A "Third Age" of the Life Course?

Gendered Time Working and Volunteering, Ages 50 to 75 in the U. S.

Phyllis Moen, Sarah Flood, and Vincent Louis

University of Minnesota

September 13, 2010

A “Third Age” of the Life Course?

Gendered Time Working and Volunteering, Ages 50 to 75 in the U. S.

ABSTRACT

The traditional retirement status passage in the U.S. is eroding and the new demography of aging is marked by postponement of the debilities associated with old age, leading to what is increasingly called a “third age.” We draw on life-course concepts and data from the American Time Use Survey (2003-2009) to examine both the odds of and time spent in paid and unpaid (volunteer) work for 5-year subgroups of American men and women ages 50-75. Full-time employment declines steadily over this age period, however, many in their 60s continue to work part time, be self-employed, or volunteer. Third-age women are less apt to work but more apt to volunteer than men, with volunteering and employment inversely related, and health predicting engagement in both paid and unpaid work.

ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: 127

A "Third Age" of the Life Course?

Gendered Time Working and Volunteering, Ages 50 to 75 in the U. S.

Aging is a fundamental demographic process, one that is being transformed as a result of medical advances extending health and longevity, the movement of the large boomer cohort into and through their 50s and 60s, decades of declining fertility, and the deinstitutionalization of retirement as a one-time, one-way, irreversible exit from paid work occurring at a particular chronological age. The confluence of these forces combined with a turbulent global economy call for examination of the new demography of aging, especially around the years of traditional retirement.

As early as 1980 Jacob Siegel, in his presidential address to the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, pointed to the social and cultural as well as demographic contingencies contributing to a "redefinition of old age" in the United States, noting that such definitions vary depending on "the longevity of a population, the proportion of persons in the older ages, and the degree to which persons at different ages are engaged in useful activities" (Siegel 1980: 345). Since all these factors are now in play, some scholars (c.f. James and Wink 2007; Laslett 1989) suggest a postponement of old age, with a new age period – roughly the 50s, 60s, and early 70s – preceding it.

Is there an emerging third age, beyond conventional adulthood but before "old age"? One possible hallmark of this new life stage is ongoing engagement in what Siegel terms "useful activity:" formal public activities (paid work, voluntary service to an organization) or more informal activities (caring for family members, helping out neighbors or friends). How do the incidence of and time spent engaging in paid work (whether full time, part time, or self-

employment) or unpaid but formal voluntary service shift across age groups in the 50 to 75 age window? What about non-formal but nevertheless "useful" engagement, such as informal volunteering in the form of "helping out" (Wilson and Musick 1997) friends or neighbors? This paper investigates the *social patterning of time spent working and volunteering* in the third-age years, drawing on key life course concepts to assess 1) whether the biographical pacing of alternative forms of engagement is similar or distinctive for women and men , 2) whether other life course processes – socio-locational contexts, linked lives, and lives in historical time (the effects of the Great Recession in 2009) predict both the odds of and time spent in various forms of paid and unpaid work in the third-age years. Such new evidence is essential for understanding the contours of 21st century aging as a social as well as biological process that is literally transforming the contemporary later life course (Adams and Beehr 2006). Capturing the social patterning of working and volunteering for this age group is of pragmatic as well as theoretical value, in terms of the costs of Social Security and pensions (Bidewall, Griffin, and Hesketh 2006; Munnell and Sass 2008), the health and well-being of current cohorts moving through their 50s, 60s, and early 70s (compared to prior cohorts, c.f. Hayward, Hardy and Grady 1989; Vaillant 2002), contributions to the public good (Erikson, Erikson, and Kinvick 1986; Freedman 1999, 2007), and successful aging more generally (Baltes and Baltes 1990; Moen, Dempster-McClain, and Williams 1992; Rowe and Kahn 1998).

THE THIRD AGE

There is growing recognition by social observers as well as scholars of an emerging life stage in later adulthood – somewhere between the traditionally labeled "prime" years of career/family-building and the frailties of old age. Typically defined around the years from age 50 to age 75, this new stage is variously labeled the "third age" (Gilleard and Higgs 2007; James and Wink

2007; Karisto 2007; Laslett 1989; McCullough and Polak 2007; Moen and Altobelli 2007; Moen and Spencer 2006; Sadler 2006; Silva 2008), the "third chapter" (Lawrence-Lightfoot 2009); and the "encore years" (Freedman 2007; Goggin 2009). It arguably represents both the bonus years of healthy aging produced by medical advances and lifestyle changes as well as the unraveling of conventional retirement produced by a turbulent economy, public policies delaying Social Security eligibility, and the disappearing contract between employers and employees trading seniority for job security.

The 50 to 75 third-age period is distinctive in that it involves the transition out of conventional full-time employment and into what are becoming unconventional retirements (Moen 2003). Marc Freedman (2007) sees this period of life course as, for some, a time of service, of remaining in or moving into jobs that contribute to the greater good. Others (McCullough and Polak 2007) depict the third age as a developmental event involving reduced or terminated paid work. Still others (Karisto 2007; Lawrence-Lightfoot 2009; Sadler 2006) depict it as a time of creativity, learning, and personal fulfillment. Even as "childhood" and "adolescence" were constructed in prior times as life stages prior to adulthood, and an as-yet-unnamed "emergent adulthood" is claimed to be arising in the 20s between adolescence and adulthood (Arnett 2007), so too is the third age being conceptualized as a time between traditional adult roles and old age, with being "old" now pushed back to the late 70s, early 80s. As such, the third age may well be less strictly age-defined than role- and identity-defined, a new time of life without established scripts but purportedly rife with possibilities.

Despite growing academic and public discourse on the third age, little is known about individuals' actual engagement at different age-points within this emerging life stage, and in particular, the processes of moving from full-time employment to full-time non-employment. We

draw on a life course approach (Elder and Giele 2009; Elder, Kirkpatrick Johnson, and Crosnoe 2003; Kim and Moen 2002; Mayer 2004) and data from the nationally representative American Time Use Survey (ATUS) to examine and model age- and gender-related patterns in the type and amount of engagement in paid work (full-time, part-time, or self-employment) and volunteer work (distinguishing formal volunteer work for an organization including civic association activity from informal "helping out" of a neighbor or friend - see Andersen, Curtis, and Grabb 2006; Musick and Wilson 2008; Wilson and Musick 1997).

RETIREMENT UNRAVELING

Retirement in the U.S. was institutionalized and legitimated in the middle of the last century as a planned for, universal exit from the workforce (Costa 1998; Graebner 1980). The passage was less "to" than "from," timed as a consequence of mandatory retirement regulations, Social Security benefit availability, pensions, prevailing social norms, and business policies and practices together with biographical exigencies (such as poor health). Retirement was a scripted life course transition, an exit from the career mystique of full-time commitment to paid work defining (middle-class and unionized blue-collar male) adulthood (Moen and Roehling 2005). In the ideal-typical retirement mystique, older workers moved, at ages 65 or 62, lockstep from full-time employment to full-time leisure. Age and non-employment were thus formal criteria in the institutionalization of retirement (Dannefer and Uhlenberg 1999; Kohli 2007; Levy 1986; Mayer 2004; Riley, Kahn, and Foner 1994; Settersten and Mayer 1997). Although the retirement mystique emphasized relaxation and free time as a reward for years of hard work, it also came to signify the *passage to old age*. But a confluence of economic, demographic, organizational, policy and other social forces have upended traditional retirement expectations and experiences, even as medical advances promoting healthy life expectancy have delayed old-age frailties. The

taken-for-granted "naturalness" attributed to the culture and structure of the conventions (c.f. Biggart and Beamish 2003) around the retirement exit and the ensuing "golden age" of leisure has evaporated.

Contemporary American workers are now experiencing two conflicting trends around retirement. On the one hand, retirement remains embedded in established but now outdated social and organizational policies and practices that set *retirement* apart from *unemployment* as a work exit that can be planned for, anticipated, and positively defined (Costa 1998; Graebner 1980). On the other hand, changes in the employer-employee contract, in tandem with the restructuring of corporations, a global information economy, and economic downturns mean that seniority is no longer accompanied by job security (Lippmann 2008; Marshall et al. 2001; Moen and Peterson 2009; Ruben 1996; Sweet and Meiksins 2008). The Great Recession along with a plethora of mergers, bankruptcies, and downsizing have destroyed traditional career patterns, making employment security and retirement timing increasingly uncertain and often precipitating unexpected "early" retirements through retirement packages, buy outs, and forced layoffs (Appold 2004; Bidewall, Griffin, and Hesketh 2006; Hardy, Hazelrigg, and Quadagno 1996).

Simultaneously, there has been a push to postpone the exit from paid work. Federal policies (such as those prohibiting mandatory retirement and age discrimination, along with delaying Social Security eligibility) have sought to make continued full-time employment more attractive to older adults (Munnell and Sass 2008). But different pieces of legislation create mixed messages, further advancing the deinstitutionalization of retirement. Older workers today experience both more latitude and more constraint around what is now an unscripted status transition. For example, large segments of the contemporary workforce are opting to retire from their primary career jobs "early," irrespective of traditional social norms or federal policies

aimed at postponing this status passage (Ekerdt 2004). Others are finding themselves "retired" unexpectedly, through buyouts and layoffs in the face of a competitive global workforce (Rubin 1996; Sweet and Meiksins 2008, Sweet, Moen, and Meiksins 2007). Some older workers love their jobs and don't want to retire, putting it off as long as possible (Hedge, Borman, and Lammlein 2006; Johnson 2009). Freedman (1999, 2007) has suggested that growing numbers want "encore" careers, remaining publicly engaged through unpaid civic engagement or paid work in new, meaningful, and often less than full-time jobs working for non-profits or government units. Still others find they can't afford to retire, and can't envision a time when they won't have to be employed. Thus, retirement is no longer age-graded or lockstep. Even the definition of retirement is unclear; leaving one's career job no longer necessarily means a final exit from the workforce, as people take on post-retirement jobs and there is wide diversity in the age of actually making a final exit from paid work, with the age of a final exit creeping upward. Neither is it clear to what degree and when unpaid volunteer work occurs during the third-age years.

Accordingly, this paper focuses on charting the uncertain, *ad hoc* patterns of employment and volunteering at different age points in the third-age years as well as analyzing whether and how these patterns differ by gender, by survey year, and by other social forces. Doing so sheds light on contemporary age- and gender-graded shifts in both the likelihood of employment/volunteer work and time investments in them, as well as shifts tied to various life course processes.

The leading edge of the vast boomer cohort and those in the cohort just preceding it confront uncertainties and ambivalence in this third-age period, often wanting or needing to "shift gears" rather than leave the workforce altogether (Kim and Moen 2001, 2002; Moen and

Fields 2002; Moen, Huang, Plassman, and Dentinger 2006; Moen, Sweet, and Swisher 2005). Evidence shows that many of those in the third-age years want to continue to work in alternative arrangements, for example in jobs that require fewer hours, as self-employed contractors and entrepreneurs, or else in unpaid community service (MetLife Foundation/Civic Ventures Encore Careers Survey 2008). Others prefer their retirement from full-time employment to be a gradual, phased process, including a period of reduced working hours (Davis 2009; Gobeski and Beehr 2009). A growing number of people also want or feel they must continue to work because they can't afford not to (Burr, Mutchler, and Caro 2007). As the conventional social clock around retirement is losing its legitimacy, and in the face of enormous pressures both to exit *and* to remain in the workforce, we propose and find considerable heterogeneity in the likelihood of and time spent in paid work by Americans in their 50s, 60s and 70s.

Employment is the dominant but not the only form of public participation. The notion of service, of giving back to one's community, of helping those less fortunate, of working toward a greater good, runs deep in American culture (Musick and Wilson 2008; Wuthnow 1991). Even though the free enterprise market dominates American institutions and values, the U.S. is unique in the proportions of its citizenry joining voluntary associations, participating in religious activities, and working with like-minded friends and neighbors to lobby for social change (Baer 2007). In fact, unpaid participation in voluntary associations and community service has been a hallmark of American culture going back to Tocqueville's (1835) time. It has provided the glue connecting citizens to their communities, to their cities and states, to particular causes and interest groups, to a vision of the greater good, and to one another (Putnam 2000; Skocpol 2003; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, and Carpini 2006).

Do third-age Americans continue in or make a shift from paid work to unpaid volunteer work as they move toward their mid70s? This question is especially pertinent as choices around retirement for older Americans are unclear and the concept of productive aging is taking on added currency (Burr, Mutchler, and Caro 2007; Butrica and Schaner 2005; Hank and Stuck 2008).

