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ABSTRACT

This paper explores the relationship between Internet use among college students and the production of individual level social capital. As such, this paper applied the uses and gratifications theory to motivations for using the Internet among college students, in an effort to observe the relationship between time spent online in an average day, motivations for using the Internet, and the production of individual level social capital. Individual level indicators of social capital—life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism—are discussed in detail.

An online survey measured study participants’ (N=252) time spent on the Internet in a given day, their primary reasons for using the Internet, and their general life contentment, trust in others, and volunteer behavior. A total of five motivations for using the Internet were extracted from a principal components factor analysis and were labeled surveillance, escape, boredom, entertainment, and information. Each social capital variable was regressed on the five gratification variables in a multiple regression analysis, which revealed that while total time online was not a predictor of the overall life contentment and volunteer behavior, it is predictive of interpersonal trust. Findings also showed that only the information gratification is related to interpersonal trust, but none of the other gratifications were predictive of individual level social capital. The predictive power of Internet use is then analyzed relative to key demographic characteristics.

Additionally, the functional theory was applied to determine participants’ motivations for engaging in volunteer work. A total of five motivations for volunteering were extracted from a principal components factor analysis and were labeled career, social, values, and protective. A multiple regression analysis was employed to observe which of the gratifications sought by Internet use is predictive of each motivation to volunteer. Findings showed that overall time online in an average day is predictive of motivation to volunteer out of personal values. Findings also showed that respondents who use the Internet to be entertained are motivated
to volunteer by career ambitions, respondents who use the Internet for surveillance are more likely to volunteer as a reflection of their personal values, and respondents who use the Internet to escape are motivated to volunteer by the prospect of reducing their own guilt for being more fortunate than others. A second multiple regression was conducted to determine whether life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior are predictive of particular motivations to volunteer. Additional research on social capital and new media is suggested. Implications of study findings are also discussed.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Everybody can be great...because anybody can serve. You don't have to have a college degree to serve. You don’t have to make your subject and verb agree to serve. You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.”

—Martin Luther King Jr.

On January 19, 2009, Dr. Martin Luther King’s vision of the power of service to strengthen communities was realized when more than 13,000 service projects took place across the country: a number that nearly doubles last year’s efforts. With the help of President Obama’s call to make it a “day on, not a day off,” the 2009 King Day of Service received unprecedented support. Just one day before the inauguration of a president elected on the platform of hope and change, many Americans exhibited their belief that the day represented a new day and a new dawn in the United States of America.

Research has shown that civic engagement as seen in club memberships, work on community projects, and attendance at neighborhood meetings has slipped in the past 30 years, contributing to erosion of community life (Putnam, 2000). Social capital, a term used to describe how elements of community life provide the means for citizens to work on joint problems, has also been observed to be in decline. Along with decreased interpersonal trust and decreased life contentment (two other indicators of social capital), civic participation continues to decline.
Some scholars attribute declining social capital to increasing use of new media. The most outspoken proponent of media’s negative effects, Robert Putnam, claims that time spent using media (most of his studies focus on television use) will be related negatively to social capital. The time displacement hypothesis contends that the more time an individual spends with media, the more disengaged he or she will be. This research will attempt to support the claim that it is not time spent on the Internet that decreases social capital, as explained by Putnam, but rather how particular uses of the Internet will affect individual level social capital differently.

Inconsistent research on the effect of Internet use on civic participation has led to the conclusion that scholars should be interested in how individuals use the Internet rather than what Internet use does to them. By employing uses and gratifications theory to understand reasons for going online and spending time there, this study will begin to explain why college students use the Internet and its effect on individual level social capital. Rather than looking broadly at civic engagement, this study will focus on volunteerism, as most recent scholarship has focused on political participation. The ailing economy and the increasing dependence of nonprofit organizations on volunteers make a study about civic engagement and motivations to volunteer especially timely.

Additionally, this research will look into motivations for volunteering, so as to observe how they relate to both Internet use and individual level social capital. This study will add to the literature by employing the functional theory to begin a discussion of the motivations of college students to volunteer. The percentage of students who report
spending at least some time in volunteer service during the year before entering college has increased from 42 to 59 percent since 1987 (Astin, 1998). However, the motivations of college students to volunteer is a little researched but very interesting and practical question. This study will begin to address this concern.

The research questions that will be answered are: What Internet usage conditions are related to high levels of personal contentment, interpersonal trust, and civic volunteerism? Conversely, under what usage conditions is Internet use related to lower life contentment, social mistrust, and withdrawal from civic volunteerism? Finally, what is the relationship between Internet usage, interpersonal trust, personal contentment, volunteer behavior, and motivation to volunteer?

Practical implications of this study are clear. The relationship between Internet use and volunteer activity can give nonprofit organizations insight into how to use the Internet to promote themselves and both attract and retain volunteers. If volunteer coordinators at nonprofit organizations understand this media effect, they can be armed with knowledge to create an effective online presence for their organization.

A convenience sample of 258 students from various majors and concentrations were given an online survey to answer the research questions. College students provide an interesting glimpse into Internet use habits. Media consumption patterns for life form around the time when young people leave for college (Al-Obaidi, Lamb-Williams, & Mordas 2004). Additionally, changes in civic participation have been tied to generational differences, where “Gen-Xers” are less
participatory, trusting and satisfied than their “baby boomer” parents, who are less connected than their “civic generation parents” (Putnam, 2000). Similarly, in a study by Shah, Kwak, and Holbert (2001) measuring the effects of Internet use on social capital across generations, the authors determined that the civic correlates for Internet use were stronger among members of Generation X (the youngest group) whereas the Civic Generation was least prone to the effects of Internet use. Clearly, recent findings indicate the reliance of college students on the web for all kinds of information.

According to research (e.g. Gerard, 1985; Hettman and Jenkins, 1990; Penner, Midili, and Kegelmeyer, 1997; Wilson and Musick, 1997) the “prototypical volunteer” is a middle aged, middle class, married woman with more than a high school education and dependent school age children. The outpouring of support for the 2009 King Day of Service and the subsequent projected increase in civic engagement show that this is not the only demographic for whom volunteer work is appealing. Each year, approximately one third of adult Americans participate in a volunteer organization to help others (Independent Sector, 2006). The American tradition of volunteerism has unequivocally benefited organizations and volunteers alike. Indeed, nonprofit organizations throughout the world rely heavily upon donated labor. Scholars agree that Americans’ increasing adoption of the Internet, as well as other information sources, is transforming civic life. Some declare that it is the increased use of media that has contributed to a decrease in social capital and civic participation, while others proclaim that new media offers the unprecedented connections and information that leads
to civic engagement (Uslaner, 2004). When French political thinker Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States in the 1830s, it was Americans tendency toward civic work that impressed him the most as the key to a successful democracy. He said, “Nothing, in my view, deserves more attention than the intellectual and moral associations in America.” An understanding of the role of Internet use will help contribute to an understanding of what behavior encourages volunteerism (and other forms of civic participation), acts that many believe are vital for the maintenance of a healthy American democracy.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Capital

Originally coined by Hanifan in 1916, the term “social capital” stresses the importance of community involvement to sustain democracy (Zhang & Chia, 2006). He initially identified social capital as, “those tangible substances that count for most in the daily lives of people: namely good will, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse among the individuals and families who make up a social unit…” (p.130).

Robert Putnam (1993, 1995a, 1995b, 2000) propagated the term to describe how elements of community life, such as civic engagement, interpersonal trust, and life satisfaction, allow people to work together on common societal problems. More specifically, social capital is defined as “the features of social organizations such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 1995). The ideas behind social capital stem from the social theory traditions of de Toqueville and Mill, but Putnam’s writings have modernized the concepts. More recently, Shah, McLeod, and Yoon (2001) defined social capital as “the resources of information, norms, and social relations embedded in communities that enable people to coordinate collective action and to achieve common goals” (p.467). The benefits of social capital are numerous and complex. Scholars believe social capital and
the concepts that comprise it produce better schools, faster economic development, lower crime, and more effective government (Putnam, 1995a, 1995b). Putnam (1995b) declared that life is easier in a community “blessed with a substantial stock of social capital” (p. 2).

According to social capital theorists and researchers, there are three levels at which social capital, a multilevel construct, is present. It exists in communities at the macro level in local institutions and organizations, at the meso level by interpersonal communication networks and connections, and at the micro level by individual characteristics that make people likely to participate in community life (Shah et al., 2001). This final micro level is the one on which previous research has focused, and that which the present study will examine. By questioning individuals’ reports of their resources, motivation, attitudes, and knowledge that facilitate their civic participation, this micro level social capital can be empirically tested.

The current study will employ the concepts of interpersonal trust, life contentment, and volunteer behavior as individual-level indicators of social capital. Previous studies have used differing indicators, though researchers acknowledge that micro-, meso-, and macro-level factors influence their production (Shah et al., 2001). Trust and engagement (volunteerism, in the case of the present study) “create the context for collective problem resolution, whereas life satisfaction—that is, personal contentment—strengthens the governmental democratic functioning” (Almond & Verba, 1963, 1980; Inglehart, 1997, as cited in Shah et al., 2001, p.142).
There are many reasons given by scholars for the growth of social capital through Internet use. Many scholars argue that the Internet creates social capital by making information flow more efficiently through communities (Lin, 2001; Wellman, 2001, as cited in DiMaggio, Hargittai, Neuman, & Robinson, 2001, p.318). Kraut (1998) saw that Internet use is associated with greater participation in community activities, as well as increased trust. Other scholars believe that the Internet builds social capital by making voluntary associations more effective, however according to DiMaggio et al., (2001) there is currently very little research to support this claim.

Putnam (1995a), however, noted that Internet users are no different than non-Internet users in their civic engagement, and even believes that the Internet may diminish social capital.

