the private sector, the nonprofit sector offers opportunities to develop and utilize professional competencies. The converse can be true as well; students who experience lesser-quality service-learning will likely be less aware of the nonprofit sector as a career option, or at its worst, form negative perceptions of the nonprofit workforce.

Students who participate in service-learning courses frequently note that service-learning courses require much more time and effort than their non-service-learning alternatives (Gray et al., 2000). However, the service-learning students are also more likely to give a favorable evaluation to the course than their counterparts taking a non-service-learning section of the same course (Gray et al., 2000). Additionally, service-learning students traditionally have higher GPAs than their non-service-learning counterparts before participation (Gray et al., 2000), and receive higher grades in similar classes than non-service-learning students. This has been attributed to the effectiveness of the pedagogy, as well as the student’s ability to develop critical thinking skills during their service-learning experiences (Astin et al., 2000; Strage, 2004). It is evident that students who engage in service-learning courses are more successful academically, and as stated earlier, have
selected majors that coincide with careers in the “caring professions”. Are these students more inclined to pursue graduate degrees, and if so, are those graduate degrees that are typically found among the nonprofit workforce?

**Volunteerism and service-learning.**

Student engagement is a learned behavior, a product of socialization. Beckman and Trozzolo (2002) found that parents of service-learning participants were three times more likely to be very active within their communities than their non-service-learning parent counterparts. This is consistent with Eyler-Walker’s (1997) conclusion that family experience with community service and civic engagement is prognostic for student involvement in college. When students see their parents and other role models volunteer and engage in service, they are more likely to participate themselves. Further, Isley notes that once a student begins to volunteer, that work becomes “an accepted part of who they are” (1990, p. 36). Participating in service-learning and interaction with the third sector is no longer a “task”; instead it becomes a defining point in an individual’s life. These findings are consistent with literature on the socialization of volunteers, which was discussed earlier in this chapter. Like volunteers, service-learning participants begin to engage because of parental influence. However, meaningful and positive experiences lead these students to internalize the importance of community engagement. Figure 3 illustrates the relationship between parental and role-model socialization and service-learning participation. Those whose parents emphasized the importance of community service and helping others tend to be more likely to engage in service-learning while in college.
Like volunteering, civic engagement through service-learning could be part of a patterned behavior. Service-learning participants are more likely to have volunteered during high school (Astin & Sax, 1998; Sax, Astin & Astin, 1996). When compared with students who did not complete service-learning courses, service-learning participants showed a significant increase in desire to engage in civic action beyond the scope of the class (Gray et al., 2000; Moely et al., 2002). Maryann Gray and her colleagues list “developing a sense of personal responsibility to their community and nation” (2000, p. 32) as one of the fundamental goals of service-learning. Similarly, in Lee’s 2005 study on minority service-learning participants, minority and lower-class students indicate that they enjoy participating in service-learning projects; they view it as an opportunity to “give back to my community” (p. 317). Service-learning participants feel the need to help, engage, and make their
communities a better place through service. Figure 4 illustrates the relationships and interconnectedness between volunteering and service-learning. Although not all service-learning participants are prior volunteers, there is a pattern of engagement, and a desire for continued engagement.

Volunteering and service-learning certainly share a lot of similarities, as both have been found to be part of a patterned behavior. However, there is an important distinction to be made between volunteering and service-learning, in that volunteering does not include the integration of course concepts and service, nor does it include an intentional period of reflection. Service-learning programs are typically designed to allow students to apply
practical skills and course concepts in a nonprofit setting, while volunteer experiences can range from meaningless (endless filing) to meaningful (designing and implementing a direct mail campaign).

**Impact of service-learning on future engagement.**

Jones and Hill (2003) note that participation in generic community service, including service-learning, motivates students to look beyond themselves and focus more readily on others’ needs. Perhaps the structured interactions within local communities allow students to more clearly define their role in society. Institutions like nonprofit organizations allow young people to assign meaning to the world around them, clarify personal values, and define social issues in their world (Erikson, 1968; Larson, 1994; Yates & Youniss, 1996; Youniss, McLellan & Yates, 1997).

Just as volunteerism becomes a part of who an individual is, one goal and outcome of service-learning is the ability of students to modify their behavior and attitudes from “patronizing” charity workers, to discovering “a greater sense of the importance of political action to obtain social justice” (Eyler & Giles, 1999, pp. 47, 135). Strain (2005) suggests that it is not, in fact, the service-learning course itself that develops a student’s sense of morality, but instead the act of engaging in the community, serving local organizations, and working with people students would not otherwise interact with. Students who engage in service-learning projects do report an increased interest in civic engagement, as well as intent to remain active in the community upon completion of the program (Moely et al., 2002). Compared to their non-service-learning counterparts, service-learning students report a significant increase in civic action, or “Value Expression” on the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire scale, a heightened level of political awareness, and a higher score on social
justice attitudes (Moely et al., 2002). Moely’s group asserts that these scores reflect the student’s changing conceptualization of self, others, and societal issues. Similarly, Astin et al. (2000) discovered that service-learning students find an increase in racial understanding and a stronger commitment to activism.

Student service-learning participants frequently note an increased knowledge of and respect for the community in which they are placed. They are proud of their work, and generally feel that they contributed to their community in a meaningful way (McCarthy & Tucker, 1999). Jane Addams, argued to be one of the pioneers of service-learning (Daynes & Longo, 2004; Stevens, 2003), developed her programs within Hull House with the intention of demonstrating cultural and communal equality among the service recipients and volunteer workers. Her aim was to allow program participants to work with people not like themselves, and to have programs that brought different cultures to life. Through these experiences, both workers and participants were able to foster an appreciation for one another, and were able to understand and respect one another. Similarly, Moely et al. (2002) and Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) indicate that service-learning students develop an awareness for social justice and an appreciation for differences from the opportunity to engage with people different from themselves.

Strain describes student moral development utilizing Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau & Thoma’s (1999) series of four stages: moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral character. As students develop and interact with the organizations on their service-learning projects, they progress through the stages of development in their own ways and at their own pace. The ultimate goal of progressing through these stages is to integrate morality and character (Strain, 2005). The individual will include morality and moral action
as a part of his or her identity, or as Jones and Hill describe it, “…students directly connect service with self” (2003, p. 530). This idea complements Selznik’s (1992) concept of core volunteers, and is also ideologically similar to those working in the nonprofit sector (Drucker, 1990; Flanigan, 2010; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jeavons, 1992; Light, 2002; among others). Those who have internalized the desire to help others will incorporate the act of service and doing good into their personal identity.

**Impact of service-learning on career.**

Gray and colleagues (2000), indicate that one of the more powerful benefits to service-learning participation is the chance for students to identify and develop career goals, as well as learn relevant skills needed in their respective careers. Several researchers found that participating in service-learning courses is, in fact, a strong predictor of choosing a service-related career (Astin et al., 2000; Jones & Abes, 2004; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). However, Astin et al.’s study only considered medical careers, educational careers, environmental careers, and careers in the public sector in the items measuring propensity to choose related fields (2000, p. 21). The significance of this finding, as Astin describes it, is that, “…one’s career choice often represents a lifelong commitment that consumes a large part of one’s waking hours, (and) there is perhaps no stronger expression of commitment to service than to choose a career that is service based.” (2000, p. 24).

One of the more interesting features of service-learning participants, and students who participate in community service, is that they do not place a high priority on making money upon graduation (Astin et al., 2000; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983). The students value other, more intrinsic rewards from their future employers. One student interviewed in Astin and his colleagues’ study explained that she had entered college as a biology major because
her mother “pushed her” to make a lot of money in the future (2000, p. 63). Her service-learning experience allowed her to find something that “makes (her) happy inside”, and because of that, places little focus on how much money she will be making at a job (2000, p. 64). She would prefer a rewarding career to one that offers a high level of income.

Service-learning students demonstrate a preference for intrinsic benefits in their careers, as opposed to merely financial benefits (Astin et al., 2000; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983). These students prefer a rewarding and fulfilling job in which their work directly impacts their community. The ideals and personal motivations that students develop as a part of their service-learning participation are quite similar to those that nonprofit employees display and cite as reasons for choosing third sector careers (Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Rose-Ackerman, 1996).

That students are more predisposed to certain types of careers because of their experiences with service-learning is of great importance to both the nonprofit sector and the university hosting service-learning programs. Nonprofits have an opportunity to present themselves as potential employers when working with student groups on service-learning projects. Organizations can involve students in more engaging projects, allowing them to develop a more comprehensive feel for how that particular nonprofit operates. Universities can work with students as they develop their interest in particular fields, by including nonprofit employers and other service-learning host sites in career fairs, by maintaining updated listing of job openings within the nonprofit sector in their career services offices, and by continually fostering relationships with local nonprofits for enhanced and long term partnerships.
Service-learning and the nonprofit workforce.

The leadership skills and abilities students develop in service-learning programs are similar to those needed in most workplaces, but tend to be particularly useful in nonprofit organizations. Such organizations typically interact with a broad group of stakeholders, and service-learning students are better prepared to work with such a diverse population with differing interests, needs, and challenges (Eyler et al., 1997; Moely et al., 2002). As a result of their service-learning participation, students have demonstrated attitudinal shifts and moral growth (Astin, 2000; Jones & Hill, 2003; Moely et al., 2002; Strain, 2005). With service-learning programs, students are able to interact with populations they would not necessarily interact with otherwise, and are consequently encouraged to develop an understanding for diverse populations, diverse situations, and focus on the needs of others. Most importantly, research indicates that students begin to define themselves by a standard of service to others and continue this service beyond their undergraduate careers (Astin, Sax & Avalos, 1999; Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005; Jones & Hill, 2003; Misa, Anderson & Yamamura, 2005; Stukas et al., 1999; Warchal & Ruiz, 2004).

Service-learning participants tend to report a higher level of perceived leadership ability (Moely et al., 2002). In service-learning programs, students are challenged to work in new situations, new environments, and with new people. These interactions allow students to develop valuable skills like effective communication and conflict resolution. Additionally, students must build the trust of the community they work with, and at times, must act as a coalition builder because of their role as “an outsider”. Similarly, nonprofit employees operate rather autonomously (Mirvis & Hackett, 1983), and tend to have a high level of
responsibility in their positions (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Onyx & Maclean, 1996; Rawls et al., 1975).

While students participating in service-learning experience certain changes in the way they feel about their world, employees in the nonprofit sector often experience and implement these learned qualities in the workplace. Rawls, Ullrich and Nelson (1975) find that nonprofit managers place a greater value on personal relations. It is important to note that while students experience an increase in moral development as a result of service-learning participation, nonprofit employees generally have those values and ideals already in place, which is why they choose to find employment in the nonprofit sector.

**SLTCDM and service-learning.**

Much like SLTCDM’s interconnection with volunteering and socialization, SLTCDM allows us to see how the relationships between socialization, volunteering, and service-learning connect and potentially lead to nonprofit career awareness. First, service-learning has primarily been available to the Millennial Generation, and possibly to some of the younger members of Generation X (Titlebaum et al., 2004). As such, an individual’s age can help determine whether service-learning experiences facilitated interactions with nonprofit organizations that led to awareness of nonprofit careers. Further, service-learning participants tend to come from families and communities that demonstrated voluntary behavior, have volunteered themselves prior to service-learning, and will continue to serve after their service-learning experience (Astin & Sax, 1998; Beckman & Trozzolo, 2002; Eyler-Walker, 1997; Isley, 1990; Sax et al., 1996). All of these interactions with nonprofit organizations, and their staff, provide practical and curriculum-oriented insight into the working world of nonprofits. Those experiences, good and bad, may help students become aware of nonprofit
sector careers, and help in forming opinions of the working world of the nonprofit sector. Finally, service-learning coursework may provide students with an unanticipated introduction to nonprofit careers. The impact of service-learning participation on the selection of a nonprofit career will be hypothesized as:

\[ H_8: \] There will be generational differences in the impact of service-learning on nonprofit career awareness.

\[ H_9: \] Students with more service-learning experience indicate that the service-learning experience helped introduce them to nonprofit careers.

\[ H_{10}: \] Those with higher quality service-learning experiences indicate that their service-learning helped introduce them to nonprofit careers.

\[ H_{11}: \] Increasing levels of exposure to the nonprofit sector through socialization and various engagement activities increases awareness of nonprofit sector careers.

**Conclusions**

This chapter began with a description of the nonprofit workforce, outlining the sector’s demographics, and typical characteristics and motivations of the nonprofit employee. Nonprofit employees tend to volunteer, prefer autonomy and challenge in their work, and perhaps most importantly, prefer work that makes a difference. Although research has described the motivations of nonprofit workers, it has not evaluated the impacts of early life experiences like parental and role model socialization, volunteering, and service-learning on the eventual choice of a career in the nonprofit sector.

The author then evaluated competing theories of career choice, and selected the SLTCDM model as the theory that will likely best describe how individuals obtain careers in
the nonprofit sector. It recognizes the importance of familial and role model socialization and life experiences that drive career decision-making (Krumboltz et al., 1976). Those with parents or role models who have positive (or negative) interactions with the nonprofit sector are more likely to view it in a positive (or negative) light, at the very least. Those with parents working in the nonprofit sector are afforded an extra bit of socialization, as they are able to see careers within the nonprofit sector, and not just volunteer opportunities. Further, those who have positive interactions in a “professional” capacity, through service-learning projects, volunteer assignments, and the like, might be more likely to associate the nonprofit sector with positive opportunities to fulfill their career aspirations in the sector. Of note is the element of happenstance, which makes this theory particularly interesting. Individuals typically do not consider the nonprofit sector as a place to work. As such, employees tend to anecdotaly cite “chance” as having influenced their career trajectory into the sector.

In the last section of this chapter, common characteristics between the employees of the nonprofit sector, volunteers, and service-learning participants were identified and discussed. Further, the patterns of socialization into the nonprofit sector seem to be similar for those who are core volunteers and service-learning participants, in that they begin to identify service as part of who they are as a person. Finally, volunteering and service-learning were examined not only for their positive impacts on the nonprofit sector, but also for their ability to serve as a method of socialization and early exposure to nonprofit work. With the amount of research being conducted on nonprofit workforce issues, volunteering, and service-learning individually, no scholar has integrated the literature and assessed the relationship between service-learning participants, volunteers, and those who are employed in the nonprofit sector.
Through the course of this chapter, several common characteristics between service-learning students, volunteers, those socialized into the nonprofit sector, and employees in the nonprofit sector have been illuminated, indicating a possible career linkage. As stated previously, those similarities have yet to be studied fully. The key purpose of this research is to identify a gap in the literature bridging these populations, within the context of career development theory, as it seems of great benefit to both the sector and colleges and universities, to see potential career development linkages. The next step in this research project will be an empirical study to determine whether there is a progression from socialization, service-learning, and/or volunteerism, to employment in the nonprofit sector.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey design, and incorporated several previously-validated surveys into the current instrument. The purpose of the study was to assess the relationships between early-life and pre-career experiences, nonprofit career awareness, and current employment in the nonprofit sector, among a sample of members of a national nonprofit association.