COVARIATES

We argue that the third-age years reflect a larger temporal patterning of changing social behavior. Individuals ages 50 to 75 are immersed in a key life course *project,* a project involving remaining or moving into some form of (often less than full-time) paid or unpaid engagement, in contrast to what was traditionally a more taken-for-granted, crisp labor force exit . Four key sets of covariates characterize our life-course theoretical model of engagement patterns in the 50s, 60s, and early 70s: biographical pacing, social-locational contexts, linked lives, and historical timing.

Biographical Pacing

The first set of covariates involves the concept of *biographical pacing* (Han and Moen 1999)--the temporal patterning in terms of the ages and stages at which women and men engage in paid and unpaid work. The nature of the *pacing* of various forms of employment and civic engagement throughout the third-age years is unknown. Are paid work and civic engagement in these years mutually reinforcing, at odds with one another, or independent processes? For example, does being employed promote or reduce the odds of volunteering in the 50s, 60s, and early 70s? The incidence and time spent in informal volunteering, what Wilson and Musick (1997) call 'helping out,' is also unclear. Does informal assistance to neighbors and friends occur in place of, in addition to, or independent of formal civic engagement and/or paid work?

Social-Locational Contexts

The second life course theme places the third-age years in *context*, considering social-locational markers of inequality – race, education, homeownership, and gender – shaping or constraining options (O'Rand and Henretta 1999). Social class is a powerful environmental force affecting time use throughout adulthood, including the purported third-age years, with high socioeconomic status linked to cumulative advantages in opportunity and resources. Traditionally, persons lower on the socioeconomic hierarchy in terms of educational attainment have tended to retire earlier and for different reasons than those with a college education. Those with more education have been found to be more reluctant to retire from full-time work or from the workforce altogether (Cahill, Giandrea, and Quinn 2006; Han and Moen 1999; Reitzes and Mutran 2004).

We propose that socioeconomic status operates as both a motivator and an inhibitor, with a college education (or more) increasing the likelihood of employment and civic engagement, while wealth (in this case gauged by homeownership) decreases the likelihood of working for pay but increases the likelihood of unpaid civic engagement. Race, too, should matter, with whites better positioned in the labor market than Blacks or Hispanics and more apt to volunteer (Brown and Warner 2008; Martin and Soldo 1997; Musick and Wilson 2008).

Gender is also a key social-locational marker. Historically, retirement has been a male transition; whole books have been written on retirement without even mentioning women (e.g. Costa 1998; Graebner 1980 but see Hayward, Grady, and McLauglin 1988a and b). This is the first time in history that cohorts of married women are retiring in large numbers. Divorced or widowed women also are more apt than men to remain single, and thus, relying on their own earnings, remain longer in paid work.

Linked Lives

Third, we capture the life course theme of *linked lives* by modeling the social embeddedness of third-age individuals in relationships (marriage, caring for aging relatives, having a spouse who is employed, and whether there are still children under 18 at home). This period of the life course may for some involve the continuation or cessation of active parenting and marriage, the taking on of adult-care obligations of ailing parents or other relatives, and informally "helping out" neighbors and friends, all aspects of interconnected of lives.

Women's expanded labor force participation (Blau and Kahn 2007) underscores the importance of considering the effects of couple-level indicators in an effort to understand the patterning of individual-level behavior. For couples, retirement has become an interdependent process of managing two sets of transitions (Henkens 1999; Henretta, O'Rand, and Chan 1993a and b; Ho and Raymo 2009; Kim and Moen 2001, 2002; Moen, Huang, Plassman, and Dentinger 2006; Moen and Peterson 2009; Smith and Moen 1998). Spouses tend to aim for joint retirement (Moen, Sweet, and Swisher 2005), though often in gendered ways. Most commonly, married women tend to mold their retirement exit plans to those of their husbands (Moen, Sweet, and Swisher 2005). Given traditional gender scripts (Ridgeway and Correll 2004), we propose that having a wife who is employed will *increase* the likelihood of men in their 50s, 60s, and early 70s remaining engaged in paid employment and/or volunteer work. By contrast, we hypothesize that women will be *less* likely to continue to work for pay during the third-age years if they are married and if their husbands are employed, given the strong income effects of their husbands' earnings and/or retirement pensions. Since civic engagement on the part of women conforms to gender scripts, women – and especially wives – may be equally likely to volunteer regardless of their husbands' employment status. Prior research on civic engagement (Musick and Wilson 2008) suggests that being married should increase formal volunteering for both men and women.

Family obligations, such as having dependent children or care-giving responsibilities for older relatives, have tended to delay expected retirement age (Henkens 1999; Szinovacz, DeViney, and Davey 2001). But, since it has often been said that children "volunteer" their parents, we propose that having children still at home in the third age years increases the likelihood of women and men volunteering, as well as the time they spend doing so. Similarly, providing adult care may lead women and men to engage in both formal volunteering and informal "helping out," with adult care possibly promoting time spent in formal civic engagement.

Research suggests that gender norms also complicate the relationship between caregiving responsibilities and the timing of retirement, such that having dependent children at home and/or caring for ailing family members (such as aging parents) should increase the likelihood of *men* engaging in and spending more time in paid work (as breadwinners) while decreasing *women's* tendency to do so. Men may be more likely to delay their exit from full-time work due to their normative provider role, while women (but not men) have been shown to retire early to take on the caregiving of their spouses (Dentinger and Clarkberg 2002). Given prevailing gender norms, we propose that caregiving for parents or other relatives decreases both the likelihood of and the time women (but not men) spend working for pay (Chesley and Moen 2006), while it increases the odds of women (but not men) volunteering, as well as the amount of time women volunteer.

Historical Timing

A fourth life course process, *historical timing*, links history with lives by considering the effects on this age group of large-scale historical forces – in this case the Great Recession – on paid and unpaid engagement. The very concept of the third age derives from historical shifts in education, health, and longevity.

We expect all of these life-course processes to matter, even as we assume that the likelihood and time spent in any form of engagement declines over the third-age years from 50 to 75, with poor health creating a powerful push toward disengagement.

DATA AND PROCEDURES

To capture engagement in the third-age years, we investigate the actual time spent in paid and unpaid (volunteer) work by Americans ages 50 to 75, including, for comparison, respondents both pre-third age (45-49) and post-third age (75-79). Drawing on 2003 to 2009 data from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS), we describe and model both the likelihood of, and the time spent in, paid and unpaid work by men and women in six age groups. Using binary logistic and ordinary least squares regression, we estimate: 1) the distribution and heterogeneity of the biographical pacing of various forms of and time spent in both employment and volunteering by age group and gender, 2) how social locational markers and social relations (linked lives) predict the likelihood of and time spent in public engagement (paid and unpaid) of women and men in the third-age years, 3) whether self-reported health (available only for a subsample) predicts all forms of third-age engagement regardless of gender, and 4) the impacts on various forms of employment and volunteering of historical timing as lives intersect with the Great Recession, captured by survey year.

We document both age differences and gender differences as well as within-group heterogeneity, developing and testing multivariate models of labor force and civic engagement and time spent in them. First, we take a wide lens and model the odds of working (full-time, part-time, self-employment) to capture any effects of social location and linked lives, as well as the biographical pacing in the form of age-group differences in broad patterns of engagement. We also investigate historical timing, possible period effects over the seven years data were

collected, from 2003 through 2009. We consider the impacts of the 2007-2009 economic downturn known as the Great Recession (peaking in 2009) by capturing the year (from 2003 through 2009) in which respondents were surveyed. We then use a tighter lens to examine on the ATUS diary day the different likelihoods and amounts of time spent on the average day in paid (for comparison with the previous models) and unpaid volunteer work for American men and women before, during, and after the third-age years, from age 45 to age 80. Finally, we incorporate evidence on the effects of health for a subsample on which we have a self-reporting measure. The paper concludes with research and policy-relevant issues, including a call to widen the pool of options for meaningful engagement for women and men in their 50s, 60s, and early 70s.

Data

We use integrated[1] data from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS) collected annually from 2003 to 2009 (Abraham, Flood, Sobek, and Thorn 2010). The ATUS is a time diary study of a nationally representative sample of Americans. Respondents in the ATUS reported the activities they engaged in over a 24-hour period from 4:00 a.m. of a specified day until 4:00 a.m. of the following day as well as where, when, and with whom they occurred. Activities are coded using a three-tier, six-digit coding scheme that represents over 400 activities. All responses were recorded using Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) procedures.

ATUS sample members are invited to complete the survey following exit from the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a household survey of the civilian, noninstitutionalized population. One individual aged 15 or older per former CPS participating

1 Data were downloaded from http://www.atusdata.org.

household was randomly selected to participate in the ATUS during the two to five months following their exit from the CPS. ATUS response rates were over 50% for each of the five years (Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Fatigue is the most common reason for ATUS nonresponse, which is a result of using CPS as the sampling frame (O'Neill and Sincavage 2004). Research on nonresponse bias in the ATUS finds little evidence for busyness as a source of nonresponse, though individuals weakly integrated into their communities are less likely to respond to the survey (Abraham, Maitland, and Bianchi 2006) and volunteers are more likely to respond to the survey (Abraham, Helms, and Presser 2009), which may result in an overestimate of engagement in volunteering, although the characteristics of volunteers should not be affected.

The 2003-2009 ATUS captures the daily experiences of 45,322 Americans aged 45-74 of whom 19,702 are men and 25,620 are women. Data are collected all days of the week and on holidays, and weekends are oversampled. Weights correct for the survey design such that aggregating across different days of the week results in a representative picture of average time use among the population.

The Eating and Health module was a supplement to the ATUS fielded from 2006 to 2008. We use data from respondents in these years, who reported their general health, to conduct supplemental analyses which parallel those of the full sample. These models include a measure of general health, and we highlight results that differ after including this control.

Dependent Variables

Our dependent variables capture 1) engagement in paid work and unpaid volunteer activities, and 2) the time spent participating in those activities on the ATUS diary day. The first set of dependent variables are categorical and indicate whether respondents work for pay (full-time,

part-time, or self-employment) and engagement in paid or unpaid volunteer work (formal and informal helping out) on the diary day. The second set of dependent variables consists of the time spent in paid and unpaid engagement among respondents who report these activities and may range from as little as one minute to an entire one-day period (1440 minutes).

Independent Variables

Based on our life course framing, we include several independent variables in our models that are indicators of social-locational context, linked lives, and biographical pacing, and historical timing, the four key processes in our theoretical model. Indicators of social-locational context include education, race, home ownership, and gender. College education is a categorical indicator of whether the respondent received less than a high school degree, a high school degree, some college education, a college degree, or an advanced degree. Race is also categorical with white non-Hispanic people as the reference group contrasted with non-Hispanic blacks, other non-Hispanics, and Hispanic groups. Supplemental analyses also control for self-reported health which we code as good (excellent, very good, good) or poor (fair, poor). All models are estimated separately for men and women.

We include indicators of social relations to capture the "linked lives" aspect of involvement in paid and unpaid (volunteer) work. We combine marital status and spouse's employment, resulting in a three-category independent variable where not married is the reference category and respondents who are married are distinguished by whether their spouse is

employed. We also include dichotomous measures of the presence of children under 18 in the home and caring for ailing adults such as aging parents.[2]

Our final set of independent variables reflects our theoretical interest in biographical pacing in terms of the timing of alternative forms of engagement. We capture overall pacing by age-group and gender. But, since we are also interested in the interplay between paid and unpaid work, we include in our multivariate model measures of employment status, formal volunteering, and informal volunteering (or helping out) to understand their interrelated effects. Employment status indicates whether respondents are working full time, part time, are self-employed, or not working for pay (reference category). Formal volunteering[3] is a measure of involvement in unpaid volunteer activities through organizations. Informal volunteering indicates helping any person who is not a household member.[4] Finally, we use survey year (from 2003 through 2009) to capture any effects of historical shifts in the economy.

THIRD-AGE PROFILES BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER

Table 1 describes the biographical pacing of engagement for five-year age groups in the 50 to 74 age span, as well as those five years pre- and post- these third-age years. We first consider the extent to which men are engaged in paid work and formal unpaid volunteer work at different ages (Table 1A). Men aged 50-54 are similar to pre-third agers (45-49) in paid work, with 16%

---

2 This measure is created based on the respondents' report of care of household or non-household adults on the ATUS diary day. Respondents who reported one or more minutes of care were assigned a 1; all other respondents were coded 0 on this measure.

