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Abstract

This research attempted to examine the motivational differences between different student population subgroups. The participants in this study were undergraduate college students from SUNY College at Brockport (students, n=437; males, n=159; female, n=278; volunteers, n=373; nonvolunteers, n=64; service-oriented majors, n=169; nonservice-oriented majors, n=177). A survey instrument that was developed for this study included the Volunteers Function Inventory (VFI). It was used to assess the research data. The instrument measured the subjects' perception of the importance of six motivational functions (Values, Career, Understanding, Social, Enhancement, and Protective) in regards to volunteer experience, gender, and major. The results suggest the existence of motivational differences for volunteering: 1) in the Values, Understanding, Enhancement and Career functions between volunteer and nonvolunteer students, 2) in the Values, Understanding, and Enhancement functions between male and female students, and 3) in the Values function between service and nonservice-oriented majors.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Volunteers are arguably the most important group of customers in voluntary organizations (Wright, Larsen, & Higgs, 1995). The dollar value of volunteer time in the U.S. was $11.30 per hour for 1998 and increased to $15.40 per hour in 2000 (Independent Sector, 2001). However, volunteerism is a social phenomenon that takes place worldwide (Curtis, Grabb, & Baer, 1992). A recent study in Europe estimated that every dollar invested in volunteering brought eight in return (Smith, 2001).

The activity of volunteerism takes many forms such as involvement in voluntary associations, activism focusing on social change or donations of money, supplies or blood donations, etc. (Wilson, 2000). Other expressions of volunteering are mutual help in the health and social welfare field, and philanthropy to others within voluntary or community organizations. Volunteers in hospitals, schools, religious organizations, sport clubs and other community organizations all contribute to the breadth and effectiveness of services (Hiatt & Jones, 1998).

Every year, millions of people devote important amounts of time and energy to volunteer in different organizations. According to findings from a national survey, 44% of adults in the U.S. over the age of 21 volunteered in a formal organization in 2000. Of these formal volunteers, 63% reported that they volunteer on a regular basis (monthly or more often) (Independent Sector, 2001).

Although the dollar value of volunteer hours increased over the past 10 years in the U.S., the percentage of volunteers decreased over the 1998-2000 period from
55.5% to 44%. The same phenomenon was observed in the UK, where the level of volunteering had fallen slightly over the past six years, from 51% of the adult population in 1991 to 48% in 1997 (National Survey of Volunteering in the UK, 1997). Another concern related to the study is that young people and men are two groups most often under represented. While more retired people are volunteering today than six years ago, the participation rate has fallen for young people in the UK and in the U.S. (National Survey of Volunteering in the UK, 1997; Independent Sector, 1998). Additionally, several studies report that volunteering is gender specific with more women volunteering relative to men (Fitch, 1987; Morrow, Howell & Mui, 1989; Okun, Barr, & Herzog, 1998; Bussel & Forbes, 2002).

Due to the indication that the volunteer pool is decreasing (Independent Sector, 2001) and the competition for volunteer recruitment by public sector and voluntary organizations is stronger, volunteer managers have become increasingly concerned with the recruitment and retention of volunteers (Bussel & Forbes, 2002). Moreover, there are fewer new volunteers coming forward to replace the ones who leave (Smith, 1998). Thus, marketing techniques are playing a more important role in this area (Bussel & Forbes, 2002).

**Significance of the Study**

An important marketing technique for the recruitment and retention of volunteers is *understanding* what motivates individuals to volunteer their time and effort to different organizations (Benson, Dohority, Garman, Hanson, Hochschwender, Lebold, Rohr, & Sullivan, 1980; Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner &

Although the volunteer population is diverse, Wymer (1997a) suggests that homogenous subgroups of volunteers can be segmented for target marketing purposes.

The majority of the studies conducted in this area conclude that volunteers are composed in homogenous subgroups depending on the different reasons or motives for joining a volunteer organization (Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Cuskelly, McIntyre, & Boag, 1998). Moreover, these groups may predict the amount of help (deciding whether to help and how much) the volunteers will contribute to an organization (Clary & Miller, 1986; Rosenhan, 1970).

Previous studies report that motivation issues may affect the retention of volunteers (Clary & Miller, 1986; Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner & Finkelstein 1998). These findings indicate that some volunteer motivations may predict the volunteers' commitment to involvement in a volunteer activity. These motivations should be sought by organizations in the volunteer recruitment process. Thus, from an applied perspective, it is important to learn about the factors that lead people to volunteer in different organizations, and to understand these factors and use them successfully in the planning, recruiting, and managing process.

Purpose of the Study

The objectives of this study are to: 1) Explore the motivational differences for volunteering between volunteer and nonvolunteer students, 2) Examine the motivational differences for volunteering between male and female college students,
and 3) Study the motivational differences for volunteering between college students pursuing a service-oriented major versus college students pursuing a nonservice-oriented major.

**Research Questions**

Three research questions are explored in this paper:

1) Are there specific motivational patterns related to volunteer behavior among college students?

2) Do gender differences exist in motivation to volunteer in college students?

3) Does the choice of type of major (service vs. nonservice-oriented) correlate with motivations for volunteerism?

**Definition of Terms**

1) Volunteering- an activity that is voluntarily undertaken for no financial reward and benefits someone other than the person who volunteers (UN Volunteers, 1999).

2) Motivation- the internal, psychological forces that move people to overcome obstacles and become involved in volunteer activity (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998).

3) Recruiting process- to persuade someone to work for a company or become a new member of an organization (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2003).

4) Retention- the continued use, existence or possession of something or someone (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2003).
5) Altruism—willingness to do things that benefit other people, even if it results in disadvantage for yourself (Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, 2003).

6) Gender—refers to the social categories of male and female and implies that characteristics of males and females may be due to cultural and social beliefs, influences, and perceptions (Arnett, 2002).

7) College major—a student’s primary area or concentration of coursework (www.dccc.edu/homepages/ssarafin/terms.pdf -).

8) Service-oriented major—those majors that would most likely lead to professions where people will have to work in social and customer service settings. The service-oriented students will possibly work towards the welfare of different groups, such as children, seniors and minorities.

9) Nonservice-oriented major—those majors that would most likely lead to highly ordered professions, both verbal and numerical and likely in an office setting. Nonservice professions will be more oriented to the self and success.

**Limitations**

Due to the nature of this study and the resources available, several limiting factors must be considered in the interpretation of the study results. Foremost, among these is the relatively non-representative nature of the sample. The population selected for the study was students at SUNY College at Brockport. Due to the purposive nature of the sampling methods established for this study, the ability to generalize the results of the study to the larger population is limited. The purposive
sample selection is due to the limited resources available to the researcher. Therefore, results should be viewed in light of this limitation.

Additional environmental factors such as childhood experiences, prior negative volunteer experiences, and others may also have influenced subjects' responses. In addition, the fact that the data was collected by self-report methods may have had a clouding effect on the data.

**Delimitations**

In light of the preceding limitations, this study is delimited to students at SUNY College at Brockport. It should be recognized that results apply only to this population, however, should similar circumstances occur in other situations, it is possible to make some meaningful comparisons.

It is outside of the influence of the researcher to influence the history of study participants. Factors like childhood experiences, bad volunteer experiences, ethnicity, family income status, and others are endemic to the human condition and present challenges that influence the interpretation of study results. The researcher attempted to control for these factors in the instrumentation, which yielded consistent factor solutions in exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses on diverse samples.

Although resources available to the researcher preclude the use of crosschecking measures, the researcher encouraged sincere responses by reassuring the participants that the survey would be anonymous and that all the appropriate measurements will be taken for the confidentiality of the data. However, with those
measures taken into consideration, results must be viewed in light of potential bias of the participants.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The purpose of this section is to review the literature pertinent to volunteers' motivations, and the influence that these motivations may have in the recruiting process and the retention of the volunteers. The review of the literature has been grouped into seven categories: (a) volunteerism and motivations, (b) measurement models of volunteers' motivations, (c) the functional approach to volunteerism, (d) volunteers' motivations and the recruiting process, (e) volunteers' motivations and service retention, and (f) volunteerism and gender differences, (g) volunteerism and college students.