*Interpersonal Trust*

Robert Putman (1995a) asserts that the concept of social capital presumes that the more we connect with other people, the more we trust them, and vice versa. Likewise, Simmel (1950) wrote, “trust is one of the most important synthetic forces within society” and is a central tenet in the social capital concept (as cited in Newton, 2001, p.202). Uslaner (2002) said, “trust as a moral resource leads us to look beyond our own kind. It means we downplay bad experiences and cooperate even when we are not sure that others will oblige.” Fukuyama (1995) contends that social trust is needed to achieve collective prosperity. Here, trust can be defined as “the actor’s belief that, at worst, others will not knowingly or wittingly do him harm, and at best, that they will act in his interests” (Newton, 2001, p.202). Bates (1988) writes, “trust is a rational gamble that cooperation
with others will ultimately pay off as well as a commitment to ‘prosocial’ behavior even if others don’t always reciprocate.”

There are two types of trust: particularized trust and generalized trust (Yamigichi & Yamigichi, 1994). While particularized trust has to do with people in one’s own community or one’s acquaintances, generalized trust is trust in strangers. This study will employ the “generalized trust” definition. As Uslaner (2002) writes, “If societies are to do more than reproduce themselves, if they are to prosper, they must interact with others. And they must make the rational gamble that others are trustworthy.”

Indeed, that trust influences civic participation is largely beyond dispute (Greeley, 1996; Verba, Scholzman, Brady, 1995; as cited in Uslaner, 1997). People who trust others are simply more likely to participate in volunteer work and give to charity, as well as participate politically. Because of this, the decline of trust in modern American society is strongly linked to noted declines in civic engagement (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Putnam, 1995b; Uslaner, 1997). Putnam (2000) asserted that civic engagement and trust have slipped together. Studies have shown that trust in other people has fallen from 58 percent in 1960 to 35 percent in the mid 1990’s (Uslaner, 1997). Likewise, some research has shown that Americans belong to fewer voluntary organizations, vote less often, volunteer less, and give a smaller share of gross national product to charity (Knack, 1992; Putnam, 1995a, 1995b, as cited in Uslaner, 1993, pp. 96-97). While the decline of interpersonal trust and its importance is not disputed, the reasons for why trust has declined is much more controversial. Rahn and Transue (1998) note that material preoccupations among young people severely erodes trust in other people. Putnam
blames media consumption for this decline in trust and civic engagement. Uslaner (1993), however, rejects this view and in support of media contends that trust depends on optimism in the future, and decreasing optimism has led to decreased trust, which eventually leads to decreased civic engagement (Uslaner, 1998).

*Personal Contentment*

While civic participation and trust comprise the “virtuous cycle” of social capital, some research suggests that satisfaction with one’s life may be a third component of the cycle. Research has linked life contentment to democratic stability and participation in collective action. Additionally, researchers contend that this provides a motive for and benefit of civic volunteerism (Cohen, 1993; Schaller & Cialdini, 1998; Scheufele & Shah, 2000). Some studies support this assertion. For example, personal contentment can predict participation in labor unions (Cohen, 1993; Harlow & Cantor, 1996). Additionally, some literature supports the assertion that social integration and participation are determinants of life satisfaction (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Strong ties have also been shown between civic engagement and personal contentment. Some studies on volunteerism suggest that a motive for participation is “to feel good and boost self-esteem” (Omoto & Snyder, 1995, p.671) (Motivations for volunteer work will be discussed further later in this literature review.) Life contentment and interpersonal trust are also related, and studies have shown that dissatisfaction could lead individuals to question the honesty of people around them (Andersen, 1985; Patterson, 1982). Still other scholars claim that satisfaction begins with trust (Swords, 1998, as cited in Scheufele & Shah, 2000, p.114).
Like interpersonal trust, studies show that life contentment has dropped. Rates of both depression and suicide are all at all-time highs (Rutter & Smith, 1995, as cited by Shah, 2001, p.142). Specifically, younger people are less satisfied than their parents. Uslaner (1998) argues that increased levels of pessimism and dissatisfaction explain the erosion of social capital, rather than media use. He goes on to argue, “a worldview that reflects satisfaction with one’s personal life, socioeconomic circumstances, and value system is central to the maintenance of social capital” (Uslaner, 1998, as cited in Scheufele & Shah, 2000, p.114).

Civic Participation

Theorists such as de Tocqueville, J.S. Mill, Durkheim, Simmel, Tonnies, and Kornhauser have pointed out the social benefits that accompany membership in voluntary organizations (Newton, 2001). The basis of this argument is that citizen involvement in the community and its voluntary activities teaches “habits of the heart” (Bellah et al., 1985, as cited in Newton, 2001, p.202) of social behavior—trust, reciprocity, solidarity, and cooperation. Participating in community projects and volunteering reinforce norms of obligation and cooperation, and encourage further involvement in community life (Putnam, 1995a, 1995b). For the purposes of this research, volunteering has been isolated as a form of civic engagement. There is evidence that both giving and volunteering encourage other types of civic involvement (Smith, 1994). Additionally, volunteering and giving have been associated with increased political involvement (Verba et al., 1995; Wilson, 2000, as cited in Jones, 2006, p.250). According to Jones (2006) both charitable giving and
volunteerism represent “distinct forms of civic engagement that together should encourage a well-balanced democracy where citizens actively support public concerns and engage in civic life” (p.262). Indeed, there is room in the literature for further studies about the Internet and civic participation in the form of volunteerism rather than political engagement.

**Media Use and Social Capital**

Social scientists have long debated the relationship between media exposure and the likelihood to become involved and engaged in the community (Almond & Verba, 1963; Coleman, 1990; Habermas, 1979; Inglehart, 1997; Taylor, 1989; Tonnies, 1940, as cited in Shah et al., 2001). In citing the importance of media, Gerbner (1967) said,

“[t]his broad public making significance of mass media of communications—the ability to create publics, define issues, provide common terms of reference, and thus to allocate attention and power—has evoked a large number of theoretical contributions” (p.45).

Putnam, supported by his studies of television viewing, is an advocate of television’s role in declining social capital. His arguments are based on two ideas. The time displacement theory (Finhoult & Sproull, 1990; James, Wotring, & Forrest, 1995) asserts that new communication replaces old communication because people have limited time. He asserts that time spent with television erodes social capital at the expense of other daily activities. Additionally, Putnam claimed that individuals who
regularly interact with each other in face-to-face settings are socialized to the norms of reciprocity, gain, and generate interpersonal trust, which spills over into trust of the government, and will then generate participation in civic and community affairs. When Americans are less likely to interact with each other, social capital declines.

Through his analysis, time spent with television eroded at this obligatory face-to-face time. Scholarship to support this hypothesis is mixed. For example, Moy, Schuefele, and Holbert (1999) found that while people who watched more television were less likely to be civically active, time displacement was not the critical variable in the process.

Putnam’s second explanation for why television viewership eroded at social capital is a result of cultivation theory. Cultivation helps to explain the relationship between media consumption and community participation. Cultivation theorists contend heavy media users (readers or viewers) are guided by the media in their views of the world (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1980). Very simply put, the cultivation effect refers to the influence of media on people’s attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions. Many scholars contend that time spent with the media cultivates the belief that the world is a bad place, thus encouraging social withdrawal (Gerbner et al., 1980; Hawkins & Pingree, 1981). This skewed social reality cultivated by media use in turn diminishes civic participation through depleted trust and social anomie. Nie and Erbring (2000) extend this to the Internet age when they say that use of the Internet depletes both trust and community participation. Other scholars argue that media has positive effects on political and civic participation, and call the
previous arguments “intuitively appealing yet simplistic” (Shah et al., 2001, p.465). These scholars argue that it is not merely time spent with the media that affects participation, but rather the type of medium as well as the reasons for using it.

Putnam (2000) found television accounts for as much as 25 percent of the decline in civic engagement since 1965. Norris (1996) argued that looking at individual aspects of television use would help to understand it. Scholars have since differentiated between television news, and entertainment, as well as the time spent with each. Indeed, Pasek, Kenski, Romer, & Jamieson (2006) determined that time spent watching television was negatively related to civic activity overall, but specific forms of television (both news and entertainment) was positively related to civic activity.

Newspapers, which have traditionally been reliable indicators of civic engagement and political knowledge, have enjoyed far less popularity, especially among young people, in recent years (Putnam, 2000). Pasek et al. (2006) found the ability of newspapers to produce knowledge in young people (Chaffee & Frank, 1996) does not transfer to civic action. Overall, in their comprehensive examination of media use in young people, Pasek et al. (2006) found media use is associated with greater involvement in both civic activities and the political process. Though some uses of media were negatively related to each outcome, the overall effects of media were positive. There was also support, however, that heavy media use can interfere with knowledge acquisition and the opportunity for action (Pasek et al., 2006). More importantly, they described how voluntary activity is a precursor to later political
engagement.

As soon as the Internet gained popularity, social scientists were studying its effects on community participation (Schuefele & Shah, 2000, Shah, Kwak, & Holbert, 2001). The Internet is seen as having a unique ability to communicate across space and time, providing much needed reinvigoration of civic engagement (Weber, Loumakis, & Bergman, 2000). Indeed, Tambini (1999) claimed that civic networks could use the Internet to rejuvenate citizens through accessing information, preference measurement, deliberation, and will formation (connecting people of similar interests).

Kraut, Scherlis, Patterson, Kiesler, & Mukhopadhyay (1998) asserted, “like watching television, using a home computer and the Internet generally implies physical inactivity and limited face-to-face social interaction” (p.1019). Putnam’s work, though it has been widely accepted and has led to various empirical studies, has elicited questions about the reasons for declining social capital. Nie and Erbring (2000) found that time spent on the Internet is negatively correlated with time spent with family and friends, which could lead to diminished civic interaction. Uslaner (2004), on the other hand, said, “Internet users are not social isolates...[and that] they tend to have wider social circles than nonusers” (p.223). Pasek et al. (2006) determined that searching the Internet for information has a positive effect on both civic activity and political knowledge. Shah, Schmierbach, Hawkins, Espino, & Donavan (2002) found that time spent online had a positive relationship with public attendance and civic volunteerism. Additionally, they found no evidence of
time displacement from frequency of Internet use. Dutta-Bergman (2006) found individuals living in communities with Internet access are more likely to be involved in local community organizations than those living in non-access communities. In analyzing data regarding the 2000 presidential campaign, Shah, Cho, Eveland, & Kwak (2005) found that online information seeking (the web as both a resource and a forum) both strongly influence civic engagement. Claims about the influence of media on civic engagement, however, have focused more upon how much individuals use the Internet rather than how they use it. Drawing upon the uses and gratifications approach and testing the ways in which college students use the Internet, researchers can begin understanding whether Internet use will lead to volunteerism.