3 This measure is created based on the respondent's report of doing activities for individuals or institutions through formal organizations on the ATUS diary day. Respondents who reported one or more minutes of formally volunteering were assigned a 1; all other respondents were coded as 0 on this measure.

4 This measure is created based on the respondent's report of helping any non-household person on the ATUS diary day. Respondents who reported one or more minutes of helping others were assigned a 1; all other respondents were coded as 0 on this measure.

not employed compared to 13% of those in their late 40s. The percent of men working full time then drops with age, particularly between ages 55-59 and 60-64, from 57% to 36%, down to 14% percent for those ages 65-69, then further decreasing to 8% among the oldest third-agers (70-74) and to 4% for post-third agers (75-79). Part-time work is more prevalent among men in their 60s and early 70s (8-9%), and 14% of men in their 50s and early 60s are self-employed. Formal and informal volunteering on the diary day are both relatively stable among the different age groups, increasing to a high of 10% among men in the 65-69 age group and 14% for men in their early 50s, respectively. (Only very small percentages of men and women are engaged in educational activities on the diary day, therefore we exclude this type of engagement from multivariate analyses.)

(Table 1 about here)

Table 1B shows women less apt than men to be employed full time in the third-age years, dropping from a high of 53% for women aged 50-54 to 3% among women in their early 70s. The biggest drop in women's full-time employment occurs for the 60-64 age group: 46% of women ages 55-59 work full time, compared to only 30% of women in their early 60s. Another big drop occurs in the 60s – only 10% of those 65-69 are working full time. Part-time employment characterizes 12-14% of women ages 45-69, then drops to 8% for women ages 70-74 and 4% for women ages 75-79.

Figure 1 demonstrates the processes of biographical pacing in the form of the percent of men and women engaging in some form of paid work and unpaid volunteer work at different points in the third-age and surrounding years. Men's non-full-time engagement in paid and unpaid work increases slightly to peak in the 60s, gradually declining thereafter. The increases in less than full-time engagement by men in their late 50s and 60s coincide with steep declines in

full-time employment. For women, non-full time engagement peaks in the pre-third age late 40s. The declining engagement in less than full-time work for men after the 60s is due to decreases in self-employment and part-time work rather than disengagement from unpaid formal volunteer activities, but remains high through the late 60s, with over one-quarter of women engaging in unpaid formal volunteer work or less than full-time employment.

Women's full-time employment is highest among the pre-third-age group (45-49) at 55% and declines steadily, especially among women in their 60s. Women's part-time employment begins to decline by their early 70s, while women's self-employment declines in their 60s. Unlike men for whom less than full-time engagement increases as full-time paid work decreases, women's non-full-time engagement remains relatively steady until they reach their 70s,when there is a noticeable drop off (as there is for men).

(Figure 1 about here)

Descriptive analyses suggest that the effects of the Great Recession (coming to full force in 2009) affected engagement in paid and unpaid work in both age- and gender-related ways (see Table 2). Consider the proportion of men ages 55-59 working full time in 2006: 61.4%. This declines to 53.9% by 2009. Similar declines are found for women in this age group (moving from 48.5% in 2007 to 45.5% by 2009. However, 2009 witnessed an increase in men's (but not women's) full-time work in the early 60s, up to 43.6% by 2009 for men and down slightly to 29.1% in 2009 for women ages 60-64. The gender/Great Recession story shifts for respondents ages 65-69: only 5.2% of women of this age were working full time in 2006, a proportion that almost triples to 15.1% by 2009, actually higher than men's 2009 participation (at 14.5%) in this age range. Over one in 10 men (10.8%) in their early 70s are working full time by 2009, compared to 3.87% of women. Men's 2009 rates of part-time employment are the highest they

have been over the last seven years for men ages 45 to 69, with the exception that ages 60-64 in 2006 men's participation rates in full-time work was higher than in previous years. Women's rates of self-employment were relatively consistent in recessionary and non-recessionary years, while men's declined; only 8.4% of men ages 60-64 were self-employed in 2009, compared to a high of 16.3% in 2005. By contrast, 9.1 % of men ages 70-74 were self-employed in 2009, up from 7% in 2008. Declines in full-time employment among men were coupled with increases in formal volunteering among most men in 2009 (except for those in their late 50s and early 70s whose rates of participation were similar to previous years). In 2009 fewer women in their late 50s were (formal) volunteers while more women in their late 60s volunteered (11.7%) than in previous years. Rates of informal volunteering were largely similar across survey years for men and women in their respective age groups.

(Table 2 about here)

Supplemental analyses (not shown) reveal that the percentage of men working part time who formally volunteer is highest among men 55 to 69 (9-12%) and among self-employed men 65 to 79 (13-15%). Among women who are self-employed, we see high rates of volunteering at all ages between 45 and 79 (from 10-17%) and in their 60s and 70s (from 9-20%) among women employed part time and those not working for pay. These patterns suggest increased participation in formal volunteering coinciding with the cessation from full-time employment in the third age years.

PREDICTING VARIUS FORMS OF PAID WORK

Table 3 reports the relative risk ratios of men and women engaging in various levels of paid work compared to the omitted category of no paid work, confirming the importance of life-course processes of biographical pacing, social-locational contexts, linked lives, and timing, the

historical embeddedness of life in the third age. We find strong age- and education-gradients, with the odds of engaging in full-time, part-time, or self-employment (relative to no paid work) declining with age and increasing with educational level for both men and women in the third-age years. The decline in the odds of part-time work is statistically significant for men ages 65 and older; the decline in the odds of women's part-time or self-employment becomes significant for women in their early 60s.

(Table 3 about here)

Is volunteering at odds with full-time work? We find further evidence of biographical pacing in that unpaid volunteer work is negatively associated with full-time employment for both men and women. Men formally volunteering for an organization are .76 as likely to work full time (compared to men who do not volunteer), and women formally volunteering are only .65 times as likely to work full time. Men and women informally helping out neighbors and friends are only .76 and .82 as likely to work full time, respectively. There is also biographical pacing between volunteering and self-employment. Net of other factors in the model, men who are informal volunteers are only .74 times as likely to be self-employed, relative to men who are not informal volunteers. Neither formal nor informal volunteering predicts the odds of either women or men working part time or of women being self-employed.

We also hypothesized and find that linked lives matter, with marital status and especially spouses' employment status predicting employment, but in gendered ways. Having a wife who is employed almost triples the odds (2.70) of men of engaging in full-time work, more than doubles the odds (2.31) the odds they will be self-employed, and increases the odds by over half (1.65) of men working part time. By contrast, having an employed husband *decreases* the odds of women's full-time employment (.78) while increasing the odds of women working part time

(1.31) or being self-employed (1.53). Having a wife who is not employed also increases the odds (1.34) of men's full-time work, while having a husband who is not employed *decreases* the odds of women engaging in full-time (.41), part-time (.61) or self-employment (.51), compared to women without husbands.

Children's lives are also linked to the employment of their parents. Having children under 18 in the home increases the odds of third-age men's full-time work (1.3) and self-employment (1.47), while active parenting *decreases* the odds of third-age women's full-time employment to .70 and self-employment to .77 (compared to those with no children at home). Caring for parents and other ailing relatives is also linked to engagement. Men providing such adult care to have lower odds of either full-time work (.50) or self-employment (.57); women care-providers also have reduced odds of full-time (.52) and part-time (.75) employment.

Social-locational markers predict paid engagement in the third age years – sometimes in unexpected ways. Contrary to our expectations, Hispanic men in this age group are 1.46 times *more* likely than white men to work full time. Black men are less apt to be engaged in any form of paid work, while black women have lower odds of working part time or being self employed compared to white women.

The timing of lives related to the historical period in which they play out also predicts third-age employment. Models (not shown) that include interactions between age and year show that there are no age-specific recession effects except for men ages 45 to 49, who have higher odds of working full time in 2003-2005 and 2007 compared to 2009, and men ages 50-54, whose odds of working full time are 1.62 times higher in 2008 compared to 2009. Third-age women's patterns of full-time employment seem largely unaffected by the Great Recession.

PREDICTING VOLUNTEERING

Table 4 presents the odds of engaging in formal and informal volunteer behavior on the ATUS diary day separately for men and women, as well as, for comparison, the odds of any paid work. We see *no age differences* in the odds of engaging in formal volunteer activities on the ATUS diary day for men, with the exception of *increased* odds of formal volunteering among those in their early 70s (1.51) compared to men ages 45-49. While third-agers' full-time employment reflects biographical pacing in the form of declining participation, formal volunteer work follows a different life course rhythm with age. We also see increased odds of formal volunteering for women in their late 60s and 70s (1.30, 1.31, and 1.44, respectively, compared to women ages 45-49). Men show no age differences in informal volunteering, while women in their late 60s and 70s are less likely to help out neighbors or friends net of other factors in the model. Note the steady declines in the odds of any paid work among both men and women ages 55 and older, reinforcing the evidence that, while paid work may attenuate through the third age years, this is not the case for volunteer work. In terms of biographical pacing, except for the negative effects of full-time employment, other types of employment have no significant effect on the odds of women or men engaging in formal or informal volunteer activities, with the exception that men who are self-employed are only .74 times as likely to informally help out friends and neighbors as those not working for pay.

(Table 4 about here)

As with paid work, we see different social-locational context effects in the form of a strong educational gradient in the odds of engaging in formal volunteer activities, with more educated women and men having higher odds of formally volunteering and of informally helping out. Hispanic men are less (.56) likely to engage in formal volunteer work as white men, in

contrast to their increased odds of paid work. Black and Hispanic women have lower odds of volunteering formally or informally compared to white women We also see positive associations between formal volunteering and engaging in helping behaviors (informal volunteering) for women and men (OR=1.40 and OR=1.25, respectively).

The ways in which men's and women's lives are linked to those around them impact their odds of formally and informally volunteering. Married men are more apt to formally volunteer than those without wives, and married men whose wives are employed are more apt to help out neighbors and friends. As theorized, men with children still at home are 1.45 times more apt to formally volunteer. Men caring for an infirm adult are 2.73 times as likely to informally help out neighbors and friends.

Linked lives also affect women's odds of formally and informally volunteering. Women who are married are more likely to formally volunteer than women who are not married. Like men, women with children still at home have higher odds (1.2) of formally volunteering than those without children at home, though still caring for children negatively predict the odds (.83) that women will informally help out neighbors and friends. Engaging in caregiving for infirm adults reduces women's odds of formally volunteering (to .69), but more than triples (3.39) their odds of their informal volunteering.

In terms of historical timing, net of other factors in the model, men interviewed in the recessionary year 2009 are 1.4 times as likely to formally volunteer as those interviewed in 2003, but less likely (.79) to informally help out.

HEALTH EFFECTS

Health is intertwined with paid work, but does it predict all forms of paid work in the third-age years? Does it also predict volunteer engagement for this age group? We show health

coefficients from age- and gender-specific models (similar to Tables 3 and 4) for a subsample of respondents for whom we had a measure of self-reported health (in the 2006-2008 surveys). It is clear (Table 5) that good health has strong effects on employment, increasing the odds of engaging in any type of paid work for both men and women between the ages of 45 to 69. The magnitude of the health coefficients largely declines with age for men, though less so for women. The effect of health on volunteer behavior shows no consistent pattern, suggesting that poor health does not necessarily predict the absence of volunteering. Including self-reported good health (data not shown) in the model makes the relationship between formally volunteering and engaging in paid work no longer significant for men and slightly attenuates the effect for women. Controlling for health in subsample analyses, full-time employed men have similar odds of formal volunteering as men who are not employed, while women employed full time are not statistically different from women who are not employed in their likelihood of informally volunteering.

(Table 5 about here)

Including health in our models (for this subsample) also suggests that some of the social-locational effects may be capturing health effects. Educational gradient effects on formal and informal volunteering effects are attenuated for men when we include health in the model and are slightly stronger for women net of health effects. Net of health, black men are 1.5 times as likely as white men to formally volunteer. The effects of race -- Black and Hispanic women have lower odds of volunteering formally or informally compared to white women -- are no longer significant when we include a health measure in the model.

PREDICTING TIME SPENT IN PAID AND UNPAID WORK

Table 6 shows the results of OLS regression models predicting the number of minutes men and women in this age group who do work or volunteer spend actually engaged in paid work and unpaid volunteer work on the ATUS diary day. Models on the subsample of men and women for which we have a health measure (surveyed from 2006 to 2008) show similar results; self-reported health is *not* significantly related to the time spent actively engaged in paid or volunteer work in the subsample models. The paid work model in Table 6A shows clearly how the time spent in paid work is substantially lower among working men in their 60s and 70s compared to those ages 45-49. Working men ages 60-64 spend about 35 minutes less per day on paid work compared to 45-49 year olds, while those ages 65-69 spend 88 minutes less on average, net of other factors in the model, falling to 108 minutes for those 70-74.