Research Questions

The following are research questions for this study:

1. What are the impacts of early life experiences on understanding and pursuing careers in the nonprofit sector?

2. Are nonprofit careers a product of “right place, right time”, or the product of socialization and exposure to nonprofit “work”?

3. Is there a difference between those who belong to the Millennial generation and those who belong to older generations in how they became familiar with the nonprofit sector as a potential career option?

These research questions have been informed by the previous review of literature, and have resulted in the following hypotheses:

H1: Those whose parents and role models demonstrated service and philanthropic behaviors were more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector.

H2: Those whose parents and role models were employed in the nonprofit sector are more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector.
H₃: Those with less exposure to the nonprofit sector through socialization, volunteering, and service-learning will be more likely to indicate that their career choice was influenced by a serendipitous event.

H₄: There will be a difference among generations in whether they were aware of nonprofit careers at a young age.

H₅: Those who were encouraged to volunteer frequently at a young age are more likely to have expressed interest in a “helping” career from a young age.

H₆: Those who begin volunteering at an earlier age are more likely to have been aware of nonprofit careers at a young age.

H₇: There will be generational differences in the impact of volunteering on nonprofit career awareness.

H₈: There will be generational differences in the impact of service-learning on nonprofit career awareness.

H₉: Students with more service-learning experience indicate that the service-learning experience helped introduce them to nonprofit careers.

H₁₀: Those with higher quality service-learning experiences indicate that their service-learning helped introduce them to nonprofit careers.

H₁₁: Increasing exposure to the nonprofit sector through socialization and various engagement activities increases awareness of nonprofit sector careers.

**Participants**

The target population for this research is the national membership of the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network. YNPN is a membership organization of over 30,000 young
professionals working in the nonprofit sector in a variety of capacities (volunteer coordination, development, programmatic, executive, etc.). In addition, YNPN chapters have individuals who are not employed in the nonprofit sector, either because they are current job-seekers; have transitioned out of the nonprofit workforce; work in government or other businesses with nonprofit-related staff, like volunteer managers or corporate civic engagement staff; or are simply volunteers working with nonprofit organizations, and are interested in professional development through this channel. YNPN currently has 37 chapters across the United States, with thirteen chapters in the Midwest, five chapters in the Northeast/Mid-Atlantic states, seven chapters in the Southeast, three chapters in the Southwest, and eight chapters in the West. Members of YNPN are typically between 22 and 40 years of age, which encompass both Generation X and the Millennial Generation. This is an important feature of this population, as there are individuals among this group who have likely not had an opportunity to engage in service-learning due to their age. Because of the variety of mission categories represented within the membership, the generations represented within YNPN, and the national scope of the organization and its chapters, they were an ideal population to be included in this research. Although it is important to learn about the larger population of nonprofit professionals, this study only focuses on a limited group of YNPN members.

The national office of YNPN does not collect information on its members; that information is kept at the local chapter level, and individual chapters were not able to provide full membership lists from which to draw a sample, for proprietary reasons. Being that a random sample was not attainable, the survey utilized a convenience sample, and was administered to four chapters of YNPN that indicated a willingness to facilitate participation
in this research project to their members: San Diego, CA (n=1717 members); Denver, CO (n=1552 members); Research Triangle, NC (n=392 members); and Kansas City, MO/Kansas City, KS (n=424 members).

The convenience sampling technique presented a potentially biased sample, particularly since the researcher was aware neither of the demographic make-up of the members, nor of the chapter demographics in terms of organization types and/or missions represented. However, by collecting the state of residence, mission category, and other identifiers, the researcher was able to determine that there were no key differences on the independent and dependent variables among respondents across the various YNPN chapters and other demographic points. Potential bias will be discussed in later chapters.

**Materials**

Data were collected via an online survey instrument that included both quantitative and open-ended items. The survey evaluated particular characteristics and experiences of individuals, including their sector of employment, socialization to the nonprofit sector, and experiences with volunteering and service-learning. Features of each of the broader categories are outlined below, and a full version of the survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.

**Measures**

**Dependent variables.**

1. Nonprofit career awareness at a young age. (“NoClue”)
2. Interested in helping career at a young age. (“Helping”)
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3. Family helped respondent think about nonprofit sector as a career option
   (“FamInspire”)

4. Serendipitous occasion impacting career choice. (“Serendipity”)

**Independent variables.**

1. Socialization into the nonprofit sector, measured by both the number
   (“NumYoung”) and who (“WhoYoung”) among parents and/or role models
   volunteered or worked in the nonprofit sector, as well as whether parents or other
   role models demonstrated altruistic behavior to the respondents when they were
   younger (“SocComp”).

2. Volunteering, measured in terms of age when respondent began volunteering
   (“AgeVol”), whether the respondent’s parents encouraged them to volunteer at a
   young age (“ParentUrged”), as well as impact of the experience on nonprofit
   career awareness (“VolInspire”).

3. Service learning experience, measured in terms of frequency (“NumberSL”) and
   quality (“QualitySL”), value of the service-learning project to the nonprofit
   partner (“S-Lval”) as well as impact of the experience on nonprofit career
   awareness (“SLInspire”).

4. Impact of unplanned events on career choice, including service-learning
   (“UnplSL”), volunteering (“UnplVol”), being in the right place at the right time
   (“UnplRP”), unintended exposure to a type of work the respondent found
   interesting (“UnplDid”) or uninteresting (“UnplDidNot”). In contrast, intent to
   pursue a nonprofit career (“AlwaysNP”).
5. Demographic variables, to include: age/generation, gender, education, mission of current employment, budget of current organization of employment.

**Open-ended items.**

Each major section of the survey also included open-ended questions intended to collect qualitative responses for some of the larger themes, and provide context for quantitative responses. These questions were:

1. Briefly describe how you first became interested in a career in the nonprofit sector.
2. Please describe that serendipitous event that you feel influenced your career.
3. How did volunteering help you think about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
4. How did service-learning help you think about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
5. How did family or role models help you think about the nonprofit sector as a career option?

**Career choice.**

Variables in this instrument measured current sector of employment, as well as the importance of particular features within that career choice. These items included considerations made when selecting a career: for example, doing something to improve their community, allowing them to be well-off financially, and general availability of jobs. These constructs came from multiple previously validated sources, like the College Senior Survey.

---

5 This item only appeared if the respondent indicated that they felt that an unplanned event influenced their career choice.
(2013), a standardized instrument that determines the success of college outcomes, as well as the self-sacrifice construct from Perry’s (1997) Public Service Motivation scale. Survey items also determined whether nonprofit sector employment was the respondent’s primary career goal, or whether their current position was perhaps the only option available to them during their last job search. These items were taken from Biggerstaff’s (2000) Social Work Career Influence Questionnaire. The dependent variables “NoClue” and “Helping” were measured using a Likert scale that assessed level of agreement to various items. The Likert scale was constructed with five levels: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).

Socialization.

The online instrument included variables that measure aspects of socialization to the nonprofit sector by parents, relatives, and role models. Questions in this piece of the survey came from Clary and Miller’s (1986) parental altruism/socialization scale, which was used to determine whether the respondent’s parents modeled altruistic behaviors, creating socialization into patterns of service. The survey instrument identified whether the respondent recalls any role models volunteering or working in the nonprofit sector, to help determine whether respondent actions mimicked modeled values. This information was included to determine whether voluntary activity is a “normalized” activity among the respondent’s social and familial network. The parental socialization scale was comprised of eleven items included on a Likert scale that measured agreement to various assertions. The Likert scale was constructed with five levels: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. Reliability analysis found the socialization scale to be a consistent measure (Cronbach’s alpha = .866), and so items were added together.
to create a continuous variable that measured composite parental socialization ("SocComp"). The socialization scale has not been thoroughly researched; however, subsequent research in this area has shown this scale to have construct validity. Although Perry (1997) is the only researcher to utilize the scale beyond the widely cited Clary and Miller (1986), he found similar factor loadings using a different population of respondents.

The variable “WhoYoung” identified several relatives or role models who might have worked in the nonprofit sector when the respondent was younger, to include: parent/guardian; sibling; other family member; and role model, non-relative. Respondents were able to select all applicable categories. “NumYoung” is a calculated variable, which tallied the number of categories selected in “WhoYoung”. A similar set of measures was created to identify relatives and role models currently employed in the nonprofit workforce.

**Volunteering.**

Current voluntary behaviors and motivations were captured with three factors from Clary and Snyder’s (1999) Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI): Career, Social, and Values. The VFI, a standardized instrument for measuring volunteer motivation, assessed the respondent’s purposes of volunteering. These items measure agreement to statements about volunteer motivation using a seven-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all important/accurate for you, and 7 = extremely important/accurate for you. Like Clary and Snyder concluded, items loaded onto three distinct factors: Career (Cronbach’s alpha = .856), Social (Cronbach’s alpha = .893), and Values (Cronbach’s alpha = .849). The components of the VFI have similar factor loadings across multiple populations and demonstrated construct validity by many researchers (Clary, Snyder & Stukas, 1996; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Gage & Thapa, 2012; Wu, Wing Lo & Lu, 2009; among others).
Fenzel and Peyrot’s (2005) voluntary participation measures evaluated current volunteer behaviors, including participation in year-of-service programs, and volunteer service to specific types of community organizations. Respondents provided the approximate age of initial volunteering using a continuous variable (“AgeVol”). Both “VolInspire” and “ParentUrged” were measured on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. “VolInspire” asked whether the respondent felt that their volunteering experiences helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a place to work. “ParentUrged” asked whether respondents’ parents encouraged them to “get involved with volunteer projects” when they were younger.

**Service-learning.**

The amount of service-learning coursework, “NumberSL,” was measured with a continuous variable that asked respondents the number of service-learning courses they took as an undergraduate student. The perceived value of the service-learning project to the nonprofit partner was measured with a three-point Likert item, where 1 = not valuable, 2 = somewhat valuable, and 3 = very valuable. Additionally, the respondents’ perceptions of service-learning coursework contributing to thinking about the nonprofit sector as a career option, “SLInspire,” was measured with a five-point Likert scale, where where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

Service-learning experiences were also measured using validated items from Fenzel and Peyrot’s (2005) and Payne’s (2000) instruments that measure not only the frequency of service-learning coursework, but also the quality of that coursework, its impact on future service and/or employment, as well as perceived value to the organization. “QualitySL” is a dichotomous variable, where 0 = generic and 1 = quality. The variable was defined using
Fenzel and Peyrot’s (2005) recommendation of categorizing service-learning into “generic” service-learning and “quality” service-learning. Quality service-learning is determined by the amount of service (measured by a Likert scale, where 1 = less than 5 hours, 2 = 5-10 hours, 3 = 11-15 hours, 4 = 16-20 hours, and 5 more than 20 hours); amount of reflection (measured by four dichotomous categorical variables, listing types of reflection, which yielded 1 = yes and 2 = no to each type); and integration of course concepts into the service project, which was measured by a four-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all related, 2 = slightly related, 3 = moderately related, and 4 = highly related. Those with high-quality service-learning experiences had at least two forms of reflection, at least eleven hours of service associated with the project, and respondents reporting that the project was at least moderately integrated into the course curriculum.

**Serendipity.**

Several items in this survey evaluated the career path of respondents, including examination of serendipitous events. The researcher used Bright, Pryor, Wilkenfield and Earl’s (2005) validated measure of unplanned events that influence career choice. The critical incident technique (Betsworth & Hansen, 1996; Flanagan, 1954; Kirchner & Dunnette, 1957) is utilized in the field of counseling psychology to gather information from an individual regarding specific behaviors and decisions. Respondents were asked whether a chance event in some way impacted their career decision. The dependent variable “Serendipity” was a dichotomous variable, where 1 = yes and 2 = no. Those who indicated that their careers have been influenced by a chance event or serendipity (“Serendipity” = 1) were asked to elaborate on that event in subsequent open-ended items. In a separate question, respondents were also asked to indicate whether a series of specific events had an unexpected influence on their
career. These items, including “UnplSL”, “UnplVol”, “UnplRP”, “UnplDid”, and “UnplDidNot” were measured on a three-point Likert scale, where 1 = no influence, 2 = some influence, and 3 = a great deal of influence. “AlwaysNP,” in contrast, used a five-point Likert scale to measure whether respondents had always wanted to work in the nonprofit sector. This scale was coded as 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

**Demographics.**

The instrument also collected basic demographic information, including level of education and actual degrees pursued or attained. Respondent age, gender, race/ethnicity, state of residence, YNPN chapter membership, and employer’s mission category were collected, to determine characteristics of the sample pool, and compare them to the population from which the sample was drawn.

**Procedure**

Chapters distributed an initial participation solicitation, as well as two follow-up emails to a total of 4,085 members between November 2012 and February 2013. The email solicitation was sent from a member of each chapter’s leadership team: either the board chair, or someone responsible for chapter communications, and included a link to the online survey. The solicitation, following Dillman’s (2000) suggestion, clearly articulated the benefits of the research to the potential participants, as well as an incentive for completion, in this case, participants were registered in a drawing to win a Kindle Fire. These solicitations resulted in a total of 360 responses, yielding an overall response rate of 8.8 percent. Twenty-three cases were deleted, as they failed to respond to the question that included the dependent variable.
This resulted in 337 useable responses, and a final response rate of 8.2 percent. Of the final 337 responses, 132 were from the San Diego chapter, 76 were from the Denver chapter, 40 were from the Research Triangle chapter, and 39 were from the Kansas City area chapter.

