THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO VOLUNTEERISM IN ORGANIZATIONAL VOLUNTEERS

A Thesis presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

CHARLES A. BRUNETTE

Dr. David Vaught, Thesis Supervisor

DECEMBER 2011

THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO VOLUNTEERISM IN ORGANIZATIONAL VOLUNTEERS

A Thesis Defense in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Charles A. Brunette

Approved by Thesis Committee:

_____

Dr. David R. Vaught, Committee Chairperson

_____

Dr. Alexander Waigandt, Committee Member

_____

Dr. Nicholas Watanabe, Committee Member

November 18, 2011

University of Missouri – Columbia

If you believe in yourself and have dedication and pride - and never quit, you'll be a winner. The price of victory is high, but so are the rewards.

- Paul Bryant

Thanks to all of my family and friends for their ongoing love and support. Without you I would never have learned or appreciated the value of hard work and perseverance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to formally thank my thesis committee chair, Dr. David Vaught, for his assistance in the entire thesis writing and presentation process. I would also like to formally thank Dr. Alex Waigandt and Dr. Nick Watanabe for their assistance and support as thesis committee members. To all, I truly appreciate the ideas, insight and time you afforded me as part of this experience. I would also like to thank the entire Parks, Recreation and Tourism department and other University of Missouri graduate faculty who I had the opportunity to work with for providing and nurturing a positive and constructive atmosphere of learning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

ABSTRACT

The act of volunteering has been described as "any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, organization or group (Wilson, 2000, p. 215)." Such prosocial behavior is carried out by an array of individuals whose involvement in numerous helping activities are linked to a variety of altruistic, ego-oriented and other influences. Because of the previously understood and future contributions of volunteers, this study sought to broaden and update the demography, attitudes, motives, outcomes and commitment of volunteers using a functional approach. A variation of Clary et al.'s (1998) Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) was administered to two distinct organizational volunteer samples from mid-Missouri. Electronic questionnaires were disseminated to volunteers from each affiliate over the summer of 2011. Demographic results were consistent with most previous studies, which portrayed the mid-Missouri volunteer as primarily white, middle aged, highly-educated, financially stable and female. In terms of motivation and outcomes, the values function was considered the most important driving force for voluntary activity. The functional constructs of understanding, self-enhancement, social, career and ego-protection were also present in secondary varying order among organizations. Volunteers from these samples were also highly ambitious to continue volunteering one full year in the future and were not overtly influenced by organizational intent. Though the results of this study are not fully representative of the complete administration of the VFI or to all volunteers and locales, they do help reaffirm previously obtained findings that used a similar functional approach and shed light on a few additional nuances toward the investigation of volunteerism.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The totality and progression of voluntary activity can be expressed under the contexts of both voluntarism and volunteerism. Voluntarism is the overall guiding "principle or system of doing something or relying on voluntary action (Voluntarism, 2011). Butcher and Smith (2010) depict it universally as "a positive channel for the simple desire to help others (p. 27)." Volunteerism, on the other hand is the explicit "act or practice of doing volunteer work (Volunteerism, 2011)." Under most pretenses, both refer to and are considered prosocial behavior that is performed on behalf of intrapersonal attitudes, values, altruism and mutually beneficial outcomes for the volunteer and recipient (Clary, Ridge, Stukas, Snyder, Copeland, Haugen & Miene, 1998; Finkelstein, Penner & Brannick, 2005; Hardy & Kisling, 2006; Hitlin, 2003; Katz, 1960; Piliavan & Charng, 1990). Prosocial is a term that signifies general behaviors that positively act upon and influence the well-being of society (Hardy & Kisling, 2006). Attitude, which "is the predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of his world in a favorable or unfavorable manner" and the expectations and attitudes of others help to shape beliefs and values (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Katz, 1960; p. 168). As a result, values are expressed as a combination of attitudes, motivations, goals, desires, morals, principles and expectations that help to guide, select and manifest individual behavior (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Finkelstein et al., 2005: Hitlin, 2003; Katz, 1960).

The more broad aspect of altruism is generally understood as an unconditional regard for the welfare of someone or something in the form of humanitarian helpfulness and concern (Piliavan & Charng, 1990). Most accompanying to voluntarism are the concepts of volunteer decision, activation, motivation, perceived reward, satisfaction, benefit and commitment (Clary et al., 1998; Murnighan, Kim & Metzger, 1993; Piliavan & Charng, 1990; Stebbins, 1999). In culmination, volunteerism can be observed as an activity motivated by the opportunity for individuals to attain personal internal and external wants, needs and rewards, while simultaneously allowing for satisfaction of personal values and assistance in societal altruistic demands (Clary et al., 1998; Finkelstein 2008a; Finkelstein, 2008b; Hitlin; 2003; Piliavan & Charng, 1990; Unger, 1991).

The act of volunteering has been described as "any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, organization or group (Wilson, 2000, p. 215)." It is a process illustrated through planning, decision-making, follow through and feedback (Harrison, 1995; Murnighan et al., 1993). Volunteerism is wide-ranging, varied and done for a number of reasons among different communities, institutions, organizations and cultures; incorporating people from all races, ethnicities, genders, religions, life cycle groups, socioeconomic and educational levels (Bussell & Forbes, 2002). This suggestion is evidenced by the most recent United States Department of Labor Statistics on Volunteering (2011), purporting that around 62.8 million individuals participated in at least one episode of volunteer activity between September of 2009 and September of 2010. Of those volunteers, both genders, those aged 16 and over and multiple races, educational and employment statuses were documented and represented (United States

Department of Labor, 2011). The sheer number and variety of those who participate in volunteerism reflects a notion that "volunteers and volunteering make an important contribution to communities across the spectrum of social endeavor (Lockstone-Binney, Holmes, Smith and Baum, 2010, p. 436)." Voluntarism overall has thus been identified as essential to social and political community welfare and development, civic involvement and as an economic system that benefits society through "producing goods or services at or below market rate (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Butcher & Smith, 2010; Wilson, 2000, p. 215)." Therefore, the importance of volunteer activity toward the benefit of communities and more generally "others" whom are different and presumably less fortunate is significant to the overall well-being of social and governmental institutions and all constituents within them (Aitchison, 2000; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Wilson, 2000). More justifiably, because volunteerism is considered a vehicle of large scale maintenance and improvement, it is completely necessary to determine and understand the reasons and goals for volunteering and the "effects of volunteering on the volunteer (Clary et al., 1998; Wilson & Musick, 1999, p. 141)."

Originally, prosocial behavior, specifically the act of helping and volunteering, was thought to be mostly altruistic, but Piliavan and Charng (1990) concluded that many such behaviors have an egoistic element as well. That is, people who participate as volunteers seek to do so along a continuum of common good and self-gratification (Clary et al., 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1999; Finkelstein, 2008a). Each volunteer may very well participate for the same general outcome or purpose, but the motivations and reasons for participation and the satisfactions derived could be quite different (Clary et al., 1998).

Finkelstein (2008a) and Finkelstein et al. (2005) expand and additionally posit the possibility that over time the purpose could remain the same, but the motivations and potentiality for volunteering change. By establishing the act of volunteerism as diverse and dynamic, the meaning and implication for its action could be considered as inherently dissimilar for everyone. Consequently, individuality, personal choice, preference and organizational affiliation can uniquely shape volunteer processes, chosen volunteer activity, expectations of volunteer activity, motivations to volunteer, likelihood to continue to volunteer and satisfactions and benefits obtained from volunteering (Clary et al., 1998; Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein, 2008b; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Harrison, 1995; Iso-Ahola, 1999; Sin, 2009; Stebbins, 1999).

Statement of the Problem

The active process of volunteerism generally has the capacity to initiate change, improve social and personal welfare and increase awareness in regards to a particular topic (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Sin, 2009). Given that volunteerism is an action to benefit others, the question then begins to arise as to whether it also benefits the volunteer. Previous models and studies have concluded that volunteer participation, much like any other activity, has semblance of internal attitudinal and need based motivation (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Clary et al., 1998; Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992; Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein, 2008b; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Harrison, 1995; Kim, Zhang & Connaughton, 2010; Maslow, 1970; Mayer, Fraccastoro & McNary, 2007; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Piliavan & Charng, 1990; Sin, 2009). Understandably, because volunteerism helps to preserve and provide important services and aids in the relief of social inequities and

difficulties, it is quite relevant to update and further determine the attitudes, motivators and needs for one of the largest workforces in the nation and across the world: volunteers (Hustinx, Handy, Cnaan, Brudney, Pessi & Yamauchi, 2010; United States Department of Labor, 2011; Wilson & Musick, 1999).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The main purpose of this research is to explore the motivation to volunteer from a functional perspective. It is particularly investigative of organizational volunteers within central Missouri. Research questions and hypotheses will be generally developed from prior research findings.

Research Question 1: What are the functional motivations for volunteerism among the local organizational volunteer samples?

Research Question 2: Is there a difference in functional motivation for volunteerism between organizations?

Hypothesis 1: There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean volunteer motive scores for the six volunteer constructs and organizational affiliation.

Research Question 3: What are the functional outcomes of volunteerism among the local organizational volunteer samples?

Research Question 4: Is there a difference in the functional outcomes of volunteerism between organizations?

Hypothesis 2: There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean volunteer outcome scores for the six volunteer constructs and organizational affiliation.

Research Question 5: What are the long-term intentions for volunteerism among the volunteer samples?

Research Question 6: Is there a difference in the propensity to continue to volunteer score between the two volunteer organizations?

Hypothesis 3: There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean propensity to continue to volunteer score and organizational affiliation.

Basic Assumptions

The decision to volunteer is generally based on more than one factor. Influences to such a decision are based on the individual's preferences, likes and dislikes, value systems, "social integration," organization and role type and a host of other variables (Brown, 1999; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Clary et al., 1998; Murnighan et al., 1993; Wilson, 2000). The varieties of variables associated with volunteer participation then become part of and hold varying degrees of influence over each person's motivation process to follow through with that decision (Clary et al., 1998). The functional approach only presumes that volunteering serves certain specific functions and does not nearly account for all reasons or outcomes for volunteer participation (Clary et al., 1998; Winniford, Carpenter & Grider, 1997).

Delimitations

The delimitations or scope of this study are set by a few particular factors. The extent of this inquiry will be confined to a centralized area within the central counties of Missouri (One particular affiliate ranges over 16 counties and the other has a range of 7 counties). Secondly, the study will only be projected onto those who have expressed

interest in or who have volunteered previously through one or both of these organizations, confining the study to organizational volunteers. Demographic measures will be applied to this study in a similar fashion as many of the previous studies on volunteerism (Brown, 1999; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Wilson, 2000). The questionnaire will look to determine attitudes, motivations and preferred outcomes toward volunteering and the propensity to continue volunteering, as well as gender, age group, race, household income levels, education level and employment status.

Limitations

The study will be restricted to reliance on Katz's (1960) original functionalist approach and attitudinal measures by Clary et al.'s (1998) Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). Though the VFI has been used in a number of studies and has proven a reliable measure, its main framework, functionalism, is considered somewhat dated. Additionally, the VFI only links attitudes with motivation and outcomes which are only small facets of the multitude of influences on the volunteer decision-making process (Clary et al., 1998; Winniford et al., 1997). A second limitation to this particular study is the dissemination of the questionnaires. Questionnaires will be disseminated via electronic mail, targeting only those volunteers who have access to the internet and an electronic mail service. Because this questionnaire was electronically disseminated and used previous or existing volunteers, there were potential issues regarding the delivery and answering of questionnaires. First, the electronic address provided may no longer be in use or exist. The actual person who answered the questionnaire may not be the actual volunteer whom the questionnaire was intended. And, despite a formal explanation, some respondents

may have felt obligated or pressured to answer in certain ways dependent on who they felt the questionnaire was for. Another area of concern was the possibility of the same person receiving the questionnaire twice because they had volunteered for each organization. Within the methods, another limitation that could have profound influence was the decision to reduce the entire questionnaire by nearly half. To reduce length, fewer items were randomly selected to measure the constructs. This reduced the total number of questions and sum score for each construct. This may very well have limited the reliability and validity of the questionnaire as compared to the original VFI and other studies (e.g. Clary et al., 1998), but should have helped to muster more responses and provide the same general results as the more thorough version. These factors could have had an influence on response rate and potential error or bias within the data. Further limitation included the inability of this study to generalize toward other geographical locations, organizations or affiliates because of the focus solely on Mid-Missouri volunteers.