Volunteerism and Motivations

Helping is a human behavior that occurs when an individual makes significant personal sacrifice for another person (Clary et al., 1998). Human helpfulness has two types of manifestation; spontaneous and nonspontaneous help. Spontaneous helping situations often involve surprising subjects with an opportunity to help, requiring an immediate decision (Clary, & Orenstein, 1991), and only one relatively brief act of help (Benson et al., 1980). In contrast, nonspontaneous helping situations involve considerably more planning, sorting of priorities and matching of personal capabilities and interests with the type of intervention (Benson et al., 1980).

As defined, volunteerism is a nonspontaneous help and volunteers are individuals who a) often actively seek out opportunities to help others; b) may deliberate for considerable amounts of time about whether to volunteer, the extent of
their involvement, and the degree to which particular activities fit their own personal needs; and c) may make a commitment to an ongoing helping relationship that may extend over considerable period of time, energy and opportunity (Clary et al., 1998).

Volunteerism takes different forms and meanings in different settings. The concept of volunteerism is strongly influenced by the history, politics, religion, and culture of a region, but is also influenced by the nature of the volunteers themselves (personality characteristics, lifestyle, experiences etc.). However, it is possible to identify some basic common defining characteristics of the voluntary activity: (a) the activity should not be undertaken for monetary reward, (b) the activity should not be an obliged commitment, but should be undertaken voluntarily, (c) the activity should (in some form), contribute to the society other than the volunteer. A substantial amount of research has investigated the motivational characteristics of volunteers (Benson et al., 1980; Clary, & Orenstein, 1991; Penner, & Finkelstein, 1998; Cuskelly, McIntyre, & Boag, 1998; Farmer & Fedor, 2001).

Measurement Models of Volunteers’ Motivations

The one-factor model is a unidimensional model that suggests that volunteers act from a combination of motives described as a meaningful whole and not from a single motive or a category of motives (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Luciani, 1993). Cnaan and Goldgerg-Glen (1991) conducted an exploratory factor analysis in a study of 258 committed volunteers from human services and 104 nonvolunteers and found that a single-factor model provided a better fit to the data than several multifactor models. Specifically, twenty-two items loaded on this factor and were
used to form the Motivation to Volunteer Scale (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). However, a theoretical framework did not support the items on this Scale. Lucianin (1993) did an exploratory analysis on Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen’s 22 items and found seven factors.

Conversely, other researchers argue that some people have more than one reason for volunteering (Unger, 1991; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). The two-factor model suggests that individuals volunteer for two reasons; 1) for concerns to others (altruistic motives) and 2) for themselves (egoistic motives). Frisch and Gerrard (1981) administered 11 items on motives for volunteering to a sample of Red Cross volunteers and found that altruistic and egoistic motives were distinct dimensions of volunteer motivation. When Lating (1990) did an exploratory analysis on nine items on motives for volunteering to a sample of Big Brothers and Big Sisters, the two factors that emerged were *Altruistic* and *Egoistic*.

Different individuals might be involved in the same activities but have different goals (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1991). The classic issue in the literature concerns the helper’s motives and whether they are altruistic as opposed to egoistic. Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991), from their extensive literature review, concluded that a combination of altruistic and egoistic motives leads people to volunteer. Research has examined several aspects of altruistic motivation and found links to helping behavior: situational empathic concern (Batson, 1987); dispositional sympathy (Eisenberg et al., 1989); the combination of high nurturance and low succorance (Romer, Gruder, & Lizzadro, 1986); and moral cognitions (Blasi, 1980).
Altruistic motives have been found to relate positively to the amount of contact male AIDS volunteers had with people infected with HIV (Penner, & Finkelstein, 1998). Clary and Orenstein (1991) also found that altruistic motives were related to the amount of help provided by crisis-counseling volunteers. These findings are consistent with the findings of an investigation of volunteers' multiple contributions to a charitable organization conducted by Farmer and Fedor (2001). On the other hand, Omoto and Snyder (1995) found positive relationships between self-centered motives and volunteerism.

Okun (1994) found that the strongest correlate of frequency of volunteering among older volunteers was the need to feel useful or productive. Volunteering is sometimes viewed as a way for the volunteer to develop skills which may be useful in a future career (Gora & Nemerowicz, 1991), or help to obtain employment (Unger, 1991), gain academic credits, or even aid career advancement (Riecken, Babakus, & Yavas, 1994). Caudron (1994) suggests that another motivation for volunteering will be to generate good public relations. Additionally, religious involvement and religious beliefs have been shown to be associated with a greater likelihood to volunteer (Wymer, 1997b). Wilson and Pimm (1996) discovered some less obvious reasons why people may volunteer including wanting to wear a uniform, perks obtained, mixing with celebrities, health and fitness, and travel opportunities.

The Functional Approach to Volunteerism

One of the most promising strategies for discovering the motivational forces underlying an activity such as volunteerism comes from functional theories or beliefs
and behaviors. According to the original theorists (Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956), the functional approach seeks to understand the psychological and social needs and goals, plans, and motives that individuals are attempting to satisfy through their beliefs and behaviors. Furthermore, this approach suggests that similar beliefs or behaviors may well serve different psychological functions for different people. Hence, in volunteering, people engage in volunteer work in order to achieve important psychological goals, and that different individuals will be seeking to satisfy different motivations through volunteer activity (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998).

The functional theorists identified the basic psychological functions that were involved in human activity. Although the labels vary, several functions are common to the functional approach as articulated by Katz (1960) and Smith (1956). According to the functional approach, some attitudes are thought to serve a knowledge (object appraisal) function and bringing a sense of understanding to the world. Those attitudes that allow an individual to express and act on important values serve a value-expressive (quality of expressiveness) function, and other attitudes serve an ego defensive (externalization) function buffering people against undesirable or threatening truths about the self. Katz (1960) proposed a utilitarian function that reflects rewarding and punishing experiences with social entities, while Smith, Brunner, and White (1956) suggested a social adjustive function served when attitudes help people fit in with important reference groups.

Recently, Clary et al. (1991, 1992, 1994, 1995) have been applying the functional approach to the motivations underlying involvement in volunteer work.
(Clary & Snyder, 1991; Clary, Snyder, & Ridge, 1992; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994; Clary et al., 1995). This work has resulted in the identification of six categories of motivations or psychological functions that may be served by volunteering.

The functional approach to volunteerism (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998) suggests that people may be attempting to satisfy a *Values* function, whereby they participate in volunteer work to express and act on values important to the self (e.g. humanitarian values or altruistic concerns). In the case of the *Career* function, some people engage in volunteer work to gain experiences that will benefit their careers. For others, volunteering helps them to increase their knowledge of the world and to develop and practice skills that might otherwise go unpracticed, thus satisfying an *Understanding* function. Other people view volunteer work as an opportunity to help them fit in and get along with social groups that are important to them, thus serving a *Social* function. However, for some individuals, volunteer work serves the purpose of allowing the individual to engage in psychological development and enhance self-esteem, thereby satisfying an *Enhancement* function. Finally, some people attempt to satisfy a *Protective* function and engage in volunteer work to cope with inner anxieties and conflicts, thus affording some protection for the ego (e.g. to reduce feelings of guilt, to combat feelings of inferiority) (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998).