This response rate is relatively similar to survey research conducted on the YNPN membership, which has typically been low overall. These studies’ response rates range from 3.6 percent to 16.57 percent (Dobin & Tchume, 2011; Schwartz, Weinberg, Hagenbuch & Scott, 2011; Solomon & Sandahl, 2007). Response rates for surveys sampling the general population of nonprofit sector employees are not regularly reported in academic publication; however, those that are reported tend to have response rates closer to thirty percent (Brown & Yoshioka, 2003; Hull Teegarden, 2004; Lee, 2012; Park & Word, 2012; Wang & Ashcraft, 2012). Research examining response rates on internet-based survey research, specifically, has found similar response rates to those found in the nonprofit management literature (Cook, Heath & Thompson, 2000; Kaplowitz, Hadlock & Levine, 2004), making this survey’s response rate a bit low, comparatively.

The online survey, which included fifty items, took an average of twenty-six minutes to complete. Respondents answered questions in seven separate sections: educational background, career ambitions at an early age, work preferences and motivations, experiences with unanticipated events, volunteer experiences and preferences, service-learning experiences, and socialization to the nonprofit sector. Although respondents were able to enter the survey, save, and complete the survey at a later time, all completed the survey in one consecutive period. Items were a mixture of forced-choice and open-ended questions, and several items included filter questions. For example, only those who had participated in service-learning coursework completed the service-learning quality scale.
The length of the survey may have led to some item nonresponse that occurs in the dataset. The percentage of missing data per variable ranges from 0 to 15 percent, although the categorical variables of employer’s mission and employer’s budget size had 29 and 31 percent missing data, respectively. On average, 8.8 percent of data are missing for each variable. However, listwise deletion of cases would have further reduced the sample size, so multiple imputation was conducted to preserve the remaining 337 respondents. Further elaboration of multiple imputation procedure is included in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Data Preparation

Data from the quantitative portion of the research project were collected in an online survey instrument and downloaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Prior to analysis, variables were examined through SPSS for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and fit between their respective distributions and the assumptions for uni- and multivariate analysis.

Several variables had over 5 percent of the data missing, and SPSS Missing Value Analysis was conducted to determine the nature of the missing data. Data were found to be missing in a non-random pattern using Little’s MCAR test ($X^2 = 428.269$, df = 356, $p < .01$). When non-randomly missing data are deleted in a listwise manner, biased parameter estimates may occur (Graham, 2009; Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). As such, the researcher conducted SPSS Multiple Imputation$^6$ using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method (Schafer, 1997) on the data, and included all independent and dependent variables that were potentially related to the pattern of missing data. This can produce more accurate imputation estimates, and also strengthens the validity of the analysis on the data (Graham, 2009; Rubin, 1996; Yuan, 2008). Five data sets were imputed, and the pooled regression algorithm was used to combine the multiple datasets for analysis. The original and imputed distributions were compared using difference of means tests, and no significant differences were found between the pooled imputations and the original incomplete dataset. All data imputation and transformations left 337 cases for analysis. Were all incomplete cases removed from the

---

$^6$ Multiple imputation is the process of replacing missing data with estimates computed from the observed values of each case (Schafer & Graham, 2002), and has recently been used within nonprofit management literature (see McBride, Lough & Sherraden, 2012; Tang, 2008).
dataset, there would be 289 cases left for analysis. Appendix A provides more information on the data missing for the original dataset.

Once a complete dataset had been imputed, the data were screened for skewness and kurtosis. The variables measuring the number of influencers working in the nonprofit sector when the respondent was younger (“NumYoung”) were transformed using the square root function to reduce moderate skewness and kurtosis. The variable measuring the number of courses taken during their undergraduate education (“NumberSL”) was logarithmically transformed to reduce extreme skewness and kurtosis.

Three cases had extremely low z scores on helping careers, three cases had an extremely high z score on the age began volunteering, and four cases had extremely high z scores on the number of service-learning classes taken during their undergraduate education. Using Field’s (2005) guideline, the scores were transformed back to scores that would generate a z score of 3.29.

**Data Analysis**

The results of the data analysis are presented in five sections. The first section outlines the impact of parental and role model socialization on nonprofit career awareness, both through modeled voluntary behavior and through modeled employment in the nonprofit workforce. The second section outlines the impacts of the respondent’s voluntary and service-learning participation on nonprofit career awareness. The third sector examines differences among generations, as those belonging to Generation X or older may not have had exposure to the types of engagement that the Millennials have had. Prior research has shown that service is first demonstrated, and then becomes internalized as part of who they
are. The fourth section examines that pattern through a multiple regression model, which evaluates the impact of the three primary predictors: socialization to the nonprofit workforce, volunteering, and service-learning, on nonprofit career awareness. The final section assesses the impact of serendipity on the choice of a nonprofit sector career.

The hypotheses are not tested in the order presented in earlier chapters, as they are presented in a more chronological order here, noting that theory has shown parental engagement tends to lead to child engagement, and that those who participate in service-learning while in college have typically volunteered prior to their service-learning experience. Finally, the non-random nature of the sample will not allow for generalization to the larger population of those working in the nonprofit sector, and although significance levels were included in reports, they are only used in interpretation to help identify relationships between variables. Thus, when a null hypothesis is rejected, this provides some support for the alternative hypothesis in this sample.

**Open-Ended Items**

Several items collected open-ended responses, which were used in analysis to support and enrich quantitative findings. Qualitative responses were categorized into broader themes by the researcher. Common themes found among the qualitative responses, on the whole, provided support for the quantitative responses, and will be used to highlight some of the conclusions found in Chapter 5.
Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the sample drawn from members of the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network, by chapter. Over one-third (39.2 percent) come from the San Diego YNPN chapter, which has the largest membership of the chapters represented in the sample. Although the San Diego chapter comprises one-third of the respondents in this study, a difference of means test shows no significant difference in response to the dependent variables \( F (3, 336) = 1.07, p > .05 \).

The members of these chapters tend to be highly educated, with the majority (94.8 percent, \( n = 199 \)) holding at least a bachelor’s degree, and over one-third (35.7 percent, \( n = 116 \)) holding at least a masters-level degree. The respondent pool is predominantly female (86.6 percent, \( n = 292 \)), and Caucasian (78.9 percent, \( n = 266 \)), which are similar to prior demographics found in the nonprofit workforce (Light, 2003; Solomon & Sandahl, 2007). The second most frequent ethnicities represented in the sample are Asian and Hispanic/Latino, which is larger than what is typically found in studies of the nonprofit workforce. This can be attributed, in part, to the percentage of respondents who claim San Diego chapter membership, and their larger proportion of Asian respondents. The respondents are, on average, 31 years old (\( M = 30.77, SD = 5.71 \)). Using Brinckerhoff and Hyman’s (2007) and Kunreuther, Kim and Rodriguez’s (2009) suggested cut-off of 1980 as the separation of Generation X (or Gen X) and the Millennial Generation (or Gen Y), approximately 75 percent (\( n = 255 \)) of the survey participants belong to the Millennial generation, and slightly less than 25 percent (\( n = 82 \)) are Gen X or older. Because YNPN inherently caters to the young nonprofit professional, this is not surprising.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of YNPN Members by Chapter Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YNPN Chapter</th>
<th>San Diego (n=132)</th>
<th>Denver (n=76)</th>
<th>Kansas City (n=39)</th>
<th>Research Triangle (n=40)</th>
<th>Other (n=50)</th>
<th>Total (n=337)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PhD or equivalent</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Medical Degree</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Law Degree</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Master’s Degree</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>34.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>59.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Associates Degree</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Vocational School</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HS Diploma/GED</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>86.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Gen X or older</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Gen Y</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>69.20</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>75.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African American</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% AIAN</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Caucasian</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>88.20</td>
<td>89.70</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>78.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NHPI</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were most commonly employed in human service/multipurpose organizations (12.58 percent, n = 42) or in health and rehabilitation organizations (8.90 percent, n = 30). Respondents were also typically working in medium-sized organizations with annual budgets of $1,000,000-5,000,000 (36.9 percent, n = 124). Table 2 shows the
most common mission categories represented, as well as the budget sizes, in the respondent pool.

Table 2
Mission Categories and Budget Sizes of Respondents’ Organizations by YNPN Chapter Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YNPN Chapter</th>
<th>San Diego (n=132)</th>
<th>Denver (n=76)</th>
<th>Kansas City (n=39)</th>
<th>Research Triangle (n=40)</th>
<th>Other (n=50)</th>
<th>Total (n=337)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Human Services/Multipurpose</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Health &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Environment/Conservation</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Education: Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Youth Development</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Under $250,000</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $250,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $1,000,000 to $2,499,999</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>21.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $2,500,000 to $4,999,999</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $5,000,000 to $9,999,999</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $10,000,000 to $24,999,999</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $25,000,000 and over</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 summarizes respondent fidelity to one sector or another. Respondents have held positions in approximately 4 organizations since entering the workforce as an adult (M = 3.74, SD = 2.201), and on average, applied for 23 jobs in their last job search (M = 22.89. SD
Further, survey participants were, on average, able to choose from two competing job offers in their last search (M = 1.60, SD = 1.717).

Over eighty percent (81.6 percent, n = 275) of the survey respondents are currently employed in the nonprofit sector in some capacity. Approximately forty percent (n = 142) of the respondents have stayed employed consistently within the same sector. However, 43 percent (n = 146) of the respondents have transitioned from another sector into the nonprofit sector at some point in their career, and nearly 10 percent (n = 33) transitioned out of the nonprofit sector. Intuitively, these data make sense, as the respondent population is comprised predominantly of those who currently work, or are seeking work, in the nonprofit sector.

Table 3

Fidelity Within Individual Sectors of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of Prior Employment</th>
<th>% Has not worked in different sector</th>
<th>% Nonprofit sector</th>
<th>% Public sector</th>
<th>% Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector (n=275)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector (n=23)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector (n=25)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (n=14)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 provides descriptive statistics for the dependent and independent variables utilized for the regression analyses presented in this chapter. The dependent variables are “FamInspire”, which measures the amount of perceived influence family members had on

---

7 Four cases were substantial outliers, resulting in such a high mean and standard deviation. Because this variable was only included for descriptive purposes, there were no alterations made to the outlier scores.
nonprofit career awareness; “Helping”, which measures agreement to wanting a helping career from a young age; “NoClue”, which is a reverse-coded item that measures agreement to not knowing the nonprofit sector provided employment opportunities; and “SLInspire”, which measures the extent to which respondents felt the service-learning experience contributed to thinking about a nonprofit career. FamInspire, NoClue, and SLInspire all have average responses of “neutral”, and respondents, on average, agree that they wanted a helping career from a young age. Respondents had, on average, one influencer working in the nonprofit sector when they were young, and on average, have a neutral response to items on the composite socialization scale. In terms of engagement activities, respondents typically began volunteering when they were about 13 years old, agree that volunteering helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option, and had neutral responses to parental encouragement to volunteer at a young age. Finally, respondents took, on average, one service-learning course in college, and felt that their service project was valuable to the host agency. However, they tend to have neutral feelings regarding the impact their service-learning had on helping them think about nonprofit careers, and had generic service-learning experiences.
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Variables Included in Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FamInspire</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoClue</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLInspire</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumYoung</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocComp</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteering Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeVol</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParentUrged</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VolInspire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service-Learning Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumberSL</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Lval</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QualitySL</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Impact of Socialization

Socialization, for the purposes of this project, was measured both through modeled altruistic behavior, and through role-model employment in the nonprofit workforce. Several items measured the impact of parental and role model socialization on nonprofit career awareness. The eleven-item parental socialization scale (Perry, 1997) was an internally consistent measure of socialization (Cronbach’s alpha = .855), and so items were combined to create a single variable measuring parental socialization to the nonprofit sector (“SocComp”). 32.64 percent of the respondents (n = 110) either agreed or strongly agreed that their parents actively participated in volunteer organizations when they were younger, and nearly half of the respondents (48.66 percent, n = 164) agreed or strongly agreed that
their parents encouraged them to volunteer when they were younger. Table 5 shows the relationships between socialization to the nonprofit sector and nonprofit career awareness.

Table 5
Correlations Between Socialization Variables and Nonprofit Career Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NoClue</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.222**</td>
<td>-.230**</td>
<td>-.217**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocComp</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumYoung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.374**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FamInspire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

H₁: Role Model Engagement and Career Awareness

A simple regression analysis was conducted to test H₁: Those whose parents and role models demonstrated service and philanthropic behaviors were more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector. The predictor, the composite socialization variable, measured various forms of parental socialization, through both parent-demonstrated behavior, and through parent-encouraged helping or volunteer behavior of the respondent. The dependent variable in this analysis is agreement to “I did not know that jobs in the nonprofit sector were a career option when I was younger” (“NoClue”). Although the predictor is significant (β = -.225, t = -4.112, p < .05), supporting the hypothesis, r² is small (.051), showing a small amount of variance explained by this predictor (Cohen, 1988). This shows a small negative relationship between the variables, such that as parental socialization

---

8 This, and all subsequent, regression hypotheses are presented in the form of alternative hypotheses.

9 The non-random nature of the sample will not allow for generalization to the larger population of those working in the nonprofit sector, and although significance levels were included in reports, they are only used in interpretation to help identify relationships between variables. Thus, when a null hypothesis is rejected, this provides some support for the alternative hypothesis in this sample.
increases disagreement to not knowing that nonprofit jobs were a career option decreases. Stated differently, more parental socialization leads to increased awareness to nonprofit careers at a young age.

This hypothesis was also assessed through a dependent variable measuring respondent perception of the impact of socialization, “FamInspire”, which measured the extent to which respondents felt their family or role models helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option. A simple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the composite socialization variable helped predict family or role model impact on career awareness, and it was found to be a significant predictor as well ($\beta = .466, t = 9.398, p < .05$). The relationship between these variables is a bit stronger, with $r^2 = .218$ indicating a moderate amount of explained variance, and further supporting the hypothesis. This shows that as parental socialization to helping behaviors increase, so does the perception that family helped the respondent view the nonprofit sector as a career option.

**H$_2$: Role Model Employment and Career Awareness**

Although the majority of respondents (63.2 percent, $n = 213$) reported having no influencers working in the sector when they were young, many of the respondents did have family or role models working in the nonprofit workforce when they were younger. Respondents were asked to identify various role models and individuals who may have worked in the nonprofit sector when the respondent was young, including parents, siblings, other family members, and non-related role models. Eighty respondents (23.79 percent) reported that they had either a parent or other role model working in the nonprofit sector, and
44 (13.10 percent) reported having more than one influencer employed in the nonprofit workforce when they were younger.