(Table 6 about here)

We see negative associations between volunteering and time spent in paid work, such that those who formally or informally volunteer spend nearly an hour less in paid work (51 and 60 minutes, respectively). Married men spend more time in paid work than non-married men, on the order of 20 and 18 minutes for those whose wives are employed and not working for pay, respectively. Working men who care for infirm relatives spend about an hour less on the job, on average, compared to men who do not engage in adult care.

Time spent formally volunteering among men (Table 6A) is much less clearly patterned than time spent working. Working full time most substantially affects the time men spend formally volunteering, with a reduction of nearly an hour compared to men who do not work for pay. Self-employed men put in 38 fewer minutes formally volunteering than those who do not work for pay. Engagement in less than full-time paid work and in informal volunteering

negatively affect men's formal volunteering, as do the ways in which men's lives are linked to those around them.

Among women who work for pay (see Table 6B), there is a steady decline with age in the time spent working. The gap widens from 19 fewer minutes for women ages 55 to 59 (compared to women ages 45 to 49), to over two hours (123 minutes) for women ages 75 to 79. We find that employed black women spend about 30 minutes *more* in paid work than white women. As was the case for men, we also find a negative relationship between formal and informal volunteering and time women spend doing paid work, with each associated with about an hour decrease in paid work, net of other factors. Whereas married men spend *more* time in paid work than non-married men, married women spend more than 20 minutes *less* in paid work than non-married women (24 minutes less if their spouse is employed and 23 minutes less if their spouse is not employed). Having young children at home and caring for infirm adult relatives both predict women spending less time working (19 and 60 minutes less, respectively).

As was the case for men, women's models of time spent formally and informally volunteering are less clear than models of time in paid work (Table 6B). Full-time employment reduces women's time in formal volunteering by 47 minutes and part-time work reduces volunteering by 30 minutes. Informal volunteering is reduced by 11 minutes when women are employed full time. We find Hispanic women who volunteer spend 38 minutes *more* in formal volunteer work, on average, than white women. Note that, net of other factors in the model, age, education, and home ownership are not significantly associated with women's volunteer time. In terms of associations between different forms of engagement, we see negative relationships between women who formally/informally volunteer and time spent informally/formally volunteering (11 minutes and 19 minutes less, respectively).

CONCLUSIONS

While gender headlined the story of the changing 20th century workforce demography, the most striking demographic change in the U.S. workforce in the early 21st century is a story about age *and* gender, with a growing proportion of the workforce consisting of women as well as men in their 50s and 60s, and fewer young people entering it (Schmidt and Purvi 2009; Schnittker 2007). Four historical trends—longer and healthier life spans, uncertain retirement prospects and forced early as well as delayed retirements, the aging of the large boomer cohort, and fertility declines—account for this remarkable change in the age structure of the nation's workforce. Moreover, there is a large—and growing—retired force no longer in their career jobs. The third-age argument is that a significant portion of what is a more vigorous, more educated emerging third-age life stage – now boomers and those just preceding them -- in their 50s, 60s, and early 70s – are eager to remain engaged, but in different ways and with different time investments, rather than accept traditional notions of "retirement" as being on the sidelines of society.

We used the American Time Use Survey from 2003-2009 to investigate the incidence and the time actually spent in both paid and unpaid engagement, by different age groups of third-age women and men. Drawing on data on women and men ages 50 to 75, as well as five years on either side (45 to 49; 75 to 80), we find evidence of the deinstitutionalization of conventional retirements and evidence for some of an emerging third-age lifestyle—somewhere between total retirement leisure and total full-time work. We find that for many the third age consists of ongoing but heterogeneous forms of engagement: declines with age in full-time work, but ongoing or increasing part-time work, self-employment and formal or informal volunteer work. There is not as of yet an institutionalization of this third age, what some call an 'encore' life

stage (Freedman 2007), but neither is there a sharp tipping point from total engagement to total non-engagement at any particular age.

Our life-course formulation theorized four key processes operating to shape patterns of engagement in work or volunteering in the third-age years (Elder and Giele 2009; Moen 2001; Moen and Spencer 2006). The first is the biographical pacing of different forms of engagement across age-groups and different amounts of time spent in various activities. Prior to the third age (ages 45-49), 87% of American men and 76% of American women are working for pay. Beyond the third age years (ages 75–79), fully 85% of men and 92% of women are not employed, with 80% of men and 87% of women in their late 70s saying they are "retired." By contrast, unpaid work does not decline markedly. Only 7% and 9% respectively of pre-third age men and women (ages 45-49) formally volunteer and 10% and 13% respectively informally help out; but post-third age (75-79) we find that men's and women's formal volunteering is even higher This study sheds light on the biographical pacing of different forms of engagement in the years in between.

Our life course approach to engagement in the emergent third-age years also points to the importance of social-locational context. The third-age process of shifting down from full-time work cannot be understood apart from the context of gender, with the intersection of age and gender producing distinctive life course patterns for women and men in their 50s, 60s, and early 70s. For example, women ages 50 to 75 are less likely than men to be married and are more apt to be caring for infirm relatives, both of which predict various forms of engagement. Women are less apt than men to work full time or be self-employed at every age group. Women and men also have different patterns of volunteering and helping out. More women than men formally volunteer at all ages, though men are more apt to help out friends and neighbors. Both social

class (in the form of educational level) and race/ethnicity are key social-locational factors predicting engagement, but we find some evidence that these factors may in some cases be reflecting the effects of poor health. We were surprised to see the on-going full-time engagement of Hispanic men compared to white men, a finding that requires further investigation.

The third theme is that of linked lives, the fact that decisions to remain in, enter, or exit different types of engagement are made in relation to the people in one's life. For example, third-age men who are married and whose wife is employed are more apt to remain employed themselves, while women are less apt to work for pay if their husbands are employed.

The final life-course theme is historical timing. We find evidence of recessionary effects on men's patterns of engagement though less so for women. Men are more likely to formally volunteer and less likely to work full time or to be self-employed in the recessionary year of 2009 compared to pre-recessionary 2003, with the exception of men ages 60-64 and 70-74, who are more apt to be working full time by 2009 (data by age group available from authors). Third-age women's patterns of engagement have been largely unaffected by the Great Recession which may be related to the lower levels of employment and higher levels of unpaid engagement of this age group of women prior to the recession. There is, however one exception: while only 8 % of women ages 65-69 were working full time in the 2003 survey year, fully 15% were doing so by 2003.

There are of course considerable limitations to this investigation. To really capture the dynamics of engagement and of the life course processes predicting these dynamics requires longitudinal data on individuals over time. And the absence of good health data is a real handicap. Nevertheless, the ability to capture changes in different forms of engagement (both likelihood and amount of time) for men and women at different points in the third age years is a

real strength of the ATUS data, as is the ability to capture changes over historical time, by considering the survey year from 2003-2009. But this analysis does not capture the fact that recruitment for paid and unpaid work is geared to past models of young workers and young volunteers. The third-age years can only promote ongoing engagement if those in this age group can find jobs, paid and unpaid, that are flexible and reduced in time commitments – opportunities that have yet to be institutionalized.

The experiences and impacts of both the growing older workforce and the growing retired force are key policy issues, high on government and business agendas. Ages of the final exit from the workforce are consequential in terms of the pool of available labor, the costs of Social Security and pensions, and family economic viability (Munnell and Sass 2008). We find that only one in 20 men or women in their early 50s are receiving Social Security, while nine in ten are by their early 70s (not shown- data available from authors). Moreover, retirement from career jobs has, in the past, signaled the cessation of meaningful public engagement, a topic that matters beyond economic or political concerns. Research has shown that participation in meaningful activity (such as paid work or unpaid civic engagement) matters for health and well-being (Berkman and Kawachi 2000; Greenfield and Marks 2004; Moen et al. 1992; Moen and Fields 2002; Pillemer et al. 2000).

This study also has important implications for the reframing of taken-for-granted tools in the demography of aging, such as the operationalization and use of the term "retired" in surveys or the construction of "dependency ratios." The middle of the 20th century witnessed retirement as part of an orderly flow of persons through age-graded institutions, and this is captured in demographic tables of those in the workforce and those who aren't, of those who say they are retired or not. In established surveys, respondents who say they are "retired" are *not* asked

whether or not they are working for pay or without pay. Moreover, respondents who say they are "employed" or "in the workforce" are *not* asked whether or not they are retired from a previous job. Neither are the use of age groupings such as "50 and older," "60 and older," or "65 and older" capturing the considerable heterogeneity in this segment of the population.

Paid work has provided the organizational blueprint for life, at least for white, middle-class and unionized blue-collar men in the U.S. and Europe, beginning with a period of education, followed by years of paid work, and then retirement (Kohli 1986, 2007; Riley 1987). This lock-step career mystique went hand in hand with the retirement mystique, the promise of golden years of continuous, full-time leisure as a well-deserved ending to a lifetime of full-time employment (Moen and Roehling 2005). But the lock-step life course is unraveling, even as expanded longevity and healthy life expectancy are rewriting the demography of aging. And these mystiques never fit the experiences of women, minorities, or low-wage workers.

We labeled the emerging third age as a life-course project for those moving through it, but there are no blueprints in the form of various options or a range of pathways through this life stage. New forms of living and working for people in their 50s, 60s, and 70s have implications for health and well-being, as well as for organizations and institutions like Social Security, the realities of a new labor market and a new volunteer market, and retirement (Wang and Schultz 2010). Life paths and opportunities in the third age constitute a provocative and fertile research agenda, as do comparative studies of these processes across cohorts and countries.

References

Abraham, K.G., S.M. Flood, M. Sobek, and B. Thorn. 2010. "American Time Use Survey Data Extract System: Version 1.0." [Machine-readable database]. Maryland Population Research Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, and Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Abraham, K.G., S. Helms, and S. Presser. 2009. "The Impact of Survey Nonresponse on Estimates of Volunteer Work in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 114:1129-65.

Abraham, K.G., A. Maitland, and S.M. Bianchi. 2006. "Nonresponse in the American Time Use Survey: Who is missing from the Data and how much does it Matter?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70:676-703.

Adams, G.A. and T.A. Beehr. 2006. *Retirement: Reasons, Processes, and Results.* New York: Springer Press.

Andersen, R., J. Curtis, and E. Grabb. 2006. "Trends in Civic Association Activity in Four Democracies: The Special Case of Women in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 71:376-400.

Appold, S.J. 2004. "How Much Longer would Men Work if there were no Employment Dislocation? Estimates from Cause-Elimination Work Life Tables." *Social Science Research* 33: 660-80.

Arnett

Baer, D. 2007. "Voluntary Association Involvement in Comparative Perspective." Pp. 67-125 in *State and Civil Society in Northern Europe: The Swedish Model Reconsidered,* edited by L. Trägärdh. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Baltes, P.B. and M.M. Baltes. 1990. *Successful Aging: Perspectives from the Behavioral Sciences.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Berkman, L. and I. Kawachi. 2000. *Social Epidemiology.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bidewall, J., B. Griffin, and B. Hesketh. 2006. "Timing of Retirement: Including a Delay Discounting Perspective in Retirement Models." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 68:368-87.

Biggart, N.W. and T.D. Beamish. 2003. "The Economic Sociology of Conventions: Habit, Custom, Practice, and Routine in Market Order." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:443-464.

Blau, F.D. and L.M. Kahn. 2007. "Changes in the Labor Supply Behavior of Married Women: 1980-2000." *Journal of Labor Economics* 23(3):393-438.

Brown, T.H. and D.F. Warner. 2008. "Divergent Pathways? Racial/Ethnic Differences in Older Women's Labor Force Withdrawal." *Journal of Gerontology* 63B(3):S122-S34.

Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. American Time Use Survey User's Guide: Understanding ATUS 2003 to 2009.

Burr, J.A., J.E. Mutchler, and F.G. Caro. 2007. "Productive Activity Clusters among Middle-Aged and Older Adults: Intersecting Forms and Time Commitments." *Journal of Gerontology* 62B:S267-S75.

Butrica, B. and S. Schaner. 2005. "Satisfaction and Engagement in Retirement. " *The Retirement Project: Perspectives on Productive Aging (no.2).* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Cahill, K.A., M.D. Giandrea, and J.F. Quinn. 2006. "Retirement Patterns from Career Employment." *The Gerontologist* 46(4):514-23.