Previous studies on volunteers' motivations are in agreement with the functional approach's emphasis on multiple motivations and is consistent with the specific motivations identified by the functional approach. The *Understanding*
function appears to be operating in health and mental health volunteers who are attempting to gain "self-development, learning, and variety in life" through their volunteer experience (Gidron, 1978). A concern for others, the essence of the *Values* function, distinguishes volunteers from nonvolunteers (Allen & Rushton, 1983), as well as more committed from less committed volunteers (Clary & Miller, 1986; Clary & Orenstein, 1991). The *Social* function is found in those volunteers who emphasize obtaining social rewards for volunteering, and avoiding social disapproval for not volunteering (Rosenhan, 1970). The *Enhancement* function is exemplified by those who report that they volunteer for personal development (Anderson & Moore, 1978), or personal growth and self esteem (Jenner, 1982). Jenner (1982) found that 15 percent of her sample of Junior League volunteers viewed volunteering in terms of preparing for a new career or maintaining one's career-related skills, and that points to the *Career* function. The *Protective* function has been reported in volunteers who wanted to escape from negative feelings (Frisch & Gerard, 1981).

**Volunteers' Motivations and the Recruiting Process**

The recruitment of the right volunteers has been a major management issue for many organizations. Recruitment efforts should begin with an understanding of the motivations of one's current volunteers and particularly one's committed volunteers, and then attempt to find potential volunteers who resemble the motivational profile of one's current volunteers (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998).

The functional approach suggests that underlying the decision to volunteer is a process by which individuals come to see volunteerism in terms of their personal
motivations; one way that they can come to view volunteering this way is through exposure to persuasive messages (Clary, Ridge, Stukas, Snyder, Copeland, Haugen, Miene, 1998). Extent literature supports the premise of the functional hypothesis in that matching messages to motivations enhances persuasive impact (Clary et al., 1998; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994).

Clary et al. (1998) examined a fundamental aspect of functional theorizing, namely the importance of matching the motivations of the individual and the opportunities afforded by the environment. In this study (Clary et al., 1998), the researchers created six advertisements that asked readers to become volunteers, with each advertisement corresponding to one of the psychological functions (values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement) of volunteerism identified by the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). Each advertisement advocated volunteerism as a means toward a set of ends relevant to one of these six motivations. Participants judged each advertisement as effective and persuasive to the extent that it matched their personal motivations. Thus, an organization that understands the motivations of their volunteers may use them to promote the most appealing advertisements to recruit the best-qualified volunteers.

Clary et al. (1998) using the six motivations of VFI (values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement) compared the motivations of respondents who reported some volunteering in the previous 12 months with those who reported no volunteering (volunteers provided their reasons for volunteering and nonvolunteers reported how important each reason for volunteering would be to
Volunteers and nonvolunteers differed on five of the six motivations with volunteers reporting greater levels of Values, Enhancement, Social, and Understanding motivations than nonvolunteers, and nonvolunteers reporting a greater level of Career motivation than volunteers. These findings indicate that some volunteer motivations may predict serious intention of involvement in a volunteer activity and maybe these motivations are the ones to be pursued by the organizations in order to recruit their volunteers.

The same study (Clary et al., 1998) also examined the relationship between motive and area of activity. Those who had volunteered in the past year were asked to indicate the area or areas in which they had volunteered: health, education, religious organizations, human services, environment, public/society benefit, recreation/adult, arts/culture/humanities etc. The researchers (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998) attempted to explore the possibility that the motivations of volunteering can usefully distinguish between different types of volunteers. The findings suggested that the functions of volunteerism are related to the types of volunteer activities to which a person might be attracted, with each of the six motivations associated with involvement in some types of activities and unrelated to others. The configuration of motivation varies with activity type and this can be used as a recruiting tool.

**Volunteers’ Motivations and Service Retention**

Previous studies suggest that motivation issues may affect the retention of the volunteers’ services (Clary & Miller, 1986; Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner & Finkelstein 1998). Rosenhan’s study (1970) found that those with the socialization
antecedents of altruistic motives exhibited a much greater involvement in the civil rights movement than those with the antecedents of egoistic motives. In a replication and extension of Rosenhan's (1970) study, the commitment of egoistic helpers to crisis-counseling volunteer work was found to increase with the presence of situational benefits, while altruistic helpers maintained a high rate regardless of variations in situational benefits (Clary & Miller, 1986).

Clary and Orenstein (1991) found that altruistic motives were related to the amount of help provided. Early terminating volunteers reported lower levels of altruistic motivation for volunteering at the beginning of training than screened and completed-service volunteers. Egoistic motivation resulted in less persistence given the likelihood that over time personal benefits will be more variable, while costs will definitely increase (more time and effort will be required). Altruistic motivation involves a willingness to endure greater costs on behalf of others and to be less concerned about the consequences for oneself and hence leads to a greater degree of commitment (Clary & Orenstein, 1991).

The results from a study of motivation in Spanish voluntary workers who work with persons with AIDS and persons with Cancer, demonstrated the great importance of other-oriented (altruistic) motivations for the permanence of volunteers in organizations (Fuertes & Jimenez, 2000). This study examined a sample of 112 volunteers from nine AIDS and cancer organizations who were categorized in three groups. Group 1 was made up of volunteers that had been in the organization for less
than 3 months, those of Group 2 had been working for between 4 and 7 months, those of Group 3 between 8 and 28 months, and those of Group 4 more than 19 months.

From the results, it was concluded that regardless of their length of service, volunteers would appear to identify *Values* (other-oriented motivation) as the most important motivation. Moreover, other-oriented motivations were significantly more important for those volunteers with longest service in an organization. However, analysis of the motivational profiles associated with length of service confirmed that volunteers that have spent longest in an organization (more than 18 months) lend more importance to self-oriented motivations (knowledge, personal development, and social relationships) than those with the least time served. Thus, both other-oriented and self-oriented motivations, at their highest levels, were related to permanence in volunteers.

Clary et al. (1998), in a functional approach of volunteerism, found that volunteers who were high in motivation to volunteer and who received relevant benefits were more likely to indicate that they would be active as volunteers as far as 5 years into the future than other volunteers. The results of that study (Clary et al., 1998) indicated that volunteers who received benefits relevant to their primary functional motivations were not only satisfied with their service but also intended to continue to volunteer in both short-and long-term future.

Supporting this study, Penner and Finkelstein (1998) found that altruistic motives were positively related to length of service related to the dispositional and structural correlates of volunteerism. Furthermore, Farmer and Fedor (2001) also
found that altruistic motives for volunteering predicted greater financial donations and time worked by the volunteer.

**Volunteerism and Gender Differences**

Findings from several studies report that volunteering is gender specific with more women than men volunteering (Bussel & Forbes, 2002). According to the National Survey, (Independent Sector, 1998) a higher percentage of women (62%) than men (49%) volunteered in the year 1998 in the U.S. However, a survey on volunteerism in the United Kingdom (1997) found that, in terms of gender, men and women were equally as likely to volunteer (48%), with women having a slight drop from 1991 to 1997.

Clary et al. (1998) examined survey data on volunteerism in the U.S and explored the role of motivations in relation to gender differences. They (Clary et al., 1998) found that females assigned more importance to all six motivations of the VFI (values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement) than did males. However, they found that men and women assigned the same importance on the six functions, with the highest rated motives being Values, Enhancement, and Social, and the lowest rated motives being Understanding, Protective, and Career (Clary et al., 1998).

Another gender difference on volunteerism focused on the different areas in which women volunteer as opposed to men. In accordance with the findings of the volunteering survey in the UK in 1997, women were three times more likely than men to volunteer in schools, and also more likely to be involved in social welfare
groups, while men were twice as likely to be involved in sports groups. Men were more active on committees and women in fundraising (UK National Survey, 1997).

**Volunteerism and College Students**

Undoubtedly, student involvement in extracurricular activities in the total educational environment is a means of student development. The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) reported that the more highly involved the students are through participation in different organizations, work on-campus, and frequent interaction with faculty and student peers, the greater their growth, achievement, satisfaction and persistence in college. This report was supported by Astin (1977, 1984a, 1984b) who concluded that student participation in extracurricular activities increases students' satisfaction regarding college and limits the possibility of dropping out.

Volunteering in different organizations is a type of extracurricular activity. Findings for students' volunteer action are divided. The Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching (1984) reported that 29% of college students had volunteered for a charity organization since entering college. Another survey (Independent Sector, 1985) found that 43% of the people in the 18-24 age group had volunteered during the preceding year.