To test the impact of family or role model employment in the nonprofit sector on nonprofit career awareness, analyses were conducted on both the number of influencers, as well as the type of influencer (parent, family member, other role model, etc.). A simple regression analysis measured the relationship between the number of influencers working in the nonprofit sector, and nonprofit career awareness. The number of influencers in the nonprofit workforce when the respondent was younger is a significant, but weak, predictor ($\beta = -.230$, $t = -4.166$, $p < .05$, $r^2 = .053$) of awareness of nonprofit sector careers at a young age, supporting the hypothesis that those with role models working in the nonprofit sector are more aware of nonprofit careers. The negative coefficient reflects the reverse-coded dependent variable, and shows that individuals with more role models employed in nonprofits disagree that they did not know about nonprofit careers when they were young.

A difference of means test was conducted to determine the impact of the particular type of role model on the average score of nonprofit career awareness. A one-way ANOVA shows a significant difference between groups’ awareness of nonprofit careers $F(5, 336) = 4.78$, $p < .05$. Hochberg’s GT2 post hoc comparisons show that the significant difference does not, in fact, lie between the different types of role models (parent versus non-relative role model, for example), but instead only between those with zero role models employed in the nonprofit sector and those who indicated that more than one role model was employed in the nonprofit workforce when they were younger. Specifically, those with no role models employed in the sector, on average, agree that they did not know that jobs existed in the nonprofit sector ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.34$), and those with multiple role models, on average,
disagreed (M = 2.50, SD = 1.25). The data show that it is not necessarily the specific type of individual or role model who influences career awareness, but instead, the number of role models and influencers who are working in the sector that influence nonprofit career awareness. Table 6 provides the means and standard deviations for all six groups.

Table 6

*Means and Standard Deviations on the Career Awareness Measure in Relation to the Number of Influencers Working in the Nonprofit Sector When Respondent was Young*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Participants in Group</th>
<th>Nonprofit Career Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed in nonprofit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>63.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family member</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model, non-relative</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple role-models</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both tests support the second hypothesis, which postulates that those whose parents and role models were employed in the nonprofit sector are more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector. As with the first hypothesis, although supported, there is a moderate relationship, at best, between the type and number of individuals working in the nonprofit workforce and its impact on nonprofit career awareness at a young age.

**The Impact of Engagement**

As discussed earlier, various types of engagement can lead to either helping careers or careers in the nonprofit sector. For the purposes of this research, engagement is defined as volunteering and service-learning. On average, respondents have been volunteering since they were 13 years old (SD = 4.60), currently volunteer an average of 11-20 hours in the last
year (SD = 1.41, median = over 20 hours), and are currently a member of 2 organizations, on average (SD = 1.28). Further, the respondents agree, on average, that volunteering helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option (M = 4, SD = 1.16).

Only 114 (33.83 percent) of the respondents had participated in service-learning coursework while in college. However, of those who were exposed to service-learning curricula, respondents took an average of 2 service-learning courses (SD = 1.094), and had some (M = 3.10, SD = .805) prior volunteer experience. Seventy-four percent had either “some” or “a great deal of” volunteer experience prior to their service-learning coursework (n = 85). When asked whether their service-learning host site helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a potential career option, the majority (n = 62, 54.0 percent) indicated neutral or negative responses. Table 7 provides additional descriptive statistics about the respondents’ service-learning experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Means (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of s-l courses taken</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning participants</td>
<td>33.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality service-learning experience</td>
<td>37.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic service-learning experience</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volunteering Patterns

Table 8 illustrates the correlation coefficients between the volunteer-specific independent and dependent variables. There is a strong correlation between parental encouragement and the age at which individuals began volunteering. There is as a moderate inverse relationship between nonprofit career awareness and parental encouragement to
volunteer at an early age. The direction of the relationship is due to the reverse-coded career awareness variable, “NoClue”, which shows that with more parental encouragement to volunteer, respondents tended to disagree that they were unaware of nonprofit careers at a young age. Stated differently, more parental encouragement is related to agreement to nonprofit career awareness.

Table 8
Correlations Between Volunteering Behaviors and Nonprofit Career Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.125*</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>-.141*</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoClue</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.160**</td>
<td>-.232**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VolInspire</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeVol</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParentUrged</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01

**H₅: Encouraged voluntary behavior.**

The first hypothesis related to the impact of volunteering on nonprofit career awareness examines the relationship between parental encouragement of volunteer behaviors and a more general sense of nonprofit work: envisioning a career where they were helping people at a young age. A simple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the variables, and encouraged volunteering was found to be a significant predictor of desire for a helping career at a young age ($\beta = .141$, $t = 2.392$, $p < .05$), supporting this hypothesis. Again, although the predictor is a significant one, it explains a relatively small proportion of the variance in the dependent variable ($r^2 = .022$). As respondents were encouraged to volunteer at a young age, they indicate that they envisioned a career where they were helping people at a young age.
**H4: Enacted voluntary behavior.**

The second hypothesis assessed the impact of volunteering on nonprofit career awareness at an early age. A simple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the age the respondent began volunteering and nonprofit career awareness. Volunteering age was a significant predictor of nonprofit career awareness ($\beta = .160$, $t = 2.874$, $p < .05$), however, only a small amount of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by this predictor ($r^2 = .027$). Thus, those who begin volunteering at an earlier age tend to agree that they aware of nonprofit careers at an early age.

Finally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the age the respondent began volunteering and parental encouragement to volunteer made a significant contribution to nonprofit career awareness. Although the model was significant $F(2, 336) = 9.949$, $p < .05$, only parental encouragement was a significant predictor ($\beta = -.209$, $t = -2.960$, $p < .05$), and explained variance was still relatively small ($r^2 = .058$). As respondent’s parents encouraged volunteering, they agreed that they were aware of nonprofit careers at a young age.

**Service-Learning**

Correlation coefficients of the service-learning variables are provided in Table 9. Quality of the respondent’s favorite service-learning course is a dichotomous variable, and thus, not included in this table. However, the data show a significant, although small, correlation between feeling the service-learning project was valuable to the nonprofit organization and indicating that the service-learning experience did something to facilitate thinking about the nonprofit sector as a career option.
Table 9
*Correlations Between Service-Learning Participation and Service-Learning Inspired Career Awareness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NumberSL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Lval</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLInspire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**H9: Quantity of service-learning.**

A simple regression analysis was used to test the first service-learning hypothesis, which looked at the relationship between the quantity of service-learning courses and service-learning inspired nonprofit career awareness. Specifically, this hypothesis tested whether the number of service-learning courses taken increases feelings of agreement to service-learning experiences helping introduce the respondent to nonprofit careers. Amount of service-learning coursework is not a significant predictor of service-learning helping introduce individuals to nonprofit careers (β = .107, t = 1.124, n.s.), leaving the hypothesis unsupported, and showing no effect. Respondents with service-learning experience did not feel as though their service-learning coursework allowed them to think about careers in the nonprofit sector.

**H10: Quality of service-learning.**

The second service-learning related hypothesis measures the quality of service-learning, and its effect on nonprofit career awareness, acknowledging not all instructors are alike, nor are all components of what is deemed “quality” service-learning (Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005) equally implemented. Respondents were asked several characteristics of their favorite
service-learning course, and “quality” was calculated by having at least 10-15 hours of service as part of the curriculum, having at least two forms of reflection (reflection paper, journaling, in-class discussion, etc.), and having the service component at least moderately integrated into the course. Those indicating fewer characteristics than needed for “quality” service-learning were categorized as having “generic” service-learning experiences. An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in feelings of service-learning having provided nonprofit career awareness between those with “generic” and “quality” service-learning experiences. No significant difference was found in career awareness (t = .055, df = 113, p > .05), as both groups average response was a neutral response (M_{generic} = 3.46, SD = 1.41; M_{quality} = 3.52, SD = 1.11).

Finally, as another measure of “quality” of the service-learning experience, the relationship between providing a service that was valuable to the agency during the service-learning class and service-learning inspired nonprofit career awareness was examined. A simple regression analysis found that service-learning projects that were perceived to be valuable to the organization have a significant, yet small, correlation with service-learning inspired nonprofit career awareness (β = .234, t = 5.064, p < .05), and a small amount of explained variance (r^2 = .055). Although the quality of the service-learning curriculum, as defined by Fenzel and Peyrot (2005), does not seem to lead to increased nonprofit career awareness, meaningful service projects do lead to increased career awareness, leaving this hypothesis partially supported.
Generational Differences

For the purposes of this project, respondents were separated into two groups: those belonging to the Millennial Generation (“Gen Y”), and those older than the Millennials (“Gen X or older”). Several tests were conducted to determine whether there were generational differences in response to some of the dependent variables, as opportunities to engage civically have changed over the past few decades. Table 10 shows the means and standard deviations of generational differences between several of the key independent and dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GenX or Older</th>
<th>Gen Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NoClue</td>
<td>3.26 (1.40)</td>
<td>3.34 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeVol</td>
<td>14.58 (5.86)</td>
<td>12.96 (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VollInspire</td>
<td>3.98 (1.15)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplVol</td>
<td>2.10 (.74)</td>
<td>2.01 (.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumberSL</td>
<td>1.72 (1.11)</td>
<td>1.67 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLLInspire</td>
<td>3.63 (1.42)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplSL</td>
<td>1.62 (.72)</td>
<td>1.77 (.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H₄: Generational Differences in Career Awareness

The first hypothesis pertaining to generational differences examines the level of awareness in nonprofit careers. An independent samples t-test comparing mean scores on the “NoClue” variable of the two generational groups shows no difference in nonprofit career awareness at an early age (t = .399, df = 336, p > .05). Both groups’ mean scores
corresponded to a neutral response, indicating a relative lack of awareness of nonprofit careers at an early age. As such, this hypothesis is unsupported.

**H7: Generational Differences in Volunteering**

The second hypothesis compared generations’ experiences with volunteering, and its impact on nonprofit career awareness. An independent samples t-test found a significant difference in the average age each generation began to volunteer \((t = 8.085, \text{df} = 336, p < .05)\). On average, those in the Millennial generation began volunteering when they were 13 years old \((M = 12.96, \text{SD} = 4.19)\), and those in older generations began volunteering at the age of 15 \((M = 14.58, \text{SD} = 5.55)\). An additional independent samples t-test found no difference in volunteer experience allowing them to think about the nonprofit sector as a place of employment \((t = .194, \text{df} = 336, p > .05)\), leaving this hypothesis unsupported. Both groups’ mean scores corresponded to an affirmative response, indicating agreement with their volunteer participation leading to nonprofit career awareness. Respondents from both generational groups indicated that they felt their experience volunteering had “some” unplanned influence on their careers \((M_{\text{GenX+}} = 2.10, \text{SD}_{\text{GenX+}} = .74; M_{\text{GenY}} = 2.01, \text{SD}_{\text{GenY}} = .80)\).

Only respondents from the Millennial generation indicated having at least some experience with volunteering prior to their service-learning coursework. Those not in the Millennial generation most commonly reported having very little volunteer experience prior to service-learning, and the Millennials most commonly reported having a great deal of volunteer experience prior to their service-learning coursework. Table 11 illustrates these generational differences.
Table 11

*Generational Differences in Volunteering Prior to Service-Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Volunteering</th>
<th>% GenX or Older</th>
<th>% Gen Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>20.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>39.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>40.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H8: Generational Differences in Service-Learning**

The third hypothesis compared generations’ average responses regarding service-learning experience, and whether that experience contributed to their awareness of nonprofit sector careers. An independent samples t-test found no significant generational difference in the number of service-learning courses taken during their undergraduate education (t = .151, df = 113, p > .05), leaving this hypothesis unsupported, as well. Both generational groups took, on average, one service-learning course during college. Additionally, an independent samples t-test found no difference between the generations in service-learning allowing them to think about the nonprofit sector as a career option (t = .055, df = 113, p > .05). Both groups’ mean scores corresponded to an affirmative response, indicating agreement to the idea that service-learning coursework while in college helped them think about careers in the nonprofit sector. Further, respondents from both generational groups indicated that they felt their service-learning experience had “some” unplanned influence on their careers ($M_{GenX+} = 1.62$, $SD_{GenX+} = .72$; $M_{GenY} = 1.77$, $SD_{GenY} = .77$).
Combined Effects of Socialization and Engagement

Two multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine the various impacts of socialization and engagement on nonprofit career awareness. The first multiple regression examines the impacts of various activities on nonprofit career awareness, and the second multiple regression analysis assesses the respondents’ perception of certain variables and its impact on nonprofit career awareness.

H_{11}: Impacts of Socialization and Engagement

The first multiple regression analysis conducted tested the impact of the number of influencers working in the nonprofit sector when the respondent was younger, the composite score on the socialization scale, the age the respondent began volunteering, and the number of service-learning courses the respondent has taken on nonprofit career awareness at a young age. The multiple regression model was significant, but only two predictors, SocComp and NumYoung, were significant ($\beta_{\text{SocComp}} = -.156$, $t = -2.502$, $p < .05$; $\beta_{\text{NumYoung}} = -.171$, $t = -2.810$, $p < .01$), and the model explained only a small amount of variance, $R^2 = .089$. Table 12 shows the standardized coefficients, significance, and goodness of fit indices. These data only partially support the hypothesis, as only the socialization-related independent variables were found to be significant predictors of nonprofit career awareness in the final model.
While the first model tested the impact of actual socialization, volunteering, and service-learning practices, the second model tested whether respondent perceptions of socialization, volunteering, and service-learning having an impact on their career awareness at a young age. Similar to the first multiple regression, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether agreement to family helping them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option, service-learning experience helping them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option, and volunteering helping them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option led to increased awareness of nonprofit careers when younger.