Definition of Terms

Volunteering – the physical act of assisting or helping a specific individual, population or cause marked by the donation of time for very little or no monetary or material compensation

Functionalism – the determination of what purpose the holding of certain attitudes, beliefs and behaviors serve for the individual within a specific activity or topic

Functional motivation – the drive or push to perform some task or participate in some activity to serve an individualized purpose

Altruism – a general compassion, understanding and concern for fellow persons, causes and certain situations

Ego-oriented – the general want or need to perform a task or behave in a particular way to receive an internal or external personal outcome or benefit

Volunteer dilemma – the combination of weighing pros and cons, past experiences and other factors toward the decision to participate in volunteer activity or to refrain from it

Significance of the Study

The intent of this inquiry was to further identify volunteer motivations, needs and outcomes using a functional approach. "The logic of the functional approach to volunteerism is to identify the motives that are satisfied, the needs that are met and the goals that are reached when a person gets involved in volunteerism (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992, p. 335)." The study sought to determine attitudes and motivations toward volunteerism in two organizational populations of volunteers. The volunteers in both organizations raise funds and donate their time by taking part in events to promote health and public awareness. One organization is based on the singular cause of raising consciousness and monies for cancer. The other organization is more general in nature and looks to promote community health and welfare. Most of the volunteer opportunities for both organizations are episodic in nature and occur across the entire country in smaller regions and communities. Volunteers from both organizations were assessed using a variation of Clary et al.'s (1998) original Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) with additional questions directed at specific volunteer action, individual volunteer outcomes and simple demographic information. The VFI looks to identify motivators and

needs associated with volunteerism participation under the constructs of values, understanding, socializing, career, ego-protection and self-enhancement (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992). The objective is to quantify, analyze and compare attitudes of and the needs met by volunteerism among and between two exclusive and differing organizational populations and activities, adding to the wealth of existing voluntarism research.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Due to the broad and cumulative impact on society and the individual, the topic of volunteerism has been mentioned and approached by a number of common disciplines and exclusive perspectives, including, but not limited to; leisure studies (Butcher, J. & Smith, P. 2010; Iso-Ahola, 1999; Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010; Sin, 2009; Stebbins, 1999), sociological inquiry (Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1999), psychology and social psychology (Clary et al., 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1999; Finkelstein, 2008b; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Harrison, 1995; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Stukas, Snyder & Clary, 1999) and economics and corporate and non-profit business and management (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Clary et al., 1992; Cuskelly, Taylor, Hoye & Darcy, 2006; Kim et al., 2010; Mayer et al., 2007; Monga, 2006). In leisure studies, the dichotomy of work and free time, autonomy, commitment and liberally chosen activity are the staples which help to determine ultimate satisfaction and enjoyment of an individual's volunteer participation (Iso-Ahola, 1999, Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010; Stebbins, 1999). Within the sociological sciences, voluntarism is distinguished as an act to provide for the public good, promote holistic societal welfare and establish, translate and "maintain civil society (Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1999, p. 141)." Psychological and social psychological approaches to voluntarism mainly focus on attitudes, motivations, motive fulfillment and sustainability (Clary et al., 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1999; Finkelstein, 2008, Finkelstein et

al., 2005, Harrison, 1995; Monga, 2006; Omoto & Snyder, 1995), role-identity (Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Hardy & Kisling, 2006; Hitlin, 2003) and the description and understanding of intentions to volunteer in a variety of situations (Stukas et al., 1999). From the business and management perspective, voluntarism is described in terms of human capital and resource (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Cuskelly, Taylor & Hoye, 2006; Kim et al., 2010), as a function within organizations (Clary et al, 1992; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Stukas et al., 1999) and within event management (Bang & Ross, 2009; Monga, 2006). Among all disciplines, understanding, targeting, recruiting and retaining volunteers is a prioritized and common theme (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Clary et al., 1992; Cuskelly et al., 2006; Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2010; Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Stebbins, 1999; Stukas et al., 1999; Wilson & Musick, 1999). With respect to coverage, all disciplines include functions as well as separate theoretical models and perspectives and have looked to expand the overall understanding and impact that volunteerism has on an array of ecological levels.

The Volunteer Context

Before delving deeper into the functions and motivations associated with volunteerism, it is important to first identify and explain the contexts surrounding volunteers. Volunteers are individuals, whom may or may not be affiliated with an organized movement, that partake in freely chosen humanitarian and self-benefitting helping behavior (Stukas et al., 1999). For the most part, volunteers are given little or no tangible remuneration for their efforts (Brown, 1999; Stukas et al., 1999; Wilson, 2000).

Being that there is much agreement that volunteerism is expressed outside of required work, family and other obligations; the work-time dichotomy becomes an essential aspect of relevance (Iso-Ahola, 1999; Stukas et al., 1999; Unger, 1991; Wilson, 2000). The work-time dichotomy is most easily understood by the divergence of obligatory and non-obligatory time (Iso-Ahola, 1999). Non-obligatory time is defined as time without commitment (Iso-Ahola, 1999). Relief of commitment consequently allows for any number of activities to be freely chosen to fill the non-obligatory void (Brown, 1999; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Iso-Ahola, 1999; Murnighan et al., 1993; Unger, 1991; Wilson, 2002). Alternatively, obligatory time is classified as required time for any external responsibility (Iso-Ahola, 1999). General adult responsibilities that fit into the distinction of obligatory time include work, family commitments, household chores and other required activities (Iso-Ahola, 1999; Wilson, 2000). Also, the factor of non-obligatory time donation is what helps delineate volunteerism as an objectively non-materialistic activity from other types of giving like philanthropy and blood or organ donation (Unger, 1991). It is also one of the main features separating volunteers and non-volunteers (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Murnighan et al., 1993).

Unger (1991) suggests that the difference is influenced by the availability of time and what benefits can be obtained within a certain time-frame and effort. Murnighan et al.'s (1993) study supports by consistently finding that "instrumental issues (money and work time) are critical in determining voluntary action (p. 534)." That is, some portions of the population will volunteer if they can do so within their perception of free time (volunteer effort is within constraints of their schedule) and under conditions where their

cost and benefit ratio to volunteer is below the commensurate value of work they are compensated for (volunteer effort is lower than that of work effort for the same benefits or outcomes) (Murnighan et al., 1993; Unger, 1991).

On the contrary, Brown (1999) and Wilson (2000) propose that this might not be the case for all individuals. They present information that those who work more are more inclined to volunteer at levels above and matching the required effort of their compensated work (Brown, 1999; Wilson, 2000). The basis for this argument is that those in the work-force at any capacity are more "socially integrated" and are presented many more opportunities to volunteer than those who are not (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Brown, 1999; Unger, 1991; Wilson, 2000). Despite more time constraints, those who are afforded increased volunteer opportunity may be subject to base voluntary action solely on the severity of their obligations (Iso-Ahola, 1999). According to Iso-Ahola (1999), "it is suggested that the more obligatory people perceive their work, the greater the sense of freedom they perceive in obligatory non-work activities" and even more so in non-obligatory non-work activities (p. 36). Unger (1991) similarly suggests that "it seems that we volunteer not based on the amount of time we have available, but despite it, if something needs to be done (p. 93)." Hence, the perceived rigor of obligation, availability of non-obligatory time and awareness of costs and benefits are presumed by previous research and review to be varied and important determinants to initiate freely chosen voluntary activity. The remaining volunteer context is best described by Wilson (2000), who explains the volunteer on simple bases of who the volunteer is, the range of activity

volunteers participate in, the amount of time volunteers spend volunteering and how committed and consistent volunteers are in their efforts.

Volunteer Demographics

In description of the volunteer, Van Dyne and Farmer (2005, *as cited by* Finkelstein, 2008a) put it best: "volunteering becomes not so much what one does [or why they do it], but who one is (p. 1355)." While Finkelstein (2008a) used this to point to the role outcomes of consistent volunteerism, it is quite pertinent as a lead in to uncover who volunteers really are. Brown (1999), Bussell and Forbes (2002), Hustinx et al. (2010), The United States Department of Labor (2011), Unger (1991) and Wilson (2000) attempt to convey the volunteer demographic through literature review and statistical analysis by: age, gender, race, education level, income level, employment status, lifestyle, life cycle stage, marital status, parental status and location (Wilson & Musick, 1999). In respect to age, volunteering occurs in all groups from childhood to geriatrics (Brown, 1999; Wilson, 2000). The most active volunteers though are those in the middle age (35-54) bracket (Bang & Ross, 2009; Corporation for National and Community Service, 2010; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996 *as cited by* Brown, 1999; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001; United States Department of Labor, 2011). This could be due to the heightened ability and opportunity for voluntary activity previously mentioned by Bussell & Forbes (2002), Brown (1999), Unger (1991) and Wilson (2000); more social integration and opportunity.

Across volunteer activity in general, women are slightly more likely to be volunteers than men (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2010; United

States Department of Labor, 2011; Wilson, 2000). However, there are differences in gender participation based on volunteer activity. For instance, men were more apt to be AIDS volunteers in a study carried out by Omoto and Snyder (1995), women helped more than twice as much as men in the 2004 Twin Cities Marathon (Bang & Ross, (2009) and male participants dominated in a study of youth sport volunteers performed by Kim et al. (2010). In the case of race, whites constituted the majority of volunteers in the United States as of data collected in both 1996 (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996 *as cited by* Brown, 1999 and Wilson, 2000) and 2010 (United States Department of Labor, 2011), representing 51.9% and 28.3% of all volunteers respectively. It should be noted that in 1996 race was only listed as white and non-white, which might not have been appropriately representative as a demographic measure and may very well explain the redistribution of rates (Wilson, 2000).

The notion of education is related in a few ways to volunteerism as well. Those who have higher levels of education, aspirations for higher education and those in higher education settings all have a propensity to volunteer more often than individuals with lower levels of education (Brown, 1999; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Hustinx et al., 2010; Lockstone-Binney et al. 2010; Wilson, 2000). Bang and Ross (2009), Mayer et al. (2007), Omoto and Snyder (1995), Thoits and Hewitt (2001) and Unger (1991), among others, all found higher education levels (secondary, post-secondary and professional degrees) to be indicative of volunteer participation. Similarly and most likely related to higher education is the descriptor of socioeconomic status and income level (Brown, 1999; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Wilson & Musick, 1999; Wilson, 2000). While most of the studies in this

review place volunteers among middle wage earners, the highest incomes were found in Mayer et al.'s (2007) study of "Relay for Life" volunteers where 55% had incomes over $60,000 (Hustinx et al 2010; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Unger, 1991). Even further linked, Omoto & Snyder (1995) found 72% of AIDS volunteers to be full-time workers and Unger's (1991) 34% volunteer majority was employed as professionals. More personally, constructive family dynamic, meaning those whom are married and have children volunteer more frequently too (Brown, 1999; Wilson, 2000). Thoits and Hewitt (2001), in their study of volunteering and well-being, found consistencies with existing research that married persons and those with children volunteer for more hours than single people.

The final demographic variable mentioned in the literature concerned geographical location. Hustinx et al. (2010) found differing rates of volunteerism in Belgium, Canada, China, Finland, Japan and the United States. Highest rates were found in China (84.5%), Canada (79.7%) and the United States (78.8%) and the lowest in Japan (39.1%). In the United States, most volunteerism was shown to take place in the Midwest (56.9%) followed by the West (55%), East (46%) and the South (39%) (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996 *as cited by* Brown, 1999). In summary, tendencies of the volunteer appear to lie with those whom are middle aged, white, highly educated, employed, married and have children (Thoits & Hewitt, 2001). In light of this inclination it is imperative to point out that there are a multitude of voluntary activities for not only the typical volunteer, but for anyone willing to donate time. The following section will look to outline the assortment of volunteer areas and opportunities.

Volunteer Range

With respect to range, volunteers are typically focused toward one specific realm of social need or issue, but have also been found to act on and within multiple levels and categories of voluntary activities (Brown, 1999). According to Brown (1999) and Bussell and Forbes (2002), activities are most easily categorized by sector: arts, education, environment, health, human services, international policy, political, private, community, public, recreation, religious, corporate and youth development. Depending on the situation and organization, volunteers in all sectors can take on any number and different types of leadership, management or basic roles. For instance, Finkelstein (2008a) tried to determine the basic reasons for volunteers giving time in palliative care clinics in the southeastern United States, Mayer et al. (2007) investigated organizational self-esteem in "Relay for Life" participants in southeast Texas and Edwards (2005) sought to determine the motivations and impact of volunteers to the Australian museum industry. Each of the three studies involved volunteers in different roles, pursuing different means and performing different tasks in completely separate geographic locations. Such studies exemplify the vast array of opportunity and range of participation for volunteerism. Thus, it is understood that most volunteers participate and fundamentally influence narrow personal, community and organizational environments; speculating that volunteerism is primarily a "local phenomenon (Brown, 1999, p. 22; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Wilson, 1999)."