According to Dutta-Bergman (2006), scholars are mistaken in taking a homogeneous approach to conceptualizing the relationship between media consumption and community participation. As he explains, the consumption of media is not a homogeneous experience, and different individuals consume media to satisfy different needs. Norris (1996) asserted that studying media effects only by time spent with the media is “drawn in black-and-white terms, as though there is one television experience, rather than multiple channels and programs, and one audience, rather than different types of viewers” (p.475). Therefore, the functions served by a specific medium are a better predictor of civic engagement than time spent on the actual medium. The question remains, then, of what effect Internet use has on likelihood to participate in one’s local community and contribute to social
Clearly, a further investigation into the uses and gratifications of media use is necessary to begin to understand the reasons for individuals’ use of the Internet.

**Uses and Gratifications Theory**

Research on uses and gratifications has attempted to provide an understanding of the relationship between patterns of media use and civic engagement. The uses and gratifications approach examines how the audience uses mass media to satisfy social and psychological needs. According to this perspective, audiences actively select among media based on their ability to gratify their needs. Some of the needs that can be filled by media use are explained in detail below:

*Cognitive needs:* for information, knowledge, and understanding of the environment

*Affective needs:* for aesthetic, pleasurable, and emotional experiences

*Personal integrative needs:* for credibility, confidence, stability, and personal status

*Social integrative needs:* for contact with family, friends, and the world.

*Escapist needs:* for escape, diversion, and tension release.

According to Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch (1974), interest in the gratifications provided by media to their audiences begins with early empirical mass communication research. Examples cited by Ruggiero (2000, p.4) include Herzog’s (1944) research on quiz programs and soap operas, Suchman’s (1942) research on the motives for listening to music on radio, Wofle and Fiske’s (1949) research on children’s interest in comics, and Berelson’s (1949) research on newspaper...
reading. Though these studies paved the way for future research, they neglected to explore links between gratifications and the origins of the needs that were satisfied. Additionally, they failed to search for interrelationships among various media functions. In other words, they were purely descriptive studies, attempting to classify audience responses into categories. Therefore, they did not result in a detailed picture of media gratifications. According to most scholars, early research on uses and gratifications had very little theoretical coherence (McQuail, 1994). It was not until the 1960s that researchers began to identify and operationalize many social and psychological variables presumed to be precursors to different types of consumption and gratifications (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997). 

Blumler and Katz (1974) presented uses and gratifications as a way of looking at media in terms of how it met the needs of individuals using them. There were five assumptions associated with the original uses and gratifications approach. First, that the audience is an active participant in the communication process. Second, users are goal-oriented in their media usage, the ultimate goal to fill their needs through media. Third, mass media competes with other sources to gratify the needs of users. Fourth, many goals about media use can be taken from self-reported audience data. Finally, value judgments about the cultural significance of mass communication should be put on hold until further study (Blumler & Katz, 1974). Though much research has been done that has uncovered regular patterns of consumption and fulfillment that contrast information and surveillance motives with entertainment (McQuail, 1985; Norris & Jones, 1998; Shah et al., 2001),
informational motives for media use in particular have received attention regarding civic engagement. Specifically, scholars believe that informational motives for using media are tied to political knowledge and awareness of civic opportunities (Eveland, Shah, & Kwak, 2003). The consensus among researchers is that informational motives for using media have pro-civic consequences. For example, McCleod, Daily, Guo, Eveland, Bayer, & Yang (1996) and McCleod, Schuëfle, & Moy (1999) found that newspaper reading and local news viewing are related to civic participation.

Likewise, individuals who use the Internet to gather news and explore interests have been shown to be more engaged (Shah et al., 2001). This can potentially be attributed to the immediacy of the Internet, its ability to allow various viewpoints, to customize content, and to elaborate on issues of greater concern (Davis, 1999; Jones, 1995, as cited in Shah et al., 2001). These benefits will make it easier for users to attain the benefits they seek out in using the Internet. They will be knowledgeable when they communicate with others, which increases opportunities to discuss issues, express their views, and recruit people into civic life (Shah et al., 2005).

According to these authors, there is one additional explanation: the “communication mediation model” (Sotirovic & McLeod, 2001). This model dictates that the effects of media on participation are indirect, where information uses of media influence participation through their effects on discussion and reflection (in this case, about politics.) In addition, the interactive nature of the Internet allows individuals to share perspectives and concerns with others through email, instant messaging, and chats (Price & Capella, 2002). Shah et al. (2001) proposed that communication among citizens is an intervening variable between news consumption and civic
participation. From this theoretical framework, and national panel survey data, they found that informational use of media directly influences this discussion, which then shaped political participation. Indeed, they found this information to be extremely relevant to young Americans who are active media consumers yet disengaged from public life.

**Uses and Gratifications and the Internet**

Kaye and Medoff (2001) refer to the Internet as a cross between television and a computer. This has been enforced by studies showing that motives for web use are similar to motives for television use, namely entertainment, escapism, and social interaction (Eighmey, 1997; Ferguson & Perse, 2000; Kaye, 1998; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000, as cited in Kaye & Johnson, 2002, p.56). Despite this similarity, there are also some fundamental differences, the most prominent of which is the interactivity associated with the web. Regular patterns of gratifications have emerged, though some researchers have claimed that the interactive nature of the Internet may require the development of a new typology for media uses and gratifications (Norris & Jones, 1998). For example, Norris and Jones said the web will never be a mass media in terms of a “shared experience” and distinguished four types of Internet users: “researchers” (spend time online doing research for work or school), “home consumers” (spend time online doing practical tasks, such as finding information about travel, stock quotes, and finances), “political expressives” (spend time in online discussions about politics), and “party animals” (spend time with games and entertainment information.) Norris and Jones found that “researchers”
were more politically knowledgable than other Internet users, while “party animals” may not experience the civic benefits of the Internet. The thought is that “researchers” may come across more information and encounter increased opportunities for civic activities, whereas people who go online to socialize may experience poorer and fewer social relationships (Krat et al., 1998). Therefore, it seems important to explore patterns of Internet use: not only the time spent online, but also people’s reasons for going online, and then analyze these relationships in relation to individual-level social capital.

According to Kaye & Johnson (2002) the Internet could be particularly well suited to the uses and gratifications approach. The two-way nature of the Internet requires the audience to be active. Additionally, individuals using the web will actively search for information by clicking on links and using search engines, thus indicating that the web is goal oriented and that users are aware of the needs they are attempting to satisfy (Lin & Jeffres, 1998, as cited by Kaye & Johnson, 2002, p.56). Finally, because there is so much material available online, users should be able to fill a variety of needs (Kaye, 1998). To this end, scholars have also suggested that different functions of the Internet serve different needs.

The second part of the present study focuses on one important aspect of social capital: volunteerism. It focuses on the motivations for volunteer work, with the application of the functional theory to describe volunteer motivations. With an understanding of volunteerism and volunteer motives, gratifications for Internet use
and individual level social capital indicators will be applied to attempt a better understanding of why college students volunteer (or do not volunteer).

**Volunteerism**

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 60.8 million people volunteered through or for an organization at least once between September 2006 and September 2007. This accounts for more than 26 percent of the American population. Additionally, the incidence of volunteer work has increased more than 170 percent, from 22 million in 1964 to 61.2 million in 2006 (Independent Sector, 2006). The annual 15 billion hours of formal volunteering has an estimated value of $182 billion (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). Still, noticeable decreases in interpersonal trust, personal contentment, and overall social capital threaten these burgeoning numbers. Many researchers believe there is much room for improvement (Houle, 2005).

Research on volunteerism is extensive. That people would contribute significant time and energy to helping other people without pay has long been an interest of social scientists (e.g. Batson, 1991; Eisenberg, 1986; Latane & Darley, 1970; Piliavin, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 1981; Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio, & Piliavin, 1995; Staub, 1978). Indeed, De Toqueville (1835), in his writings on democracy in America, said volunteers become essential intermediary communities between the mass of individuals and the institutions of government. He further claimed that volunteerism helped to create a “generalized trust—a trust that extends beyond the boundaries of kinship and friendship—on which democratic political life depends” (Wilson & Musick, 1999, p.142).
There are three main approaches to the definition of volunteerism. The first type of volunteerism is unexpected situations in which help is offered to strangers, reflecting the altruistic motivation of the person who offers it. Referred to as “spontaneous helping,” it is usually in the event of an emergency and therefore short in duration. Examples of this type of volunteer work can be seen in the support offered by Americans during such tragedies as September 11, 2001 or Hurricane Katrina. Perhaps the best-known example of this type of volunteer work is in Latane and Darley’s (1970) bystander intervention study, where they found that the presence of others inhibits spontaneous helping in emergencies. Some researchers have proposed that such helping reflects humanitarian concerns and altruistic personalities (Carlo, Eisenberg, Troyer, Switzer, & Speer, 1991; Rushton, 1984). Other answers involve claims about motivation, where people are motivated by selfish concerns (Archer, Diaz-Loving, Gollwitzer, 1981).

The second line of research in volunteerism concerns continuous and prolonged situations of helping, which is planned and involves people who are known to one another. This “obligatory” helping (Omoto & Snyder, 1995) is generally the result of legal, ethical or familial obligations that tie the helper to the recipient. Research has focused on the nature of this care giving and the tolls among the people involved, such as coping strategies, resources, and stress-related outcomes of people who provide sustained care giving (e.g. Cohen & Eisdorfer, 1988; Coyne & Smith, 1991; Folkman, Chesney, Cooke, Boccellari, & Collette, 1994; George & Gwyther, 1986; Schulz, Tompkins, & Rau, 1988; Thompson, Bundek &

The third line of research and the one most relevant to this study is volunteer work, which is defined as voluntary, sustained, and ongoing helpfulness (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998) and “calls for considerably more planning, sorting out of priorities, and matching of personal capabilities and interest with type of intervention” (Benson, Dehority, Garman, Hanson, Hochschwender, Lebold, Rohr, & Sullivan, 1980, p.89). Volunteerism combines features from both spontaneous helping and obligated caregiving. This line of research also raises questions about personality, motivations, and the mechanisms of sustaining help. According to Omoto and Snyder (1995), there is remarkably little research on this type of volunteerism, considering its potential to engage a very wide range of theoretical questions. According to Clary et al. (1998) volunteers actively (a) seek out opportunities to help others, (b) may deliberate for considerable amounts of time about whether to volunteer, the extent of their involvement, and which activities to consider, and (c) may make a commitment to an ongoing helping relationship.