This multiple regression model was also significant, but only one of the predictors (“FamInspire”) was significant ($\beta = -0.310$, $t = -3.177$, $p < .01$), and the model explained only a moderate amount of variance, $R^2 = .118$. Table 13 shows the standardized coefficients, significance, and goodness of fit indices. As with the first multiple regression analysis, these data only partially support the hypothesis, as only perceived impact of role models is found to be a significant predictor of nonprofit career awareness.
Table 13
Results of Second Multiple Regression Analysis: Perceived Impacts of Volunteering, Service-Learning and Family on Nonprofit Career Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.723</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VolInspire</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLInspire</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FamInspire</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.310**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The Impact of Serendipity

A little over half of the respondents (n = 191, 56.68 percent) indicated that they have always wanted to work in the nonprofit sector, and over half of the respondents (67.60 percent, n = 228) reported that they were unaware of careers in the nonprofit sector when they were younger, signifying a potential lack of career awareness, and perhaps no “typical” path to entry in the nonprofit workforce. 74.78 percent of respondents (n = 252) report that a serendipitous event has impacted their career. Table 14 shows the proportion of respondents who felt that various unexpected events impacted their careers. The most frequently reported event was simply being in the right place at the right time (87.25 percent, n = 294), although exposure to work the respondent found interesting was reported nearly as frequently (86.93 percent, n = 293).
Table 14
*Impact of Serendipitous Events on Respondents’ Careers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unplanned influence</th>
<th>% No Influence</th>
<th>% Some/A Great Deal of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right place / right time</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>87.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to work <em>did</em> find interesting</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>86.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering at an organization</td>
<td>29.08</td>
<td>70.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to work <em>did not</em> find interesting</td>
<td>40.39</td>
<td>59.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning experience</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>54.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H₃: Less Exposure Leads to Serendipitous Careers**

A logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the respondent having always wanted to work in the nonprofit sector was related to feeling that a serendipitous event impacted their career path. The Chi-square statistic for variables not entered in the initial model (“AlwaysNP”) was 4.932, df = 1, p < .05, indicating that the addition of this variable to the model impacted the predictive power. Further analysis showed that as the respondents’ agreement to always wanting to work in the nonprofit sector increased, the likelihood of them saying that their career selection was not a product of serendipity also increased. Stated differently, those who have not always wanted to work in the nonprofit sector found their careers to be more a product of serendipity. Table 15 provides the beta values, standard errors, and model statistics of the logistic regression model.
Table 15

*Logistic Regression Analysis: Intentional Careers and Serendipity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI for exp b</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.027** (.493)</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>1.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlwaysNP</td>
<td>.254* (.124)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .015$ (Cox & Snell), .022 (Nagelkerke)

Model $X^2 (1) = 4.932$, p < .05

* p < .05, ** p < .001

Correctly predicted yes: 74.1%; Correctly predicted no: 29.1%

The second step in evaluating this hypothesis was to determine which events, in particular, contributed to feeling that a nonprofit career is the product of serendipitous events. A logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine whether respondent socialization to voluntary behavior, the age the respondent began volunteering, and exposure to service-learning was related to feeling that a serendipitous event impacted their career path. Specifically, this logistic regression tested the hypothesis that less exposure to the work of the nonprofit sector through those various means of engagement would lead to more reports of serendipitous career selection. The Chi-square statistic for variables not entered in the initial model was 1.523, df = 3, p > .05, indicating that the addition of any of the independent variables to the model would not impact the predictive power. Thus, the hypothesis is not supported. Table 16 provides the beta values, standard errors, and model statistics of the logistic regression model.
Table 16

*Logistic Regression Analysis: Impacts of Socialization, Volunteering and Service-Learning on Serendipity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI for exp $b$</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>exp $b$</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.156* (.954)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocComp</td>
<td>.019 (.018)</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeVol</td>
<td>.029 (.032)</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumberSL</td>
<td>-.039 (.124)</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .005$ (Cox & Snell), .008 (Nagelkerke)

Model $\chi^2 (3) = 1.523$, $p > .05$

* $p < .05$

Correctly predicted yes: 97.8%; Correctly predicted no: 1.3%

The results for H3 are mixed in that they show that having always sought a career in the nonprofit sector helped predict less instances of serendipitous careers. However, the three primary forms of socialization to the nonprofit sector, which have been found to be significant predictors of nonprofit career awareness in other regression analyses, did not lead to less reports of serendipity in respondent career selection. As a result, this hypothesis is partially supported.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This exploratory research will help establish a framework through which to consider nonprofit career awareness. The purpose of this study was to assess the relationships between early-life experiences, nonprofit career awareness, and current employment in the nonprofit sector, among a sample of members of a national nonprofit association.

Methods and Procedures

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey research design. The survey was distributed to 4,085 members from four chapters of the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network. Chapter leaders distributed an initial participation solicitation to their members, as well as two follow-up emails between the fall of 2012 and the winter of 2013. The email solicitations resulted in a total of 360 responses, yielding an overall response rate of 8.8 percent. After data cleaning and modification, a total of 337 useable responses were left in the dataset, with a final response rate of 8.2 percent.

Major Findings

The primary research questions of this study were what are the impacts of early life experiences on understanding and pursuing careers in the nonprofit sector? Are nonprofit careers a product of “right place, right time”, or the product of socialization and exposure to nonprofit “work”? Finally, is there a difference between those who belong to the Millennial generation and those who belong to older generations in how they became familiar with the
nonprofit sector as a potential career option? Several hypotheses were tested in Chapter 4, and the outcomes of those tests are summarized below:

- **H1**: Those whose parents and role models demonstrated service and philanthropic behaviors were more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector – SUPPORTED
- **H2**: Those whose parents and role models were employed in the nonprofit sector are more aware of career opportunities within the nonprofit sector – SUPPORTED
- **H3**: Those with less exposure to the nonprofit sector through socialization, volunteering, and service-learning will be more likely to indicate that their career choice was influenced by a serendipitous event – PARTIALLY SUPPORTED
  - **H3a**: Always wanting a nonprofit career related to less serendipity – SUPPORTED
  - **H3b**: Socialization elements related to less serendipity – NOT SUPPORTED
- **H4**: There will be a difference among generations in whether they were aware of nonprofit careers at a young age – NOT SUPPORTED
- **H5**: Those who were encouraged to volunteer frequently at a young age are more likely to have expressed interest in a “helping” career from a young age – SUPPORTED
- **H6**: Those who begin volunteering at an earlier age are more likely to have been aware of nonprofit careers at a young age – SUPPORTED
- **H7**: There will be generational differences in the impact of volunteering on nonprofit career awareness – NOT SUPPORTED
H₈: There will be generational differences in the impact of service-learning on nonprofit career awareness – NOT SUPPORTED

H₉: Students with more service-learning experience indicate that the service-learning experience helped introduce them to nonprofit careers – NOT SUPPORTED

H₁₀: Those with higher quality service-learning experiences indicate that their service-learning helped introduce them to nonprofit careers – PARTIALLY SUPPORTED

H₁₀ₐ: “Quality” as defined by curricular elements – NOT SUPPORTED

H₁₀₉: “Quality” as defined by service that is of value to the agency – SUPPORTED

H₁₁: Increasing exposure to the nonprofit sector through socialization and various engagement activities increases awareness of nonprofit sector careers – PARTIALLY SUPPORTED, as only the socialization variables were significant

Having tested and either found support or not for these hypotheses¹⁰, this chapter will now focus on the meaning behind these findings, as well as the implications of this research. Finally, this chapter will identify questions that arose from this research project, as well as avenues for future inquiry.

**Discussion**

The second chapter highlighted literature surrounding career decision-making, and its impact on the selection of nonprofit sector careers. In the sections below, the results of this

---

¹⁰ All hypotheses are presented as alternative hypotheses in this research.
study will be discussed within the context of the research questions posed, as well as previous research surrounding career selection.

**Limitations**

Because this research utilized a nonprobability sample, it is not possible to say whether these respondents are “typical” of younger people who are working in the nonprofit sector, or are representative of the general nonprofit workforce. As such, any interpretation of this research should be generalized only to this member subset of the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network. This group of respondents may be similar to other members of the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network, but it is not possible to confirm whether they are, indeed similar, as demographic data for the entire population are not available.

This project was a retrospective study of those working in the nonprofit workforce. One limitation that can arise from retrospective reports is the ability to correctly recall information from when an individual was younger, leading to possible recall bias (Golden, 1992; Huber & Power, 1985; Wolfe & Jackson, 1987). In addition, this research did not utilize a comparison group to determine whether the experiences of those currently working in the nonprofit sector were significantly different from those working in the government or for-profit sectors, further limiting generalizability.

**Impacts of Early-Life Experiences**

The impacts of early-life experiences will be examined first through the lens of parental and role model socialization. What are the implications of childhood socialization to volunteering, and parents or role models working in the nonprofit sector? Next, this section
will tease out the effects of continued volunteer participation and service-learning experiences on nonprofit career awareness.

**Socialization.**

Social learning theory of career decision-making indicates that individuals tend to learn about career opportunities because of the environment in which they are raised, and the values that are espoused and enacted at home, in school, and in the immediate community (Biggerstaff, 2000; Bright et al., 2005b; Brown & Mann, 1991; Krumboltz et al., 1976; Niles & Harris-Bowlsbey, 2002; Palladino Schultheiss et al., 2005; Scherer et al., 1991). As such, both family and role models play an important role not only in helping young people understand the family or community’s values and priorities, but also in helping young people learn about the various careers that are available to them (Aronson, 1999; Erikson, 1968; Hackett, Esposito & O’Halloran, 1989; Kelman, 1961). This research tested and supported prior work in the area of socialization to nonprofit careers. In this study, family and role model socialization to nonprofit careers was examined both through the number and type of role model working in the nonprofit sector, as well as the environment in which the respondent was raised vis-à-vis socialization to engagement and helping behavior.

**Socialization to engagement.**

Socialization contributes to career choice, but it also contributes to early participation in voluntary behavior. Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, a fundamental component of social learning theory of career decision-making (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Mitchell et al., 1979), helps explain how parents and other role models convey the importance of service, and facilitate early engagement among young people (Janoski et al., 1998; Janoski & Wilson, 1995). Parents and role models initially model the behavior, but then reward the child for
their own engagement. As children are socialized into the values of their community, they reflect on and build their identity around those values (Avrahami & Dar, 1993; Bekkers, 2004, 2007; Youniss et al., 1999). It is the internalization of service that leads an individual to build their personal identity around a life of service.

This research finds results similar to those in prior studies surrounding socialization into volunteering and helping behaviors, in that many of the participants were socialized into nonprofit service and helping behaviors at a relatively early age. One respondent remarks, “Having a mother from a third-world country, I grew up in a family/community-centric atmosphere that valued the wellness of the whole over the success of an individual. My father took me along on volunteer projects from a young age and was highly involved in volunteerism.” Another states, “I was highly influenced by the Jewish value of ‘Tikun Olam’ [healing the world] and knew I wanted to do something that made a difference and contributed to the greater good.” Influenced by community socialized values, these respondents sought careers in which they could enact those values professionally.

Respondents were encouraged to lend a helping hand (71.21 percent, n = 240), were encouraged to help each other in their family (81.00 percent, n = 273), and frequently discussed moral values with their parents (71.81 percent, n = 242). These espoused valued tended to correspond into enacted values, as respondents to this study came from families that volunteered regularly (32.64 percent, n = 110), encouraged voluntary behavior from a young age (48.66 percent, n = 164), regularly donated to charitable causes (33.23 percent, n = 112), or encouraged donative behavior from a young age (23.74 percent, n = 80). The average respondent began volunteering themselves when they were 13 years old (SD = 4.60). Further, there is a strong relationship between being encouraged to volunteer at a young age
and the age the respondent began volunteering \((\beta = -0.524, p < .01)\). Respondents whose parents encouraged them to volunteer began volunteering when they were younger.

This study found that socialization, when measured by a composite socialization scale, predicts nonprofit career awareness \((\beta = -0.225, t = -4.112, p < .05)\), but only a small amount of variance is explained by this particular predictor \((r^2 = 0.051)\). As such, although there is a relationship, it does not seem as though these values and early-life experiences alone necessarily translate into an understanding of careers in the nonprofit sector. One interesting discovery is that the composite socialization scale correlated moderately with reports of family helping the respondent think about the nonprofit sector as a place of employment “FamInspire” \((r = 0.463, p < .001)\). “FamInspire” was not used as the dependent variable because it is not time-specific and limits interpretation for career awareness at a young age. However, the correlation does show that families engaged in service are, at the very least, also engaged in conversation surrounding the respondent’s nonprofit career. Another respondent notes that, “They helped me make decisions about where to take my academic and career paths based on facets of my personality that aligned with nonprofits…”

**SLTCDM and socialization to nonprofit careers.**

Social learning theory of career decision-making notes that alongside socialization to the values or preferences inherent in a particular career path, associative learning also provides a set of information to young people as they explore opportunities available to them. External sources provide positive or negative ideas about particular occupations (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Mitchell et al., 1979; Palladino Schultheiss et al., 2005), and individuals then make conclusions about that particular career. As young people see family and role models engage in various career opportunities, they notice whether that role model is having a
positive or negative experience in that occupation. That young person then begins to form positive or negative opinions of that occupation, based on the feedback received from their parent or role model working in that capacity. One respondent articulates this point concisely, “My mother worked in the public sector and with nonprofits, and had a very successful career. My father worked a variety of dead end corporate jobs that left him tired and bitter.”

About one-third of the respondents (36.80 percent, n = 124) report having at least one parent or role model working in the nonprofit sector when they were younger. Regression analysis supports the notion that having influencers working in the nonprofit sector led to greater awareness of nonprofit careers ($\beta = -0.230$, $t = -4.166$, $p < .05$), although this, like socialization to helping behaviors, explains only a small portion of the variance in nonprofit career awareness ($r^2 = .053$).

Further analysis uncovered that it was not, in fact, who (parent, role model, other family member) is working in the nonprofit sector when the respondent is younger, but instead, how many people are working in the nonprofit sector that impacts nonprofit career awareness $F(5, 336) = 4.760$, $p < .05$). The number of influencers working in the nonprofit sector correlated moderately with reports of family helping the respondent think about the nonprofit sector as a place of employment “FamInspire” ($r = .374$, $p < .001$). What seems to matter most is having multiple parents or role models working in the nonprofit sector when the respondent was younger. As respondents have greater socialization to the work of the sector, and to helping or altruistic behaviors, they are better able to see the nonprofit sector as a place of employment. One respondent reports, “My mother, who is an executive director of a nonprofit serving the elderly, is my hero and I have always wanted to help people in the
same way that she has helped our community.” They see their parent making a difference in the community, feeling good about the impact she has in others’ lives through her profession, and want to have a similar experience in their own career.

This notion of role model socialization into helping behaviors and careers in the nonprofit sector builds on Perry’s (1997) work, which indicates that socialization leads to higher public service motivation. Not only does socialization lead to behaviors and values that are preferred for public and nonprofit sector work, watching role models working in the nonprofit sector makes individuals aware of the sector as a place of employment. People are often exposed to the “work” of the nonprofit sector for the first time through their role models. They are then able to see career options within the nonprofit workforce and assign meaning to “nonprofit careers”.