Allen and Rushton (1983), in a review of 20 studies of the personality characteristics of community volunteers, compared volunteers with nonvolunteers and concluded that volunteers had higher moral standards, had higher self-esteem, were more empathic, and were more emotionally stable than nonvolunteers.
Fitch (1987) reported that College student volunteers are not very different from the general student population with the exception that women and residence hall students are overrepresented. Fitch (1987) also found that students volunteered for both egoistic and altruistic reasons. An interesting finding was that the large majority of students involved in community service were involved in such activities before entering college (Fitch, 1987).

Fitch (1991) also examined the characteristics that distinguish student volunteers from other students who are involved in extracurricular activities, not of a service nature, and from those who are not involved at all. Neither sex, employment status, nor class standing seemed to be associated with the students' decision to be involved in extracurricular activities. However, women were more likely than men to be involved in community service activities.

An examination (Fitch, 1991) of the subdivision of academic majors by involvement revealed three interesting results. Social majors, were much more likely to be in service activities, enterprising majors were involved in extracurricular. Fitch (1991) also reported that the students involved in service were significantly different from both of the other groups on all three scales, scoring higher on Conformity (doing what is actually correct and conforming to regulations) and Benevolence (helping the unfortunate and doing things for others) and lower on Independence (being able to do things in one's way and being free to make one's own decisions). Religious oriented students were more highly involved in service activities (Fitch, 1991).
CHAPTER III

Methodology

The purpose of this portion of the paper is to describe the methodology used in the research. The methodology section has been grouped into seven categories: (a) the setting of the study, (b) the research subjects, (c) the subjects’ selection procedure, (d) the materials, (e) the measures, (f) the design and procedure, and (g) the data analysis.

The setting of the Study

The sample for this study consisted of students selected from SUNY College at Brockport. The SUNY College at Brockport is a state university located in the town of Brockport, New York. The College has three Schools: the School of Arts and Performance, the School of Letters and Sciences and the School of Professions. Within these schools, a total number of 40 bachelor’s degree programs are offered.

In 2003, 6700 matriculated full-time and part-time undergraduate students enrolled by first major in the institution. From these 6700 students, 2919 are male and 3851 are female students. Approximately 75% of these students are white-non-Hispanic, 17.7% are 25 years old and older, and the average age of full-time undergraduate students is 22. Thirty seven point five percent of these undergraduate students live on campus and 62.5% live off campus or commute.

Research Subjects

The sample consisted of 437 undergraduate students enrolled at the SUNY College at Brockport during the spring semester of 2004 and enrolled in classes in six
departments of the College: Psychology, Recreation and Leisure Studies, Nursing, Business and Administration, Communications, and Biology. The survey was completed by 452 students; 437 student surveys were used for the analyses.

From the 437 students, 159 (36.4%) were male and 278 (63.6%) were female. Thirty-three (7.6%) students were freshmen, 75 (17.2%) sophomores, 171 (39.1%) juniors, and 158 (36.2%) seniors.

The majority of the students' major was Business (30.7%). The others were: Recreation and Leisure (7.1%), Psychology (9.2%), Biology (4.1%), Communications (5.5%) and Nursing (22.4%). However, the rest of the sample (21%) included Health Science, Criminal Justice, Physical Education, Philosophy, Social Work, English, Political Science, Environmental Science, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Fine Arts, Computer Science, History, Anthropology and Undecided majors.

Students who had volunteered at least once in their life represented 85.4% of the sample, but only 63.8% of those had volunteered the past 12 months. The most common areas for volunteering among student volunteers were Education (36.1%), Recreation (36.1%), Youth (33.2%) and the least common areas for volunteering were International (1.3%), Political (2.9%) and Arts (6.3%).

Subjects' Selection Procedure

Purposive stratified sampling was used to divide the population of the 40 undergraduate majors into two groups (service oriented majors and nonservice-oriented majors). Service-oriented majors were those majors that would most likely lead to professions where people would have to work in social and customer service
settings. The service-oriented students will possibly work towards the welfare of different groups, such as children, seniors and minorities. By investigating the related coursework and career market of the different majors 21 service-oriented majors offered at SUNY College at Brockport were offered: Dance, Physical Education, Theatre, African and Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Liberal Studies, English, Environmental Science, French, History, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Spanish, Women Studies, Criminal Justice, Health Sciences, Nursing, Recreation and Leisure Studies and Social Work. Subsequently, the researcher closely examined the coursework and career options of these 21 service-oriented majors to determine which three college majors were considered the most service-oriented majors. Based on this examination, the researcher identified Psychology (PSH), Recreation and Leisure Studies (REL), and Nursing (NUR) college majors as the most representative service-oriented majors.

Nonservice-oriented majors were those majors that would most likely lead to highly ordered professions, both verbal and numerical and likely in an office setting. Nonservice professions were more oriented to the self and success. By investigating the related coursework and career market of the different majors the researcher identified 19 nonservice-oriented majors that were offered at SUNY College at Brockport: Art, Communication, Interdisciplinary Arts, Journalism, Biology, Chemistry, Computational Science, Computer Science, Earth Science, Geology, International Studies, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Meteorology, Physics, Water Resources, Accounting, Business Administration, and International Business.
Subsequently, the researcher closely examined the coursework and career options of these 19 nonservice-oriented majors to determine which three college majors were considered the most nonservice-oriented majors. Based on this examination, the researcher identified the Business and Administration (BA), Communications (CMC), and Biology (BIO) college majors as the most representative nonservice-oriented majors.

The researcher surveyed students who attend classes in the six departments (PSH, REL, NUR, BA, CMC, and BIO), where the probability of students accessing these six majors increased. Then, by using the cluster sampling method the researcher selected 17 (2 REL, 3 PSH, 2 NUR, 6 BUS, 3 CMC, 1 BIO) sessions to survey the students.

**First Sample: Volunteer vs. Nonvolunteer Students**

The researcher divided the initial sample of 437 students into two groups; volunteers and nonvolunteers. The number of students who had volunteered at least once in their life was 373 (85.4%), but only 238 (63.8%) of those students volunteered in the past 12 months. Thus, for the first sample, the researcher examined two groups. Students who had volunteered at some point in their life (Group A, \(n_A=373\)), and students that had never volunteered (Group B, \(n_B=64\)).

Table A depicts the basic characteristics of those students who had volunteered at least once in their life and those students who had never volunteered.
Table A: Basic Characteristics of Volunteer vs. Nonvolunteer Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>NONVOLUNTEERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonservice</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonservice</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Popular Area for Volunteering: Education (36.1%) & Recreation (36.1%)

Second Sample: Female vs. Male Students

The 437-student sample was composed of 278 (63.6%) females and 159 (36.4%) males. Among the females, 87.8% volunteered at least once in their life and of those, 62.1% have volunteered the past 12 months. Among the males, 81.1% volunteered at least once in their life and of those 66.7% have volunteered the past 12 months. The most common area of volunteerism among females was Education (39.5%) and among males was Recreation (50%).
The second sample, was composed of two groups. The first group, was female students (Group A, n_A=278) and in second group was male students (Group B, n_B=159). It should be note that the second group contained a representation of both those with and without volunteer experience.

Table B demonstrates the basic characteristics of the male and female students of the sample.
Table B: Basic Characteristics of Female Students vs. Male Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonservice</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonservice</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Volunteer</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Volunteer</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer last 12 m</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvolunteer last 12 m</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most popular area for volunteering</td>
<td>Recreation (50%)</td>
<td>Education (39.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Popular Area for Volunteering</td>
<td>International (1.2%)</td>
<td>Political (1.3%) &amp; International (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Sample: Service vs. Nonservice Oriented majors**

In the attempt to divide the 437 students into service-oriented (SO) majors and nonservice-oriented (NSO) majors the researcher encountered an unexpected obstacle. Although the goal was to obtain a representative sample from the sessions in the six departments (PSH, REL, NUR, BA, CMC, and BIO), the researcher did not
consider the fact that students who attended those sessions might not have been pursuing the equivalent majors. Thus, from the 437 students surveyed, only the 346 belonged to PSH, REL, NUR, BA, CMC, and BIO majors. Specifically from these 346 students, 177 (51.7%) NSO and 169 (48.3%) were SO students.