However, despite the fact that most particular acts of helping remain limited to certain locales; recent lines of research have begun to focus on the study and comparison

of voluntarism nationally and abroad in the practice of volunteer tourism (Butcher & Smith, 2010; Hustinx et al., 2010; Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010; Sin, 2009). Globally, volunteerism is participated in at levels of similar proportions and circumstances to the United States (Hustinx et al., 2010). Hustinx et al. (2010) accumulated nearly 12,000 responses from 15 countries concerning volunteerism and concluded it as a continually evolving and internationally comparable subject on the basis of social, political, educational and personal values and welfare. Volunteer tourism describes the individual or group position of traveling to a non-local setting to help or "change the circumstances… encounter[ed] in tourist cultures (Rojek, 2000, p. 54)." This type of volunteerism projects an increased awareness and consciousness for a specific extra-national topic that benefits tourists and hosts in exclusive ways (Sin, 2009). Butcher and Smith (2010) and Sin (2009) convey that volunteer tourism infuses free-willed outsider assistance to support and further develop local ways of life and culture in foreign lands. Considering all levels of study, volunteerism can vary by cause, sector, location and interaction. Therefore, its range has absolutely been established as a "local phenomenon" of global proportions (Brown, 1999, p. 22).

The Value of Volunteer Time

The impact of volunteering has been expressed in values of amounts and percentages of people who volunteer (Brown, 1999; Corporation for National and Community Service, 2010; Independent Sector, 2010; United States Department of Labor, 2011), estimated number of and value of hours volunteered (Independent Sector, 2010; Corporation for National and Community Service, 2008) and how often and

routinely people help (Finkelstein, 2008a; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Stebbins, 1999). The Corporation for National and Community Service (2010), the Independent Sector (2010) and the United States Department of Labor (2011) all agree that an estimated 62 million people in the United States participated in some form of volunteerism in the past year, which comes to around 26% of the population. The Corporation for National and Community Service (2010) breaks the information down further by state (rates ranging from 19-44%) and city (city rates as high as 60%). Data for all groups were taken from the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a monthly survey of approximately 60,000 United States residents (United States Department of Labor, 2011). Volunteers were identified by the CPS as those individuals who performed "unpaid work through or for organizations (United States Department of Labor, 2011)." It is imperative to note that this definition of volunteer does not account for "neighborly" or other forms of helping that are not associated with organizational leadership or affiliation. Not including "free-lance" volunteers would then slightly underestimate the quantification of United States volunteers, leaving room for an even higher possible prevalence of volunteerism than what is reported and could be included as a needed future inquiry.

From a slightly different standpoint, the Independent Sector (2010) expresses volunteering in terms of time and value. The Independent Sector (2010) is primarily a "leadership forum" focused on non-profit and charitable organizations that use volunteer services to accomplish their missions, which does not account for non-affiliated volunteers. Using CPS data, the Independent Sector (2010) approximated that in 2009, volunteers in the United States donated a total of 8.1 billion hours, which amounted to

around 130 hours per volunteer. The totality of hours represented nearly $169 billion worth of unpaid labor and activity (Independent Sector, 2010). Consequently, on average, one hour of volunteer time in 2009 was worth around $20.85 (Independent Sector, 2010 – For additional information on calculation see http:// independentsector.org/ volunteer_time). The representation of volunteerism in terms of hours and money allows for easy description and perception of the value and reach of volunteerism to society. To move beyond the superficial volunteer context, it is necessary to further advance to the psychologically and externally mitigating factors that surround the volunteer.

Volunteer Commencement, Consistency and Commitment

The total concept of voluntary activity commencement, consistency and commitment is descriptively intriguing and central to the viability of the current and future volunteer population and all of the causes and people that are dependent on it. According to Bussell and Forbes (2002) and Wilson and Pimm (1996), these three variables are essential for a healthy and maintained workforce. Wilson and Pimm (1996) advise that because volunteerism overall is so convoluted, there can be no exact science to defining the volunteer on a basis of why or how often each volunteer plans to help. Because volunteers are generally restricted to intangible and potentially inconsistent motivations, rewards and terms of service, there unfortunately seems to be an unpredictable aspect to volunteer motivation and uniformity in the understanding, instigation, and commitment processes of the volunteer (Clary et al., 1992; Wilson & Pimm, 1996). Omoto and Snyder (1995) impart the following disposition in reference to the beginnings of the volunteer process; “volunteers typically seek out their opportunities

to help and may deliberate long and hard about the initiation, extent and precise nature of their involvement (p. 672)."

With respect to commencement, Murnighan et al. (1993) present the "volunteer dilemma" as the concept of why and when a volunteer chooses to volunteer. Each volunteer opportunity is understood to present a dilemma in the form of extracting causes to volunteer for, intrapersonal appraisal of external factors, costs and benefits (to the volunteer and recipients) related to the volunteer opportunity and a decision about whether the cause and benefits are in agreement with the volunteer's wants, needs and expectations (Clary et al., 1998; Murnighan et al., 1993). To begin, volunteers require proper balance within the work-time dichotomy, opportunities to volunteer and motivations to do so (Iso-Ahola, 1999). Cleave and Doherty (2005) examined the decision-making process of the volunteer as a factor of intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural constraints. They specifically found themes, using focus groups, that non-volunteers failed to participate because of a personal lack of interest in the opportunities presented, a lack of interest in volunteering overall, inadequate beliefs in ability, personal costs, social conflicts, confusion in the application process and most importantly, time (Cleave & Doherty, 2005). Cleave and Doherty (2005) also suggested that the main differences between those who volunteered and those who didn't were a direct product of whether individuals were motivated or able enough to overcome such barriers. Another detail concerning the beginning of the volunteer process is the intention of the volunteer. Harrison (1995) found that volunteers participated on the basis of the freedom of choosing an activity and the strength of the intention to participate in that activity.

Harrison (1995) presented initial information and found that intentions were formulated by personal attitudes, social norms and support, locus of control and the ability to choose volunteering over other "competing intentions (Harrison, 1995)." In relation to locus of control, Stukas et al., (1999) found that those who perceived little control over voluntary activities were much less likely to volunteer than those with higher feelings of control. Fundamentally then, it would seem that a successful outcome from the "volunteer dilemma" would be a reflection of the volunteer's favorable assessment of the pros and cons, the ability to overcome barriers, the presence of an intention to volunteer and whether volunteers perceive control over and completely understand their voluntary activity of choice.

It has been shown that each voluntary activity has its own characteristics. Shedding further light on the intention and motivation to volunteer is the volunteer's expectation of the activity's "useful life (Wilson & Pimm, 1996, p. 25)." The "useful life" is described as the amount of time required of the volunteer to carry out the cause or the amount of specific time in which the volunteer opportunity is open and all of the efforts required to accommodate it (Wilson & Pimm, 1996). Depending on the situation, "useful life" can be extensive, running from one episode of voluntary action to a continuous full-time voluntary commitment (Harrison, 1995; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Wilson & Pimm, 1996). Wilson and Pimm (1996) demonstrate a volunteer's "useful life" by the likelihood of the volunteer cause to be terminated. Different voluntary activities have different "lives" or duration for participation and require different concessions and considerations (Wilson & Pimm, 1996). For instance, political and social change volunteer activism may

not be considered an option once policies are improved or altered or, on a different note, volunteer coaches may not see a need to continue coaching once their own children reach a certain age (Kim et al., 2010; Wilson & Pimm, 1996). As a result, volunteers could be compelled or retracted by the obligations necessitated by the perceived or previously experienced "life" of the voluntary activity (Wilson & Pimm, 1996). "Life" of volunteer activity duration and occasion can best be defined by the literature as either episodic or continuous (sustained) (Harrison, 1995; Omoto & Snyder, 1995).

Harrison (1995) describes episodic volunteerism as a deviation of regular habit to participate in a helping behavior; whereas continuous voluntary behavior would be that which occurs on a more regular and consistent basis. It is important to point out that episodic volunteerism can occur on a consistent basis, but that its carrying out is not something that is done as a standard practice of ordinary life (Harrison, 1995). Bang and Ross (2009), Cleave and Doherty (2005) and Monga (2006) present great examples of inconsistent episodic volunteerism through individual involvement in special sporting events that do not occur frequently. Important information concerning consistent episodic volunteers was found by Harrison's (1995) study of one day per week shelter volunteers and Omoto and Snyder's (1995) findings concerning the consistency of AIDS volunteers over a two and a half year period. Finkelstein (2008a) and Finkelstein et al. (2005) accumulated results from continuous volunteers and showed that career motives were most descriptive in identifying those who had given the most time and length of service to an organization. Wilson and Pimm (1996) offer insight that the episodic or continuous nature of an activity can play into the perception of a "useful life," giving the volunteer a

sense of what type of time or workload commitment the will be required. Consequently, in corroboration with all other factors of initiating voluntary activity, "useful life" could be a critical mitigating factor in the volunteer's choice about whether to volunteer or not.

Aside from and possibly even less telling than the preliminary external and perceptual features of volunteerism are the initial motives and ideals that push volunteer behavior. Much of the previous research suggests volunteerism to be on the gamut between selfless giving and self-interest, also called "the paradox of altruism (Hu & Liu, 2003; Piliavan & Charng, 1990; Sesardic, 1999, p. 457; Unger, 1991; Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1997)." Unger (1991) positively found altruism's existence as a motivator of volunteer participation by using the cost and benefit ratio definition of altruism; when "costs outweigh benefits, the task is considered altruistic and when benefits outweigh costs [it is] considered egoistic (p. 77)." In her review, she instituted that volunteer work is typically done for the collective good (actions to help all), but that doing so is a result of empathy, inherent sociobiological traits and "non-collective selective incentives," or self-benefitting outcomes (p. 73). Hu and Liu (2003) were able to find recognizable aspects of altruism in a study of people placed in a position to assist prisoners based on pure altruism (helping out of only humanitarian concern), cooperative reciprocal altruism ("karma") and cooperative calculating altruism (acting in a humanitarian way to receive some direct benefit in the future – i.e. prestige, recognition). In Winniford et al.'s (1997) review of college students' motivation to volunteer; it was found that no particular type of motivation or approach could explain the whole of volunteer motivation. They concluded that, based on previous literature using multiple

theories and models (see Winniford et al.'s review, 1997), motivation to volunteer is affected by egoistic, altruistic, mixed-motivational, situational, environmental and social obligations and needs (Winniford et al., 1997). In another review, Piliavan and Charng (1990) found that volunteerism, which was once considered to be strictly altruistic, does involve self-interest on some level. Clary et al. (1998), Finkelstein et al. (2005), Harrison (1995), Hitlin (2003), Kim et al. (2010) and others have looked to explain and understand motivations of specific volunteerism activities in terms of values, career motives, attendance, social support and a multitude of other internal and external explanations. For that reason, Winniford et al. (1997) sum up volunteer motivation as something that is individually decided on and varying among all volunteers and that " although most of the literature indicates that egoism is the primary motivator for volunteers, many studies…, indicate that altruism still plays an important role (p. 142)." This shows that based on much of the literature there are no true or single motivations for volunteerism commencement; only those that are personally, situationally and environmentally determined.

Expanding on the decision and motivations to volunteer, Bang and Ross (2009) and Omoto and Snyder (1995) add to the equation by identifying past experience outcomes as one of the major influences toward volunteer retention and continuation. Partially dependent on volunteer sustainability are whether such experiences "promote or deter continuing involvement (Omoto & Snyder, 1999, p. 672)." Omoto and Snyder (1995) cite satisfaction and socialization as the main experiential determinants of volunteer commitment. Clary et al. (1992) go on to describe the importance of volunteer

outcomes and experience by suggesting that when needs or wants are met, individuals are much more likely to return in the future. Additionally, Finkelstein (2008a) found that while individual satisfactions are central to the volunteer experience, they are not stagnant. Over one year, palliative care volunteers were noted as changing their motives and thus satisfactions for volunteering, from altruistic reasons at the onset of activity to self-development reasons after one year (Finkelstein, 2008a). Omoto and Snyder (1995) second this notion by finding that no explicit variable led to the prediction of volunteer duration in AIDS volunteers and then concluded that accounting for changing motivations and needed satisfactions over time could be the best way to understand volunteer commitment. The other important factor that Omoto and Snyder (1995) point out; socialization has already been linked to increased volunteer opportunity (Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Brown, 1999; Unger, 1991; Wilson, 2000) and as an aspect of volunteer intention (Harrison, 1995). Also, an added topic associated with socialization that has been discussed in the literature as critical to volunteer commitment is the formation of a volunteer identity (Finkelstein, 2008a; Hardy & Kisling, 2006; Hitlin, 2003).