Chesley, N. and P. Moen. 2006. "When Workers Care: Dual-Earner Couples' Caregiving Strategies, Benefit Use, and Psychological Well-Being." *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(9):1248-69.

Costa, D.L. 1998. *The Evolution of Retirement: An American Economic History, 1880-1990.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dannefer, D. and P. Uhlenberg. 1999. "Paths of the Life Course: A Typology." Pp. 306-236 in *Handbook of Theories of Aging*, edited by V.L. Bengtson and K.W. Schaie. New York: Springer.

Davis, M.A. 2009. "Factors Related to Bridge Employment among Private Sector Early Retirees." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63:55-71.

Dentinger, E. and M. Clarkberg. 2002. "Informal Caregiving and Retirement Timing among Men and Women: Gender and Caregiving Relationships in Late Midlife." *Journal of Family Issues* 23:857–79.

Ekerdt, D.J. 2004. "Born to Retire: The Foreshortened Life Course." *The Gerontologist* 43:3-9.

Elder, G.H., Jr. and J.Z. Giele. 2009. *The Craft of Life Course Research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Elder, G. H., Jr, M. Kirkpatrick Johnson, and R. Crosnoe. 2003. "The Emergence and Development of the Life Course." Pp. 3-19 in *Handbook of the Life Course,* edited by J. Mortimer and M.J. Shanahan. New York: Plenum.

Erikson, E.H., J.M. Erikson, and H.Q. Kinvick. 1986. *Vital Involvement in Old Age: The Experience of Old Age in Our Time.* New York: Norton.

Freedman, M. 1999. *Prime Time: How Baby Boomers will Revolutionize Retirement and Transform America*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.

Freedman, M. 2007. *Encore: Finding Work That Matters in the Second Half of Life*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.

Gilleard, C. and P. Higgs. 2007. "Third Age and the Baby Boomers: Two Approaches to the Social Structuring of Later Life." *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life* 2(2):13-30.

Gobeski, K.T. and T.A. Beehr. 2009. "How Retirees Work: Predictors of Different Types of Bridge Employment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 30:401-25.

Goggin, J. 2009. "Encore Careers for the Twenty-First Century Aging-Friendly Community." *Generations* 33(2):95-7.

Graebner, W. 1980. *A History of Retirement: The Meaning and Function of an American Institution, 1885-1978.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Greenfield, E. and N. Marks. 2004. "Formal Volunteering as a Protective Factor for Older Adults' Psychological Well-Being." *Journal of Gerontology* 59B(5):S258-64.

Han, S-K. and P. Moen. 1999. "Clocking Out: Temporal Patterning of Retirement." *American Journal of Sociology* 105:191-236.

Hank, K. and S. Stuck. 2008. "Volunteer Work, Informal Help, and Care: Further Evidence for 'Linked' Productive Activities at Older Ages." *Social Science Research* 37:1280-91.

Hardy, M.A., L. Hazelrigg, and J. Quadagno. 1996. *Ending a Career in the Auto Industry: Thirty and Out.* New York, NY: Plenum Publishing.

Hayward, M.D., W.R. Grady, and S.D. McLaughlin. 1988a. "The Retirement Process among Women in the United States: Changes in the 1970s." *Research on Aging* 10:358-82.

Hayward, M.D., W.R. Grady, and S.D. McLaughlin. 1988b. "Changes in the Retirement Process among Older Men in the United States: 1972-1980." *Demography* 25:371-86.

Hayward , M.D., M.A. Hardy, and W. Grady. 1989. "Labor Force Withdrawal Patterns among Older Men in the United States." *Social Science Quarterly* 70(2):425-48.

Hedge, J.W., W.C. Borman, and S.E. Lammlein. 2006. *The Aging Workforce: Realities, Myths, and Implications for Organizations.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Henkens, K. 1999. "Retirement Intentions and Spousal Support: A Multiactor Approach." *Journal of Gerontology* 54B:S63–S74.

Henretta, J.C., A.M. O'Rand, and C.G. Chan. 1993a. "Gender Differences in Employment after Spouses' Retirement." *Research on Aging* 15(2):148-69.

Henretta, J.C., A.M. O'Rand, and C.G. Chan. 1993b. "Joint Role Investments and Synchronization of Retirement: A Sequential Approach to Couples Retirement Timing." *Social Forces* 71(4):91-1000.

Ho, J.-H. and J.M. Raymo. 2009. "Expectations and Realization of Joint Retirement among Dual-Worker Couples." *Research on Aging* 31(2):153-79.

James, J. and P. Wink. 2007. *The Crown of Life: Dynamics of the Early Postretirement Period.* New York, NY: Springer.

Johnson, R.W. 2009. "Employment Opportunities at Older Ages: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Research on Aging* 31(3):3-16.

Karisto, A. 2007. "Finnish Baby Boomers and the Emergence of the Third Age." *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life* 2(2):91-108.

Kim, J. and P. Moen. 2001. "Is Retirement Good or Bad for Subjective Well-Being?" *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 10:83-6.

Kim, J. and P. Moen. 2002. "Retirement Transitions, Gender, and Psychological Well-Being: A Life-Course, Ecological Model." *Journal of Gerontology* 57B: P212-P222.

Kohli, M. 1986. "Social Organization and Subjective Construction of the Life Course." Pp. 271-92 in *Human Development and the Life Course: Multidisciplinary Perspectives,* edited by A.B. Sorenson, F.E. Weinert, and L.R. Sherrod. Hillside, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kohli, M. 2007. "The Institutionalization of the Life course: Looking Back to Look Ahead." *Research in Human Development* 4(3):253–71.

Laslett, P. 1989. *A Fresh Map of Life: The Emergence of the Third Age.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. 2009. *The Third Chapter: Passion, Risk, and Adventure in the 25 years after 50.* New York, NY: Farrar, Straus Giroux.

Levy, R. 1986. "Toward a Theory of Life-Course Institutionalization." Pp. 83-108 in *Society and Biography,* edited by A. Weymann and W.R. Heinz. Weinheim: Deutscher Studient Verlag.

Lippmann, S. 2008. "Rethinking Risk in the New Economy: Age and Cohort Effects on Unemployment and Re-Employment. *Human Relations* 61(9):1259-92.

Marshall, V.W., W.R. Heinz, H. Krüger, and A. Verma. 2001. *Restructuring Work and the Life Course.* Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press.

Martin, L.G. and B.J. Soldo. 1997. *Racial and Ethnic Differences in the Health of Older Americans.* Washington: National Academy Press.

Mayer, K. U. 2004. "Whose Lives? How History, Societies and Institutions Define and Shape Life Courses." *Research in Human Development* 1(3):161-87.

McCullough, M. E. and E. Polak. 2007. “Change and Stability during the Third Age: Longitudinal Investigations of Self-Rated Health and Religiousness with the Terman Sample.” Pp. 175-92 in *The Crown of Life: Dynamics of the Early Postretirement Period*, edited by J. James and P. Wink. New York, NY: Springer.

MetLife Foundation/Civic Ventures. 2008. Encore Career Survey. http://www.civicventures.org/publications/surveys/encore_career_survey/Encore_Survey.pdf

Moen, P. 2003. “Midcourse: Navigating Retirement and a New Life Stage.” Pp. 267-91 in *Handbook of the Life Course,* edited by J. Mortimer and M.J. Shanahan. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Moen, P. 2001. “The Gendered Life Course.” Pp. 179-196 in *Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences,* 5th Edition, edited by L. George and R.H. Binstock. San Diego, CA: Academic.

Moen, P. and J. Altobelli. 2007. “Strategic Selection as a Retirement Project: Will Americans Develop Hybrid Arrangements?” Pp. 61-81 in *The Crown of Life: Dynamics of the Early Postretirement Period*, edited by J. James and P. Wink. New York, NY: Springer.

Moen, P., D Dempster-McClain, and R. Williams, Jr. 1992. “Successful Aging: A Life Course Perspective on Women's Roles and Health.” *American Journal of Sociology* 97(6):1612-38.

Moen, P. and V. Fields. 2002. “Midcourse in the United States: Does Unpaid Community Participation Replace Paid Work?” *Ageing International* 27:21-48.

Moen, P., Q. Huang, V. Plassman, and E. Dentinger. 2006. "Deciding the Future: Do Dual-Earner Couples Plan Together for Retirement?" *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(10):1422-43.

Moen, P., J.E. Kim, and H. Hofmeister. 2001. "Couples' Work/Retirement Transitions, Gender, and Marital Quality." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 64:55-71.

Moen, P. and J. Peterson. 2009. A Third Path? Multiplex Time, Gender, and Retirement Encores in the U.S. *Nova Acta Leopoldina* NF 99, 36.

Moen, P. and P. Roehling. 2005. *The Career Mystique: Cracks in the American Dream.* Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

Moen, P. and D. Spencer. 2006. "Converging Divergences in Age, Gender, Health, and Well-Being: Strategic Selection in the Third Age." Pp. 127-144 in *Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences,* edited by R. Binstock and L. George. Burlington: Elsevier Academic Press.

Moen, P., S. Sweet, and R. Swisher. 2005. "Embedded Career Clocks: The Case of Retirement Planning." *Advances in Life Course Research* 9:237-65.

Munnell, A.H. and S.A. Sass. 2008. *Working Longer: The Solution to the Retirement Income Challenge*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Musick, M.A. and J. Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

O'Neill, G. and J. Sincavage. 2004. *Response Analysis Survey: A Qualitative Look at Response and Nonresponse in the American Time Use Survey.* http://www.bls.gov/tus/papersandpubs.htm.

O'Rand, A.M. and J.C. Henretta. 1999. *Age and Inequality: Diverse Pathways through Later Life.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Pillemer, K., P. Moen, E. Wethington, and N. Glasgow. 2000. *Social Integration in the Second Half of Life*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Reitzes, D.C. and E.J. Mutran. 2004. "The Transition to Retirement: Stages and Factors that Influence Retirement Adjustment." *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 59(1):63-84.

Ridgeway, C.L. and S.J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Cultural Beliefs in Social Relations." *Gender and Society* 18(4):510-31.

Riley, M.W. 1987. "On the Significance of Age in Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 52:1-14.

Riley, M.W., R.L. Kahn, and A. Foner. 1994. *Age and Structural Lag: The Mismatch between People's Lives and Opportunities in Work, Family, and Leisure*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Rowe, J.W. and R.L. Kahn. 1998. *Successful Aging*. New York: Random House (Pantheon).

Rubin, B.A. 2007. Work Place Temporalities. Research in the Sociology of Work, Volume 17 New York, NY: Elsevier.

Sadler, W.A. 2006. "Changing Life Options: Uncovering the Riches of the Third Age. *LLI Review* 1:11-20.

Schmidt, L. and S. Purvi. 2009. "Taxes, Wages, and the Labor Supply of Older Americans." *Research on Aging* 31(2):207-32.

Schnittker, J. 2007. "Working More and Feeling Better: Women's Health, Employment, and Family Life, 1974-2004." *American Sociological Review* 72:221-38.

Settersten, R.A., Jr. and K.U. Mayer. 1997. "The Measurement of Age, Age Structuring, and the Life Course." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:233-61.

Siegel, J.S. 1980. “On the Demography of Aging.” *Demography* 17(4):345-64.

Silva, L.R.F. 2008. “From Old Age to Third Age: The Historical Course of the Identities Linked to the Process of Ageing.” *História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos*, 15(1):155-68.

Skocpol, T. 2003. *Diminished Democracy. From Membership to Management in American Civic Life.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Smith, D.B. and P. Moen. 1998. “Spouse’s Influence on the Retirement Decision: His, Her, and Their Perceptions.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:734-44.

StataCorp. 2005. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 9*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Sweet, S. and P. Meiksins. 2008. *Changing Contours of Work: Jobs and Opportunities in the New Economy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Sweet, S., P. Moen, and P. Meiksins. 2007. “Dual Earners in Double Jeopardy: Preparing for Job Loss in the New Risk Economy.” *Research in the Sociology of Work* 17:445-69.

Szinovacz, M.E., S. DeViney, and A. Davey. 2001. “Influences of Family Obligations and Relationships on Retirement: Variations by Gender, Race, and Marital Status.” *Journal of Gerontology* 56B(1):20-2.

Vaillant, G. 2002. *Aging Well*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Wang, M. and K.S. Schultz. 2010. “Employee Retirement: A Review and Recommendations for Future Investigation. *Journal of Management* 36(1):172-206.

Wilson, J. and M.A. Musick. 1997. “Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work.” *American Sociological Review* 62:694-713.