Among the SO majors, 88.8% had volunteered at least once in their life and 62.7% of those had volunteered the past 12 months. Among the NSO majors, 81.4% had volunteered at least once in their life and 58.3% of those had volunteered in the past 12 months. The most common area of volunteerism for both SO majors and NSO majors was Recreation, with 37.2% and 34.5% student volunteers respectively. For the third sample, the researcher selected two groups. The first group included the SO major students (Group A, nA=169) and the second group consisted the NSO major students (Group B, nB=177).

Table C depicts the basic characteristics of service-oriented major students and nonservice-oriented major students of the sample.
Table C: Basic Characteristics of Service vs. Nonservice oriented majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>NONSERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Volunteer</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Volunteer</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer last 12 m</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvolunteer last 12 m</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Popular Area for Volunteering</td>
<td>Recreation (37.2%)</td>
<td>Recreation (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Popular Area for Volunteering</td>
<td>Political &amp; International (0%)</td>
<td>Political, International, &amp; Arts (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumentation

The instrument used for this study was a two-part, self-administered questionnaire. The first page of the survey was an informed consent document. This document informed the students of the study's nature and content, indicated that the survey was voluntary and anonymous and that the participation in the research would not affect the participants' grades or class standings. Returning the survey indicated
their consent to participate. A contact telephone number and email was provided at the end of the document for any further questions.

The first part of the questionnaire (second page) was the six scale (values, career, understanding, social, enhancement, and protective) of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Ridge, Stukas, Snyder, Copeland, Haugen, & Miene, 1998). The VFI presented the subjects with 30 reasons for volunteering. Volunteers were asked to indicate the importance of each reason for volunteering, and nonvolunteers were asked to indicate how important each reason for volunteering would be to them. Specifically, respondents were asked to rate each reason from 1 to 4, respectively, as not at all important, not too important, somewhat important, and very important.

The second part of the questionnaire (third page) included sociodemographic questions (age, gender, major) and questions about the student’s previous volunteer experience (length of time, areas of volunteering, etc.).

Measures

Clary, Snyder, and their colleagues have been applying the functional approach to the motivations that are associated with the involvement in volunteer work (Clary & Snyder, 1991; Clary, Snyder, & Ridge, 1992; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994; Clary et al., 1995). This work has resulted in the identification of six categories of motivations or psychological functions that may be served by volunteering (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998).
The functional approach to volunteerism suggests that people may be attempting to satisfy a *Values function*, whereby they participate in volunteer work to express and act on values important to the self (e.g. humanitarian values or altruistic concerns). In the case of the *Career function*, some people engage in volunteer work to gain experiences that will benefit their careers. For others, volunteering helps them to increase their knowledge of the world and to develop and practice skills that might otherwise go unpracticed, thus satisfying an *Understanding function*. Other people view volunteer work as an opportunity to help them fit in and get along with social groups that are important to them, thus serving a *Social function*. However, for some individuals volunteer work serves the purpose of allowing the individual to engage in psychological development and enhance their esteem, thereby satisfying an *Enhancement function*. Finally, some people attempt to satisfy a *Protective function* and engage in volunteer work to cope with inner anxieties and conflicts, thus affording some protection for the ego (e.g. to reduce feelings of guilt, to combat feelings of inferiority) (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998).

Research (Clary, Ridge, Stukas, Snyder, Copeland, Haugen, & Miene, 1998) has suggested that this instrument, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), possesses desirable psychometric qualities. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses on diverse samples yielded factor solutions consistent with functionalist theorizing; each VFI motivation, loaded on a single factor, possessed substantial internal consistency and temporal stability and correlated only modestly with other VFI motivations.
The VFI asked respondents 30 reasons for volunteering, where volunteers indicated the importance of each reason for their volunteering, and Nonvolunteers indicated how important each reason for volunteering would be to them. Respondents rated each reason from 1 to 4, respectively, as not at all important, not too important, somewhat important, and very important.

The second part of the questionnaire addressed three sociodemographic questions about the gender, the major degree, and the academic year of the participants.

After the sociodemographic questions the researcher added a sentence on the page that asked the participants to answer the questions about their volunteer experience “concerning Volunteering as an activity that is undertaken for no financial reward or academic credit”. The purpose of the questions regarding the students’ volunteer behavior was examined: (a) if they had any volunteering activity in their lifetime, (b) if they had any volunteer activity the past 12 months, (c) if they had volunteered, approximately how many hours they volunteer/ed every week for an organization, and (d) the areas the students have volunteered the past 12 months. The participants were asked to define the volunteer areas of these activities by choosing from 11 areas (health, senior citizens, disabilities, religious, youth development, Education/Schools, Environment, Political, International, Recreation/Sports, Arts) and they had a “other” choice to specify.
**Design/Procedure**

The researcher distributed the surveys to 17 academic sessions within the six departments (2 REL, 5 BUS, 1 BIO, 3 PSH, 3 CMC, and 2 NUR). For most of the sessions, students completed the survey at the beginning of the class, whereas for the rest of the sessions, the students completed the survey during their spare time and returned it during the next session. In all the classes, a brief introduction for the nature and utility of the survey, a summary of the informed consent and instructions how to fill out the survey were given to the students. Students completed the questionnaire in approximately 15 minutes.

**Data Analysis**

**Volunteer vs. Nonvolunteer Students**

In regards to the first research question, “Are there any specific motivational patterns related to volunteer behavior among college students?” the researcher performed a series of t-tests where the grouping variable was *Experience* (Group A vs. Group B in sample 1) and the test variables were the Six Functions of the VFI (Protective, Values, Career, Social, Understanding, Enhancement). Moreover, to test if one or more of the six functions of the VFI could predict volunteer behavior the researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis, where *Experience* was the dependent variable and the six functions of the VFI were the independent variables. Finally, the researcher calculated the mean scores for each function for the two groups to determine which function was the most important within each group.
**Female vs. Male Students**

In regards to the second research question "Do gender differences exist in motivation to volunteer in college students?" the researcher performed a series of t-tests where the grouping variable was Gender (Group A vs. Group B in sample 2) and the test variables were the Six Functions of the VFI (Protective, Values, Career, Social, Understanding, Enhancement). Moreover, to test if one or more of the six functions of the VFI are correlated with Gender the researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis, where Gender was the independent variable and the six functions of the VFI were the dependent variables. Finally, the researcher calculated the mean scores for each function for the two groups to determine which function was the most important within each group.

**Service vs. Nonservice Oriented Majors**

In regards to the third research question, "Does choice of major (Service vs. Nonservice oriented) correlate with motivations for volunteerism?" the researcher performed a series of t-tests where the grouping variable was Major (Group A vs. Group B in sample 3) and the test variables were the Six Functions of the VFI (Protective, Values, Career, Social, Understanding, Enhancement). Moreover, to test if one or more of the six functions of the VFI are correlated to service and nonservice-oriented students' major the researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis, where Major was the dependent variable and the six functions of the VFI were the independent variables. Finally, the researcher calculated the mean scores for each function for the two groups to determine which function was the most important within each group.
CHAPTER IV

Results

In this section of the paper, the purpose is to describe the results that were obtained from the data analyses. The results section is grouped into three categories, where each category refers to the results for (a) the volunteer and nonvolunteer students sample, (b) the female and male students sample, and (c) the service and the nonservice-oriented majors.