Finkelstein (2008a) found role identity, an identification of the self with a commitment or activity based on social expectations and interactions, to be an important predictor of future and recurrent volunteer participation. More profoundly, Finkelstein et al. (2005), Hardy and Kisling (2006) and Hitlin (2003) put forward that roles are assumed based on the social variables of family extension, relationship and awareness between the volunteer, "others" and the organization, social norms and pressure and the expectation to follow through on a foundation of those personal values (Aitchison, 2000). Once a person

decides to participate as a volunteer and becomes known as a volunteer, they begin to identify with and project the social role of a volunteer, feeling unequivocally obligated to fulfill that role (Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein et al., 2005). Stebbins (1999) further relates the personal identification process of the volunteer as specific to non-obligatory time and to be under the realm of serious leisure. Serious leisure places highly valued, freely chosen activity into a career like context, where expectations are similar to that of occupational and routine participation (Stebbins, 1999). The basic tenets of serious leisure state that volunteerism (one of many possibilities for serious leisure activities) becomes so significant within an individual's life that it becomes a part of personal lifestyle (Stebbins, 1999). This distinction is obtained through perseverance, a sense of commitment, effort based on skill, knowledge or ability, identification with the activity, cause or organization, a unique "social ethos" containing other volunteers and the existence of durable benefits in terms of self-gratification, self-enhancement, enjoyment and socialization (Stebbins, 1999). Finkelstein et al. (2005) describes such features of role-identity, which can be explanatory of sustainable "serious" volunteers, to be indicative of those who have "internalized a prosocial role and who strongly feel that others expect them to continue in a manner consistent with that role (p. 414)." While social and role identity is not the topic of this inquiry, it is important to mention as an additional aspect that is formed and sustained through ongoing motivation and satisfaction; in this case bearing on reasons specifically applicable and relatable to socialization and a host of other factors. According to Finkelstein et al., (2005), satisfaction of needs was not necessarily linked to commitment directly, but was

important in fulfilling motives to begin the volunteer process. This being said, volunteerism can certainly be established as an activity that can be directly or indirectly influenced, taken on and sustained by a variety things and for number of reasons. In agreement, Clary et al. (1998) and Finkelstein (2008a) purport that volunteerism commencement, consistency and commitment are best understood as separate and dynamic multi-motivated facets of voluntary activity that serve individualized functions for each participant, fluidly changing over the course of the volunteer experience. These functions are suggested to meet psychological needs in the areas of values, understanding, socialization, career, ego-protection and self-enhancement and have been shown to be root indicators in the initiation and precursors that lead to and supplement ongoing motivations to volunteer (Clary et al., 1998).

The Functional Approach to Volunteer Motivation

The topic of motivation has been investigated by numerous researchers, models, methods and theories that have tried to define it, categorize it and understand it. Researchers like Azjen and Fishbein (1973), Iso-Ahola (1999), Maslow (1970) and Deci and Ryan (2009) have made tremendous contributions to the understanding of what motivates people and how motivation and other aspects drive behavior. One approach, functionalism, has not been as noticed, utilized and examined as some of the other motivational mainstays that we have been privy to (Herek, 1987). The functional approach is considered to be a personality or trait theory that simply looks to determine how and why people formulate certain mind-sets toward things (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960). Fundamentally defined, the functionalist approach

is based solely on the formation of specific individualized attitudes and how they drive behavior (Katz, 1960, Herek, 1987). Katz (1960) outlines the three pillars of functionalism as: derived attitudes are functional and serve as a purpose for behavior, similar attitudes can drive different behaviors across people and the concession that motivation is complex and non-exclusive to any single variable. To begin, attitudes are considered to be the predisposition of positive or negative feelings toward a definite external entity; person, place, activity or symbol (Katz, 1960). Such a predisposition is shaped as a function of each individual being uniquely influenced by experiential, environmental, social, cultural, and familial factors and outcomes (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Herek, 1987; Okun, Barr & Herzog, 1998). Herek (1987) asserts that all influences aid in the generation of individual preferences and needs which are exemplified in the formation of attitudes and help to predetermine and "provide guidelines for future interaction" and behavior (p. 288). In combination, attitudes are modified, established and reinforced based on the satisfaction of those needs and change according to encouraging or discouraging outcomes of the interaction (Clary et al., 1998; Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960). It is proposed that personal attitudes become representative of and are manifested as behavior in reference to such individualistic needs or "functions" (Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960). Because functional needs are a basic determinant of attitudes and are satisfied and reinforced by outcomes, they begin to ebb and flow with sustaining beliefs and are innately placed into the hierarchy of values (Katz, 1960; Maslow, 1970). Subsequently, when a particular need is established within the value system as an attitude, it begins to act as a purposeful driver of behavior

for satisfaction of that need and as reinforcement for the specific attitude (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Katz, 1960; Maslow, 1970). Relatively, Azjen and Fishbein (1973) confirmed that specific attitudes are indeed purveyors of behavioral intent along with norms and the willingness to observe them. Katz (1960) and Herek (1987) proceed to describe each individual's placing and prioritizing of attitudes within the value system as a factor of individual importance and outside influence. Behavior will then be motivated by and be dependent upon how important the particular attitude and its function is to the individual (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Katz, 1960; Maslow, 1970). This means that the more central or impacting a function is perceived to be toward the formation of a need, the more powerful and behavior provoking the attitude can become within the person's life (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Clary et al., 1998; Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960). Once satisfaction of the need occurs and the derived benefits and outcomes are realized, the underlying functional reasons of the need and subsequent attitude will be considered met (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Katz, 1960). In total, Snyder (1993, *as cited by* Clary et al., 1998) illustrates functional analysis as "the reasons and the purposes, the plans and the goals that underlie and generate psychological phenomena – that is, the personal and social functions being served by an individual's thoughts, feelings and actions (p. 1517)."

Katz (1960) originally described four specific functions that serve attitudes and motivation, which include the instrumental function, the ego-defensive function, the value-expressive function and the knowledge function. The instrumental function is derived to "maximize rewards and minimize penalties," forming an attitude on the

premise of consistent reward or need satisfaction (p. 170) (This function has been applied as encompassing of all current functions, Herek, 1987)." The ego-defensive function is considered a protective mechanism that helps to shield the individual from perceived threat and insecurity, while aiding in attitude formation that protects self-image (Katz, 1960). The value-expressive function is served as a standard of self-identity and represents the attitudes and beliefs that are most important to the individual (Katz, 1960). The knowledge function stimulates an attitude toward meaning and understanding of a particular topic and is representative of an attitude toward the interest in or pertinence of the topic within the life of the individual (Katz, 1960).

In Herek's (1987) functional measurement study, he found that attitudes toward gay and lesbian populations served comparatively similar functions that were based on experience, a defensive concern related to formulated beliefs about homosexuality and self-expression. Herek (1987) also found that attitude functions were measurable and were formed by extraneous factors: good and bad experiences, religiosity, social and personal networks, sex role conformity and others, which is corroborative with the suggestions posed by Katz (1960). Herek (1987) used four identifying functions to create the Attitude Functions Inventory (AFI): experiential-schematic, social-expressive, defensive and value expressive. Of those, the defensive and value expressive functions were very similar to those promoted by Katz (1960). The experiential-schematic function was described as a knowledge serving function based on past experiences, similar to the aspects presented earlier by Bang and Ross (2009) and Omoto and Snyder (1995). The social-expressive function was defined as a factor of attitude formation from the specific

social environment surrounding the individual (Herek, 1987; Omoto & Snyder, 1995). Herek (1987) found that all functions of the AFI were internally consistent (Cronbach's α = .81 (experiential-schematic), .75 (social-expressive), .80 (defensive) and .87 (value-expressive)), correlated and statistically significant ($p > .05$) with differing personality scales utilized for concurrent validity of each function (Sommer & Sommer, 2002).

Advancing the topic and applying it directly toward another subject, Clary et al. (1992) and Clary et al. (1998) used the functional approach to attempt to additionally discern the motivations associated with volunteerism. As a result, Clary et al. (1992) and Clary et al. (1998) later introduced and defined their own functions. Functions were successfully concluded upon inference from previous investigation, pilot testing and validation testing (Clary et al., 1992; Clary et al., 1998). Conclusions resulted in the identification of six specific functions contributing to the development of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) as a measure of the motivations to volunteer. The six functions were identified and found to be reliable under the conceptions of values ($\alpha = .82$), understanding ($\alpha = .84$), socialization ($\alpha = .83$), career ($\alpha = .85$), ego-protection ($\alpha = .82$) and self-enhancement ($\alpha = .85$) (Clary et al., 1998; Sommer & Sommer, 2002).

Allison, Okun and Dutridge (1998) were also able to propose three additional functional motivations for volunteerism based on open-ended questioning. After post-hoc testing, Allison et al. (1998) were able to reveal the potentiality of religious affiliation, enjoyment as a leisure activity and team building as other functional motivations for individuals to initiate and continue volunteerism. All findings establish and further strengthen the notion that functional attitude can be considered as a verified determinant

of purposeful behavior, meeting the first pillar of functionalistic motivation as presented by Katz (1960) (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973).

Allison et al. (1998), Clary et al. (1998) and Okun et al. (1998) allude to the complexities of volunteerism motivation, which has been shown to incorporate a blend of prosocial behavior, altruism, satisfaction, personal processes, individual experience and preferential egoism. Volunteer functions are derived, sustained and modified as products from each of these areas and can be evidenced as existing across different groups and individuals (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Finkelstein, 2008a; Okun et al., 1998; Yoshioka, Brown & Ashcraft, 2007). However, the alternative is also supposed, that similarly found functional needs are structured under different methods and reasons for each individual (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Finkelstein, 2008a). For instance, Yoshioka et al. (2007) Clary et al. (1998) and Finkelstein (2008a) all found that values were the most important motivational factor to volunteers, but also pointed out differences in the functions that followed in older adults (socialization), college students (understanding) and hospice volunteers (understanding). Surprisingly, values were not always found to be the most important factor, Mayer et al. (2007) found that the protective and enhancement functions were able to be combined (self-worth function), which resulted in the most motivating factor for "Relay for Life" volunteers. All of which satisfy the second and third pillars of functional independence between subjects and motivational complexity, helping to verify the original presumptions for functionalism endorsed by Katz (1960) (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Finkelstein, 2008a; Okun et al., 1998).

Therefore, the creation of the AFI (Herek, 1987), the VFI (Clary et al., 1992; Clary et al., 1998) and all ensuing results have helped to instill functionalism as an appropriate measure of attitudes and motives. In support, Okun et al. (1998) found that "the six-factor model [VFI] appear[ed] to be more viable" than other notable volunteer motivation scales to successfully explain volunteer actions under the scope of functionalism (p. 618; Yoshioka et al., 2007).

CHAPTER III

Selection of the Participants

Organization

Study participants were pulled from two affiliates of separate organizations, "The Heart of Missouri United Way" and "The Mid-Missouri Affiliate of Susan G. Komen for the Cure®." The "Heart of Missouri United Way" is part of a nationally known and respected volunteer driven non-profit organization, "The United Way." It looks to collaborate with a multitude of local agencies, institutions and government departments to instill leadership, partnership, focus and results to "tackle the most pressing human service needs in the community (Heart of Missouri United Way, 2010)."Their mission focuses on an array of service programs to reach groups of persons that need community based assistance in many different areas that involves nearly 600 local volunteers (Heart of Missouri United Way, 2010). "The Mid-Missouri Affiliate of Susan G. Komen for the Cure®" is similar in that it is an affiliate of the broader and nationally known "Susan G. Komen Foundation (Susan G. Komen for the Cure, 2011)." "The Mid-Missouri Affiliate of Susan G. Komen for the Cure®" is "dedicated to combating breast cancer at every front (Susan G. Komen for the Cure, 2011)." Their mission is to raise awareness, provide insight and assist the "Susan G. Komen Foundation" and research institutions with the raising of monies through donation, events and most notably their "Race for the Cure (Susan G. Komen for the Cure, 2011)." Both organizations rely heavily on volunteers in

their objectives on a daily basis and in the initiating, planning and carrying out of regular and special events. For this study, "The Mid-Missouri Affiliate of Susan G. Komen for the Cure®" will be described as organization 1 and the "Heart of Missouri United Way" will be described as organization 2.