**Continued engagement through volunteering.**

Prior research on patterns of volunteering, as indicated earlier in this chapter, shows that volunteering is not only a socialized behavior, but also a behavior that can become consistent, and integrated as part of the individual’s identity. Volunteers and those working in the nonprofit exhibit a similar desire for doing good and helping others (Drucker, 1990; Flanigan, 2010; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jeavons, 1992; Light, 2002) and nonprofit professionals show a desire for meaning in their chosen career (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Mirvis, 1992; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983). Volunteering was hypothesized as yet another means of socializing individuals to the nonprofit sector, by allowing them to enact their values of helping others, as well as allowing them to see the work of the sector being carried out in a professionalized manner.
On average, respondents have been volunteering since they were 13 years old (SD = 4.60), currently volunteer an average of 11-20 hours in the last year (SD = 1.41, median = over 20 hours), and are currently a member of 2 organizations, on average (SD = 1.28). Further, the respondents agree, on average, that volunteering helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a career option (M = 4, SD = 1.16). These statistics support other research, which shows that those employed in the nonprofit sector tend to volunteer more than their peers employed in other sectors (Houston, 2005; Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Wuthnow, 1994).

The impact of volunteering on nonprofit career awareness was assessed in two ways: by addressing encouraged voluntary behavior, as well as enacted voluntary behavior. Encouraged volunteering was found to be a significant predictor of desire for a helping career at a young age (β = .141, t = 2.392, p < .05), and there is a significant correlation between encouraged volunteering and nonprofit career awareness (r = -.232, p < .01), supporting this hypothesis. Those who were encouraged to volunteer at a young age were not only more interested in helping careers, they were more likely to know that they could be employed in the nonprofit sector. Volunteering age was also a significant predictor of nonprofit career awareness (β = .160, t = 2.874, p < .05). The younger the respondent begins volunteering, the more likely they are to be aware of nonprofit careers at a young age. Both predictors explain only a small amount of variance in the dependent variables (r² = .022 and r² = .027, respectively), though, which indicates that there are other elements that influence nonprofit career awareness.

Several respondents alluded to the important role volunteering did play in making them aware of the nonprofit sector as a potential career path. Says one respondent, “First of
all, it squelched the rumor that people who work at nonprofits don’t get paid. Second, it exposed me to the different aspects of running a nonprofit (fundraising, community outreach, etc.). It opened up a whole world to me that I didn’t really know much about before the volunteer experience.” Another respondent offers a similar sentiment, “I volunteered one Christmas at a friend’s work – a nonprofit in Northern California. I didn’t know you could be PAID (emphasis is respondent’s) to work in nonprofits!” Both indicate that volunteering provided them with a glimpse into the professionalized workforce that they were previously unaware of, and these results support prior research indicating that volunteers seek employment in the nonprofit sector after meaningful and successful volunteer experiences (Houston, 2006; Lee, 2009).

**SLTCDM and volunteering.**

Respondents tended to come from families that interacted with the nonprofit sector already. Parents and role models volunteered, worked in the nonprofit sector, or gave to charity when the respondents were younger. The communities in which these respondents were raised contributed to their desire to help others as well. Respondents were socialized into community engagement, participation, and helping behaviors in a variety of ways. Instrumental learning, an element of SLTCDM, suggests that experiences with volunteering may allow these respondents an opportunity to interact with nonprofit organizations in a semi-professional capacity, provided the volunteer experience is more sophisticated than not (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Mitchell et al., 1979). Respondents note that their volunteer experience helped them think about careers in the nonprofit sector, and several, through qualitative responses, outline ways in which their experiences with volunteering allowed them to see that careers in the nonprofit sector as something that might be of interest to them.
Further, volunteering was shown to be an unplanned event which led several respondents to think about the nonprofit sector as a place for employment, indicating the relevance and applicability of Happenstance Learning Theory in examining the relationship between volunteer experiences and nonprofit career awareness (Krumboltz, 2009; Krumboltz et al., 1976; Krumboltz & Levin, 2010).

**Continued engagement through service-learning.**

This research also examined the implications of service-learning experience, as it provides a structured interaction with nonprofit organizations, when implemented correctly. Like volunteering, service-learning has been identified as a socialized behavior (Astin & Sax, 1998; Beckman & Trozzolo, 2002; Eyler-Walker, 1997; Sax et al., 1996), and service-learning students begin to define themselves by a standard of service to others and continue this service beyond their undergraduate careers (Astin et al., 1999; Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005; Jones & Hill, 2003; Misa et al., 2005; Stukas et al., 1999; Warchal & Ruiz, 2004). Further, service-learning is an opportunity for students to identify and articulate career goals (Astin et al., 2000; Jones & Abes, 2004; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000), and to enact those goals in the nonprofit setting.

Only 114 (33.83 percent) of the respondents had participated in service-learning coursework while in college. However, of those who were exposed to service-learning curricula, they took an average of 1 service-learning course (M = 1.68\(^{11}\), SD = 1.094), and had some (M = 3.10, SD = .805) prior volunteer experience. Seventy-four percent had either “some” or “a great deal of” volunteer experience prior to their service-learning coursework (n = 85), which supports previous work on service-learning participants (Astin & Sax, 1998; Sax et al., 1996).

\(^{11}\) This variable was coded such that 1 = no service-learning, 2 = 1 service-learning course, etc.
Acknowledging the idea that not all service-learning curricula are created or implemented equally well, the impact of service-learning was tested both through quantity, and through quality, as defined by Fenzel and Peyrot (2005). However, this research found that neither amount of service-learning coursework ($\beta = .107$, $t = 1.124$, $p > .05$), nor quality of service-learning coursework ($t = .055$, $df = 113$, $p > .05$) had a significant impact on nonprofit career awareness, as facilitated by the service-learning experience. The only variable that had a significant correlation with service-learning inspired nonprofit career awareness is participating in service-learning projects that had a perceived value to the nonprofit host site ($\beta = .234$, $t = 5.064$, $p < .05$). Thus, hypotheses regarding service-learning’s impact on nonprofit career awareness are only partially supported.

These results are not necessarily contradictory to previous work connecting service-learning participation to nonprofit careers, as those studies found service-learning to predict more general “helping” careers, which could include those not in the nonprofit sector, but are still service-oriented (Astin et al., 2000; Jones & Abes, 2004; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). Further, their work did not evaluate nonprofit career awareness, but something akin to public service motivation, in that they outlined a commitment to service, rather than career awareness or career decision-making. Qualitative responses reinforce this idea, as respondents tended to discuss the benefits of their service-learning experience in terms of being “part of something bigger and better” or “learn(ing) about the populations and see(ing) people not as fortunate as me,” rather than seeing the work of the nonprofit sector being carried out through their service-learning activities.
SLTCDM and service-learning.

The data above show little support for service-learning as a means of nonprofit career awareness, in general. However, the relationships between parental socialization to service-learning, as well as the relationships between volunteering and service-learning participation are indicative of the relative importance of environmental conditions on service-learning experiences (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Mitchell et al., 1979). As indicated above, service-learning participants tend to come from families who volunteer, and are volunteers themselves prior to their service-learning experience. These findings are supported in the data presented in this research as well. However, as SLTCDM posits, service-learning participants are not connecting curricula to career, via either instrumental or associative learning. They are socialized to the idea of nonprofit careers through other means.

Early influences summary.

Having tested these hypotheses, it seems as though both familial socialization and volunteering provide an introduction into the working world of the nonprofit sector, but service-learning does not. Further, multiple regression analysis indicates that of those three elements, family socialization, both perceived (β = -.310, t = -3.422, p < .01) and enacted through role models working in the nonprofit sector (β = -.171, t = -2.810, p < .01), or through demonstrated behaviors (β = -.156, t = -2.502, p < .01), provides the most influence over awareness of nonprofit careers at a young age. However, although these are significant predictors of nonprofit career awareness, they are relatively small pieces of the puzzle that defines how young people learn about careers in the nonprofit sector.
Generational Influences

Another primary research question addressed the influence of generational differences on nonprofit career awareness. Young adults today have demonstrated a substantial increase in engagement, and have volunteered more than other generations (Astin et al., 2000; Pryor et al., 2008; Toppe et al., 2001). This comes both in the form of informal individual volunteering, with an increase in 1.5 million volunteers between 2010 and 2011 alone (Blackwood et al., 2012), as well as an increased presence of formalized volunteer and service-learning programs in communities and on college campuses (Astin et al., 2002; Titlebaum et al., 2004).

Generations and volunteering.

With this evident increase in volunteer engagement and community involvement, this study hypothesized that there would be generational differences in nonprofit career awareness, as well as different impacts of volunteering between the Millennial generation and those of older generations. Although respondents from the Millennial generation began volunteering at a younger age than those of older generations ($M_{Millennial} = 12.96$, $SD = 4.19$; $M_{Older} = 14.58$, $SD = 5.55$), there was no generational difference in their volunteer experience leading to nonprofit career awareness. Both groups agree that volunteering helped them think about careers in the nonprofit sector, but there was no difference in career awareness, even though the Millennials have volunteered from a younger age ($t = .399$, $df = 336$, $p > .05$).

Generations and service-learning.

This study also found no difference in the impact of service-learning between respondents from the Millennial generation and older generations. Both generations had approximately one service-learning course while in college ($M_{Millennial} = 1.67$, $SD = 1.09$;
However, 79.31 percent (n = 69) of the Millennial respondents reported having “some” or “a great deal” of volunteer experience prior to their service-learning coursework, while only 55.55 percent (n = 15) of those from older generations had as much prior volunteer experience. There was no reported difference in service-learning allowing them to think about the nonprofit sector as a career option (t = .055, df = 113, p > .05). Both groups indicated that they felt as though service-learning coursework helped them think about nonprofit careers while they were in college.

**SLTCDM and generations.**

Opportunities to engage civically have changed over the last fifty years, which provides different generations with different, or in some cases more, opportunities to interact with the nonprofit sector. Although older generations (Generation X and older) had fewer, if any, opportunities to engage in service-learning, their experiences with that pedagogical tool almost mirrored those of the Millennial generation. While respondents from the Millennial generation began to volunteer at an earlier age, there were no generational differences in terms of volunteer experience leading to nonprofit career awareness. This contradicts the SLTCDM notion of “genetic endowment” leading individuals to various career opportunities (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Mitchell et al., 1979). In this case, although Millennials began volunteering at an earlier age, the different generations of nonprofit employees denote relatively similar exposure to and experiences with the nonprofit sector prior to their career.

**Generations summary.**

These findings indicate that the research question posed requires additional study, as well as identification of additional explanatory variables. Although the younger generations
tend to volunteer from an earlier age, and volunteered more prior to service-learning, it does not seem to have had an impact on overall career awareness at a young age.

**Happenstance**

The final research question juxtaposed the intentional selection of a nonprofit career with simply being in the right place at the right time. Bright, Pryor and Harpham (2005), suggest that people view their career choices as less intentional or rational, and are more a product of external factors. Rather than acting in a manner that produces a specific career goal, people tend to treat their career path as a product of external forces (Hirschi, 2010; Krumboltz, 2009; Krumboltz, Mitchell & Jones, 1976). This can be particularly salient when a career path is relatively unknown. About half of the respondents (n = 166, 49.26 percent) reported that they were unaware of careers in the nonprofit sector when they were younger, signifying a potential lack of career awareness, and perhaps no “typical” path to entry in the nonprofit workforce. Nearly three quarters of the respondents (74.78 percent, n = 252) report that a serendipitous event has impacted their career. The most frequently reported event was simply being in the right place at the right time (87.25 percent, n = 294), although exposure to work the respondent found interesting was reported nearly as frequently (86.93 percent, n = 293).

Logistic regression analysis showed that having always wanted to work in the nonprofit sector was related to feeling that a serendipitous event impacted their career path ($X^2 = 4.932$, df = 1, p < .05). As the respondents’ agreement to always wanting to work in the nonprofit sector increased, the likelihood of them saying that their career selection was not a product of serendipity also increased. A separate logistic regression tested whether
respondent socialization to voluntary behavior, the age the respondent began volunteering, and exposure to service-learning was related to feeling that a serendipitous event impacted their career path. However, the addition of those variables did not increase the predictive power of the model ($X^2 = 1.523$, df = 3, $p > .05$). These results left the research question unsupported, as many people claimed that unplanned events impacted their career, but none of the primary independent variables led to a decrease in unplanned careers in the nonprofit sector.

**Conclusions**

The bulk of respondents, most of whom are already working in the nonprofit sector, agree to having a lack of awareness of nonprofit careers at a young age (67.60 percent, $n = 228$). Yet, they remember wanting to find a career where they were helping someone when they were younger (82.49 percent, $n = 278$). There seems to be a disconnect between having a desired occupation that involves helping people, and knowing that those types of careers, in other words paid employment, are found in the nonprofit sector. This section identifies implications of this research, as well as avenues for future inquiry.

**SLTCDM as a Framework for Nonprofit Careers**

The data outlined above show support for SLTCDM’s role in nonprofit career awareness. SLTCDM suggests that genetic endowment, environmental conditions, learning experiences, and self-efficacy contribute to an individual’s process of career decision-making (Krumboltz et al., 1976; Mitchell et al., 1979). Further, SLTCDM gives credence to the idea that unplanned events can make a substantial impact on career choices (Krumboltz, 2009;
Krumboltz et al., 1976; Krumboltz & Levin, 2010). According to this theory, individuals will learn about and select nonprofit careers based on who they are and the environment in which they are raised. Although not covered within the scope of this project, females might be more socialized into what are classified as “helping” careers, like teaching, nursing, and nonprofit work (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Betz, 1986). This would account for the overabundance of women in the nonprofit workforce, both found in this study, as well as within the population at large. What was surprising was the lack of generational differences in terms of exposure to various types of engagement, considering the increased opportunities provided to more recent generations. The next sections of this chapter will look at the ways in which the environment, learning, and self-efficacy components of SLTCDM are similar to the pre-career experiences of those working in the nonprofit sector.

**A future for SCCT in nonprofit career theory?**

Although the data from this research support the use of social learning theory of career decision making as a framework through which we can examine nonprofit career awareness, it does seem as though SCCT does intersect with some of the more developed lines of inquiry outlined above, volunteering, specifically. SCCT posits that individuals have a sense of personal agency as it pertains to their career decision-making. Stated simply, people find certain activities enjoyable, and make subsequent decisions to continue pursuing those activities (Hansen, 2005; Lent, 2005; Lent et al., 1996). We see a bit of this behavior particularly (and perhaps only) within the volunteering literature, particularly as it relates to the internalization of helping behaviors. Individuals continue volunteering on a core basis, not only because they enjoy it, but also because it becomes part of their identity (Bekkers, 2004; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Selznik, 1992). In other words, they enjoy volunteering, and
continue pursuing that activity because they enjoy it. However, this research shows that nonprofit careers are still a relatively unknown entity, making intentional choices less feasible for eventual career selection. As lines of inquiry develop surrounding elements that lead to nonprofit career awareness, as well as nonprofit career choice, it will be interesting to see whether SCCT does become a more appropriate theoretical approach.