Recent years have seen a significant increase in the number of college students who donate their time to volunteer work. Some researchers noted a general trend away from altruism during the 1970s and 1980s (Astin, 1991; Astin, Green & Korn, 1987; Levin, 1980, 1993). And since 1990, the inclination of students to say that there is a "very good chance" that they will be volunteers in college has
risen from 14.2 to 19.3 percent (Astin, 1998). Data from the UCLA annual Freshman Survey (2003) show that volunteerism has been on the rise over the past decade, with a record high of 82.6 percent of college freshmen in 2002 participating in volunteer work during their last year of high school. Even though some of this work is a one-time effort, a full 70.2 percent do so on a weekly basis (Sax, 2002). Additionally, the rise in pre-college volunteerism has been accompanied by a parallel increase in students’ intentions to volunteer during college.

There are many potential explanations for this rise in service within the past 20 years. First, there are an increasing number of service programs supported by the government (Kahne and Westheimer, 1996; Keith, 1994; Levine, 1994; O’Brien, 1993). President Clinton signed the National Community Service Trust Act of 1993 with the hope of engaging Americans in community service. A key component of this initiative was the opportunity for individuals to earn awards of $4,725 for college educational expenses. Additionally, the Community Service Provision of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1992 required all institutions receiving student work-study funds to allocate a minimum of five percent of the funds received to community service placements.

A second explanation is an increasing number of service learning opportunities at elementary and secondary schools (Eberly, 1993; Fiske, 2002). According to General Colin Powell, the founding chairman of America’s Promise, “Service-learning is a particularly fertile way of involving young people in community service, because it ties helping others to what they are learning in the
classroom. In the process it provides a compelling answer to the perennial question: ‘Why do I need to learn this stuff?’ The thought behind service-learning is that it will support the development of committed, thoughtful citizens who will provide a solid foundation for democracy (Putnam, 1993). Still other studies have observed the effects of service on students’ growth (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Increasingly, foundations, corporations, and the public are supporting the efforts of colleges and universities in expanding community service and service-learning opportunities. Accompanying this growth is an increase in related theoretical and empirical scholarship. Though the concept of service-learning is old in the sense that it “incorporates traditional principles of apprenticeship and builds on educational traditions variously described in experimental learning, project-based learning, and hands-on learning that began to spread in the late 19th and early 20th centuries,” (Fiske, 2002, p.21), it is new in that it links the concept of community service with school curricula. Studies have shown that undergraduate students who participated in the service learning section of a political science course were more likely to report that they had performed up to their potential, had learned to apply principles from the course to new situations, and had developed a greater awareness of societal problems (Markus Howard, & King, 1993).

Finally, more high schools require community service before graduation (Eberly, 1993; Fiske, 2002, Keith, 1994). In 1999, almost half of public high schools offered formal service-learning programs as part of the curriculum (Skinner & Chapman, 1999) and 89 percent of sixth through twelfth graders attended schools
that arranged service opportunities for them (Kleiner & Chapman, 2000). 5.1 million of these students were required to do this community service. According to McLellan & Youniss (2003), empirical findings have only weakly supported the arguments on behalf of service (Conrad & Hedin, 1981; Mechior, 1997; Newmann & Rutter, 1983; Sclaes & Blyth, 1999, as cited by McLellan & Youniss, 2003).

The types of students who are likely to volunteer have also been the subjects of research. In support of their hypothesis, Burns, Toncar, Reid, Anderson, Wells, Fawcett, & Gruben (2005) found that students attending different types of universities possess differing motivations to volunteer, implying that it is beneficial for human service agencies or nonprofit organizations to adapt their recruiting techniques to the collegiate background of potential volunteers. In his dissertation, Hobfoll (1980) attempted to compare the personality and attitudes of undergraduate mental health workers with those of non volunteers to determine if a more purely defined group of volunteers presented the prosocial personality and attitude profile found in previous research and to examine changes in these characteristics as a result of working as tutors for children. Trudeau and Devlin (2006) examined the volunteer versus non volunteer status of 124 college students by looking at motivation, gender, extraversion-introversion, and social anxiety, and discovered that female volunteers had a higher interest in volunteering than male non volunteers. Overall, however, there is significant lack of research on what motivates college students to become involved in community service and volunteer work.
Motivations to Volunteer

Motivation is of crucial importance in the study of volunteers in nonprofit organizations. Farrell, Johnston, & Twynam (1998) said managers should understand volunteer motivation along with the volunteering experience in order to effectively respond to management needs in the areas of recruitment, retention, and daily operations in nonprofit organizations. Further, understanding motivation can help explain the differences between volunteers who continue serving and those who abandon their activities, which can then aid in volunteer retention (Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). Lyman (1991) asserted that motivation refers to “the set of personal forces that causes people to behave in certain ways or do something” (p.6). In the present study, volunteer motivation is the group of reasons that cause people to want to engage in voluntary service. Scholarship shows that people engage in volunteer activity to satisfy important personal and social needs and goals. Further, research has shown that many individuals are pursuing more than one set of goals through their volunteer activity.

Esmond (1997) professed that the question of what motivates a person to volunteer is a complex one. Thoitis and Hewitt (2001) found that volunteer hours increase happiness, life satisfaction, mastery, and physical health. Grieshop (1985) found that “although volunteers give altruism as the reason for their wish to participate when asked directly...responses to a more in-depth questionnaire show a mix of incentives with material incentives as most prominent (p.226). Bequette (1990), through in-depth interviews, found that each interviewee showed results that correlated with altruism as a motivating factor. Schindler-Rainman and Lippit (1977) created a methodology that sought to demonstrate forces that a) cause people to volunteer, b) inhibit them from
volunteering, c) increase the likelihood of continued service, d) increase commitment, or
e) cause them to drop out of volunteer service.

Three distinct models classify the research behind volunteer motivation. The first
is the two-factor model, first developed by Horton-Smith (1981). The two motives that
characterize volunteer motivations are altruism and egoism. Theories emphasizing
egoism assert that motives for volunteering are self-seeking, whereas theories
emphasizing altruism maintain that volunteers act primarily to help others (Martin, 1994).

Altruistic Motivation

While most theories were egoistic, recent scholarship has discussed altruistic motives
Wakefield, 1993, as cited in Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1997). Indeed, Wakefield
(1993) claimed that altruism is the very foundation of humanitarianism and should be
more integrated into theories of motivation. Altruism is defined as an “aspect of human
motivation that is present to the degree that the individual derives intrinsic satisfaction or
psychic rewards for attempting to optimize the intrinsic satisfaction of one or more other
persons without the conscious expectation of participating in an exchange relationship
whereby those others would be obligated to make similar or related satisfaction
optimization efforts in return (Smith, 1981, p.23).

Studies by Frisch and Gerrard (1981) and Gillespie and King (1985) involving
Red Cross volunteers reinforced this two-factor model. In 1987, Frisch aimed his study at
understanding the motives of college students. He developed a 20-item scale that
involved three rather than two motives: altruism, egoism, and social obligation.
Howell and Mui’s (1989) research with senior volunteers produced a similar three-factor model. Refuting these claims, however, Piliavin and Charng (1990) said a truly altruistic act does not actually exist and asserted that all acts can be found to have selfish motives.

Though the two-factor model paved the way for future research on the motivations of volunteers, it did have limitations. It was generally not based on empirical evidence, it involved small sample sizes confined to one group or organization, and it didn’t consider the relationship between different motives.

_Egoistic Motivation_

Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Motivation Theory states that behavior is caused by a belief that it will result in a desired reward or goal. Three factors that affect behavior are the need for achievement (taking pride in an accomplishment), the need for affiliation (concern for one’s relationships with others), and the need for power (having an influence or impact on others.) The degree of motivation is influenced by the intensity of the needs and the degree of satisfaction anticipated. Mounter (1985) used the Expectancy Motivation Theory to assess the motivations of county extension volunteers (as cited in Winniford et al., 1997, p.136). Volunteers scored highest on affiliation, followed by achievement and power. Miller (1985) found that volunteers in social service agencies whose regular employment failed to satisfy their needs for psychological growth tended to be involved in volunteering (as cited by Winniford et al., 1997, p.137).

Maslow’s Heirarchy of Human Needs also emphasizes egoism. It states that people are motivated by unmet needs which involve physiological well-being, safety, security, love and belonging, self-esteem, and self-actualization (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).
Knowles (1972) stated that volunteerism is not simply a way to serve society but rather a means for nurturing self-actualized human beings (as cited by Winniford et al., 1997, p.137).

Herzberg’s Motivation/Hygeine Theory states that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are uni-polar, and therefore the factors that produce them are separate. Motivators are achievement, recognition, the work, responsibility, and advancement. Factors leading to dissatisfaction are policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary. Gidron (1983) applied this theory to job satisfaction among volunteers, and found that overall job satisfaction is related to two facets of job content: work and achievement, and two facets of job context: convenience and absence of job stress factors.

**Mixed Motivation**

The second model is the unidimensional model, which was developed by Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) when they conducted an extensive review of literature related to volunteer motivation. Their findings helped to create the Motivation to Volunteer Scale (MTV), consisting of 28 items. They concluded that volunteers have both altruistic and egoistic motivations, and that it is the combination of these that cause people to act on volunteering.

The Social Exchange Theory states that all interactions are based upon an exchange of costs and rewards (Phillips, 1982). While the initial motivation to volunteer may be altruistic, the decision to continue hinges on egoist rewards (Phillips, 1982; Rubin & Thorelli, 1984, as cited by Winniford et al., 1997, p.139).
Social Obligation focuses on the repayment of debt to society. In studying the motivations of college student volunteers, Fitch (1987) classified motives into egoistic, altruistic, and social obligation categories. Some researchers attribute motivation to volunteer to “situational factors,” such as demographics. For example, Gillespie and King (1985) found that a greater proportion of older individuals (over 35) volunteered to help others or contribute to society, whereas younger volunteers work to gain job training and skills.