Volunteer vs. Nonvolunteer Students

The results from the series of t-tests that compared the six motivational functions of respondents who reported some volunteering in the past with those who reported no volunteering (recall that volunteers provided their reasons for volunteering and nonvolunteers reported how important each reason for volunteering would be to them) demonstrated interesting findings. Table 1.1 presents the differences (means) and corresponding t-statistics for the scores assigned on the six functions for the volunteer and nonvolunteer subgroups.
Table 1.1: Differences and corresponding t-statistics for the scores assigned on the six functions for the volunteer and nonvolunteer students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Volunteers Mean Values</th>
<th>Nonvolunteers Mean Values</th>
<th>T-STAT</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>-.560</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>-4.005</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>-1.515</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>-2.486</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>-1.900</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, ** denote significance at the 5%, 1% levels respectively

Volunteer and nonvolunteer students differed on three of the six motivations, with volunteers reporting greater levels (* when \( a = .05 \), and ** when \( a = .01 \)) of Values (\( p = .006** \)), Understanding (\( p = .000** \)), and Enhancement (\( p = .013* \)).

Thus, the Values, Enhancement, and Understanding functions of the VFI distinguished those who had served as volunteers at least once in their life from those who had not participated in any voluntary activity in their lifetime.

The findings from the multiple regression analysis showed that only the VFI Values score predicted significantly students that had volunteered in the past (\( p = .01** \)) and the VFI Career score predicted significantly students that had never volunteered in the past (\( p = .049* \)).
Table 1.2 presents the results of the regression analysis that was used to assess the predictive ability of the six functions of the VFI to volunteer behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, ** denote significance at the 5%, 1% levels respectively

In addition, according to the mean scores for each function, the importance of the six motivations was not the same for volunteers and nonvolunteers, with the highest rated motives for volunteers being Values and for nonvolunteers Career. The lowest rated motives for volunteers was Protective and for nonvolunteers Social.

Table 1.3 depicts the mean scores of the six functions of the VFI assigned by the volunteers (Group A) and the nonvolunteers (Group B).
Table 1.3: Volunteers and Nonvolunteers' mean scores of the VFI functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Volunteers Mean Values</th>
<th>Nonvolunteers Mean Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>14.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>12.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female vs. Male Students**

The results from the series of t-tests that compared the six motivational functions of female students and male students demonstrated that female students assigned more importance (* when \( a = .05 \) and ** when \( a = .001 \)) to the Values (p = .000**), Understanding (p = .007**) and Enhancement (p = .031*) functions of the VFI.

Table 2.1 presents the differences (means) and corresponding t-statistics for the scores assigned on the six functions for female students (Group A) and male students (Group B) subgroups.
Table 2.1 Differences and corresponding t-statistics for the scores assigned on the six functions for the male and female students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>T-STAT</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean values</td>
<td>Mean Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>-3.192</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>-8.763</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>-2.563</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>-1.983</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>-7.039</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>-6.361</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, ** denote significance at the 5%, 1% levels respectively

The findings from the multiple regression analysis showed that the VFI Values (p = .000**) and Enhancement (p = .031*) scores correlated significantly with Gender and particularly positively to female students.

Table 2.2 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis that was used to assess the correlation of the six functions of the VFI to gender.
Table 2.2: Multiple regression analysis' results for the correlation of the six functions of the VFI to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-1.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>4.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>2.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, ** denote significance at the 5%, 1% levels respectively

According to the mean scores for each function, the importance of the six motivations was not the same within males and females, with the highest rated motives within females being *Values* and within males being *Career*. The lowest rated motives for females was *Social* and for males *Protective*.

Table 2.3 depicts the mean scores of the six functions of the VFI assigned by the female students (Group A) and male students (Group B).
Table 2.3: Female and male students' mean scores of the VFI functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Male Mean values</th>
<th>Female Mean Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>10.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>16.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>15.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>10.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service vs. Nonservice Oriented Majors

The results from the series of t-tests that compared the six motivational functions of SO major students and NSO major students demonstrated that SO major students assigned more importance (* when a = .05 and ** when a = .001) to the Values (p = .002**) and Understanding (p = .010**) functions of the VFI.

Table 3.1 presents the differences (means) and corresponding t-statistics for the scores assigned on the six functions for service-oriented majors (Group A) and nonservice-oriented majors (Group B) subgroups.
Table 3.1: Differences and corresponding t-statistics for the scores assigned on the six functions for the nonservice and service oriented majors' students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Service Mean Values</th>
<th>Nonservice Mean Values</th>
<th>T-STAT</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>-1.263</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>-4.726</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>-3.779</td>
<td>.010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>-2.922</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, ** denote significance at the 5%, 1% levels respectively

The findings from the multiple regression analysis showed that the only the VFI Values (p = .012*) scores correlated significantly with the service-oriented majors.

Table 3.2 presents the results of the regression analysis that was used to assess the correlation of the six functions of the VFI to service and nonservice-oriented majors.
Table 3.2: Multiple regression analysis’ results for the correlation of the six functions of the VFI to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>2.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-1.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>1.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denote significance at the 5% level

In addition, according to the mean scores for each function, the importance of the six motivations was not the same for SO major students and NSO major students, with the highest rated motives for SO majors being Values and for NSO majors Career. The lowest rated motives for SO majors was Social and Protective and for NSO majors only Protective.

Table 3.3 depicts the mean scores of the six functions of the VFI assigned by the service-oriented majors (Group A) and nonservice-oriented majors (Group B).
### Table 3.3: Service and nonservice oriented majors’ mean scores of the VFI functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Functions</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Nonservice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Values</td>
<td>Mean Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>10.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the Results**

Students who had actually volunteered at least once in their life assigned significantly more importance to the *Values, Understanding and Enhancement* functions than did those students who had never volunteered. The *Career* function was correlated with the nonvolunteer behavior. Nonvolunteers assigned more importance to this function than did the volunteers. Motivational differences for volunteering were found for the *Values, Understanding*, and *Enhancement* functions between female and male students. Female students assigned significantly more importance to these three functions than male students did. Service-oriented major students assigned more importance the *Values* and *Understanding* functions.
CHAPTER V
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the existence of motivational differences for volunteering between 1) volunteer and nonvolunteer students, 2) male and female college students, and 3) students pursuing a service-oriented major and students pursuing a nonservice-oriented major. Due to these three dimensions of the purpose, the findings of this thesis will be discussed in three sections. However, it is necessary to be reminded of the context of the six motivational functions for volunteering before continuing discussion of the motivational differences between the groups. The Values function for volunteering refers to altruistic reasons and beliefs about helping others. People who are motivated by the Career function volunteer because they want to earn experience and skills that they can use for their work. The Social function serves people who want to be accepted in the society and conform with the norms of significant others and thus they volunteer. Individuals who are motivated by the Understanding function volunteer because they want to learn more about the world and themselves. The Enhancement function refers to the enhancement of the self-esteem through volunteering and the Protective refers to individuals who volunteer because they want to reduce their guilty feelings and protect their ego.

In the discussion section, in order to make comparisons with other studies, the researcher considered the Values function more similar to the Altruistic motivation
(other-oriented), and the *Understanding, Enhancement* and the *Protective* more similar to Egoistic motives (self-oriented).

**Volunteer vs. Nonvolunteer Students**

Motivational differences for volunteering do exist between volunteer and nonvolunteer students according to the findings. These differences are centered to four of the six functions of the VFI; *Values, Understanding, Enhancement* and *Career*. These findings appear to support the Functional Theory (Clary et al., 1998), which suggests that in volunteerism there coexist a wide variety of motivations that serve different functions for individuals.

Students who had actually volunteered at least once in their life assigned significantly more importance to the *Values, Understanding and Enhancement* functions than did those students who had never volunteered. Moreover, *Values* and *Understanding* were rated as the most important functions for volunteering among the active volunteers. These findings support the Social Exchange Theory in volunteerism (Phillips, 1982) in which the exchange of costs (altruistic reasons) and benefits (egoistic reasons) is basic to all interactions including volunteerism.