Participants

Participants from each organization were obtained via database information, specifically utilizing electronic mail addresses. Both databases included volunteers who had previously volunteered and were currently performing a variety of tasks within each organization; ranging from the average volunteer to board members. Samples across the spectrum of volunteer types were obtained for comparison within and between organizations. Both samples were from cumulatively constructed information that had been collected through interest in and past volunteerism and only slightly distinguished current volunteers and those who were not currently volunteering. For the purpose of this study, samples were taken from the best group of active volunteer populations that the organizations could provide. Samples included all provided electronic mail addresses. General questions pertinent to activities and demographics were included in the questionnaire for further demarcation.

Collection of Data

Instrumentation

The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) Motives.

The primary examination tool that was utilized in this study was Clary et al.'s (1998) Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). The survey tool was utilized to determine "what function or purpose is served for a person when he or she holds a certain attitude or

behaves in a certain way" toward the act of volunteerism (Clary et al., 1992, p. 335). The questionnaire looks to assess the participant's attitudinal beliefs toward volunteering on six motive criteria. The conditions are under the contexts of values, understanding, socialization, career, ego-protection and self-enhancement (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992). Values are assessed as the altruistic or humanitarian mind-set toward volunteerism and are thought to be unique for each person (Clary et al., 1998). This construct has been found to be the most identifying in volunteer participants who have been sampled using the VFI (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Finkelstein, 2008a; Finkelstein, 2008b). The second construct, understanding, is described by Clary et al. (1998) as the general accumulation of awareness through "learning experiences that increase knowledge, ability and skill for the volunteer (p. 1518)." Socialization is the factor that represents the importance of relationships among volunteers, between volunteers and those receiving the benefits and the perceived social relationships between the volunteer and "favorably important others (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1518)." Favorably important others have been depicted as high status individuals and those who have major influence within the social atmosphere (Clary et al., 1998). The career motive is simple in that it helps the volunteer gain important skills, abilities and networking for future prospective occupations (Clary et al., 1998). The fifth motive determined by Clary et al. (1998) is the ego-protective motive. This motive is fulfilled when the volunteer participant feels that volunteering will relieve, protect or improve their own insecurities. Specifically, the ego-protective motive has been associated with personal guilt and the internal feelings of not helping "others" enough (Aitchison, 2000; Clary et al., 1998). The

final determinant, self-enhancement, is assessed on the movement and development to more successful inner feelings of adequacy, competence and self-efficacy (Clary et al., 1998).

Each of the six motives within the VFI has five relative statements, creating 30 total items for motive assessment. Each of the statements is scored on a seven-point likert scale ranging from not at all accurate (1) to extremely accurate (7) (Clary et al., 1998). The score for each statement is added together to create a motive score (5-35). The higher the total motive score, the more important the statements and perceived attitudes for that motive are. An example for a values function statement includes, "I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself." For enhancement, "volunteering makes me feel important." The premise of the instrument then is to instigate the quantification of the participant's attitude toward each statement, which in turn should be an indicator for the motivation to behave in a certain way (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Clary et al., 1998).

To reduce length of the questionnaire, three items from each construct were randomly selected using the "hat method." Each question for each construct was written on an identical sized piece of paper and placed in a nylon bag. The first three items chosen were selected for placement on the questionnaire. This method was chosen because all statements were very similar and helped to randomize the selection of items, keeping them free of any potential bias. Scoring for volunteer motives were placed along a 5 point likert scale and sum scores ranged from 3 to 15. For the purposes of this study, the scale will range from not important (1) to extremely important (5). Means of the sums were taken for each construct to yield one single score from 1 to 5. Statements for this

section are included in Appendix I. Items marked by an asterisk were included in this study.

Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) Satisfaction Outcomes.

The second section Clary et al., (1998) included within their administration of the VFI over six separate studies (mainly studies #5 and #6) was the designation of post-volunteering outcomes and satisfaction. The section's purpose is to determine which of the six volunteer functions have been observed or are being served by volunteering (Clary et al., 1998). Three statements for each function have typically been included in this section for a total of 18 responses with possible sum scores from 3 to 21 for function specific outcomes (α=.75 to α=.89, p. 1524) (Clary et al., 1998). The section also incorporates Clary et al.'s (1998) overall satisfaction variables with such statements as: "How much did you enjoy your volunteering experience?" and "How worthwhile was your volunteer experience?" (p. 1524; Clary & Snyder, 1998). The five general satisfaction statements are measured on a 7 point likert scale. Results from each statement are summed to create an overall volunteer satisfaction score between 5 and 35. The likert scale typically ranges from not at all accurate (1) to extremely accurate (7) (Clary et al., 1998). Clary et al. (1998) found the outcome and satisfaction variables to be the most important in matching motives with experienced benefits. Participants who were able to receive benefits in their most important motive areas were found to be more satisfied with their overall volunteering experience (Clary et al., 1998).

For the purpose of this study, one statement from each of the six constructs was used for analysis. Items were directly taken from Clary et al.'s (1998) original VFI

randomly via the "hat method." Items in this section have been included to find out which motives were satisfied by volunteer participation. Each item yielded a single score on a 5 point likert scale ranging from not important (1) to extremely important (5). The reason for these decisions was consistently based on reducing the overall length of the questionnaire. Statements for this section are included in Appendix II. Items marked by an asterisk were included in this study.

Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) Propensity for Continued Volunteering.

The final aspect of the VFI is the propensity to continue to volunteer. This section seeks to determine long and short term intentions for volunteers (Clary et al., 1998). Originally, Clary et al. (1998) used two short term statements and three long term statements on a 7 point likert scale to derive intention scores. To help further reduce length, only one statement; "I will be a volunteer 1 year from now," was measured on a 5 point likert probability scale (1=extremely unlikely to 5=extremely likely) (Clary et al., 1998). This item was included to help determine whether high motive or satisfaction scores were relational to intentions for future volunteerism. Statements for this section are included in Appendix III. Items marked by an asterisk were included in this study.

Demographic Information.

Basic demographic information was added to the end of the questionnaire. Demographic questions were derived and similar to the parameters set by the United States Department of Labor (2011) statistics on volunteering for 2010 and those established by Mayer et al. (2007). The questionnaire included general demographic inquiries over the topics of gender, age group, race, household income, education level,

employment status, volunteer type and zip code. Gender was divided into male and female. Age group was divided into three subgroups: 18-34, 35-59 and 60 and over. The ground for this decision is due to previous research findings that people within the "middle age bracket (35-59)" tend to volunteer more often than other age groups. Race was divided into the categories of white, black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino and Other. Household income was divided into those who make less than $29,999, $30,000 to $59,999 and greater than $60,000. Education level was divided into a high school diploma or less, associate's degree or some college and bachelor's degree or higher. Employment status was assessed as unemployed, part time employed (less than 40 hours) and full-time employed (40 hours or more). Volunteer type was investigated as general volunteers and board or committee members. Including all sections, a total minimum of 33 questions were contained within the questionnaires.

Questionnaire Specific Information.

Because one organization is focused on a specific cause, cancer, one additional question was added for further insight. It asked if the participant had been a survivor of or had known an individual who had been directly affected by cancer and whether it was a function of their choice to volunteer. While this may have been derived as a function of values or socialization, it may be quite relevant as a particular factor for volunteer motivation and participation within this single organization, which would not have been explicitly measured otherwise. Therefore, the questionnaire as administered to organization 1 had one additional question for a total of 34.

Administration

Before administering the questionnaires, the study was reviewed and approved by each organization as well as the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board (IRB). Because the survey had been altered, a preliminary pilot test was distributed. The pilot was administered to a section of University of Missouri Parks, Recreation and Tourism graduate students to check for basic content understanding, ease of administration and scoring. The survey service Zoomerang® was used to digitally represent the VFI and demographic questions for the pilot and actual study. The service directly received and collected data as the survey questionnaires were completed. A University of Missouri network mail account was used to distribute the questionnaires. Electronic mail addresses were only used for the purpose of disseminating the VFI questionnaire web page link.

Initially, both organizations agreed to place a small excerpt announcing the study to members of the volunteer organizations prior to administration in monthly and biweekly newsletters. The study commenced on June 1, 2011 with the sending of electronic mail messages to the provided recipients. The single electronic message was sent to introduce the researcher, provide study information and a link to the questionnaire. The questionnaire and data collection remained open to all participants through July 31, 2011. Questionnaires were only allowed to be taken one time and were restricted once a specified IP address was identified as having completed the questionnaire.

Treatment of Data

Raw data was electronically compiled by the survey service Zoomerang® and was extracted for statistical analysis via Microsoft Excel® to IBM SPSS Statistics 19®. Data was first broken down by frequency and descriptive analysis by both organization and as an entire organizational volunteer sample. For group analysis, each of the organizational volunteer groups was deviated and analyzed using basic frequency and mean comparisons. Data was primarily analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Further comparison was made using the collected demographic information. For more broad analysis, data from both organizations was combined and considered as a single entire sample of organizational volunteers. Additionally, reliability and other statistical tests were performed to further understand data distribution and outcomes.

CHAPTER IV

Purpose

The intent of this section is to present the results of Clary et al.'s partial VFI (1998) application to a sample of two distinct organizational volunteer groups. Both volunteer samples were taken from Mid-Missouri affiliates of nationally recognized volunteer-driven organizations. The main investigation hoped to uncover the attitudes, motivations, outcomes, intentions and description of those who made up these unique volunteer samples, as well as to identify where differences occurred.

Analysis of Data

Response Rate

Prior to data collection, both organizations provided database information including electronic mail addresses for those who had formerly served as volunteers. Organization 1 initially provided 342 electronic mail addresses and organization 2 provided 264 electronic mail addresses for a total of 606 electronic mail address. Duplicate electronic mail addresses were removed from each organization every other time they appeared, beginning with organization 1. 21 electronic mail addresses were deemed unusable by electronic mail servers for organization 1 and 10 could not be used for organization 2. Following removal of duplicate and inactive addresses, the remaining 541 total electronic mail addresses (311 for organization 1 and 230 for organization 2) were deemed viable and successfully reached destination servers. After two months of

data collection, 105 total responses were received (43 from organization 1 and 62 from organization 2). For the purposes of this study, 14 incomplete questionnaires were removed, leaving 91 usable questionnaires for data analysis. Organization 1 members provided 37 completed questionnaires, whereas organization 2 members provided 54 completed questionnaires. Independently, organization 1 garnered an 11.9% response rate and organization 2 members achieved a 23.5% response rate. Overall, both organizations were able to provide a 16.8% response rate for fully completed questionnaires. Deutskens, De Ruyter, Wetzels and Oosterveld (2004) found response rates for online questionnaires to be consistently between 9% and 30% for most electronic studies. Therefore, the response rates for this study were found to be within a previously established and acceptable parameter.

Demographic Description of Data

Of all respondents, most were female (75.8%), between the ages of 35 and 59 (53.8%), white (92.3%), had an annual income greater than $60,000 (74.7%), achieved a Bachelor's degree or higher education (78.0%) and were employed full time (76.9%). Of the 37 respondents in organization 1, volunteers were primarily female (91.9%), between the ages of 18 and 34 (51.4%), white (94.6%), had an annual income of greater than $60,000 (62.2%), had achieved a Bachelor's degree or higher education (59.9%), were employed full time (51.4%) and considered general volunteers (73.0%). Of the 54 respondents from organization 2, a smaller percentage was female (64.8%), most were in the 35 to 59 age bracket (61.1%), white (90.7%), had an annual income of greater than $60,000 (83.3%), had achieved a Bachelor's degree or higher education (90.7%), were

employed full time (94.4%) and were considered board or committee members (68.5%). While slight differences were found between organizations, the broad demographic investigation of this study lies heavily in line with the findings of previous studies as described in Chapter 2 (see Volunteer Demographics). Differences in organizations worth noting were found in gender, age group and volunteer activity. Organization 1 members tended to be younger, much less gender diverse, worked less and identified more with the "general" volunteer category.

The Functional Motivations for Volunteerism

As previously stated, each of the six motive functions; values, social, career, understanding, self-enhancement and ego protective, were used to describe the initial motivational function that volunteerism served per individual. Each participant was scored on each of the six constructs, with higher scores resulting in supposed greater motivation to participate as a volunteer. Individual constructs were scored using three separate attitudinal statements. Each statement was scored on a 5 point likert scale ranging from not important (1) to extremely important (5). Statements used in this study are included in Appendix 1. Cronbach's alphas for all motive constructs of the total sample were found and suggest nearly decent to fairly good reliability (using .70 as a generally acceptable value): values ($\alpha = .66$), social ($\alpha = .81$), career ($\alpha = .86$), understanding ($\alpha = .71$), self-enhancement ($\alpha = .73$) and ego protective ($\alpha = .66$) (Santos, 1999). Sum scores were obtained for each group of statements and one mean value was calculated for each construct for each individual.