The multifactor model (Esmond & Dunlop, 2004) is based on functional analysis and theorizing on motivation. Functional analysis of volunteerism proposes that though acts of volunteerism are similar on the surface, they reflect different motivational processes. Additionally, it proposes that the functions served by volunteering influence initiation and maintenance of the voluntary behavior of volunteerism. Clary et al. (1998) suggest that the key themes of functional analyses that have contributed to understanding attitude functions in the past can also help to understand the various motivations for volunteer activity (Clary & Snyder, 1991; Snyder & Omoto, 1992). Because volunteer work is time consuming, unpaid, and sometimes very trying, researchers were extremely interested in the internal, psychological forces that move people to become involved in volunteer activity.

**The Functional Approach**

Two main theoretical approaches have been applied to volunteerism: the Theory of Planned Behavior and the Functional Approach. The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1988) proposes that people make decisions rationally by systematically using
accessible information. It hypothesizes further that the causal antecedents of behavior are a logical sequence of cognitions (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). The immediate antecedent of behavior is the person’s intention to perform it. Intentions are proposed to be a function of three determinants: attitude (the overall evaluation of performing the behavior), subjective norm (reflects perceived social pressure to perform), and perceived behavioral control (reflects the extent to which the person perceives the behavior to be under control. Warburton and Terry (2000) provided support for the application of this theory to predicting volunteerism.

The functional approach in psychology has existed for more than a century (e.g. Angell, 1907; Dewey, 1896; James, 1890, as cited in Houle, 2005, p.1). Recent scholarship has reinforced its importance in understanding the motives behind volunteering (e.g. Clary et al., 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1991, 1995, 1999; Clary, Snyder, & Ridge, 1992; Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1996; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Omoto, Snyder, & Berghuis, 1993; Snyder, 1993; Snyder, Clary, & Stukas, 2000; Snyder & Omoto, 1992a, 1992b). Early functional theorists claim that the functional approach seeks to understand the psychological and social needs and goals, plans, and motives that individuals are attempting to satisfy through their beliefs and behaviors (Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). More recently, Clary and Snyder (1991) defined functional analysis as being “concerned with the reasons and purposes that underlie and generate psychological phenomena—the personal and social needs, plans, goals, and functions being served by people’s beliefs and their actions” (p.123). The main assertion of the approach is that attitudes serve different functions for different individuals, and that it is vital to
understand the functional bases of people’s attitudes in order to understand how to change these attitudes (Smith et al., 1956).

The functional approach can be used to ascertain people’s motivations for volunteering, and also in matching the volunteer task to motivation in hopes of encouraging benefits and eventual longevity. Houle et al. (2005) assert that volunteers are drawn toward activities that will satisfy their motives, and therefore expected that certain motives be identified with certain tasks. Their study on whether individuals prefer tasks that match their motivational needs supported this assertion. Their findings suggested that organization should make an array of tasks available that would satisfy particular motivations and also that more latitude should be given to volunteers in choosing specific tasks. Indeed, an accurate reading of the motivations of potential and current volunteers can also help contribute to recruitment and retention efforts.

**The Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI)**

Clary et al. (1998) discovered that previous research on volunteers’ motivations is compatible with motivations suggested by functional theorizing, even though the studies they encountered were designed to investigate the functional approach to motivation. Using the taxonomies of Katz (1960) and Smith et al. (1956) regarding attitude functions, Clary and his team crafted a list of six motivational functions served by volunteering.

1. **Values**: The values function focuses on the opportunities that volunteerism provides to express values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns. It is related to Katz’s (1960) value expressive function and Smith et al.’s (1956) quality of expressiveness function. In these functions, concern for others is a common characteristic of volunteers
(Anderson & Moore, 1978), distinguishes volunteers from non-volunteers (Allen & Rushton, 1983), and predicts whether volunteers will complete their service (Clary & Miller, 1986; Clary & Orenstein, 1991). When more than 70 percent of respondents cited “to help others” as a reason for volunteering, Anderson and Moore (1978) provided empirical evidence for the values function (as cited in Clary et al., 1998).

2. Understanding: The understanding function focuses on the opportunity that volunteerism affords volunteers to learn and exercise knowledge, skills, and abilities. They are related to the knowledge and object appraisal functions in attitude and persuasion theories. Gidron (1978) observed this function in working with volunteers at health and mental health institutions that expected to receive benefits related to self-development and learning (as cited in Clary et al., 1998).

3. Social: The social function concerns relationships with others in that volunteering may present opportunities to be with friends or partake in activity that is viewed favorably by important others. It is related to Smith et al.’s (1956) social adjustive function. Rosenhan (1970) observed this function in his research on civil rights activists whose efforts were guided by concerns over rewards and punishments. Additionally, Piliavin, Evans, and Callero (1984) investigated motives for donating blood and found that some people donate blood because of social motives, thus providing evidence for the social function (as cited in Clary et al., 1998).

4. Career: The career function concerns career related benefits stemming from volunteer work. It is related to the utilitarian function (Katz, 1960). An example is Jenner’s (1982) study of Junior League volunteers, 15 percent of whom perceived volunteering to be a
start of a new career. Additionally, Beale (1984) suggested when students are encouraged to volunteer, the experiences can serve as a “stepping stones” to employment (as cited in Clary et al., 1998).

5. **Protective**: The protective function centers on protecting the ego from negative features of the self. In particular, it focuses on volunteer work as minimizing guilt over being more fortunate than others. It is related to the ego defensive function (Katz, 1960) and externalization (Smith et al., 1956). Frisch and Gerard (1981) found some Red Cross volunteers reported that they volunteer to escape from negative feelings. Schwartz and Clausen (1970) studied bone marrow volunteers, and found individuals had a greater level of commitment to volunteer when personal responsibility for others was high (as cited in Clary et al., 1998).

6. **Enhancement**: The enhancement function involves the motivational process that centers on the ego’s growth and development, as opposed to the protective function’s focus on escaping negative feelings. With this motivation, volunteering serves to enhance one’s self esteem, self-confidence, and self-improvement. Many studies (Holzberg, Gewirtz, & Ebner, 1964; King, Walder, & Pavey, 1970, as cited in Houle et al., 2005) provide support for the enhancement function.

With a list of six motivational functions, Clary and his team created an instrument to measure the functions served by volunteerism. The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) was first administered to 500 active volunteers in diverse forms of volunteer service. They were presumed that people possess motivations for volunteering that are salient, accessible, and meaningful. The respondents were asked to indicate how important or
accurate each of the 30 possible reasons were for their volunteering, and scores resulted from averaging the five items for each motivation. The higher the respondent’s score, the greater the importance of the motivation to the respondent. The team did a factor analysis of responses to examine the structure of motivations for volunteering and evaluate the psychometric properties of the VFI as a measure of these motivations. The six components of the VFI were identified with Eigenvalues greater than one. The VFI was also tested with a more diverse sample of university students to ensure that the same six motivational factors would emerge when motivations were less salient. Again, the VFI was supported. Additionally, the VFI was administered at two different points in time (a one month interval) to assess test-reliability of VFI scores, and also used to look at not only recruiting, but also promoting satisfying experiences with volunteers and also maintaining retention rates of volunteers. The VFI represents one of the first measures of volunteer motivation to undergo extensive testing. The goal was an attempt to resolve inconsistencies in studies about volunteers’ motivations whose measures raised conceptual and methodological concerns (Clary & Snyder, 1991; Cnann & Goldberg-Glen, 1991).

understand what motivates their volunteers and whether they have management strategies to retain current volunteers and attract new ones. The VFI has emerged in the literature as the most reliable method of testing the motivations of college students to volunteer in the present study.

**Research Questions**

There is not enough theory to draw an established hypothesis from the literature reviewed above. Previous literature has shown that overall Internet use didn’t retain significant association with the dependent variables, however types of Internet usage (gratifications obtained through Internet use) emerged as predictors with distinct patterns. While the impact of Internet use on social capital has been measured in numerous studies, motivations for volunteering and their relation to social capital and Internet use has yet to be explored in the literature. There is no established theoretical framework to allow for a hypothesis. For this reason, the present study will seek to provide answers to three previously studied research questions:

RQ1: What Internet usage conditions are related to high levels of life contentment, interpersonal trust, and civic volunteerism among college students?

RQ2: What Internet usage conditions are related to lower levels of life contentment, social mistrust, and withdrawal from civic volunteerism among college students?

The present study will also explore a third research question that has not been previously studied, and therefore will remain a research question.
RQ3: What is the relationship between patterns of Internet use, life contentment, interpersonal trust, volunteer behavior, and motivations to volunteer?

Prior research has suggested that exploring the uses and gratifications of media can provide insight into social capital production. This study will analyze the relationship between Internet use and the production of social capital in a two steps. First, analysis will be conducted to examine the relationship between particular gratifications sought from Internet use and individual level social capital variables (life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism). The final stage of this study will analyze the relationship between Internet use, individual level social capital, and motivation for volunteering in order to answer the third research question.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

To answer the research questions, this study used a web-based survey (See Appendix B) to attempt to find relationships between the uses and gratifications sought by Internet use, overall time spent online daily, interpersonal trust, life contentment, volunteer behavior, and motivations for volunteering. It conceptualizes college students’ Internet use as a chain of events leading from gratifications sought, to Internet use, to trust and satisfaction, to volunteer behavior, to motivations for volunteering. The purpose of the survey is to generalize from a sample of the student population so that inferences can be made about the behavior and attitudes of a larger population (Babbie, 1990, as cited in Creswell, 2009, p.146). A cross-sectional web-based survey is an appropriate design for this line of research because it is relatively inexpensive, available to respondents at any time of the day for as long as it is online, and data turnaround is very fast. Additionally, college students generally have Internet access, and online surveys are shown to be most effective with a population that is known to have email or Internet access (Sue & Ritter, 2007). One source of frustration among respondents of online surveys is lack of computer knowledge (Dillman & Bowker, 2001, as cited in Sue & Ritter, 2007, p.59). The researcher assumes that college students will have adequate knowledge of computers so as to avoid this common frustration. Finally, in using web-based surveys, data entry is direct, which is more time effective for the researcher.
Research has shown that data quality from online surveys is the same or better than paper-based, telephone, or face-to-face surveys (Sue & Ritter, 2007). The research indicates that non-response rates in online surveys are lower than or similar to the rate in mail surveys. Sue and Ritter (2007) contend that although there is a great deal of research left to be done on web-based surveys, the research to date merits their recommendation of the medium.