These findings are partially consisted with Fitch’s findings (1987), which found that the most highly rated item for volunteering among college student volunteers was an egoistic response (Enhancement) and the second highest item was an altruistic response (Values). Fuertes and Jimenez’ s (2000) results from a study of motivation in Spanish voluntary workers in the fields of AIDS and Cancer also demonstrated that volunteers consider themselves motivated particularly by Values
and Self-oriented motives (Understanding or Enhancement). The findings of this research are partially consistent with the findings of national survey conducted by Clary, Snyder and Stukas (Independent Sector, 1992) who used the VFI to compare volunteers’ motivations and volunteer behavior. They found that volunteers reported greater levels of Values, Enhancement, and Understanding than nonvolunteers, but they also had an inconsistent finding about the Social function, which also loaded heavier on the volunteers group.

This study’s finding on the Values function is consisted with the majority of studies in the literature on volunteers’ motivations. Penner and Finkelstein (1998) also found that the Values motive was consistently and positively associated with subsequent volunteer activity among volunteers at a large organization that serves people who are infected by HIV. Similar results were found by Farmer and Fedor (2001) who examined motives and their correlation to volunteer contributions and found that altruistic motives predicted greater financial donations and time worked by volunteers. Schendel and Boehm (2000) also found that Social responsibility (Values) was a volunteer motive among adolescent volunteers. Fitch (1991) also found that the Benevolence interpersonal value (can be associated with the Values function) distinguished college students who were involved in community service from the students who were not. The Values function was the most salient motive for volunteering across a variety of ages (Okun & Schultz, 2003).

However, the findings of this study are inconsistent with other similar studies’ findings. Scondel and Boehm (2000) found that the need for affirmation (Social
function) was a major motive among adolescent volunteers. Fitch (1991) also found that college students who were involved in community service scored higher on the interpersonal value *Conformity* (which can be associated with the Social function) than students who did not. Clary et al. (1998) also found that the *Social* function was more important for volunteering for volunteers than for the nonvolunteers.

The *Career* function was correlated with the nonvolunteer behavior. Nonvolunteers assigned more importance to this function than did the volunteers. This finding is consistent with the finding from a National survey on volunteers’ motivations (Clary et al., 1998) where nonvolunteers reported a greater level of *Career* motivation than nonvolunteers. Moreover, Fitch (1987) reported that student volunteers rated the *Career* function near the bottom in their motivations for volunteering. The finding about the *Career* function and nonvolunteer behavior is difficult to interpret.

The *Career* function refers to volunteerism as a key to gaining higher levels of specific knowledge, skills and experience that might be useful in the future career of the individual. It could be suggested that students are seeking this kind of knowledge in their college years. Furthermore, the *Career* function has been found to be higher among younger than older volunteers (Okun & Schultz, 2003). However, nonvolunteers were the group that assigned more importance to the *Career* function. This finding might be partially interpreted by Bale’s (1996) suggestion that there are three stages of the process of becoming a volunteer: the predisposition to volunteer, making the decision to volunteer, and finally volunteering. Thus, individuals might
have different motives for volunteering at all these stages, but the motivation in the last two stages is the one that will actually lead an individual to volunteer. Therefore, the Career function might be a predisposition motivation or simply a “weak” motivation, whereas the Values, Understanding, and Enhancement function would be a motivation that actually leads the individual to volunteer.

Another interesting interpretation regarding the findings about the Career function for the nonvolunteers is the evolution of the motivations through the volunteering process (Gidron, 1984; Fuertes & Jimenez, 2000). The evolution of the motivations implies the initial motivation to volunteer may change for the person over the course of the involvement in the voluntary activity. Therefore, individuals might initially volunteer to benefit their Career (Career function), but after they become a volunteer the Values, Understanding and Enhancement functions grow and dominate over the Career function. Finally, the finding that nonvolunteers value the Career function more than the volunteers might simply indicate that there are not many volunteer opportunities that provide career skills’ development through volunteerism and this is why all these individuals have stayed as nonvolunteers.

**Female vs. Male students**

Motivational differences for volunteering do exist between female and male students, according to the findings. Particularly, Values, Understanding, and Enhancement are the functions that showed significant results in the comparison. Female students assigned significantly more importance to these three functions than
male students did. In this sample, female students (87.8%) appeared to volunteer more than male (81.1%) did. However, both had high percentages for volunteering.

The findings on the Values function fit the traditional feminine stereotype that females are more caring, emotional and service-oriented than males (Fitch, 1987). However, females also scored significantly higher on the Understanding and the Enhancement function, which indicated that females also seek to fulfill egoistic reasons for volunteering. This is consistent with the social exchange theory (Phillips, 1982), which suggests the exchange of the altruistic aspect of volunteering (cost) and the egoistic or receiving aspect of volunteering (benefits). The fact that there were no significant differences leaning to males could suggest that a combination of functions lead males to volunteer.

Findings from a National survey (Independent Sector, 1998) are partially consistent with the findings of this study. Clary et al. (Independent Sector, 1998) found that females assigned significantly more importance to five (Values, Understanding, Enhancement, Social, and Protective) of the six motivations than did males. This study found gender differences for only Values, Understanding and Enhancement. Fitch (1987) found no significant gender differences in motivations for volunteering among college students, which is in disagreement to this study’s findings.

Inconsistent with the findings of this study, Penner and Finkelstein (1998) reported that female AIDS volunteers scored lower than the males both on the measures of altruistic motives and the other-oriented motives. However, the authors
(Penner & Finkelstein; 1998) indicated that these gender effects were unique to being an AIDS volunteer because 90% of the male volunteers were homosexual.

In this study females assigned more importance to the Protective function than males did and this finding is consistent with findings from other studies that reported greater Protective scores in female volunteers than in male volunteers (Morrow, Howell & Mui, 1989; Okun, Barr, & Herzog, 1998).

**Service vs. Nonservice Oriented Majors**

Motivational differences for volunteering do exist between service-oriented major students and nonservice-oriented major students, according to these findings. Service-oriented major students assigned more importance to the Values and Understanding functions. Service-oriented major students (88.8%) in the sample had a higher percentage for volunteering than the nonservice-oriented major students (81.4%). However, both had high percentages for volunteering.

An interpretation of this finding might be that the Values function is "stronger" among the service-oriented majors due to the nature of their coursework and career orientation. It is very likely that these majors are preparing for careers in the helping professions. Service-oriented majors might be affected by others' misfortunes and therefore volunteer out of a sense of altruism. The fact that there were no significant differences between the two groups of college majors and the other VFI functions could suggest that a combination of functions lead those individuals to volunteer and that the type of college major (service vs. nonservice-oriented) cannot distinguish those motivations.
Unfortunately, not many studies have investigated motivational differences in volunteerism among college majors. Fitch's findings (1987) indicated that there were no significant differences for the egoistic items (Enhancement & Protective) among the different majors, but there were significant differences for the altruistic item. The students with majors in the Artistic category were significantly more likely to rate the altruistic item higher than were those with majors in the Conventional, Enterprising, or Investigative categories. This study (Fitch, 1987) classified the academic majors according to Holland's theory (1973) into six categories: Artistic, Social, Investigative, Enterprising, Conventional, and Realistic. However, none of these categories could be compared to the service-oriented or to the nonservice-oriented majors that were used for this study.

Godwin (2002) found that students in the College of Commerce and Finance were attracted to community service if it provided them an opportunity to maintain or enhance a positive mood (Enhancement function) and to socialize (Social function). However, he did not find any significant differences for the Engineering and Arts and Sciences Colleges that would indicate an affinity to one or more of the functional values.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusions

Overall, this study attempted to develop an understanding of the volunteers’ motivations in relation to homogenous subgroups of volunteers: Volunteers vs. nonvolunteers, male vs. female, and service-oriented majors vs. nonservice-oriented majors. Motivational differences were found between the subgroups that can be utilized in the planning, recruiting and managing process of the volunteers. The Values function, which serves an altruistic and other-oriented reason for volunteering, seemed to vary between all these subgroups. Volunteers, female students and service-oriented majors in comparison to nonvolunteers, male students and nonservice-oriented majors rated the Values function significantly more important. The Enhancement and Understanding functions distinguished volunteers from nonvolunteers, and the Career function nonvolunteers from volunteers. Females assigned more importance to the Enhancement and Understanding function of the VFI than males. Different individuals volunteer for different reasons.