**Exposure to Paid Nonprofit Work**

This research examined various ways in which people interact with the nonprofit sector as a young person, using SLTCDM as a theoretical framework to help define relevant pre-career experiences. In the sections below, each of the three major facets included in this research, socialization, volunteering, and service-learning, are evaluated for their various impacts on and contributions to nonprofit career awareness.

**Socialization leads to awareness.**

These data show that among this group of respondents, the way family discusses the importance of, and interacts with, the nonprofit sector helps an individual self-identify with helping behaviors at a young age. Socialization allows an individual to develop similar values and internalize a desire to help others, as they are encouraged to engage in activities that are consistent with and reinforce helping behaviors. Parents and role models who encourage voluntary and helping behaviors tend to have children who are more aware of careers in the nonprofit sector at a young age. This could be attributed, in part, to early exposure to volunteering, but it could also be part of broader career-related discussions between parents and their children. This topic was not explored within the research questions of this study, although is worth pursuing as an avenue for additional research.
Having parents or role models work in the nonprofit sector inherently provides an opportunity to understand that paid employment and doing good can coexist. However, role models also provide feedback about what that occupation looks like, reinforcing the appropriateness of SLTCDM as a framework through which we can understand nonprofit career awareness. If someone comes home from work each day and talks about the impact their organization has on the local community, a young person may see that as a good occupational choice. If someone comes home from work each day, as one respondent states, “bitter and jaded”, they are likely to form negative imagery surrounding that occupation, and not consider it among their choices of future careers. Those working in the nonprofit sector can provide the best promotion of, and best create awareness of, nonprofit sector careers to young people and job-seekers by not only socializing individuals into helping behaviors, but also by discussing the positive elements of working in the nonprofit sector.

**Volunteering leads to awareness.**

These respondents note that volunteering provides them a view into the *paid* working world of the nonprofit sector. They are able to see the various facets of nonprofit work, be it development, program implementation, or administration. Many of the respondents indicated in their qualitative responses that they were completely unaware, and sometimes shocked, that people could be compensated for work in the nonprofit sector. It seems as though paid employment in the nonprofit sector is still somewhat of a myth, unless an individual has a role model working in the nonprofit sector when they were younger, or is interacting with nonprofit organizations in some meaningful way on their own. Respondents’ awareness of nonprofit careers that developed from unplanned experiences volunteering also speaks to the appropriateness of SLTCDM, specifically, the element of happenstance, as a framework to
understand nonprofit careers. Unplanned volunteer experiences tended to lead this group of respondents to careers in the nonprofit sector.

Need for volunteer management.

Early exposure to the work of the nonprofit sector has helped introduce respondents to the idea of nonprofit careers, which reinforces the need for well-managed volunteer programs. Nonprofits can engage in good volunteer management practices that help provide more sophisticated experiences for volunteers, and hopefully showcase the day-to-day life of someone with a nonprofit career. Says one respondent of her well-managed volunteer experience: “I volunteered at a local arts organization as a junior in college, which was my first taste of truly volunteering for a nonprofit … The org (sic) that I volunteered for really cared about facilitating my personal and professional growth, and allowed me to take charge of one program. I was pleasantly surprised at the amount of responsibility I was given and the amount of trust and faith that they had in me. This experience grew my skill set and also made me realize that this is the kind of work I want to do.”

Core volunteers are interested in helping others, and are interested in the work of the nonprofit sector. Good volunteer management programs provide relevant and meaningful volunteer experiences that help young people preview the working world of the nonprofit sector. Nonprofit staff, whether in leadership positions or not, can take time to mentor young people who are volunteering for their organizations, and have discussions about future careers in the sector, or even encourage job shadowing programs to help promote awareness of nonprofit jobs. In addition, organizations that provide high-quality volunteer experiences for individuals who are working-aged have an opportunity to “audition” potential staff in a low-cost manner (Edwards et al., 2001).
Service-learning: Alternate goals.

One of the more surprising results was that there was no difference in the impact of service-learning on nonprofit career awareness among the generations, nor did service-learning individually have any direct impact on nonprofit career awareness. In theory, those in older generations would not be able to participate in service-learning curricula, as it had not been implemented on many college campuses until the late 1990s (Titlebaum et al., 2004; Toole, 1999), and if it was implemented, so little research had been done on the impacts of service-learning that a “preferred” pedagogical implementation had yet to be established until after most of the students from Generation X and older generations had graduated from college (Toole, 1999). That there was almost equal service-learning participation among the Millennial and older generations was equally surprising.

Neither generation felt as though service-learning contributed to their awareness of nonprofit sector careers. Further, there was no difference in nonprofit career awareness among those with “quality” or “generic” service-learning programs, reinforcing the disconnect between service-learning curricula and exposure to the working world of nonprofit careers. However, those who reported that their service-learning project was valuable to the organization felt as though the service-learning experience helped them think about the nonprofit sector as a place of employment. Although not tested, this could be indicative of better nonprofit-managed service-learning experiences, as there are varying levels of involvement from class to class. Perhaps those who work more closely with the staff of the nonprofit are then able to see a nonprofit “in action”, where those working more distantly are simply working on just another course project. Currently, Fenzel and Peyrot’s (2005) scale focuses only on the student experience, and how inter-related the course
concepts and service project are. Perhaps the quality measure, although well-developed, is missing a few components that would better address nonprofit career awareness resulting from the service-learning experience, namely the value of the service project to the agency and the level of agency involvement in the project.

Another concern with the inclusion of service-learning in this project is related to the goals or purposes of service-learning. One goal of service-learning is to allow students to move from “patronizing” charity workers, toward enacting values more aligned with social justice and understanding (Eyler & Giles, 1999). So, rather than providing nonprofit career awareness, perhaps the purpose is to simply socialize individuals toward helping behaviors, and an appreciation of the “other”. On the other hand, the institutions that were so fundamental to the widespread implementation of service-learning, like the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and (more broadly) the National Service-Learning Cooperative were primarily interested in engaging young people in service (McHugh, 2004); shouldn’t having a better understanding of the working world of the nonprofit sector and a desire to pursue a nonprofit career, then, be an additional goal?

An Accidental Career?

The results of this study did not show that early life experiences lessened the serendipitous nature of nonprofit careers. Rather, many unplanned events have impacted the career trajectories of the participants in this research, and these respondents’ careers are, by and large, a result of unplanned events. A substantial proportion of the respondents noted that they had unintentional exposure to work they found interesting, that volunteering at an
organization had provided an unplanned influence on their career selection, or that simply being in the right place at the right time created a career opportunity for them.

These data allude to the relatively unknown nature of nonprofit sector careers, but also create questions surrounding the interpretation of the unplanned events scale, as they do not ask the respondent to reflect on a particular point in time. Did those who responded that they were encouraged by others to pursue education or look into a new field receive that encouragement early in life, as they were making choices about their education or first career move, or did they receive that information mid-career? In moving forward with this project, the researcher will seek clarification surrounding those questions, as outlined below.

**Implications for Nonprofit Management Education**

This topic is important to the future of the nonprofit sector. As the sector grows and the Boomer generation retires, it will require more professionals to help maintain service provision. There is a population of individuals who experience work in a nonprofit agency regularly with service-learning participation or volunteer engagement. They are more engaged in their communities than previous generations, and are engaged in different ways (Astin et al., 2002; Kiesa et al., 2007). Generally, these individuals hold the same ideals and motivations as current nonprofit employees: altruism, desire for an intrinsic benefit in their daily work, low desire for pecuniary benefit as a main reward of their job, and a need to make the world a better place. Perry and Wise (1990) indicate that individuals with certain qualities and motivations are more likely to actively seek out employment in organizations that complement those qualities. However, these individuals aren’t aware of how to find work within the nonprofit sector (Light & Light, 2006).
As individuals interact with nonprofit organizations, they not only gain an awareness of the sector and how it operates, they gain a greater appreciation for the work of nonprofit employees. One respondent to Astin and colleagues’ study illustrates a prime example of the eventual impact service-learning participants may make on the nonprofit community:

“The service thing kind of turned on the light. There was so much more out there that I didn’t even know existed. The nonprofit agency – that never occurred to me. I think job, I think putting on nice clothes, waking up at 8:00 in the morning, going to some office-type setting, sitting at a desk. That’s what I always saw in a job” (2000, p. 64).

This student (although perhaps misinformed about the 8:00am wake-up call) clearly indicates the prime importance of engagement to the nonprofit community. Service-learning, volunteerism and socialization to the sector open new doors to those who had previously failed to consider the third sector as a future employer. Because of the ideological similarities between the groups, nonprofit organizations should begin to actively recruit these individuals from local universities. Edwards, Mooney and Heald note that some of the potential benefits of interacting with student volunteers is the, “pre-employment opportunity to evaluate and train potential staff members” (2001, p. 447).

This topic is also of great importance to colleges and universities. Because several factors, including service and socialization to the sector, help students realize yet another possible career path, it is important for career services departments at colleges and universities to help foster that relationship. When holding career fairs, universities can invite several local nonprofit agencies to participate, and offer them a reduced rate so they can participate. When forming panels on resume preparation, universities should include participants that are able to help students create a resume that will enhance the skills needed in third sector organizations. Finally, they can assess student demand, and consider offering courses in nonprofit management or philanthropic studies. If students are interested in
employment in the nonprofit sector as a result of service-learning, they should be offered a curriculum that will not only enhance their marketability to nonprofits, but also better prepare them for effective and meaningful participation within the sector.

Much of this discussion has included the importance of early-life experiences in understanding nonprofit careers. The results have demonstrated that those respondents who have certain experiences at a young age, particularly role model socialization and role models actually working in the nonprofit sector, tend to be more aware of nonprofit careers at a young age. While natural to discuss the implications for the nonprofit sector at large, it is also important to discuss the implications for nonprofit management education.

The respondents who were most aware of nonprofit careers at an early age were well-socialized into the nonprofit sector, tended to volunteer, and had role models working in a nonprofit when they were younger. Additional research has shown that those already working in the nonprofit sector tend to volunteer more than those in other sectors (Hansen et al., 2003; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Light, 2002; Park & Word, 2009; Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Word & Carpenter, 2010), and have a particular set of motivations and preferences (Drucker, 1990; Flanigan, 2010; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jeavons, 1992; Light, 2002; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Mize Smith et al., 2006; Rose-Ackerman, 1996; Word & Carpenter, 2010), similar to those who volunteer regularly. It would then seem fitting for undergraduate nonprofit management or applied social science programs to look to young volunteers as targeted pool for recruitment.

If young people are engaged in service from an early age, and socialized into helping behaviors, they may be likely candidates for careers in helping industries like social work or nonprofit management. Attracting those potentially-interested individuals into formalized
degree programs might also better professionalize the nonprofit sector, as an increasing number of those new to the working world will be better trained and prepared to handle the day-to-day challenges of working in the nonprofit sector.

**Future Research**

This exploratory study begins to answer questions surrounding nonprofit career awareness. However, due to both the limitations of this research, as well as the early nature of inquiry in this area, subsequent work needs to be done utilizing a random sample of nonprofit sector employees, so that the results will be able to be generalized to a population broader than those currently studied. In addition, there were questions left unanswered, and several new questions have formed in light of these findings. With what we know about growth in the nonprofit sector and the nonprofit workforce, what can nonprofit organizations do to help make career opportunities known among those who are likely to be interested in that particular career trajectory? Also with the recruitment process in nonprofit and other organizations already labor-intensive and difficult, how can organizations proactively recruit the right people into the nonprofit workforce?

**Mixed-methods research.**

This study is the first step in a larger research project that utilizes explanatory mixed-methods design. Now that some major themes have been uncovered, respondents who have indicated an interest in additional research participation will be interviewed to further elaborate on their quantitative and qualitative responses. These responses will help identify, in part, the influences of unplanned events, as that research question was left unanswered. In addition, those who have indicated that they participated in service-learning coursework will
be asked about their perceptions of the impact, or lack thereof, of that coursework on their awareness of nonprofit sector careers. Further, although many respondents indicate that they come from families who espoused and enacted values that are congruent with those found in the nonprofit workforce, what specific impacts did parents and other role models have on these respondents when they were younger, that led them to an interest in nonprofit careers?

**Job shock and retention within the sector.**

One of the questions that arose from the high report of unplanned influences is that of “job shock”. In other words, did perceptions of “nonprofit work” meet reality for those who perhaps did not intend to work in the nonprofit sector from a young age, or even for those who are considered “sector-switchers”? What are the differences in experience and expectation among those who are socialized into the sector by various means, have volunteered from a young age, or have even had a formalized nonprofit management education? Tangentially related to the issue of “job shock”, another avenue for future research would be to determine whether those who were socialized into the nonprofit sector were more likely to pursue undergraduate degrees in nonprofit management. Or, do those who have less socialization to the nonprofit sector, and perhaps unintentional careers in the sector, tend to pursue graduate education to fill a gap in knowledge?

**Panel study.**

An additional area of inquiry would be to conduct a longitudinal study with a group of school-aged children that measures their parental and role model socialization to the values found in the nonprofit sector, to see who, among their role models, is working in the nonprofit sector, and track their volunteering, service-learning participation, and educational trajectories through job selection. Doing so would allow researchers to determine actual
predictors of nonprofit career awareness and career selection, and provide for more in-depth analysis than a cross-sectional survey can provide.

Finally, the issue of service-learning provided several new areas of research, as indicated earlier in this chapter. The quality of a service-learning project is currently measured primarily through the lens of pedagogy, which is appropriate with it being a community-based curricular element. However, with the impetus for the service-learning movement coming from a significant push toward community engagement, couldn’t having a better understanding of the working world of the nonprofit sector and a desire to pursue a nonprofit career, then, be an additional goal or element of engagement? If so, there seems to be an element of “quality” missing. Perhaps quality could also address nonprofit career awareness and sustained engagement, resulting from the service-learning experience. Specifically, is there room to include the value of the service project to the agency and the level of agency involvement in the project as a measure of quality? Do those two variables contribute to either sustained engagement or nonprofit career awareness?