Wuthnow, R. 1991. Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Zukin, C., S. Keeter, M. Andolina, K. Jenkins, M. Carpini, M.X. Delli. 2006. *A New Engagement?: Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Table 1. Means/Percentages of Selected Characteristics by Age Group and Gender, 2003-2009

	A. Men							B. Women						
	Pre-Third	Third Age: 50-75					Post-Third	Pre-Third	Third Age: 50-75					Post-Third
	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79
	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%
Social Location														
Race														
White	73.90	76.42	76.26	80.82	78.81	81.87	82.54	71.64	74.85	76.53	78.86	79.59	82.08	84.38
Black	11.27	11.03	10.92	9.56	10.92	9.34	9.22	12.97	12.60	12.35	10.72	11.04	9.97	9.14
Other	4.03	3.66	4.13	2.95	3.59	3.03	1.80	5.04	4.22	3.80	3.49	2.99	1.92	2.19
Hispanic	10.80	8.89	8.68	6.67	6.68	5.77	6.44	10.35	8.32	7.33	6.93	6.38	6.02	4.29
Education														
Less than HS	10.31	10.06	9.97	13.02	17.53	20.78	22.10	8.92	9.00	9.99	13.06	15.95	21.05	21.83
HS	34.73	31.53	30.44	30.91	34.20	35.40	32.84	32.26	32.94	34.14	38.23	42.02	44.17	42.50
Some College	24.46	25.55	25.82	23.02	20.53	16.58	15.99	29.85	26.71	27.80	24.59	22.40	19.93	20.85
College Degree	19.01	19.62	18.97	17.44	14.19	14.51	15.89	19.89	19.59	16.01	14.07	11.19	9.89	9.33
Advanced Degree	11.50	13.24	14.79	15.61	13.54	12.73	13.17	9.08	11.77	12.06	10.05	8.44	4.97	5.48
Health (2006-2008 only)														
Good/Excellent	86.14	82.61	78.76	75.04	73.23	70.45	66.43	84.42	81.96	78.12	78.43	76.66	69.49	66.85
Own Home														
% Yes	80.60	83.87	86.84	86.76	89.02	89.65	89.44	81.29	83.59	85.81	86.36	85.59	87.44	85.86
Engagement														
Employment status														
Full time	70.87	67.83	56.60	36.17	13.59	8.06	4.25	54.76	53.02	46.44	29.63	9.80	3.32	1.69
Part time	2.96	2.79	4.50	7.60	9.66	7.85	5.01	14.38	13.62	14.34	12.29	12.01	7.93	3.67
Self employed	13.17	13.53	14.25	13.84	11.31	7.49	5.34	7.12	7.17	8.05	6.43	4.62	3.05	1.82
Not employed	13.09	15.87	24.65	42.39	65.48	76.74	85.40	23.86	26.31	31.23	51.69	73.56	86.00	92.90
NILF: Retired[1]	0.00	2.16	8.96	26.01	54.47	70.01	79.79	0.00	3.55	9.52	32.91	60.88	77.72	86.82
NILF: Disabled[1]	3.90	5.36	6.00	6.06	2.99	2.00	0.95	4.90	5.74	6.62	5.23	4.25	2.17	1.58
NILF: Other[1]	9.10	8.33	9.69	10.32	7.98	4.59	4.66	18.83	16.90	15.03	13.51	8.44	5.81	4.43
% Any paid work on diary day	64.67	64.08	55.12	42.49	24.30	16.96	10.66	52.69	51.57	46.84	32.76	17.16	8.98	4.74
Minutes in paid work[2]	490.65	486.73	485.45	457.53	396.28	375.50	314.77	439.13	437.88	425.56	411.96	367.48	352.97	320.60
(sd)	(187.56)	(189.41)	(189.07)	(200.13)	(221.21)	(199.25)	(170.20)	(172.02)	(187.23)	(182.20)	(188.13)	(186.81)	(200.65)	(180.26)
Formal Volunteer Civic Engagement														
% Yes	7.00	6.53	7.23	7.30	8.18	9.48	8.08	8.91	8.28	7.66	9.25	10.03	9.22	9.81
Minutes formally volunteered[2]	135.50	142.48	95.80	160.35	142.08	139.07	143.69	119.46	121.08	123.41	130.05	120.61	141.39	141.41
(sd)	(142.50)	(142.21)	(99.77)	(149.09)	(131.42)	(125.43)	(133.73)	(131.54)	(135.78)	(127.93)	(126.46)	(129.76)	(129.05)	(119.50)
Educational Activities														
% Yes	1.55	1.56	1.25	0.98	0.55	1.28	1.41	3.41	2.46	1.92	1.58	1.97	1.93	1.49
Informal Volunteer (Helping out)														
% Yes	10.06	11.71	10.33	10.69	12.61	11.83	9.38	12.75	13.58	13.90	12.37	11.94	9.49	9.41
Minutes informally volunteered[2]	56.56	57.88	53.46	61.28	55.11	48.62	37.99	31.27	39.53	43.41	43.39	32.83	42.47	36.33
(sd)	(102.16)	(99.52)	(95.23)	(106.31)	(94.52)	(79.74)	(62.08)	(57.48)	(68.89)	(75.87)	(66.43)	(56.48)	(71.18)	(68.38)

	A. Men							B. Women						
	Pre-Third	Third Age: 50-75					Post-Third	Pre-Third	Third Age: 50-75					Post-Third
	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79
	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%	Mean/%
Linked Lives														
Marital Status-Spouse's Employment														
Married, Spouse Employed	51.22	52.02	49.87	41.81	25.97	13.66	10.42	59.79	56.66	46.36	30.37	16.48	9.07	4.19
Married, Spouse Not Employed	18.89	20.12	25.96	35.22	51.91	62.20	61.66	8.79	10.72	19.50	33.09	42.87	44.95	37.52
Not married	29.89	27.85	24.17	22.97	22.12	24.14	27.91	31.43	32.62	34.13	36.54	40.64	45.99	58.29
Children under 18 in the home														
% Yes	47.84	29.61	14.71	8.50	5.47	5.01	2.87	45.17	22.44	11.58	7.85	5.53	4.12	3.35
Adult Care														
%Yes	1.66	2.68	2.83	3.35	2.74	3.99	4.84	4.59	5.61	5.21	6.61	6.05	5.05	5.83
Timing of Interviews														
Weekday	71.42	71.49	71.50	71.48	71.45	71.41	72.59	71.48	71.42	71.41	71.43	71.45	71.49	72.14
Year														
2003	13.79	13.26	12.66	12.56	13.05	14.07	14.06	13.81	13.32	12.79	12.59	13.13	14.25	15.37
2004	13.95	13.60	13.35	13.09	13.44	13.94	12.69	14.11	13.64	13.30	13.16	13.37	14.24	14.98
2005	14.22	13.94	14.02	13.42	13.66	13.96	15.33	14.24	13.92	14.02	13.49	13.68	14.06	13.62
2006	14.47	14.28	14.62	13.93	14.00	14.10	15.09	14.37	14.29	14.66	13.91	14.02	14.09	14.09
2007	14.52	14.65	14.90	14.89	14.59	14.22	14.54	14.46	14.66	14.75	14.88	14.60	14.15	12.34
2008	14.53	15.03	15.11	15.64	15.34	14.71	13.56	14.51	14.97	15.06	15.65	15.36	14.44	14.96
2009	14.53	15.24	15.35	16.47	15.92	15.00	14.73	14.49	15.20	15.42	16.31	15.84	14.77	14.66
N of Observations	4510	3999	3377	2660	2165	1639	1352	2041	1755	1583	1359	1135	911	844

[1]Of the entire sample.

[2]Of those who engaged in the activity.

Source : Authors' calculations of the 2003-2009 American Time Use Survey (ATUS).

Notes : Means are weighted; sample sizes are not.

Table 2. Employment and Volunteering by Survey Year, Age Group, and Gender, 2003-2009

	A. Men (N=19702)							B. Women (N=25620)						
	Pre-Third	Third Age: 50-75					Post-	Pre-	Third Age: 50-75					Post-
	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Employment														
Full-Time														
2003	72.51	67.05	56.12	35.55	15.28	8.53	3.04	53.65	52.88	44.32	25.16	8.21	3.63	0.51
2004	74.60	66.94	55.63	33.57	11.20	4.16	4.34	54.26	49.24	47.83	24.16	11.45	2.88	2.67
2005	70.18	67.39	57.22	36.24	10.32	6.12	4.68	55.18	52.73	46.08	31.60	8.24	3.43	1.62
2006	70.80	68.70	61.40	33.14	12.47	4.29	3.43	55.00	52.29	47.55	37.29	5.16	2.40	0.11
2007	74.06	72.56	53.45	34.34	16.03	11.03	5.15	58.17	53.84	48.47	30.36	9.25	4.87	0.11
2008	69.85	67.84	58.51	35.36	14.93	11.08	4.84	54.91	55.09	45.23	29.14	10.40	2.18	4.80
2009	64.29	64.36	53.87	43.62	14.51	10.81	4.29	52.11	54.63	45.53	29.13	15.11	3.87	1.62
Part-Time														
2003	2.59	2.61	4.23	8.94	10.77	7.69	6.33	14.93	14.29	13.19	14.35	10.04	6.75	3.63
2004	1.18	2.40	3.39	4.19	10.71	9.37	2.80	16.62	15.54	12.52	12.22	9.96	7.18	5.48
2005	3.47	3.79	3.81	4.92	10.44	6.29	4.53	12.52	13.98	14.64	14.24	12.19	9.03	4.36
2006	2.03	0.90	5.03	12.83	10.24	11.59	2.64	14.18	15.37	12.92	11.28	13.29	10.29	5.83
2007	3.49	2.21	4.96	7.60	6.59	5.96	5.38	14.54	15.29	15.20	12.50	10.76	5.96	2.48
2008	3.49	3.74	3.84	9.68	8.33	7.52	6.86	13.95	12.29	16.14	10.92	16.39	8.44	1.57
2009	4.38	3.79	6.01	5.06	10.76	6.63	6.47	13.98	9.04	15.37	11.15	11.00	7.86	2.31
Self														
2003	12.63	14.65	18.44	14.93	10.37	8.18	3.73	6.05	7.05	8.19	5.19	3.16	2.14	0.42
2004	12.13	13.78	13.96	15.23	11.32	7.27	2.71	6.66	6.00	5.07	9.08	4.60	0.83	2.91
2005	16.14	14.97	16.96	16.34	12.49	5.68	10.44	6.94	7.18	5.86	6.49	5.70	2.26	2.37
2006	13.58	15.61	11.12	13.66	8.14	8.99	11.07	7.32	8.66	9.48	7.23	4.17	3.23	1.36
2007	10.43	9.40	14.88	15.19	14.11	6.02	3.21	7.08	8.68	7.34	5.61	6.73	4.97	3.80
2008	13.13	15.76	11.69	14.22	11.82	7.09	4.50	8.13	6.04	11.87	5.27	3.10	4.12	1.72
2009	14.17	10.82	13.46	8.44	10.82	9.11	0.83	7.59	6.61	8.11	6.37	4.88	3.75	0.51
Volunteering														
Formal														
2003	5.81	6.44	7.09	4.79	6.22	10.80	8.73	10.02	7.50	6.47	8.14	8.12	8.34	7.62
2004	6.81	6.23	5.70	7.40	8.53	7.70	8.61	9.96	9.54	8.12	9.24	11.44	9.90	7.42
2005	7.05	6.38	5.57	6.34	9.28	12.70	6.49	9.00	8.42	7.51	8.85	11.50	5.79	17.12
2006	7.00	7.06	11.05	7.67	9.28	4.88	5.18	8.84	6.81	8.35	7.54	9.46	7.68	9.70
2007	5.80	5.96	9.70	7.39	5.70	11.40	4.45	8.29	7.86	7.32	11.17	10.55	11.21	12.31
2008	7.23	6.16	4.80	7.74	7.25	8.62	10.47	7.36	9.08	10.64	9.74	7.45	11.34	7.61
2009	9.21	7.45	6.52	9.12	10.76	10.24	12.98	9.00	8.74	5.15	9.70	11.66	10.18	8.00
Informal														
2003	11.20	14.52	10.11	13.57	15.77	13.31	12.51	16.71	15.60	16.29	13.61	10.71	11.97	7.65
2004	11.51	12.18	9.04	11.88	13.92	15.41	11.73	13.28	14.19	12.70	14.60	13.01	8.44	11.26
2005	9.60	12.06	10.10	13.12	10.85	10.53	8.43	13.14	12.32	13.64	13.30	12.07	8.99	13.50
2006	9.13	13.97	11.12	9.63	10.59	14.52	6.04	9.93	11.73	14.03	8.71	11.73	8.44	7.65
2007	9.80	8.42	10.22	10.57	6.95	11.35	7.05	9.10	13.59	15.50	12.22	15.13	9.36	9.13
2008	7.67	10.27	12.09	10.91	16.11	10.64	12.91	15.17	15.14	11.03	10.59	10.26	9.46	5.92
2009	11.59	11.00	9.46	6.35	14.01	7.40	7.82	12.11	12.63	14.31	13.79	10.81	9.76	11.06