For the entire sample (N = 91), the value function was most heavily associated with a motivation to volunteer, boasting a mean score of 4.54. A considerable ordinal difference appeared to exist among the understanding (3.88), self-enhancement (3.31), social (3.27), career (2.42) and ego protective scores (2.08) that followed. Standard deviations and error were largest among the career and social function scores, which suggested a higher variation in responses in those categories. The organizations separately had mean VFI scores that were relatively comparable with the findings of the overall sample. Organization 1 matched the overall sample, whereas organization 2 differed as the social function was more relevant to the volunteer motivation process than the self-enhancement function. Also, organization 1 provided higher mean VFI scores over nearly all categories with the exception of the value score. Full mean and standard deviation calculations are presented in Table 1.

Mean function scores differed significantly between organizations on only 3 of the 6 VFI motive functions: self-enhancement ($p < .05$), career ($p < .01$) and ego protective ($p < .01$). These results supported the most important motives for volunteerism as found in other studies, but the discrepancy in the secondary motives of self-enhancement, career and ego-protective functions indicate that members of different organizations were secondarily motivated to a different extent by similar functions. Consequently, based on the findings, because differences were present, Hypothesis 1 was rejected. The one-way ANOVA results for mean VFI motives are contained in Table 2.

TABLE 1 All Participant Mean VFI Motivation Scores (N = 91)[a]

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Mean Value Score	Organization 1	37	4.54	.605	.100
	Organization 2	54	4.54	.531	.072
	Total	91	4.54	.559	.059
Mean Understanding Score	Organization 1	37	3.98	.959	.158
	Organization 2	54	3.80	.678	.092
	Total	91	3.88	.804	.084
Mean Self Score	Organization 1	37	3.58	1.035	.170
	Organization 2	54	3.13	.901	.123
	Total	91	3.31	.977	.102
Mean Social Score	Organization 1	37	3.29	1.197	.197
	Organization 2	54	3.27	.907	.123
	Total	91	3.27	1.029	.108
Mean Career Score	Organization 1	37	2.82	1.327	.218
	Organization 2	54	2.14	.924	.126
	Total	91	2.42	1.149	.120
Mean Ego Score	Organization 1	37	2.43	1.015	.167
	Organization 2	54	1.83	.624	.085
	Total	91	2.08	.854	.089

a. 1 = not important, 5 = extremely important

TABLE 2 One-Way ANOVA Results for Mean VFI Motivation Scores and Organizational Affiliation[a]

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Mean Value Score	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.982
	Within Groups	28.144	89	.316		
	Total	28.144	90			
Mean Understanding Score	Between Groups	.708	1	.708	1.096	.298
	Within Groups	57.437	89	.645		
	Total	58.144	90			
Mean Self Score	Between Groups	4.386	1	4.386	4.785	.031*
	Within Groups	81.570	89	.917		
	Total	85.956	90			
Mean Social Score	Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.011	.918
	Within Groups	95.232	89	1.070		
	Total	95.243	90			
Mean Career Score	Between Groups	10.088	1	10.088	8.259	.005*
	Within Groups	108.710	89	1.221		
	Total	118.799	90			
Mean Ego Score	Between Groups	7.880	1	7.880	12.157	.001*
	Within Groups	57.692	89	.648		
	Total	65.573	90			

a. Significant scores are marked by an asterisk (*)

The Functional Outcomes for Volunteerism

Outcomes were scored on the same six general constructs: values, understanding, self-enhancement, social, career and ego-protective. The questionnaire contained one outcome statement for each construct. Participants responded to the attitudinal statement on a 5 point likert scale ranging from not important (1) to extremely important (5). The outcome statements used in this study are included in Appendix II. Similar to the motive results, the most highly overall experienced outcome variable was the value outcome with a mean of 4.65. In order of importance, the understanding (3.64), self-enhancement (3.60), social (2.82), ego-protective (2.02) and career (1.96) outcomes followed. The order of outcome functions was nearly identical to the motive functions with the exception of the final two constructs; ego-protective and career. Standard deviations ranged from .721 for the value outcome to 1.387 for the social outcome. Separately, mean outcome scores varied more than the motive scores, predominantly in the less essential functions. Organization 1 outcomes differed in order from the overall sample on two constructs; self-enhancement (4.05) and understanding (3.85) and career (2.43) and ego-protective (2.41). Organization 2 was consistent with the overall sample. Total descriptive statistics for the outcome analysis can be found in Table 3. In regards to differences between organizations, mean outcome scores were statistically different and significant on the self-enhancement ($p < .01$), social ($p < .01$), career ($p < .01$) and ego protective ($p < .01$) constructs. The results put forward that, similar to the motive scores, secondary outcomes vary in order and level of importance between organizations. As a result, Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Results are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 3 All Participant Mean VFI Outcome Scores (N = 91)[a]

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Value Outcome	Organization 1	37	4.65	.753	.124
	Organization 2	54	4.65	.705	.096
	Total	91	4.65	.721	.076
Understanding Outcome	Organization 1	37	3.84	1.191	.196
	Organization 2	54	3.50	1.129	.154
	Total	91	3.64	1.160	.122
Self Enhancement Outcome	Organization 1	37	4.05	1.026	.169
	Organization 2	54	3.30	1.268	.173
	Total	91	3.60	1.228	.129
Social Outcome	Organization 1	37	3.49	1.367	.225
	Organization 2	54	2.37	1.218	.166
	Total	91	2.82	1.387	.145
Career Outcome	Organization 1	37	2.43	1.519	.250
	Organization 2	54	1.63	.917	.125
	Total	91	1.96	1.255	.132
Ego Protect Outcome	Organization 1	37	2.41	1.301	.214
	Organization 2	54	1.76	.950	.129
	Total	91	2.02	1.145	.120

a. 1 = not important, 5 = extremely important

TABLE 4 One-Way ANOVA Results for Mean VFI Outcome Scores and Organizational Affiliation[a]

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Value Outcome	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.997
	Within Groups	46.747	89	.525		
	Total	46.747	90			
Understanding Outcome	Between Groups	2.506	1	2.506	1.882	.174
	Within Groups	118.527	89	1.332		
	Total	121.033	90			
Self Enhancement Outcome	Between Groups	12.607	1	12.607	9.111	.003*
	Within Groups	123.151	89	1.384		
	Total	135.758	90			
Social Outcome	Between Groups	27.351	1	27.351	16.692	.000*
	Within Groups	145.836	89	1.639		
	Total	173.187	90			
Career Outcome	Between Groups	14.151	1	14.151	9.864	.002*
	Within Groups	127.674	89	1.435		
	Total	141.824	90			
Ego Protect Outcome	Between Groups	9.167	1	9.167	7.499	.007*
	Within Groups	108.789	89	1.222		
	Total	117.956	90			

a. Significant scores are marked by an asterisk (*)

Propensity to Continue to Volunteer

The intention to volunteer in the future was scored using a single statement: "I will be a volunteer 1 year from now." The statement was scored on a 5 point likert scale ranging from extremely unlikely (1) to extremely likely (5). Mean results for all organization members were 4.81 (organization 1 = 4.84, organization 2 = 4.80), which showed high group propensity to continue to volunteer in the future. Mean propensity to continue to volunteer scores did not differ significantly between organizations. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was accepted. Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 5 All Participant Mean VFI Propensity to Continue to Volunteer Scores (N = 91)[a]

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Organization 1	37	4.84	.501	.082
Organization 2	54	4.80	.491	.067
Total	91	4.81	.492	.052

a. 1 = extremely unlikely, 5 = extremely likely

TABLE 6 One-Way ANOVA Results for Mean VFI Propensity to Continue to Volunteer Scores and Organizational Affiliation[a]

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.038	1	.038	.155	.695
Within Groups	21.786	89	.245		
Total	21.824	90			

a. Significant scores are marked by an asterisk (*)

Cancer Influence on Decision to Volunteer

One additional portion of the questionnaire that was only administered to organization 1 was the topic of the influence of cancer on oneself or an acquaintance on the decision to volunteer. For exploratory purposes, this question was used to investigate the potential consequence of the organization's mission and whether it was an actual determinant in the sample's decision to volunteer. Surprisingly, respondents were not overtly motivated to volunteer because of the effect of cancer on their or an acquaintance's life.

TABLE 7 Mean Influence of Cancer on Volunteer Decision[a]

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Influence	37	1	5	2.86	1.337

a. 1 = no influence, 5 = it is the main reason I volunteer

CHAPTER V

Summary of Procedures

The contained study was devised, administered and analyzed to reveal the description, motivations and outcomes of two particular samples of organizational volunteers within central Missouri during the summer months of 2011. Organizational volunteers were sampled from the Mid-Missouri affiliates for "The Susan G. Komen Foundation" (organization 1) and "The United Way" (organization 2). Study specifics were discussed via direct contact with volunteer coordinators from each organization. Both organizations agreed to allow access to volunteers through electronic mail address databases.

The questionnaire for this study was created using Clary et al.'s (1998) Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). The complete VFI assesses volunteer motives, outcomes, satisfactions and the propensity to continue to volunteer. It has been previously shown as a reliable measure for the motivational and resultant aspects of volunteerism (Clary et al., 1998; Clary et al., 1992; Finkelstein, 2008b). The VFI measures the motives and outcomes for volunteers on six separate functions: values (general altruistic or humanitarian concern), understanding (creation of new learning experiences and opportunities), self-enhancement (personal development), social (group activity and bonding), career (attainment of career-related skills and contacts) and ego-protection (to address personal problems or relieve guilt) (Clary et al., 1998). Individual statements for

each construct are scored on likert scales to obtain individual function scores (between 1 and 5 for this study). Depending on the question, scales for the motive and outcome sections ranged from not at all important (1) to extremely important (5) and the scale for the propensity to continue to volunteer section ranged from extremely unlikely (1) to extremely likely (5). Not included in this study, the VFI also contains sections devoted to the satisfaction derived from volunteerism and the short term prognosis for volunteer commitment (Clary et al., 1998). This particular study utilized a condensed version of the complete VFI to reduce participant obligation and to potentially boost response rates. Included items were randomly selected using the "hat method" and the total number of statements was nearly halved. Only statements relating to motives (3 statements for each function), outcomes (1 statement for each function) and the propensity to continue to volunteer (1 long term statement) were directly transposed from the original VFI. Demographic questions were added to the questionnaire based primarily on their inclusion in previous studies. Specifically, questions concerning gender, age group, race, income, education level, employment status and type of volunteer were asked. One additional exploratory question was added to organization 1's version that involved the relative impact of cancer on an individual's decision to volunteer. This question was inserted as a means to determine whether the organization's primary reason for being would influence a volunteer's decision to participate in such an organization. The scale for this statement ranged from no influence (1) to it is the main reason I volunteer (5).

The study was conducted through electronic mail messaging and the use of the survey service Zoomerang®. Prior to the actual study, the condensed VFI was

administered to a small group of University of Missouri Parks, Recreation and Tourism graduate students to confirm questionnaire content, understanding and scoring. Both organizations included a short informational paragraph in their biweekly and monthly newsletters to notify potential participants of questionnaire distribution approximately 1 month before the beginning of the study. Prior to June 1, 2011, a total of 606 electronic mail messages were acquired from each organization. Upon approval from the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board (IRB), the databases were examined and the study was initiated. After the removal of duplicate and non-existent addresses, 541 messages were independently disseminated to both organizational samples (311 for organization 1 and 230 for organization 2) via a personal university electronic mail account. The messages contained a personal and study introduction as well as a link to the online questionnaire. The survey remained open for two full months. Questionnaires could only be completed once per computer, based on IP address recognition. On July 31, 2011, the survey was closed and data was collected directly from the online survey service. A total of 91 usable responses were gathered; 37 from organization 1 and 54 from organization 2. Data was extracted from the service using Microsoft Excel® and moved to IBM SPSS Statistics 19® for analysis. All data was analyzed for descriptive and reliability purposes. Particular means and organizational affiliation were presented and compared using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Summary of Findings

The results of this study are very consistent to the findings of much of the previous research in the area of volunteerism. This volunteer sample, much like those from Thoits and Hewitt (2001) and others (refer to Chapter 2, Volunteer Demographics for additional reference) determined that volunteers in both organizations were mostly female, white, college educated, had incomes greater than $60,000 and were full-time employed. Slight differences occurred between age group as organization 1 was represented by a larger proportion of 18 to 34 year olds (51.4%) and organization 2 had a greater number of respondents in the 35 to 59 age bracket (61.1%). The other difference arose by type of volunteer. Organization 1 respondents identified more heavily as general volunteers (73%) and organization 2 subjects considered themselves to be part of the committee or board member volunteer type group (68.5%).