In conclusion, this research is the first step in exploring which early-life experiences help determine awareness of nonprofit careers. Although the results are not generalizable beyond the respondents to this study, there is now a foundation for additional research projects. Additionally, there is an opportunity to begin building a testable model that can help determine the paths individuals take prior to their entry into the nonprofit workforce, and this researcher looks forward to pursuing these avenues of inquiry.
APPENDIX A

LISTING OF MISSING VALUES BY VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Original N</th>
<th>Missing Responses</th>
<th>Imputed N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NoClue</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FamInspire</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlwaysNP</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serendipity</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumYoung</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhoYoung</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocComp</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeVol</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParentUrged</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VolInspire</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumberSL</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QualitySL</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-LVal</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLInspire</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplSL</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplVol</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplRP</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplDid</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnplDidNot</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

SURVEY INFORMATIONAL LETTER

You are being asked to participate in an online research study because you are a member of a YNPN chapter, and either employed in, or interested in, the nonprofit workforce. The researcher in charge of this study is Erin Nemenoff, a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership.

This research will examine the ways people learn about careers in the nonprofit sector, and the influences of prior experience on the selection of a nonprofit career. The online survey should take about 20 minutes to complete, and will ask you about various experiences you had with education, volunteering, and interactions with role models, as well as your decision to join the nonprofit workforce. Responses to the online survey are anonymous, as no information will be collected that can specifically identify you as a participant, and all responses will be reported in aggregate.

You will also have the option of participating in a follow-up interview to discuss your responses a little more in-depth. If you choose to participate in the interviews, your responses will no longer be anonymous, but will be kept confidential, and no identifying information will be included in analysis or reports.

This research is considered to be minimal risk. That means that the risks of taking part in this research study are not expected to be more than the risks in your daily life. There are no other known risks to you if you choose to take part in this study. Although you may not benefit directly from participation in this research, it will help inform how nonprofit organizations recruit the next generation of nonprofit leaders into the sector. Additionally, participants completing the survey are eligible to enter a drawing for a $100 Amazon gift card, using a link in the survey below.

Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary - you can choose to participate or not, and you may quit the survey at any time for any reason. Clicking the button below indicates a willingness to participate.

You should contact the Office of UMKC’s Social Sciences Institutional Review Board at 816.235.5927 if you have any questions, concerns or complaints about your rights as a research subject. You may call the researcher, Erin Nemenoff, at 816.235.5885 if you have any questions about this study. You may also call her if any problems come up during the survey.

☐ Yes, I agree to participate (1)
☐ No, I do not wish to participate (2)

If No, I do not wish to participate is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey
**APPENDIX C**

**SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**Education:** In this section, you will be asked about your educational background and experiences.

QA1 Please indicate the highest degree you (A) have earned as of August 2012, and the highest degree you (B) plan to complete eventually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>(A) Highest Degree Completed (1)</th>
<th>(B) Highest Degree I Plan to Complete (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a High School Diploma (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma / GED (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Certificate (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's (A.A. or equivalent) (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., B.Div., etc.) (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's (M.A., M.S., M.P.A., M.N.M., etc.) (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL.B., LL.M. and / or J.D. (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D., D.O., D.D.S., or D.V.M. (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D. or D.P.A. (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QA2 What was your primary undergraduate major? (history, chemistry, etc. - leave blank if not applicable)

QA3 What was your secondary undergraduate major or minor? (leave blank if not applicable)

QA4 What was your graduate degree major? (leave blank if not applicable)

QA5 If you could choose your undergraduate major again, would you still choose that same major?
- Definitely yes (1)
- Probably yes (2)
- Maybe (3)
- Probably not (4)
- Definitely not (5)

QA6 Which undergraduate major would you choose if you were able to choose again?

QA7 In college did you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a leader in one or more organizations (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in study abroad (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in student government (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a social fraternity or sorority (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in an honors society (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a service-oriented organization (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in student clubs/groups other than those listed above (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Career, Part 1: In this section, you will be asked about your current sector of employment, experiences in your past job searches, and general opinions about your career.

QB1 In which sector are you currently employed?
- Public / government sector (1)
- Private sector (2)
- Nonprofit sector (3)
- Unemployed (4)

QB2 Did you work in a different sector previously?
- Yes, public / government sector (1)
- Yes, private sector (2)
- Yes, nonprofit sector (3)
- No (4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>I don't know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have always wanted to work in the nonprofit sector (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my last job search, I was specifically looking for jobs in the nonprofit sector (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to stay employed in the nonprofit sector with future job searches (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I was younger, I envisioned a career where I was helping people (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not know that jobs in the nonprofit sector were a career option when I was younger (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QB4 Thinking back to when you were a teenager, what were your career aspirations?

QB5 Briefly describe how you first became interested in a career in the nonprofit sector:

QB6 Approximately how many organizations have you worked for since graduating from college or entering the workforce as an adult?

QB7 Please think back to your most recent job search when answering the following questions:
   ______ Approximately how many positions did you apply for? (1)
   ______ How many job offers were you able to choose from? (2)

QB9 When thinking about your career, how important are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essential (1)</th>
<th>Very Important (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat Important (3)</th>
<th>Not important (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working for social change (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income potential (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recognition or status (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable, secure future (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and initiative (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of personal values (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of jobs (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership potential (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work / life balance (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to pay off debt (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QB10 Please rate your agreement to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>I don't know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in putting duty before self (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing well financially is definitely more important to me than doing good deeds (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much of what I do is for a cause bigger than myself (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel people should give back to society more than they get from it (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am one of those rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QB11 Please rate your agreement to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>I don't know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most social programs are too vital to do without (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seldom think about the welfare of people whom I don't know personally (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are few public programs that I would wholeheartedly support (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Career, Part 2: Sometimes unplanned events like a family move, the economy, or even learning about careers that you didn't know existed, impact our career decisions. In this section, you will be asked about those types of events, and whether they had an impact on your choice to seek work in the nonprofit sector.

QB12 A serendipitous event is an event that was not planned or predictable, but has had a significant influence on your career (e.g. an internship that turned into a permanent career, a networking opportunity that lead to a job). Do you feel like your career was influenced by a serendipitous event?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

QB13 Please describe the serendipitous event
QB14 Please rate the influence that the following unplanned events had on your career in the nonprofit sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No influence (1)</th>
<th>Some influence (2)</th>
<th>A great deal of influence (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional or personal connections that led to information about jobs, informal recommendations, etc. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous work or social experiences (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to your previous career plan (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of others (to acquire education and experience, set higher goals, pursue a new field) (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended exposure to a type of work or activity that you DID find interesting (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended exposure to a type of work or activity that you DID NOT find interesting (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major change of residence over which you had little or no control (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QB15 Please rate the influence that the following unplanned events had on your career in the nonprofit sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No influence (1)</th>
<th>Some influence (2)</th>
<th>A great deal of influence (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected advancement (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right place / right time (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences of marriage and family (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary positions became permanent (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military experiences (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of service experiences (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning experiences (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering at an organization (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of historical events (economic situation, natural disaster) (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected personal event (death of a loved one, injury, health problem) (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (11)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Volunteering: In this section, you will be asked about various experiences you have had volunteering, including how much you volunteer, whether you have been a participant in various year of service programs, and your opinions about volunteering in general.

QC1 Approximately how old were you when you first started to volunteer? (in years)

QC2 Approximately how many hours of volunteer service have you completed in the last year?
- None (1)
- One hour or less (2)
- 2-5 hours (3)
- 6-10 hours (4)
- 11-20 hours (5)
- More than 20 hours (6)

QC7 Please indicate which of the following organizations you are currently a member, if any:
- Church, synagogue, mosque or other religious organization (1)
- Political club or political party committees (2)
- Professional societies, trade or business association, or labor union (3)
- Service organizations such as Rotary or Lions (4)
- University alumni association (5)
- Youth support groups (e.g. Girl's & Boy's Club, Little League Parents Association) (6)
- Neighborhood or homeowner's association (7)
- PTA, PTO, or school support groups (8)
- Groups sports team or club (e.g. kickball team, softball team, bowling league) (9)
- Other, please specify (10) ____________________

QC3 Have you ever participated in any "year(s) of service" programs?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

QC4 Which "year(s) of service" programs did you participate in? (please select all that apply)
- AmeriCorps (1)
- Peace Corps (2)
- Senior Corps (3)
- Teach for America (4)
- Other (5)
QC5 Please indicate how important the following statements are to you, or how accurately they describe you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all important /accurate for you (1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Moderately important / accurate for you (4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>Extremely important / accurate for you (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends volunteer (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I'm close to want me to volunteer (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I know share an interest in community service (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I serve when volunteering (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When volunteering, I can make new contacts that might help my career (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering allows me to explore different career options (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QC6 Please indicate how important the following statements are to you, or how accurately they describe you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all important / accurate for you (1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Moderately important / accurate for you (4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>Extremely important / accurate for you (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel compassion toward people in need (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel it is important to help others (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When volunteering, I can do something for a cause that is important to me (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends and family volunteer frequently (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering experience will look good on my resume (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q66 Do you agree that volunteering did anything to facilitate thinking about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)
- I don't know (6)

Q67 What did volunteering do that helped you think about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
**Service-learning:** Service-learning is a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities. In this section, you will be asked about your experiences with service-learning curricula.

QD1 How many service-learning courses did you take as an undergraduate?
- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)
- 5 or more (6)

QD2 How much previous volunteer experience did you have before your service-learning coursework?
- None (1)
- Very little (2)
- Some (3)
- A great deal (4)

QD3 Reflecting on your favorite and least favorite service-learning courses, how many hours of community service were performed for the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>less than 5 (1)</th>
<th>5-10 (2)</th>
<th>11-15 (3)</th>
<th>16-20 (4)</th>
<th>more than 20 (5)</th>
<th>I don't know / I can't remember (6)</th>
<th>Not applicable (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorite service-learning course (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least favorite service-learning course (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QD4 Reflecting on your favorite and least favorite service-learning courses, what forms of reflection were used in each? (please select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection paper (1)</th>
<th>Journals (2)</th>
<th>Class discussion (3)</th>
<th>Other (4)</th>
<th>I don't know / I can't remember (5)</th>
<th>Not applicable (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorite service-learning course (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least favorite service-learning course (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QD5 Reflecting on your favorite and least favorite service-learning courses, how much did the service activity relate to course concepts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all related (1)</th>
<th>Slightly related (2)</th>
<th>Moderately related (3)</th>
<th>Highly related (4)</th>
<th>I don't know / I can't remember (5)</th>
<th>Not applicable (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorite service-learning course (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least favorite service-learning course (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QD6 Reflecting on your favorite and least favorite service-learning courses, how valuable do you think your service-learning project was to the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not valuable (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat valuable (2)</th>
<th>Very valuable (3)</th>
<th>I don't know / I can't remember (4)</th>
<th>Not applicable (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorite service-learning course (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least favorite service-learning course (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QD7 Do you agree that the service-learning host site did anything to facilitate thinking about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
- ☐ Strongly Disagree (1)
- ☐ Disagree (2)
- ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- ☐ Agree (4)
- ☐ Strongly Agree (5)
- ☐ I don't know (6)

QD8 What did the service-learning host site do that helped you think about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
Socialization: In this section, you will be asked about the impact of family and other role models on your choice to seek nonprofit employment.

QE3 Please rate your agreement on the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents rarely donated money to charitable causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father treated his job as one in which he tried to help other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents actively participated in volunteer organizations (such as the Red Cross, March of Dimes, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mother treated her job (in-home or out-of-home) as one in which she helped other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my family, we've always helped one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents very frequently donated money to people who collected money door to door (such as Boy Scouts, Girls Scouts, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning strangers experiencing distress, my parents generally thought that it was more important to &quot;not get involved&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents frequently discussed moral values with me (like the &quot;Golden Rule&quot;, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I was growing up, my parents told me I should be willing to lend a helping hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents often urged me to donate money to charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I was younger, my parents very often urged me to get involved with volunteer projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QE1 When you were younger, did any of the following individuals work in the nonprofit sector? (please check all that apply)
- Parent / Guardian (1)
- Sibling (2)
- Other family member (3)
- Role model, non-relative (4)
- None of these (5)

QE2 Do any of the following individuals currently work in the nonprofit sector? (please check all that apply)
- Parent / Guardian (1)
- Sibling (2)
- Other family member (3)
- Role model, non-relative (4)
- Spouse / Partner / Significant Other (5)
- None of these (6)

Q69 Do you agree that family or role models did anything to facilitate thinking about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)
- I don't know (6)

Q68 What did any family or role models do that helped you think about the nonprofit sector as a career option?
Demographics: In this section, you will be asked to provide information for classification purposes only.

QF1 What is your gender?
☑ Male (1)
☑ Female (2)

QF2 Which state do you currently live in?
(list given)

QF3 In what year were you born?

QF4 What is your race / ethnicity? (please select all that apply)
☑ African American / Black (1)
☑ American Indian / Alaskan Native (2)
☑ Asian (3)
☑ Caucasian / White (4)
☑ Hispanic / Latino (5)
☑ Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander (6)
QF5 What is your organization of employment's primary mission focus?
- Aging & Senior Care (1)
- Alcohol & Substance Abuse (2)
- Animal & Animal Welfare (3)
- Arts & Culture (4)
- Civil Rights & Social Action (5)
- Community Development, Housing (6)
- Developmental Disabilities (7)
- Economic Development (8)
- Education: Early Childhood (9)
- Education: K-12 (10)
- Education: Colleges & Universities (11)
- Environment/Conservation (12)
- Foundations/Philanthropic Grantmaking (13)
- Health & Rehabilitation (14)
- Human Services/Multipurpose (15)
- Jobs, Employment & Training (16)
- Legal Services (17)
- Mental Health & Crisis Intervention (18)
- Public Safety & Disaster Relief (19)
- Public Benefit Social Action (20)
- Recreation, Leisure & Sports (21)
- Rehabilitation & Physical Disabilities (22)
- Religion & Spirituality (23)
- Volunteerism & Philanthropy (24)
- Youth Development (25)
- Other (26)

QF6 What is your organization of employment's approximate budget size?
- Under $250,000 (1)
- $250,000 to $499,999 (2)
- $500,000 to $999,999 (3)
- $1,000,000 to $2,499,999 (4)
- $2,500,000 to $4,999,999 (5)
- $5,000,000 to $9,999,999 (6)
- $10,000,000 to $24,999,999 (7)
- $25,000,000 and over (8)
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