I. Respondents and Procedures

Wimmer and Dominick (1997) stated, “multivariate studies always require larger samples than do univariate studies because they involve the analysis of multiple response data (several measurements on the same subject)” (p.73). Additionally, they stated the following guidelines for determining sample size: 50=very poor; 100=poor; 200=fair; 300=good; 500=very good; 1000=excellent (p.73). Taking these numbers into account, as well as time and financial constraints, 250 respondents was deemed an acceptable sample size for the current study. The respondents were a convenience sample of 258 undergraduate students enrolled at a large Midwestern university. The respondents were recruited during April 2009 to voluntarily participate in an online survey (see Appendix A for recruitment script). Some students in a particular large lecture class were promised extra credit upon completion of the online survey. All procedures were approved the university IRB. The survey measured the gratifications sought by Internet use and intensity of Internet use and their effects on the variables comprising social capital (life
contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior). Additionally, the survey measured respondents’ motivations for current, past, or future volunteer work.

II. The Survey

The web-based survey was administered through www.freeonlinesurveys.com. This online survey generator helped the researcher in creating the survey in an online capacity, as well as with mass distribution, data collection, and exportation. The 74-item questionnaire was posted online in April of 2009 and advertised to students in undergraduate large lecture classes for extra credit. The students were directed to the online survey’s URL through the course website on Blackboard. In the survey, four questions collected demographic information including age, year in school, gender, and GPA. Twenty-two items collected data regarding gratifications sought through Internet use. One question measured frequency of Internet use. Four questions measured current and intended future volunteer activity. Six questions measured interpersonal trust of respondents. Five questions measured the life satisfaction of respondents. Finally, 30 questions measured motivations for current or future volunteering. The survey concluded with four demographic questions.

**Control Variables.** Survey questions about gender, age, year in school, and GPA were included to determine possible links between demographic data and Internet use as well as likelihood to volunteer and volunteer motivation. Previous studies have shown that demographic variables, particularly age, gender, and education have an impact on the other variables in the study, and it is vital that each is studied
in the analysis (e.g. Anderson, 1996; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Fukuyama, 1999; Putnam, 2000; Shah et al., 1999, as cited in Shah, 2001, p.147). Gender was measured by (1) male and (2) female. Age was measured by simply asking respondents their age. Year in school was measured by (1) college freshman, (2) college sophomore, (3) college junior, (4) college senior, and (5) graduate student. Grade point average was measured by (1) 3.8-4.0, (2) 3.7-3.4, (3) 3.3-3.0, (4) 2.9-2.5, and (5) Below 2.0.

III. Operational Measures

Internet use gratifications. Gratifications in using the Internet were determined by replicating uses and gratifications measures used in a prior study (Vincent & Basil 1997; see Appendix C). They can be conceptually defined as needs filled by the use of the Internet. Seven-point, Likert-type scales were used. Respondents indicated their level of agreement with reasons for accessing the Internet. Possible responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). These measures served as independent variables. The items were factored by principal components analysis, and tested for reliability.

Daily Internet Consumption. Daily Internet usage was measured by asking respondents how many hours they are online in an average day. The mean answer was 3.44, between “1-3 hours per day” and “3-5 hours per day” (SD=1.02). According to the “time displacement” and “mean world” hypotheses, total time spent watching television would be negatively related to trust, contentment, and
civic volunteerism (e.g. Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Putnam, 1995a). In studies about Internet use, findings generally point to negative associations with the same variables (Kraut et al., 1998; Nie & Erbring, 2000).

**Interpersonal Trust.** The literature indicates that interpersonal trust is a key component in the likelihood that people will volunteer, give to charity, and participate in the political sector. It provides citizens the means to cooperate on joint problems, making it an important individual-level indicator of social capital (Shah et al., 2001). Measures for interpersonal trust were adopted from Rosenberg’s (1956) Faith in People Scale, which has been used with only minor variations in many major surveys (see Appendix E). Rosenberg was originally interested in the association between general political orientation and views on human nature. His (1956) scale has since been applied to much research on social capital (e.g. Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Putnam, 1995a, 1995b, 2000; Rahn, Brehm, & Carlson, 2000). The original material was two forced-choice statements: “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?” Because this is a double-barreled question, it has been broken down into five questions using a five-point scale (Burnes & Kinder, 2000) to achieve a similar effect in a more understandable manner for the respondents. These questions measure “generalized trust,” that is, confidence in strangers. This measure was chosen over measures for “particularized trust” since the literature indicates that generalized trust is a better indicator of a healthy society. Therefore, interpersonal trust was operationalized on the basis of answers to five questions: “Generally
speaking, would you say that people can be trusted?” “People will try to take advantage of you if they get the chance;” “People try to be fair;” “You can’t be too careful in dealing with people;” and “People try to be helpful.” A factor analysis was performed on the questions to verify the reliability of the interpersonal trust measure.

*Life Contentment.* Life contentment, along with interpersonal trust and participation, is another individual-level indicator of social capital. Research has connected life satisfaction to democratic stability and participation in collective action efforts. The level of personal contentment of subjects was assessed using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener, Emmons, Larson & Griffin, 1985; see Appendix D). The SWLS is designed to “assess a person’s global judgment of life satisfaction, which is theoretically predicted to depend on a comparison of life circumstances to one’s standards (Pavot & Diener, 1993, p.165). As a comprehensive measure, the SWLS does not assess satisfaction with individual factors, such as health or finances, but rather with an integration of these factors in whatever way the respondent sees fit (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Finally, the SWLS has been tested for both reliability and sensitivity. It has shown strong internal reliability and moderate temporal stability (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Diener et al.’s (1985) coefficient alpha of .87 and 2-month test-retest stability coefficient of .82 are impressive, and additional investigators have reported internal consistency and temporal reliability data with the scale (Pavot & Diener, 1993).
Contentment was operationalized on the basis of five statements: “In most ways, my life is close to ideal;” “The conditions of my life are excellent;” “I am satisfied with my life;” “So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life;” and “If I could live my time again, I would change almost nothing.” Factor analysis was performed on the life satisfaction questions to verify the reliability of the life satisfaction measure.

**Volunteering behavior.** Students’ volunteer behavior and likelihood of future volunteering were measuring using five single measure questions, taken from Mattis, Jagers, Hatcher, Lawhon, Murphy, and Murry’s (2000) study on volunteerism among African American men. Respondents were asked whether they are currently involved in any volunteer activities: (M=1.55, SD=.498) where (1) yes and (2) no. Respondents were asked how often they volunteer: (M=1.51, SD=.795) where (1) 0-10 hours/year, (2) 11-50 hours/year, (3) 51-100 hours/year and (4) more than 100 hours/year. Respondents were then asked whether they intend to volunteer in the coming year (M=4.07, SD=1.96) using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=not at all likely and 7=extremely likely). Respondents were also given ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions asking if they belong to a community organization or a social/political organization.

Scholars have consistently struggled with defining volunteerism. According to Carson (1999), “Even though volunteering has been a distinguishing feature of American society since its inception, scholars continue to struggle with how to accurately describe and measure it...Defining what is meant by volunteering and what activities are included is not an easy task (p.62). Some common elements of
voluntary work are a) it is unpaid and benefits the community, b) it is undertaken by choice and not obligatory, c) it is carried out for the benefit of others, a community, or organization, d) it takes place in an organized context, and e) volunteers participate in designated volunteer positions only (Leeman, p.4)

A volunteer for this study can be conceptualized as donating time to a formal group or organization without asking for monetary compensation. The literature review mentioned both formal and informal volunteering. This study will employ the formal volunteer definition. According to Maher (2005), “One of the main differences between the two is that formal volunteering is carried out through a not-for-profit organization or project, while informal volunteering is a more fluid activity that occurs without the protection of incorporation and the standards of organizational practice” (p.3) Definitional criteria of volunteer work in this study includes the activity benefits the community, is not focused on “immediate family,” and is without pay. Because many factors other than media consumption can influence informal helping (such as with a sick family member or friend), formal volunteering will be the type that is best suited to answering the research question.

**Volunteer motivations.** The motivations of respondents to volunteer were measured using the Volunteer Function Index (VFI), created by Clary et al. (1992). The items were derived from conceptualizations of six proposed psychological and social functions served by involvement in volunteer work (values, understanding, career, social, protective, and enhancement). Development of this instrument was also informed by previous (qualitative and quantitative) research on volunteerism
(Clary et al., 1998). The instrument contains 30 items assessing each of the six functions. Previous research has established reliability (Chronbach’s alpha=.82 to .85) of the VFI (Clary et al., 1998; Okun et al., 1998). The survey included 30 items using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 7 (extremely important). A higher number indicates a motivation of greater importance for the respondent. Though the VFI has been shown to be effective with volunteers and nonvolunteers alike, this study separated the two by stating, “If you have done volunteer work before or are currently doing volunteer work, please indicate how important each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you. If you have not been a volunteer before, please indicate how important each of the following reasons for volunteering would be for you” (Yoshioka et al., 2007).

IV. Measurements

A. Gratifications sought by Internet use

Participant responses to scale items first undergo a principle components factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Items are assigned to a particular factor if the primary loadings are greater than .60 (Stevens, 1986, as cited in Kaye & Johnson, 2002) and secondary loadings are less than .40. Summated indexes of each factor are created by summing individual variables, and then dividing by the number of variables. Gratifications variables will then be calculated using the retained items. The variables will represent the reasons for which respondents use the Internet. Strongly loaded items for each factor will undergo a reliability analysis. The closer
the alpha is to 1.0, the more reliable the coefficient will be considered. Reliable items will be averaged and used to create new variables, each representing a gratification acting as a predictor variable. A correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the extracted gratifications. Pearson Correlation coefficients and the significance of the correlations are reported.