Table 3. Multinomial Logistic Regression of Odds of Various Ways of Working for Pay by Gender

	A. Men									B. Women								
	Full Time			Part Time			Self-Employed			Full Time			Part Time			Self-Employed		
	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR
Social Location																		
Age																		
Third Age																		
50-54	-0.24 **	0.09	0.79	-0.28	0.19	0.76	-0.17	0.11	0.84	-0.23 **	0.07	0.80	-0.12	0.09	0.89	-0.15	0.12	0.86
55-59	-0.91 ***	0.09	0.40	-0.28	0.18	0.76	-0.60 ***	0.11	0.55	-0.53 ***	0.07	0.59	-0.16	0.10	0.85	-0.14	0.13	0.87
60-64	-1.91 ***	0.09	0.15	-0.30	0.17	0.74	-1.19 ***	0.12	0.31	-1.42 ***	0.08	0.24	-0.72 ***	0.10	0.49	-0.75 ***	0.14	0.47
65-69	-3.23 ***	0.11	0.04	-0.43 *	0.17	0.65	-1.73 ***	0.13	0.18	-2.87 ***	0.10	0.06	-1.03 ***	0.11	0.36	-1.32 ***	0.16	0.27
70-74	-3.83 ***	0.15	0.02	-0.74 ***	0.19	0.48	-2.23 ***	0.15	0.11	-4.07 ***	0.14	0.02	-1.55 ***	0.13	0.21	-1.78 ***	0.19	0.17
Post-Third Age																		
75-79	-4.58 ***	0.17	0.01	-1.30 ***	0.22	0.27	-2.68 ***	0.18	0.07	-4.91 ***	0.28	0.01	-2.43 ***	0.16	0.09	-2.42 ***	0.22	0.09
Race																		
Black	-0.55 ***	0.08	0.57	-0.29 *	0.13	0.74	-1.16 ***	0.12	0.31	-0.12	0.07	0.89	-0.32 ***	0.09	0.73	-0.65 ***	0.14	0.52
Other	-0.32 *	0.15	0.72	-0.34	0.27	0.71	-0.60 **	0.18	0.55	0.11	0.12	1.12	0.15	0.16	1.16	-0.08	0.20	0.93
Hispanic	0.38 ***	0.10	1.46	-0.01	0.17	0.99	-0.25	0.14	0.78	-0.01	0.08	0.99	-0.22	0.11	0.81	-0.20	0.16	0.82
Education																		
HS	0.48 ***	0.09	1.62	0.37 **	0.14	1.45	0.37 **	0.13	1.44	0.94 ***	0.09	2.57	0.56 ***	0.10	1.75	0.80 ***	0.17	2.24
Some College	0.65 ***	0.09	1.92	0.29	0.15	1.34	0.54 ***	0.13	1.72	1.21 ***	0.09	3.37	0.66 ***	0.11	1.93	1.21 ***	0.17	3.35
College Degree	1.15 ***	0.10	3.17	0.64 ***	0.16	1.89	1.12 ***	0.13	3.05	1.40 ***	0.10	4.07	0.79 ***	0.12	2.21	1.33 ***	0.17	3.79
Advanced Degree	1.36 ***	0.11	3.92	0.89 ***	0.16	2.43	1.39 ***	0.14	4.00	1.85 ***	0.11	6.35	0.79 ***	0.13	2.21	1.73 ***	0.18	5.63
Own Home																		
Yes	0.26 ***	0.07	1.30	-0.13	0.12	0.88	0.76 ***	0.11	2.13	0.42 ***	0.06	1.51	0.17 *	0.08	1.18	0.52 ***	0.12	1.69
Engagement																		
Formal Volunteer/Civic Engagement																		
Yes	-0.28 **	0.09	0.76	0.08	0.17	1.08	-0.05	0.12	0.95	-0.44 ***	0.08	0.65	0.06	0.09	1.06	0.04	0.12	1.04
Informal Volunteer (Helping out)																		
Yes	-0.28 **	0.08	0.76	0.03	0.13	1.04	-0.30 **	0.10	0.74	-0.19 **	0.07	0.82	-0.03	0.09	0.97	-0.08	0.11	0.92

	A. Men									B. Women								
	Full Time			Part Time			Self-Employed			Full Time			Part Time			Self-Employed		
	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR	β	S.E.	RRR
Linked Lives																		
Marital Status-Spouse's Employment																		
Married, Spouse Employed	0.99 ***	0.07	2.70	0.50 ***	0.12	1.65	0.84 ***	0.08	2.31	-0.25 ***	0.05	0.78	0.27 ***	0.07	1.31	0.43 ***	0.09	1.53
Married, Spouse Not Employed	0.29 ***	0.07	1.34	-0.04	0.12	0.96	0.04	0.09	1.04	-0.89 ***	0.06	0.41	-0.49 ***	0.08	0.61	-0.67 ***	0.12	0.51
Children under 18 in the home																		
Yes	0.26 ***	0.07	1.30	-0.06	0.13	0.94	0.38 ***	0.09	1.47	-0.36 ***	0.06	0.70	0.07	0.07	1.07	-0.26 *	0.10	0.77
Adult Care																		
Yes	-0.69 ***	0.15	0.50	-0.13	0.28	0.87	-0.56 *	0.22	0.57	-0.66 ***	0.11	0.52	-0.29 *	0.13	0.75	-0.20	0.17	0.82
Timing of Interviews																		
Weekday	-0.03	0.05	0.97	-0.04	0.08	0.96	0.05	0.06	1.05	0.02	0.04	1.02	0.03	0.05	1.03	0.12	0.07	1.13
Year																		
2004	-0.14	0.08	0.87	-0.38 **	0.14	0.69	-0.21 *	0.10	0.81	0.05	0.07	1.05	0.06	0.09	1.06	0.06	0.12	1.07
2005	-0.03	0.09	0.97	-0.08	0.15	0.92	0.09	0.11	1.10	0.08	0.08	1.09	0.05	0.09	1.05	0.11	0.13	1.12
2006	0.00	0.09	1.00	0.03	0.15	1.03	-0.05	0.11	0.95	0.15	0.08	1.16	0.12	0.10	1.13	0.32 *	0.13	1.38
2007	-0.02	0.09	0.98	-0.15	0.16	0.86	-0.21	0.12	0.81	0.19 *	0.07	1.21	0.11	0.10	1.12	0.33 *	0.13	1.38
2008	-0.03	0.09	0.97	0.02	0.15	1.02	-0.09	0.11	0.91	0.13	0.08	1.14	0.07	0.10	1.08	0.27 *	0.13	1.32
2009	-0.20 *	0.09	0.81	-0.07	0.14	0.94	-0.34 **	0.11	0.71	0.04	0.08	1.04	-0.10	0.09	0.90	0.13	0.13	1.14
Constant	0.48 ***	0.13		-1.73 ***	0.22		-1.39 ***	0.18		-0.17	0.12		-1.35 ***	0.14		-2.91 ***	0.22	
Model Fit																		
F-test/Likelihood Ratio Chi-square	42.70 ***									46.08 ***								
df	81									81								
Total observations	19702									25620								

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Notes: Reference categories are ages 45-49, white, less than high school, rents home, not a formal volunteer, not married, no children under 18 in the household, not giving adult care, not an informal volunteer, weekend, 2003.

Table 4. Logistic Regression of Odds of Formal/Informal Volunteering and Paid Work on ATUS Diary Day by Gender

	A. Men									B. Women								
	Formal Volunteering			Informal Volunteering			Paid Work			Formal Volunteering			Informal Volunteering			Paid Work		
	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR
Social Location																		
Age																		
Third Age																		
50-54	-0.06	0.11	0.95	0.13	0.09	1.14	-0.02	0.06	0.98	-0.07	0.10	0.94	0.01	0.08	1.01	-0.12	0.06	0.89
55-59	0.07	0.12	1.07	-0.05	0.10	0.95	-0.47 ***	0.07	0.62	-0.11	0.11	0.90	0.02	0.09	1.02	-0.32 ***	0.07	0.73
60-64	0.06	0.14	1.06	-0.04	0.11	0.96	-1.03 ***	0.08	0.36	0.15	0.11	1.16	-0.18	0.10	0.84	-0.90 ***	0.07	0.41
65-69	0.21	0.15	1.23	0.15	0.12	1.16	-1.84 ***	0.09	0.16	0.26 *	0.12	1.30	-0.24 *	0.11	0.79	-1.76 ***	0.09	0.17
70-74	0.41 **	0.16	1.51	0.08	0.13	1.08	-2.26 ***	0.11	0.10	0.27 *	0.13	1.31	-0.49 ***	0.12	0.61	-2.49 ***	0.12	0.08
Post-Third Age																		
75-79	0.24	0.18	1.27	-0.19	0.15	0.83	-2.84 ***	0.13	0.06	0.36 **	0.13	1.44	-0.52 ***	0.13	0.59	-3.26 ***	0.15	0.04
Race																		
Black	0.14	0.11	1.16	-0.12	0.10	0.88	-0.49 ***	0.07	0.61	-0.17 *	0.08	0.84	-0.17 *	0.08	0.84	-0.19 **	0.06	0.83
Other	-0.37	0.20	0.69	0.13	0.14	1.14	-0.06	0.13	0.94	-0.27	0.17	0.76	0.10	0.14	1.10	0.08	0.11	1.08
Hispanic	-0.59 **	0.17	0.56	0.13	0.11	1.14	0.21 *	0.08	1.23	-0.45 **	0.14	0.64	-0.22 *	0.11	0.80	-0.04	0.08	0.96
Education																		
HS	0.47 **	0.17	1.61	0.34 **	0.11	1.41	0.33 ***	0.08	1.39	0.58 ***	0.14	1.79	0.32 **	0.10	1.38	0.59 ***	0.09	1.81
Some College	0.90 ***	0.17	2.46	0.34 **	0.11	1.41	0.48 ***	0.08	1.62	1.03 ***	0.14	2.80	0.38 ***	0.10	1.47	0.81 ***	0.09	2.25
College Degree	1.24 ***	0.17	3.47	0.34 **	0.12	1.41	0.88 ***	0.09	2.41	1.56 ***	0.15	4.76	0.34 **	0.11	1.41	1.01 ***	0.09	2.75
Advanced Degree	1.40 ***	0.17	4.05	0.45 ***	0.12	1.56	1.23 ***	0.09	3.41	1.70 ***	0.15	5.49	0.38 **	0.12	1.46	1.40 ***	0.10	4.04
Own Home																		
Yes	0.20	0.12	1.22	0.03	0.09	1.03	0.13 *	0.06	1.13	0.15	0.09	1.16	0.12	0.07	1.13	0.27 ***	0.06	1.31
Engagement																		
Employment status																		
Full time	-0.28 **	0.10	0.76	-0.28 ***	0.08	0.75	--	--	--	-0.44 ***	0.08	0.64	-0.20 **	0.07	0.82	--	--	--
Part time	0.07	0.17	1.08	0.04	0.13	1.04	--	--	--	0.05	0.09	1.06	-0.03	0.09	0.98	--	--	--
Self employed	-0.05	0.12	0.95	-0.30 **	0.10	0.74	--	--	--	0.03	0.12	1.03	-0.09	0.11	0.92	--	--	--
Formal Volunteer/Civic Engagement																		
Yes	--	--	--	0.23 *	0.10	1.25	-0.30 ***	0.08	0.74	--	--	--	0.38 ***	0.08	1.47	-0.23 **	0.07	0.79
Informal Volunteer (Helping out)																		
Yes	0.23 *	0.10	1.26	--	--	--	-0.44 ***	0.07	0.64	0.38 ***	0.08	1.46	--	--	--	-0.32 ***	0.06	0.72