In terms of motives for volunteerism, the value function was highest among both organization samples. This finding was agreeable with the majority of previous research, meaning respondents were highly motivated to volunteer based on general humanitarian and altruistic ideals. The results are specifically similar to a portion of the primary findings from, among others, Yoshioka et al. (2007) Clary et al. (1998) and Finkelstein (2008a). Not surprisingly, like this investigation, most studies varied on the precise order and relative importance of secondary motives. Understanding, self-enhancement, social, career and ego-protective motives were ordered accordingly for the entire organizational sample in this inquiry. Per group results were principally the same, with the only difference in secondary motivations arising in organization 2, where the social function

was more important than the self-enhancement function. Mean motive function scores were statistically significantly different on 3 of 6 functions between organizations; self-enhancement ($p < .05$), career ($p < .01$) and ego protective ($p < .01$), forcing rejection of Hypothesis 1.

Outcome results were quite similar to those of motives. The most important outcome function, or what volunteers perceived as being the product of their service, was the value outcome with a mean of 4.65 for both organizations. For the total sample; understanding, self-enhancement, social, ego-protective and career outcomes followed. By organization, outcomes differed in organization 1 on the self-enhancement and understanding functions and the career and ego-protective functions. Organization 2 outcomes were consistent with the entire sample. In terms of group affiliation, there were statistically significant mean differences between organizations on the self-enhancement ($p < .01$), social ($p < .01$), career ($p < .01$) and ego protective ($p < .01$) constructs. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was rejected. For the most part, the ordered outcome results from this study differ only minutely from the results found by Clary et al. (1998).

To understand estimated long-term volunteer persistence, the questionnaire presented a simple statement about whether participants would still be volunteers in 1 year. Responses were highly affirmative for both volunteer samples (organization 1 mean = 4.84, organization 2 mean = 4.81) and no statistically significant difference between organizations was present. Hypothesis 3 was accepted.

The final finding was investigative in nature, but related to the fact of attempting to match a portion of the volunteer decision-making process to the profoundly

communicated intent of a particular organization. One single statement about the influence on the decision to volunteer because of the direct or indirect effects of cancer was included in the questionnaire for organization 1. Organization 1 is extremely associated with awareness and fundraising for breast cancer. However, unpredictably, the mean response for this statement was 2.86 on a 1 (no influence) to 5 (it is the main reason I volunteer) likert scale.

Conclusion

Though this particular study was not groundbreaking, it is confirmatory in describing the initial inquiry of this investigative update as to who the modern organizational volunteer is, what types of principles drive them and what they perceive as the result of their service. One of the arrived conclusions of this study portrays the current volunteer samples to be chiefly female, white, middle aged, educated, full-time employed and financially stable. As this is not surprising, it does present the notion that these particular groups of volunteers are characteristically homogenous and are categorically similar to what has been derived as the "typical" volunteer (Thoits & Hewitt, 2001).

In regards to the motivational and consequential functions of volunteerism, this study has substantiated by far that values are the most heavily driving motive and largest outcome. Among both organizations and overall, the functions of understanding, self-enhancement and socialization are also moderately important. While the individual VFI functions are certainly located at different points along the ego-altruistic continuum, this study points largely to altruistic standards as the prime determinants of volunteer initiation and recognition. Results are also suggestive that ego-oriented motives and

outcomes (understanding and self-enhancement) do exist and potentially play different secondary influential roles. The results imply a slight distinction between some of the secondary motives and outcomes for each individual and organization and their potentiality to serve as additional motivators and outcomes, supporting suggestions of multi-faceted influences on volunteer activity (Winniford et al., 1997). Because there was significant variation between organizations on some of the mean function scores that cannot be fully explained through the use quantitative methods; additional investigation using other methods (i.e. qualitative methods) could help to uncover what the true differences in these motive and outcome scores actually are.

The involved participants were also depicted as having positive long term commitment intentions. These results represent the notion of ambition for high volunteer participation in the future. Such information conveys the possibility that when aspired motives and outcomes are adequately met (similar results for both motive and outcome functions) the participants' desire to continue volunteer work remains high. This particular relationship was not tested with these samples, but the assumption has been addressed by other researchers and could be important for further study.

The final conclusion is related to the fact that in this study, a particular organization's mission was not necessarily a tremendous factor in the volunteer motivation process. While there appeared to be a mild influence from the effects of cancer on the decision to volunteer within organization 1, it was seemingly not an overwhelmingly important factor to the overall volunteer decision-making process. Thus, this too could maintain the impression that the act of volunteerism is not inevitably

determined by any one singular factor, but by a number of influences that play on each individual or group in different ways.

Discussion and Implications

The general conclusions of this study primarily helped to strengthen and support the current understanding of volunteerism as it has been presented by a number of other researchers. Despite the clear findings, there are important nuances and additional ramifications that should be mentioned in reference to the particular organizations and participants of this study. As the methods, instrumentation and parameters that defined this study were previously utilized and verified; it is imperative to point out the possible real-world implications of their application to these particular groups. According to Clary et al. (1992), the most considerable value to volunteer-driven organizations of these results lies in their relevance to the identification, recruitment, placement and retention of volunteers. For each of the organizations, the outcomes of this study assist in the further understanding of mid-Missouri volunteers. Particularly, their characteristics, motivations, functions served and intent for continued participation. While the results and perceptions of the current data cannot be fully generalized, they certainly help to categorize these two unique samples.

For the most part, this sample was demographically exemplary of the "typical" volunteer (Thoits & Hewitt, 2001). However, in regards to other research, there are deeper seeded indications for the identification and targeting of potential volunteers with respect to these samples. For example, in support of Unger's (1991) and Iso-Ahola's (1999) proposition that actual volunteers are not necessarily enticed by uncommitted time

and fewer obligations; but by more of them, was the 76.9% of full-time employees found within these samples. Highly related to such employment were the overwhelming majority of volunteers who were found to be financially secure and highly educated, which are typically related to increased societal integration and presumably more volunteer opportunities (Unger, 2001; Wilson, 2000). Other highly homogenous findings in this study were found in race and gender, where most volunteers were white and female. Such discoveries could be resultant of the sample's common knowledge and witness to the impact of volunteerism from a more profound perception than others who volunteer less or are less financially secure. The results could also be based on institutional, social, cultural, environmental and familial characteristics specific to the particular region of study, organizations or volunteer groups sampled in this study (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973). Added possibilities for homogeneity might include the existence of a network of positive social associations with similar persons who are also exposed to and participate in volunteerism. And, that volunteer opportunities are related to those who have the resources, abilities and understanding (i.e. experience and knowledge) to carry out tasks which are required of volunteers in certain positions and organizations (Azjen & Fishbein, 1973; Clary et al., 1992; Wilson, 2000). Lastly, the results may be founded solely on the types of organizations that were surveyed or by the types of volunteers that were willing to provide electronic mail addresses. While these descriptions and possible explanations of mid-Missouri volunteers only highlight some of the total characteristics; the identification and recruitment of individuals that fit such descriptions may prove fruitful in maintaining the current volunteer population and persona.

Second to the identification and recruitment of volunteers and the VFI is the consideration of the "matching hypothesis" as presented by Clary and Snyder (1999). The "matching hypothesis" posits that recruitment and placement activity should be tailored to the intended audience (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1992). The basic premise is that the overall recruitment messaging and placement procedures should match the specified motive functions that have been determined to drive volunteer behavior (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1992). In their study, Clary and Snyder (1999) found that recruitment methods that were in-line with certain highly desired motives created higher intent to volunteer than non-adapted, general methods of recruitment. Clary et al. (1992) found that once volunteers made the commitment to volunteer, they should subsequently be placed in areas that match their motive needs and are simultaneously beneficial to the organization. In both recruitment and placement, the matching of motives to the volunteer decision-making and participative processes created better volunteer initiation than through more universal practices (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1992; Finkelstein, 2008b). In the case of this study, all data for both organizations point heavily to the value, self-enhancement and understanding functions as being those that initiate the highest volunteer intent. Moreover, differences in order and degree of importance between these motives for each organization may require individual acknowledgement to establish the most successful recruitment and placement procedures. While this data has been sampled only from known volunteers, the indication of what influenced them to participate, in addition to how strongly it motivated them, could offer insight into what motive descriptions these organizations could focus on for improved volunteer recruitment and

placement purposes. One additional implication also signifies that the intent and cause for which the organization was founded does play a role in the volunteer decision-making process, albeit not to a tremendous extent. Therefore, these findings support the fact that the best approach should include tailored recruiting activities and messaging and the provision of volunteer placement options that match intended motives which are unique to the volunteer populations themselves and done in manner that is consistent with the organization's mission, objectives and resources. Though such a process is difficult to develop and implement when motives are broad, unknown or individuals are separately motivated by a variety of additional influences, the implications are quite thought-provoking. If successful, locating and motivating wanted and essential volunteers will only become easier and would help to bolster the organization's range and effectiveness. However, limiting to organizations utilizing such methods could be the added time commitment and costs associated with highly tailored messaging and placement of potential volunteers.

As these results display, the volunteer participants questioned in this study were very ambitious in their desire to volunteer in the future. Potentially meaningful, the outcome functions of this study were ordered very similarly in importance to the motive functions. Thus, the findings might recommend that since participant motives were being adequately met, a desire for continued service was realized. Though this study does not address this relationship specifically, in partial support, Finkelstein (2008b) found that the matching of motives and outcomes was suitable for explaining volunteer retention and commitment and that early on, "participants were more satisfied the more their

experiences matched their reasons for helping (p. 14).” Finkelstein et al.’s (2005) findings were similar in that “motive fulfillment did predict [early term] satisfaction, but satisfaction did not predict whether or not one persisted [in the long term] in volunteering (p. 405).” Therefore, despite the high propensity for future volunteerism and the consistency between motives and outcomes found here, the full explanation of high long term intent to these volunteer samples may not be able to be fully described with the data collected or procedures used. It has been proposed that long term commitment and the volunteer retention process may be related to motive and outcome agreement, but also to larger social influences that impede on and manipulate initial motives over time and to a greater sense of long term psychological role-identity formation and fulfillment (Finkelstein, 2008b). Other methods and additional investigation is needed to advance the link between motives, outcomes, long-term intent and other factors to the preservation of volunteer populations.

Understandably, this data does not begin to account for all volunteer participants within these groups or in any larger capacity, but it does provide a distinct perspective on the characteristics, motivations, conclusions and intentions that make them an integral part of the total volunteer landscape. By continuing to pursue the root description of volunteers, we may be able to successfully identify, motivate and retain them when they are needed most. Moving forward, volunteers will likely remain difficult to fully understand; however, with an ever-growing population and increasing humanitarian needs, volunteers will undoubtedly be called upon as an impetus for social, environmental and political maintenance and change. The results of this study, along with

many others, have shown that volunteers are motivated based heavily on altruistic ideals. Findings also propose that volunteers are secondarily encouraged through the presence of ego-oriented and organizational attitudes. Thus, to establish and preserve a healthy and successful volunteer population, those who recruit, place and maintain volunteers must become aware, accepting and understanding of the total characteristics and processes related to the decision-making, motivations, and outcomes for volunteerism.

Recommendations for Further Study

The current study only attempted to describe the local volunteer base in the areas of demography, attitudes, motives, outcomes and intent. To become more highly aware of these and other volunteer samples, added research methods, procedures and future inquiries are needed. Particularly, improvements in this study should be made for future re-application. For instance, to get a more inclusive sample of volunteers, questionnaires could have been administered at large events, over the phone and through electronic mail messaging to incorporate participants without certain lines of communication. Increased placement of study advertisements could have been placed in newsletters and addressed at events much earlier and more often to reach as many potential participants as possible. Follow-up electronic messages could have been valuable reminders for parts of the sample who missed the initial request. For future analysis, correlation and regression analysis could be used to address additional relationships, especially between motives, outcomes and the propensity to continue volunteering.