A. Social Capital Variables

The three variables chosen for this study to represent social capital are life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior. Data collected from participant responses to the items asking about life contentment and interpersonal trust will be subjected to principal components factor analysis. Factors with Eigenvalues greater the absolute value of 1.0 will be retained for further analysis. Strongly loaded items for each factor will undergo a reliability analysis. Reliable items will be averaged and used to create new variables for life contentment and interpersonal trust. The items measuring volunteer behavior were designed as single item measures because they measured different concepts. The items used in the analysis were “Are you currently involved in any volunteer activities?” (1) yes, (2) no, “How many hours per year do you volunteer?” (1) 0-10 hours, (2) 11-50 hours, (3) 51-100 hours, (4) More than 100 hours, and finally, “In the coming year, how likely is it that you will volunteer time in a nonprofit or government organization, where (1) = not at all likely and (7) = extremely likely. A correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the extracted variables for life satisfaction and interpersonal trust, as well as the variables
comprising “volunteer behavior.” Pearson correlation coefficients and the significance of the correlations are reported.

**B. Motivations scales**

Data collected from participant responses to the items measuring their motivations for volunteering (Clary’s et al., 1994) VFI scale (Appendix F) will be subjected to a principal components factor analysis. Factors with Eigenvalues greater than the absolute value of 1.0 will be retained for further analysis. Additionally, strongly loaded items for each factor will undergo a reliability analysis to determine whether the items used in creating each variable are reliable. Reliable items will be averaged and used to create new variables, each representing a motivation for volunteering. A correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the extracted motivations. Pearson Correlation coefficients and the significance of the correlations are reported.

**V. Analysis**

The data from the questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS 16.0. This research will analyze the association between Internet use and the production of social capital. Multiple standard regression analysis was the chosen analysis to determine whether gratifications sought by Internet use are predictive of the variables that comprise social capital: life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism. This method of analysis was used because the research questions explore linear relationships between the predictor and criterion variables. Other criteria for the use of a multiple
regression is that both the criterion variable and the predictor variables were measured on continuous scales in the survey. Finally, the number of respondents, 258, is an adequate number of observations to necessitate a multiple regression analysis.

A. Predictors of Social Capital

In answering RQ1 and RQ2, multiple standard regression analysis was used to determine which gratifications sought by Internet use predict life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism. First, a bivariate correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between the social capital variables. Next, multiple regression was employed to determine the relationship between life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism and total time spent online. Then, life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism were regressed with each gratification variable. This determined how strongly individual gratifications predict life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism, and thus determining the effect of each gratification on social capital.

B. Predictors of Motivation to Volunteer

In answering RQ3, multiple standard regression was used to understand which of the gratifications sought by Internet use is predictive of each motivation to volunteer. Because this research question aims to understand what types of conditions surround specific motivations to volunteer, additional analysis was conducted. Another multiple regression was conducted to determine whether life
contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior are predictive of particular motivations to volunteer. Finally, the demographic variables were analyzed (age, GPA, year in school, and gender).

VI. Statistical Assumptions

The assumed significance level was set at $p<.05$. This level of significance has been accepted and used in many research studies. Findings resulting in a significance level of $p<.01$ were acknowledged with two asterisks, and findings with a significance level of $p<.05$ were acknowledged with one asterisk (as noted in the tables reporting the findings). Two-tailed tests were appropriate for the present study because very little was known about the outcomes the study would produce (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997, p.232).
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

I. Participant Demographics

A total of 258 participants responded to the online survey. Six responses of the total 258 contained missing values. This may have been a case of random missing values because subjects inadvertently did not answer some questions (as opposed to non-random, whereby subjects intentionally don’t answer particular questions). Because these six responses were missing values that could potentially compromise the results of the present study, these six were removed from the SPSS data file and were not used in future analyses. For every missing value in the dataset, the subjects with the missing values were deleted. This process left complete data for all of the subjects, reducing the sample size from 258 to 252. Of the 252 retained responses, 123 were male (48.8% of total respondents) and 129 were female (51.2% of total respondents). The mean age of the respondents was 21.03 (SD=3.58). Cumulative grade point averages were also collected. Of the 252 valid responses, 41 respondents had a GPA of 3.8-4.0 (16.3% of total respondents), 51 had a GPA of 3.7-3.4 (20.2% of total respondents), 63 had a GPA of 3.3 to 3.0 (25% of total respondents), 55 had a GPA of 2.9 to 2.5 (21.8% of total respondents), 33 had a GPA of 2.5 to 2.0 (13.1% of total respondents), and 9 had a GPA of 2.0 or below (3.6% of total respondents). The sample mean was 3.06 (SD=1.39).
The respondents were also asked to indicate their year in college. Of the 252 responses, 117 respondents identified themselves college freshmen (46.4% of total respondents), 43 respondents identified themselves as college sophomores (17.1% of total respondents), 19 respondents identified themselves as college juniors (7.5% of total respondents), 15 respondents identified themselves as college seniors (6.0% of total respondents), and 58 respondents identified themselves as graduate students (23% of total respondents).

II. Gratifications sought from Internet use

Vincent & Basil’s (1997) gratifications scale contained 22 items. To ensure all items loaded on a single factor, participant responses to the 22 items were subjected to a principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation. A total of five factors with eigenvalues greater than the absolute value of 1.0 emerged from the factor analysis conducted on Vincent & Basil’s (1997) gratifications scale. To further determine which factors would be retained and which items would load strongly on each factor, a criterion for factor and item retention was employed. According to Stacks (2002), the criteria for a factor to be considered for further statistical analysis is, (1) each factor has at least two items that ‘load’ at +/- .60 and (2) each item does not ‘load’ on other factors greater than +/- .40. Only the factors and items that fit Stacks’ (2002) criteria were obtained. A total five items did not adhere to the criteria and were dropped from further analysis. Table 1 summarizes the Internet gratifications variables created from participant responses to the current study.
Table 1: Rotated factor pattern from principal components analysis for Gratifications from Internet use (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U&amp;G SCALE AND ITEMS (eigenvalue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance (4.045)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I use the Internet so I can understand the world.</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To find out things I need to know about daily life.</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It makes me want to learn more about things.</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because it helps me learn things about myself and others.</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It shows me what society is like nowadays</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. So I can learn about what might happen to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It helps me judge what political leaders are really like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. So I can keep up with what the government is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. So I can talk with other people about what's covered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It helps me satisfy my curiosity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. So I can learn what is going on in the country and world.</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape (3.557)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It helps me get away from everyday worries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It helps me when I want to be cheered up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It helps me forget about school/homework.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It helps me take my mind off things.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It helps me relax.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom (3.702)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When I have nothing better to do</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Just because it's there</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Because it passes the time, especially when I'm bored.</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When there's no one else to talk to or be with.</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Because it's a good thing to do when I'm alone.</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (2.773)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Because it's enjoyable.</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Because it's exciting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Because it's thrilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A reliability analysis was conducted to determine the internal consistency of the gratifications variables. According to Stacks (2002), “In general, good reliability estimates are coefficients of .70 or higher. Great reliability estimates are coefficients of .80 or higher. Excellent reliability estimates are coefficients of .90 or higher” (p.132). According to these specifications, the present study considers the reliability coefficients representing gratifications sought by Internet use “great” estimates of internal consistency. In total, all four factors from Vincent & Basil’s (1997) original scale were retained, which included 18 total items. Interestingly, a fifth factor, which was not present in Vincent and Basil’s (1997) original study, emerged in the factor analysis. Questions 7 and 8 on the questionnaire, which were originally meant to measure surveillance, emerged as their own factor. The items that factored into the fifth factor were, (1) “I use the Internet to help me judge what political leaders are like,” and (2) “I use the Internet so I can keep up with what the government is doing.” This new factor was labeled “information” for the present study. The five factors were labeled: surveillance ($\alpha=.836$), escape ($\alpha=.880$), boredom ($\alpha=.879$), entertainment ($\alpha=.867$), and information ($\alpha=.790$). Finally, the final item of the ‘entertainment’ variable was retained in the study, despite its factor loading value of only .598. Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the extracted gratifications variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and individual scale items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Surveillance’ Variable (Cronbach’s alpha = .836)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet so I can understand the world</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out things I need to know about daily life</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet makes me want to learn more about things</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps me learn new things about myself and others</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps me satisfy my curiosity</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Escape’ Variable (Cronbach’s alpha=.880)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet helps me to get away from everyday worries</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet helps me when I want to be cheered up</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet helps me to forget about school/homework</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet helps me take my mind off things</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet helps me relax</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Boredom’ Variable (Cronbach’s alpha=.879)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet when I have nothing better to do</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet just because it’s there</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet passes the time, especially when I’m bored</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet when there is no one else to talk to or be with</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when I’m alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet because it’s a good thing to do</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Entertainment’ Variable (Cronbach’s alpha=.867)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet because it’s exciting</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet because it’s thrilling</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet because it amuses me</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information' Variable</th>
<th>6.80</th>
<th>2.190</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Internet helps me judge what political leaders are really like</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet so I can keep up with what the government is doing</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All questions were answered on a seven-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = 'I completely disagree' and 7 = 'I completely agree'.

A bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to observe the relationship between the gratifications extracted from the factor analysis. Table 3 illustrates the correlation analysis, and includes the Pearson Correlation and significance (two-tailed) of the correlations between the gratification variables.

Table 3: Correlation matrix between gratification variables (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surveillance</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Boredom</th>
<th>Enter</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveillance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.273** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.381** (.000)</td>
<td>.490** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.378** (.000)</td>
<td>.591** (.000)</td>
<td>.466** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.426** (.000)</td>
<td>.122 (.054)</td>
<td>.121 (.055)</td>
<td>224** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

The correlation analysis revealed eight statistically significant relationships between gratifications sought for going online. The gratifications significantly related to each other included the following: escape and surveillance \( r = .273, \)
boredom and surveillance \( (r=.381, p<.001) \); entertainment and surveillance \( (r=.378, p<.001) \); boredom and escape \( (r=.490, p<.001) \), entertainment and escape \( (r=.591, p<.001) \), and entertainment and boredom \( (r=.466, p<.001) \), information and surveillance \( (r=.426, p<.001) \), and information and entertainment \( (r=.224, p<.001) \).