	A. Men									B. Women								
	Formal Volunteering			Informal Volunteering			Paid Work			Formal Volunteering			Informal Volunteering			Paid Work		
	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR	β	S.E.	OR
Linked Lives																		
Marital Status-Spouse's Employment																		
Married, Spouse Employed	0.39 ***	0.10	1.47	0.32 ***	0.08	1.38	0.59 ***	0.06	1.80	0.35 ***	0.07	1.43	-0.01	0.06	0.99	-0.15 **	0.05	0.86
Married, Spouse Not Employed	0.31 **	0.10	1.37	-0.02	0.08	0.98	0.12 *	0.06	1.13	0.19 *	0.08	1.20	-0.05	0.07	0.95	-0.69 ***	0.06	0.50
Children under 18 in the home																		
Yes	0.37 ***	0.09	1.45	-0.08	0.08	0.92	0.13 *	0.05	1.14	0.18 *	0.07	1.20	-0.19 **	0.07	0.83	-0.26 ***	0.05	0.77
Adult Care																		
Yes	-0.10	0.20	0.90	1.00 ***	0.14	2.73	-0.74 ***	0.15	0.48	-0.37 *	0.15	0.69	1.22 ***	0.09	3.39	-0.56 ***	0.11	0.57
Timing of Interviews																		
Weekday	-0.05	0.07	0.95	-0.09	0.05	0.91	1.77 ***	0.04	5.85	0.00	0.05	1.00	-0.09	0.05	0.92	1.68 ***	0.04	5.35
Year																		
2004	0.04	0.11	1.04	-0.09	0.09	0.92	-0.15 *	0.07	0.86	0.15	0.09	1.16	-0.09	0.08	0.91	0.08	0.07	1.08
2005	0.08	0.12	1.09	-0.18	0.10	0.84	0.02	0.07	1.02	0.13	0.10	1.13	-0.11	0.09	0.89	0.13	0.07	1.14
2006	0.18	0.12	1.20	-0.17	0.10	0.85	-0.08	0.08	0.92	0.00	0.10	1.00	-0.28 **	0.09	0.75	0.18 *	0.07	1.20
2007	0.09	0.13	1.10	-0.34 **	0.11	0.71	-0.12	0.08	0.89	0.11	0.10	1.11	-0.13	0.09	0.88	0.16 *	0.07	1.17
2008	0.04	0.12	1.04	-0.16	0.10	0.85	-0.13	0.08	0.88	0.07	0.10	1.08	-0.15	0.09	0.86	0.11	0.07	1.12
2009	0.33 **	0.11	1.39	-0.28 **	0.10	0.76	-0.10	0.07	0.90	0.02	0.10	1.02	-0.11	0.09	0.90	-0.01	0.07	0.99
Constant	-3.97 ***	0.22		-2.25 ***	0.16		-1.39 ***	0.11		-3.67 ***	0.18		-2.04 ***	0.14		-1.80 ***	0.11	
Model Fit																		
F-test/Likelihood Ratio Chi-square		9.65 ***			5.41 ***			100.3 ***			16.72 ***			11.57 ***			42.45 ***	
df		29			29			27			29			29			78	
Total observations		19702			19702			19702			25620			25620			22028	

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Notes: Reference categories are ages 45-49, white, less than high school, rents home, not working for pay, not a formal volunteer, not married, no children under 18 in the household, not giving adult care, not an informal volunteer, weekend, 2003.

Table 5. Effects of Good Health on Employment and Volunteering by Age Group and Gender, 2003-2009

A. Men

	Pre-Third			Third Age: 50-75													Post-Third			FULL SAMPLE		
	45-49			50-54			55-59			60-64			65-69			70-74			75-79					
	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR
Employment																								
Full-Time	2.09 **	0.24	8.11	2.56 **	0.24	12.96	2.17 **	0.23	8.75	1.45 **	0.24	4.27	1.15 **	0.37	3.17	-0.34	0.45	0.72	0.59	0.59	1.80	1.76 **	0.12	5.82
Part-Time	1.67 **	0.55	5.30	1.77 **	0.62	5.85	1.23 **	0.43	3.43	1.32 **	0.40	3.74	1.20 **	0.44	3.33	0.34	0.42	1.40	-0.09	0.78	0.91	1.11 **	0.19	3.03
Self	2.58 **	0.38	13.17	2.28 **	0.38	9.81	1.80 **	0.32	6.06	1.59 **	0.37	4.93	0.98 *	0.41	2.67	0.01	0.50	1.01	0.79	0.81	2.21	1.59 **	0.16	4.89
Volunteering																								
Formal	-0.24	0.37	0.79	0.53	0.37	1.70	0.13	0.44	1.14	0.25	0.44	1.29	0.13	0.43	1.13	1.20 *	0.61	3.31	0.70	0.65	2.01	0.35	0.18	1.41
Informal	0.79	0.42	2.21	0.33	0.40	1.39	-0.49	0.30	0.61	1.18 **	0.40	3.25	-0.30	0.34	0.74	0.67	0.47	1.95	0.03	0.44	1.03	0.29 *	0.14	1.34

B. Women

	Pre-Third			Third Age: 50-75													Post-Third			FULL SAMPLE		
	45-49			50-54			55-59			60-64			65-69			70-74			75-79					
	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR	β	S.E.	OR/RR
Employment																								
Full-Time	1.69 **	0.20	5.41	1.87 **	0.23	6.52	1.60 **	0.21	4.96	1.37 **	0.23	3.93	1.45 **	0.43	4.26	0.87	0.51	2.38	3.61 **	0.98	37.10	1.61 **	0.11	5.02
Part-Time	1.73 **	0.30	5.62	1.91 **	0.30	6.73	0.82 **	0.27	2.26	1.44 **	0.31	4.20	1.11 **	0.39	3.04	0.83	0.47	2.29	0.58	0.55	1.79	1.25 **	0.13	3.51
Self	1.36 **	0.44	3.91	1.52 **	0.41	4.56	1.69 **	0.39	5.43	2.23 **	0.64	9.31	2.04 **	0.66	7.71	0.52	0.50	1.69	2.18 *	0.99	8.84	1.44 **	0.20	4.21
Volunteering																								
Formal	0.52	0.35	1.68	0.09	0.39	1.10	0.36	0.39	1.44	0.63	0.36	1.88	0.84	0.44	2.31	0.95 *	0.41	2.59	0.58	0.41	1.79	0.50 **	0.15	1.65
Informal	-0.14	0.28	0.87	0.77 **	0.27	2.15	0.56	0.34	1.75	0.51	0.32	1.66	0.88 *	0.40	2.40	0.81	0.41	2.25	1.04 **	0.37	2.84	0.56 **	0.13	1.74

Note: Employment health coefficients are from age- and gender-specific multinomial logit models that parallel those show in Table 3 for the full sample by gender. Volunteering health coefficients are from age- and gender-specific logit models that parallel those shwon in Table 4 for the full sample by gender. Full sample models parallel those in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 6. OLS Regression of Minutes Spent Working and Formally and Informally Volunteering on ATUS Diary Day by Gender

	A. Men						B. Women					
	Paid Work		Formal Volunteering		Informal Volunteering		Paid Work		Formal Volunteering		Informal Volunteering	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Social Location												
Age												
Third Age												
50-54	-3.98	6.35	6.30	13.65	0.74	7.48	-4.65	6.33	-2.83	11.45	5.61	4.49
55-59	-6.89	7.43	-55.53 ***	14.05	-5.52	8.32	-19.30 **	6.89	-5.34	13.64	8.49	5.49
60-64	-34.99 ***	8.70	-4.22	18.14	1.05	9.64	-33.85 ***	8.34	-10.77	14.83	6.65	5.76
65-69	-87.66 ***	14.00	-31.90	19.68	-8.12	9.49	-69.87 ***	11.70	-27.69	15.69	-5.92	6.12
70-74	-108.33 ***	17.13	-47.78 *	19.40	-16.20	9.81	-87.79 ***	20.17	-14.70	17.09	4.29	7.87
Post-Third Age												
75-79	-151.11 ***	21.71	-43.45 *	20.75	-29.58 **	9.36	-123.35 ***	25.15	-14.85	17.40	-2.66	7.42
Race												
Black	1.54	8.59	12.99	12.85	-18.40 *	7.14	30.07 ***	6.85	5.93	10.21	-6.22	4.06
Other	10.22	10.81	33.05	37.43	-0.80	11.24	22.54	13.05	34.74	21.12	-15.68 ***	4.44
Hispanic	-4.82	8.81	18.36	25.20	-3.28	8.51	12.10	9.33	37.86 *	15.70	-8.23	4.35
College educated												
HS	5.39	10.25	-19.32	25.57	-1.98	9.05	0.49	10.79	-2.01	17.95	6.32	4.79
Some College	-1.74	10.43	-15.46	25.43	-3.87	9.52	0.50	10.83	-0.76	17.53	-0.29	4.44
College Degree	-19.38	10.69	-24.77	25.71	-14.96	9.48	-0.79	11.53	2.11	17.92	3.00	5.43
Advanced Degree	-22.92 *	11.42	-19.14	25.17	-19.67 *	9.56	-1.09	12.17	-4.53	18.16	11.37	5.90
Own Home												
Yes	-7.24	7.05	-0.46	17.89	3.12	7.38	7.28	7.23	-9.21	10.90	-0.51	4.74
Engagement												
Employment status												
Full time	--	--	-57.80 ***	12.35	-8.68	6.81	--	--	-46.85 ***	9.17	-11.20 **	4.08
Part time	--	--	-30.23	17.99	-16.27 *	7.59	--	--	-29.90 **	9.32	-3.48	5.29
Self employed	--	--	-38.03 *	15.11	-21.39 **	7.60	--	--	-8.84	13.95	0.37	7.05
Formal Volunteer												
Yes	-51.10 ***	9.93	--	--	-12.20 *	6.13	-61.44 ***	9.56	--	--	-11.41 **	3.82
Informal Volunteer (Helping out)												
Yes	-66.44 ***	8.05	-12.46	10.15	--	--	-67.31 ***	7.51	-18.88 *	8.16	--	--

	A. Men						B. Women					
	Paid Work		Formal Volunteering		Informal Volunteering		Paid Work		Formal Volunteering		Informal Volunteering	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Linked Lives												
Marital Status-Spouse's Employment												
Married, Spouse Employed	19.58 **	6.18	6.10	11.94	-12.75 *	6.30	-24.31 ***	5.51	-16.05	8.47	3.07	3.62
Married, Spouse Not Employed	18.30 *	7.11	10.40	11.95	-16.10 *	6.36	-23.40 **	7.74	-20.35 *	8.95	-1.89	3.84
Children under 18 in the home												
Yes	-6.09	5.64	-17.02	11.27	-11.26 *	5.71	-19.30 **	5.65	-19.88 *	9.20	-6.11	3.44
Adult Care												
Yes	-54.88 **	17.49	-10.83	24.88	-14.20 *	6.36	-59.87 ***	12.13	-13.69	15.74	8.51 *	4.16
Timing of Interviews												
Weekday	166.43 ***	6.54	-27.01 **	8.36	-22.13 ***	5.24	165.20 ***	6.09	-10.87	6.28	-7.20 *	3.04
Year												
2004	-7.68	7.60	-3.14	13.90	6.52	9.13	-2.57	7.37	-0.81	11.43	-6.68	5.01
2005	-13.74	8.22	-10.79	14.56	-1.70	8.09	-12.23	8.31	-16.82	10.56	-7.69	4.76
2006	-2.95	8.65	-1.88	14.98	-4.55	8.15	-4.60	7.86	-18.35	10.78	2.45	6.58
2007	0.11	8.57	0.89	15.24	-11.35	7.60	-8.76	8.07	14.03	12.24	-7.45	4.85
2008	-4.90	8.23	33.11 *	15.95	2.72	8.45	-2.15	8.51	-7.92	12.35	-10.96 *	4.44
2009	-7.57	8.21	-6.93	13.56	-5.49	6.86	-4.71	7.69	-3.26	11.65	-5.75	5.26
Constant	366.60 ***	13.51	221.99 ***	32.33	106.04 ***	14.20	329.17 ***	13.96	192.59 ***	24.87	48.36 ***	8.39
Model Fit												
F-test/Likelihood Ratio Chi-square	39.92 ***		3.49 ***		2.95 ***		43.38 ***		3.08 ***		2.89 ***	
df	27		29		29		27		29		29	
Total observations	8004		1469		2208		7631		2294		3047	

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Note : Reference categories are ages 45-49, white, less than high school, rents home, not working for pay (in formal volunteer and informal volunteer models), not a formal volunteer (in paid work and informal volunteer models), not married, no children under 18 in the household, not giving adult care, not an informal volunteer (in paid work and formal volunteer models), weekend, 2003.

Figure 1. Formal Engagement by Gender in the ATUS (2003-2009)