In general, this study and others found volunteer samples to be extremely homogenous. Contrary to the possible strengths and reasons for this finding, each

organization's spread of influence, external perception and internal culture may not be comprehensive enough to provide the most assistive and wide-ranging outreach and volunteer opportunities as possible. This question is especially concerning to generally non-diverse populations. To examine the full extent of a volunteer population in relation to the community it serves, additional data is required to determine the true population, success and scope of services that the volunteers of these organizations provide. Furthermore, greater understanding is needed to uncover what distinctions are present between the volunteer population, the population of those being served and the population of the community as a whole and whether or not those differences have any impact on the effectiveness of a particular volunteer system. Similarly, if discrepancies are present, future research is concurrently required to conclude the actual community and individual needs and effects of a more diverse volunteer population, why a diverse population does not exist and what efforts may be needed to obtain one.

A second item that may considerably improve the overall understanding of these volunteer and other samples and the individuals within them is to explore the extent of overall helping and its influence on volunteer motivation, participation and identification for organizations. Future inquiries in this area, that were not addressed here, could relate to the number of organizations that a volunteer is presently a part of, how long they have volunteered overall and for certain organizations, why they may have moved or become part of new organizations and why they chose one volunteer organization over another. Additional introspections may look to investigate how often volunteers participate in "neighborly" or non-organizational volunteerism and a description of their perceptions on

who they are actually helping and whether or not these things play a definitive role in the volunteer decision-making and continuation processes.

Thirdly, future research may be necessary to find what methods are most appropriate for the recruitment, placement and retention of potential volunteers in relation to the results of VFI administration and other latent factors. For the recruitment process, it would be beneficial to determine which tailoring techniques would be sufficient in conveying messages that fit the certain motivational functions of these and other organizations (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Clary et al., 1992). Similarly, it would be interesting to locate other initial motivating factors outside of internal attitudinal measures that could influence volunteerism participation in these samples, how they relate to the functional approach, and what actions could be taken to express and apply them to potential volunteers (Winniford et al, 1997). For example, Cleave and Doherty (2005), Harrison (1995), Wilson and Pimm (1996) and Murnighan et al. (1993) identified the extraneous factors of time and other constraints, cost to benefit ratio, competing obligations and social conflict as part of the multi-motivational process that is considered essential to the volunteer decision-making process (Winniford et al., 1997). As well, it would be pertinent to establish which placement strategies and activities are most capable of satisfying initial motivational functions and if they produce outcomes that match. Given that short-term volunteer commitment has been associated with the congruency of functional motives and outcomes (though not expressly here) and the notion that functions can be realized differently by different volunteers; for retention purposes, it would be helpful to expand upon prior research from Finkelstein (2008a). For instance,

shorter and longer-term intent and the relationships between length of volunteer time, motivations, satisfactions, other explanations (i.e. role-identity) and how previous and future results could lead to or detract from volunteer persistence. One final area of investigation includes the further study of the influence of organizational missions and branding on the volunteer decision-making process. Also, how they could be used and improved upon to invoke increased awareness, inspiration and participation for potential and current volunteers.

Appendix I

Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI)

Original Motive Statements (Clary et al., 1998)

*Will be Included in Proposed Study

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

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

Career
Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work.*
I can make new contacts that might help my business career.
Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.*
Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.*
Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.

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

Self-Enhancement
Volunteering makes me feel important.*
Volunteering increases my self-esteem.*
Volunteering makes me feel needed.
Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.*
Volunteering is a way to make new friends.

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

Appendix II

Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI)

Original Outcome Specific Statements (Clary et al., 1998)

*Will be Included in Proposed Study

Values
I am genuinely concerned about the people who are helped.
I did something for a cause I believe in.*
I performed a service for an important group.

Social
People close to me learned that I did volunteer work.
People that I know best saw that I volunteered.
My friends found out that I did volunteer work.*

Career
I made new contacts that might help my business or career.
I was able to explore new career options.*
I was able to add important experience to my résumé.

Understanding
I learned more about the cause for which I worked.
I learned how to deal with a greater variety of people.*
I was able to explore my own personal strengths.

Self-Enhancement
My self-esteem was enhanced.
I felt important.
I felt better about myself.*

Ego-Protection
I was able to escape some of my troubles.*
I was able to work through some of my own personal problems.
I felt less lonely.

General Satisfaction
On the whole, the volunteer experience was very positive for me.
I was personally very satisfied with the responsibilities given to me at the site.
I don't think I got anything out of the volunteering experience at this site.

Appendix III

Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI)

Original Volunteer Benefit Statements and Intentions for Future Volunteering (Clary et al., 1998)

*Will be Included in Proposed Study

Values
I was able to express my personal values through my work at this site.

Social
The work I performed at the site was appreciated.

Career
I learned some skills that will be useful in my future career by working at this site.

Understanding
I learned something new about the world by working at my site.

Self-Enhancement
I gained a sense of accomplish from my work at this site.

Ego-Protection
Working at the site about me to think about others instead of myself.

Long-Term Intentions
I will be a volunteer 1 year from now.*
I will be a volunteer 3 years from now.
I will be a volunteer 5 years from now.

Short-Term Intentions
I will work at the same site next semester.
I will volunteer somewhere else next semester.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitchison, C. (2000). Poststructural feminist theories of representing others: A response to the 'crisis' in leisure studies' discourse. *Leisure Studies, 19*, 127-144.

Allison, L. D., Okun, M. A., & Dutridge, K. S. (2002). Assessing volunteer motives: A comparison of an open-ended probe and likert rating scales. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 12,* 243-255.

Azjen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1973). Attitudinal and normative variables as predictors of specific behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27*(1), 41-57.

Bussell, H. & Forbes, D. (2002). Understanding the volunteer market: The what, where, who and why of volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 7*(3), 244-257.

Bang, H. & Ross, S. D. (2009). Volunteer motivation and satisfaction. *Journal of Venue and Event Management, 1*(1), 61-77.

Brown, E. (1999). The scope of volunteer activity and public service. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 62*(4), 17-42.

Butcher, J. & Smith, P. (2010). 'Making a difference': Volunteer tourism and development. *Tourism Recreation Research, 35*(1), 27-36.

Clary, E. G., Ridge, R. D., Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., Copeland, J., Haugen, J. & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1516-1530.

Clary, E. G. & Snyder, M. (1998). The functional approach to volunteers' motivations [VFI]. Retrieved from http://oregonmentors.org/files/library/ Volunteer%20Function%20Inventory%20scale%20_Clary%20et%20al_. pdf

Clary, E. G. & Snyder, M. (1999). The Motivations to Volunteer: Theoretical and practical Considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*(5), 156-159.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M. & Ridge, R. (1992). Volunteer's motivations: A functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. *Nonprofit Management Leadership, 2*(4), 333-350.

Cleave, S. L. & Doherty, A (2005). "Understanding volunteer and non-volunteer constraints: A mixed-method approach". Presented at the 11th Canadian Congress on Leisure Research, May 17 - 20, 2005 Nanaimo, BC

Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Policy Development (2010). *Volunteering in America 2010: National, state and city information*. Retrieved from http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/assets/resources/IssueBriefFINALJune15.pdf

Corporation for National and Community Service (2010). *Volunteering in the U.S.* Retrieved from http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/national

Cuskelly, G., Taylor, T., Hoye, R. & Darcy, S. (2006). Volunteer management practices and volunteer retention: A human resource management approach. *Sport Management Review, 9*, 141-163.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R.M. (2009). Intrinsic motivation . In Weiner, I. B. & Craighead, W.E. (Eds.). *The corsini encyclopedia of psychology, volume 2 , 4th Ed.*, (pp. 868-870). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Deutskens, E., De Ruyter, K., Wetzels, M., & Oosterveld, P. (2004). Response rate and response quality of internet-based surveys: An experimental study. *Marketing Letters, 15*(1), 21-36.

Edwards, D. (2005). It's mostly about me: Reasons why volunteers contribute their time to museums and art museums [Abstract]. *Tourism Review International, 9*(1), 21-31.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2008). Predictors of volunteer time: The changing contributions of motive fulfillment and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(10), 1353-1364.

Finkelstein, M.A. (2008). Volunteer satisfaction and volunteer action: A functional approach. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(1), 9-18.

Finkelstein, M. A., Penner, L. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2005). Motive, role identity, and prosocial personality as predictors of volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*(4), 403-418.

Hardy, S.A. & Kisling, J. W. (2006). Identity statuses and prosocial behaviors in young adulthood: A brief report. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 6*(4), 363-369.

Harrison, D.A. (1995). Volunteer motivation and attendance decisions: Competitive theory testing in multiple samples from a homeless shelter. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(3), 371-385.

Heart of Missouri United Way (2010). *What we do.* Retrieved from http://uwheartmo.org/Community_Impact_Overview.php

Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(4), 285-303.

Hitlin, S. (2003). Values as the core of personal identity: Drawing links between two theories of self. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 66*(2), 118-137.

Hu, Y. A. & Liu, D. Y. (2003). Altruism versus egoism in human behavior of mixed motives: An experimental study. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 62*(4), 677-705.

Hustinx, L., Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Brudney, J. L., Pessi, A. B., & Yamauchi, N. (2010). Social and cultural origins of motivations to volunteer: A comparison of university students in six countries. *International Sociology, 25*(3), 349-382).

Independent Sector (2010). *About Us.* Retrieved from http://independentsector.org/about

Independent Sector (2010). *Value of Volunteer Time.* Retrieved from http://independentsector.org/volunteer_time

Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E.L. Jackson & T.L. Burton (Eds.), Leisure studies: prospects for the 21st century (pp. 35-51). State College: Venture Publishing.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*(2), 163-204.

Kim, M., Zhang, J.J. & Connaughton, D. (2010). Modification of the volunteer functions inventory for application in youth sports. *Sport Management Review, 13*(1), 25-38.

Lockstone-Binney, L., Holmes, K., Smith, K & Baum, T. (2010). Volunteers and volunteering in leisure: social science perspectives. *Leisure Studies, 29*(4), 435-455.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). A theory of human motivation. *Motivation and personality: Third edition.* (pp. 15-31). New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Mayer, B. W., Fraccastoro, K. A., & McNary, L. D. (2007). The relationship among organizational-based self-esteem and various factors motivating volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(2), 327-340.

Mid-Missouri Affiliate of Susan G. Komen for the Cure (2011). *About us.* Retrieved from http://www.komenmidmissouri.org/about-us/

Monga, M. (2006). Measuring motivation to volunteer at special events [Abstract]. *Event Management, 10*(1), 47-61.

Murnighan, J. T., Kim, J. W., & Metzger, A. R. (1993). The volunteer dilemma. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*(4), 515-538.

Okun, M. A., Barr, A., & Herzog, A. R. (1998). The motivation to volunteer by older adults: A test of competing measurement models. *Psychology and Aging, 13*(4), 608-621.

Omoto, A. M. & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 671-686.

Piliavin, J.A. & Charng, H. W. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 16*, 27-65.

Rojek, C. (2000). Mass tourism or the re-enrichment of the world? Issues and contradictions in the study of travel. In Gottdiener, M. (Ed.), *New forms of consumption: Consumers, culture and commodification* (pp. 51-69). Lanham, England: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Santos, J. R. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension, 37*(2). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php

Sesardic, N. (1999). Altruism. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 50*, 457-466.

Sin, H. L. (2009). Volunteer tourism – "Involve me and I will learn"? *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(3), 480-501.

Sommer R. & Sommer, B. (2002). Standardized tests and inventories. *A practical guide to behavioral research* (pp. 224-234). New York: Oxford University Press.

Stebbins, R.A. (1999). Serious leisure. In E.L. Jackson & T.L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: prospects for the 21st century* (pp. 69-79). State College: Venture Publishing.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M. & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on the intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10*(1), 59-64.

Thoits, P. A. & Hewitt, L. N. (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 42*(2), 115-131.

Unger, L. S. (1991). Altruism as a motivation to volunteer. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 12*, 71-100.

United States Department of Labor. (2011). *Volunteering in the United States, 2010.* Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm

Voluntarism. (2011). *Merriam-Webster.com.* Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/voluntarism

Volunteerism. (2011). *Merriam-Webster.com.* Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/volunteerism

Wilson, A. & Pimm, G. (1996). The tyranny of the volunteer: The care and feeding of voluntary workforces. *Management Decision, 34*(4), 24-40.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 215-240.

Wilson, J. & Musick, M. (1999). The effects of volunteering on the volunteer. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 62*(4), 141-168.

Winniford, J. C., Carpenter, D. S., & Grider, C. (1997). Motivations of college student volunteers: A review. *NASPA Journal, 34*(2), 134-146.

Yoshioka, C. F., Brown, W. A., & Ashcraft, R. F. (2007). A functional approach to senior volunteer and non-volunteer motivations. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 24*(5), 31-43