Implications for Practice

Clary and his colleagues (1998) suggest that people can be recruited into volunteerism by appealing to their own psychological functions. College students are more likely to intend to volunteer when they are exposed to persuasive messages (advertisements, commercials, etc.) that are tailored to the most salient motive for volunteering (Clary et al., 1998). Therefore, according to the findings of this study, Values play the biggest role in motivating an individual to volunteer, especially when
these individuals are female students and service-oriented major students. Volunteer recruitment messages for everyone should include *Value* statements and benefits, and especially when an organization is interested in recruiting female students or service-oriented majors.

Moreover, practitioners might want to develop messages identifying direct benefits to personal development and positive feelings (Understanding & Enhancement functions), because these functions were more important to volunteers than the nonvolunteers. These functions also loaded significantly for female in comparison to male students. Although the *Career* function was more important among nonvolunteers than among volunteers, this might indicate that organizations should try to recruit these individuals by developing messages that identify direct benefits to the career development of the individual.

Volunteer coordinators who are seeking to recruit college students, after they target their potential volunteers among college students, they can use accordingly these findings on the VFI to develop appeals that emphasize these functions and recruit the volunteers. For example, if an organization is looking to recruit female students, they should develop persuasive messages that emphasize *Values, Enhancement* and *Protective* functions.

Individuals may come to be satisfied volunteers and may plan to continue to serve as volunteers to the extent that they engage in volunteer work that serves their own psychological functions (Clary et al., 1998). Organizations should understand
their volunteers’ motivations and try to satisfy these motivations and this might affect their service retention (Clary et. al, 1998).

According to the findings of this study, volunteer coordinators should try to satisfy the *Values* function on their volunteers that appeared to be rated very important as a function for volunteers as opposed to nonvolunteers in this research. They could also use the findings on the other functions that loaded significantly on the comparisons on the different groups and try to satisfy these functions for these groups. For example, they should try to satisfy the Protective and Enhancement function for the female volunteers. However, it would be advisable for the organizations to first measure the motivations of their already existed satisfied volunteers and then try to satisfy these motivations, because the findings of this study might not be applicable for all populations.

Finally, these findings might enable colleges and universities to better market volunteer opportunities to students without the use of formal requirement such as academic credit that might lower volunteering intentions (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). After all, aside from volunteerism’s contribution to the social welfare, students who participate in extracurricular activities are less likely to drop out and more likely to be satisfied with their college experiences than are nonparticipants (Astin 1977, 1984a, 1984b).

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Further research is necessary to understand the reasons that motivate individuals to volunteer. It would be beneficial to investigate motivations in relation
to short-term vs. long-term volunteers (volunteering for an ongoing program vs. a one
time event) or motivations in relation to the area of volunteering (health, recreation,
youth, etc.). In addition, researchers’ can conduct a longitudinal studies to explore
how the initial motivations of the volunteers develop through their volunteering
experience. Similar studies can focus on female vs. male volunteers and
nonvolunteers.

In addition, little research has been done in the past related to student’s
motivation and career orientation or college major. A replication of this study would
be recommended, since this is the only study that divided college majors into two
type of majors (Service-oriented majors). However, a more careful definition of
majors that are Service or Nonservice-oriented is recommended. Moreover, a broader
sample of majors belonging to each type of major and from different institutions is
recommended for more valid and reliable results. In regards to the student population,
a research suggestion would be a longitudinal study of how motivations develop
throughout the college years.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Document

The purpose of this research project is to examine the factors that lead people to volunteer in different organizations. Specifically, the study will explore students’ motivations for volunteering in regards to their gender and college major. This research project is also being conducted in order for me to complete my master’s thesis for the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies at the State University of New York College at Brockport.

In order to participate in this study, your informed consent is required. You are being asked to make a decision whether or not to participate in the project. If you want to participate in the project, and agree with the statements below your completion of the survey signifies your consent. You may change your mind at any time and withdraw from the study without penalty, even after the study has begun.

I understand that:

1. My participation is voluntary and I have the right to refuse to answer any questions.
2. My confidentiality is guaranteed. My name will not be written on the survey. There will be no way to connect me to my written survey. If any publication results from this research, I would not be identified by name.
3. There will be no personal risks or benefits because of my participation in this project. My participation in the research will not affect my grades or class standings.
4. My participation involves reading a written survey of 37 questions and answering those questions in writing. It is estimated that it will take 15-20 minutes to complete the survey.
5. Approximately 600 students will take part in this study. The results will be used for the completion of a master’s thesis by the primary researcher.
6. Data will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in the investigator’s office. Data and consent forms will be destroyed by shredding when the research has been accepted and approved.

I am 18 years of age or older. I have read and understand the above statements. All my questions about my participation in this study have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the study realizing I may withdraw without penalty at any time during the survey process. Returning the survey indicates my consent to participate.

If you have any questions, you may contact: epap0709@brockport.edu
Primary researcher: Katerina Papadakis
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Edward Udd
Appendix B

Questionnaire-Part One

Directions: If you have done volunteer work before or are currently doing volunteer work, then, using the 4-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following reasons for volunteering is for you. If you have not been a volunteer before, then, using the 4-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following reasons for volunteering would be for you.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
not at all & not too & somewhat & extremely 
\end{array}
\]

important important important important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People I'm close to want me to volunteer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Volunteering makes me feel important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People I know share an interest in community service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. By volunteering, I feel less lonely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel compassion toward people in need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Volunteering lets me learn through direct “hands on” experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel it is important to help others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. Volunteering makes me feel needed

27. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself

28. Volunteering experience will look good on my résumé

29. Volunteering is a way to make new friends

30. I can explore my own strengths


**Questionnaire-Part Two**

1) What is your gender?
   Male______ Female______

2) What major degree are you pursuing?

3) In what year of your undergraduate career are you?
   freshman______  sophomore______
   junior______  senior______

Please answer the following questions concerning *Volunteering* as an activity that is undertaken voluntarily for **no financial reward or academic credit**.

4) Have you ever volunteered for an organization?
   Yes____ (if yes, continue to question number 5)
   No____ (if no, do not answer questions number 5, 6, and 7)

5) Have you engaged in volunteer activities for an organization in the past twelve months? (check all that apply)
   Yes, for an ongoing program ____ (if yes, continue to question number 6)
   Yes, for a one-time event ____ (if yes, continue to question number 7)
   No ____ (if no, do not answer questions number 6 and 7)

6) How many hours approximately do you volunteer every week for an organization?
   Less than four hours ____  Four to eight hours ____
   More than eight hours ____

7) Please indicate the area or areas in which you have volunteered for an organization in the past 12 months? (check all that apply)
   Health/Hospital ________ Education/Schools ________
   Human Services ________ Environment ________
      • Senior citizens ________ Political ________
      • Disabilities ________ International ________
      • Religious ________ Recreation/Sports ________
      • Youth development ________ Arts ________
      Other (specify) ________
VFI Scale and Items

**Protective**
7. No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
9. By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
11. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
20. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.

**Values**
3. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
8. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
16. I feel compassion toward people in need.
19. I feel it is important to help others.
22. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.

**Career**
1. Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.
10. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
15. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
21. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.
28. Volunteering experience will look good on my résumé.

**Social**
4. People I’m close to want me to volunteer.
6. People I know share an interest in community service.
17. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
23. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.

**Understanding**
12. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
14. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
18. Volunteering lets me learn through direct “hands on” experience.
25. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
30. I can explore my own strengths.

**Enhancement**
5. Volunteering makes me feel important.
26. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
27. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
29. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
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