The relationships between information and both escape and boredom were approaching significance, though they were not significant at the specified \( p<.05 \) level \( (r=.122, p=.054 \) and \( r=.121, p=.055 \), respectively).

Finally, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient was calculated in order to observe the relationship between the demographic variables and the gratifications obtained for going online. Analysis showed that there is a significant positive relationship between gender and the boredom gratification \( (r=.130, p=.039) \) as well as gender and the escape gratification \( (r=.128, p=.043) \). Interpretation reveals that women go online more than men because they are bored and require escape. The analysis showed a negative statistically significant relationship between age and the entertainment gratification \( (r=-.148, p=.019) \). There were statistically significant and positive relationships noted between GPA and escape \( (r=.130, p=.039) \), boredom \( (r=.131, p=.038) \), and entertainment \( (r=.162, p=.010) \). Finally, a positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between year in school and the surveillance gratification \( (r=.211, p=.001) \). The findings from the correlation analysis are presented in Table 4, including the Pearson correlation coefficient and the significance.
Table 4: Correlations between demographic variables (gender, age, GPA, year in school) and gratifications from Internet use (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total time online</td>
<td>.198* (.002)</td>
<td>.189* (.003)</td>
<td>-.170** (.007)</td>
<td>.334** (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.118 (.061)</td>
<td>.093 (.142)</td>
<td>-.073 (.246)</td>
<td>.211** (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.128* (.043)</td>
<td>-.126 (.046)</td>
<td>.130* (.039)</td>
<td>-.098 (.122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.130* (.039)</td>
<td>-.121 (.055)</td>
<td>.131* (.038)</td>
<td>-.092 (.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.000 (.997)</td>
<td>-.148* (.019)</td>
<td>.162* (.010)</td>
<td>-.106 (.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-.030 (.640)</td>
<td>.078 (.215)</td>
<td>-.015 (.812)</td>
<td>.119 (.060)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

III. Social Capital Variables

A. Life contentment

A life contentment variable was calculated to represent the average satisfaction respondents have with their lives. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985) is among the most widely used measures in psychology to assess global life satisfaction and shows high levels of internal consistency and temporal reliability (Pavot et al., 1991). The scale contains five items. To ensure that all of the items loaded on a single factor for the present study, participant responses to the five items were subjected to a principle component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Using the same criteria as the above-mentioned gratifications factor
analysis, the factor must have at least two items that load at +/- .60 and each item must not load on other factors greater than +/- .40, as well as an eigenvalue of greater than the absolute value of 1.0. One component was extracted from the factor analysis. Table 5 summarizes the life contentment variable created from responses to the present study.

Table 5: Factor analysis of Satisfaction with Life Scale (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue: 3.104</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. In most ways, my life is close to ideal.</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. If I could live my time again, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A reliability analysis was conducted to determine the internal consistency of the life satisfaction variable. The criteria for reliability followed is the same as the previous factor analysis, where ‘good’ reliability estimates are coefficients of .70 or higher, and ‘great’ reliability estimates are coefficients of .80 or higher. Therefore, this study considers the reliability coefficient representing life contentment a ‘great’ estimate of internal consistency. In total, all five items from Diener et al.’s (1985) scale were retained, which included five total items. The factor was labeled “life contentment” (α=.839). Table 6 summarizes the life contentment variable and the items that comprise it.
Table 6: Descriptive statistics for life contentment variable (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment (Chronbach’s alpha=.841)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. In most ways, my life is close to ideal</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The conditions of my life are excellent</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. If I could live my time again, I would change almost nothing</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All questions were answered on a seven-point, Likert-type scale, where 1='I completely disagree' and 7='I completely agree'

B. Interpersonal Trust.

An interpersonal trust variable was calculated to represent the level of trust respondents have for other people. Rosenberg’s (1956) Faith in People Scale has been used with only minor variations in many surveys, and was employed by the present study. The scale contained five items, and to ensure that all items loaded on a single factor in the study, participant responses to the five items were subjected to principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Using the same criteria as the aforementioned factor analyses, the five interpersonal trust items did not factor together into a single component. The five items factored into two components. Table 7 summarizes the factor analysis for interpersonal trust.
| Table 7: Rotated principal component matrix of Faith in People Scale (N=252) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Factor Loading                  | 1               | 2               |
| 1. Generally speaking, can people be trusted? | .796             | -.053           |
| 2. People will try to take advantage of you if they get the chance  | -.165            | .744            |
| 3. People try to be fair        | .818             | -.083           |
| 4. You can't be too careful in dealing with people | -.025            | .822            |
| 5. People try to be helpful     | .786             | -.157           |

Notes: All questions were answered on a five-point scale with the following options: (1) never; (2) hardly ever; (3) some of the time; (4) most of the time and (5) all of the time.

Initially, two factors emerged with Eigenvalues greater than the absolute value of 1.0 (1.948 and 1.263, respectively), so they were both retained for future analyses. However, upon further analysis, only the first factor met the criteria for factor retention. A reliability analysis was conducted to determine the internal consistency of the interpersonal trust variables. The criteria for reliability followed is the same as the previous factor analysis, where ‘good’ reliability estimates are coefficients of .70 or higher, and ‘great’ reliability estimates are coefficients of .80 or higher. The first interpersonal trust variable (α=.726) is considered a ‘good’ estimate of internal consistency. The second variable, however, was not a good estimate of internal consistency (α=.397). This variable was removed for future analysis. In total, three items from Rosenberg’s (1965) scale (those that loaded on the first factor) were retained. The new variable was labeled “interpersonal trust” (α=.726). Table 8 illustrates the descriptive statistics for the items comprising the variable.
Table 8: Descriptive statistics for interpersonal trust items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (Chronbach’s alpha=.726)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Generally speaking, can people be trusted?</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People try to be fair</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People try to be helpful</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deleted Items:
1. People will try to take advantage of you if they get the chance | 3.16 | .685 |
2. You can’t be too careful in dealing with people | 3.51 | .781 |

Notes: All questions were answered on a five-point scale with the following options: (1) never; (2) hardly ever; (3) some of the time; (4) most of the time and (5) all of the time.

C. Volunteer Behavior

The volunteer behavior of respondents was determined using three single-measure items to measure different concepts. Respondents were asked whether they already volunteer: (1) no and (2) yes. Respondents were then asked how often they volunteer: (1) 0-10 hours/year, (2) 11-50 hours/year, (3) 51-100 hours/year, and (4) more than 100 hours/year. Finally respondents were asked whether they intend to volunteer in the coming year (responses were on a Likert-type scale, where (1) not at all likely and (7) extremely likely. Of the 252 total responses, 109 respondents (43.3% of total respondents) said they currently volunteer, while 143 (56.7% of
total respondents) said they do not currently volunteer. Of the 252 total responses, 164 respondents (65.1% of total respondents) said they volunteer 0-10 hours/year; 61 (24.2% of total respondents) said they volunteer 11-50 hours/year; 16 (6.3% of total respondents) said they volunteer 51-100 hours/year; 11 (4.4% of respondents) said they volunteer more than 100 hours/year. Table 9 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the questions about present and future volunteer behavior.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Are you currently involved in any volunteer activities?</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=yes, 2=no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How many hours per year do you volunteer?</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=0-10, 2=11-50, 3=51-100, 4=More than 100 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. In the coming year, how likely is it that you will volunteer time in a nonprofit organization?</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=not at all likely, 2=very unlikely, 3= somewhat unlikely, 4=neutral, 5= somewhat likely, 6=very likely 7=extremely likely

The three variables that comprise social capital in the present study—life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism—were tested to observe whether they were interrelated. The life contentment variable extracted from the factor analysis, the interpersonal trust variable extracted from the factor analysis, and the volunteer behavior items were calculated in a Pearson correlation
coefficient to understand the relationship between participants’ life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior. As expected, interpersonal trust and life contentment were statistically significantly associated with each other, though they are weakly correlated \( (r = 0.208, p = 0.001) \), indicating a statistically significant linear relationship between the two variables. Volunteer behavior (measured in hours spent volunteering) was statistically significantly (albeit weakly) associated with contentment \( (r = 0.124, p = 0.049) \), indicating a statistically significant linear relationship between the two variables. A weak correlation that was not statistically significant was found between volunteer work and trust \( (r = -0.058, p = 0.360) \). Additionally, life contentment and volunteer behavior (based on whether the respondents were currently volunteers) were not statistically significantly interrelated \( (r = -0.092, p = 0.145) \). As expected, hours volunteering and likelihood to volunteer were statistically significantly positively related \( (r = 0.431, p < 0.001) \). Additionally, the item measuring whether respondents are currently volunteers was negatively and significantly related to likelihood to volunteer in the coming year \( (r = -0.449, p < 0.001) \). The item measuring whether respondents are currently volunteers was negatively and significantly related to hours spent volunteering each year \( (r = -0.536, p < 0.001) \). A summary of the correlations between the variables comprising social capital in the present study is displayed in Table 10.
Table 10: Summary of correlations between social capital variables: life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior. (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contentment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>.208** (.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer</td>
<td>.052 (.414)</td>
<td>.048 (.447)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours volunteering</td>
<td>.124* (.049)</td>
<td>.046 (.471)</td>
<td>.431** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently a volunteer?</td>
<td>-.092 (.145)</td>
<td>-.058 (.360)</td>
<td>-.449** (.000)</td>
<td>-.536** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

A second Pearson’s correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, GPA, and year in school) and the variables that comprise social capital in the current study (life contentment, trust, and volunteer behavior). The analysis showed that interpersonal trust is positively and significantly associated with age ($r=.169$, $p=.007$) and nearly significantly negatively associated with GPA ($r=-.155$, $p=.014$). It also showed a positive association between hours spent volunteering and age ($r=.166$, $p=.008$). There was a positive and significant relationship between interpersonal trust and year in school ($r=.223$, $p<.001$) and also between year in school and current status as a volunteer ($r=.132$, $p=.037$). Other than these mentioned relationships, however, there were no further statistically significant
relationships between the demographic variables and the social capital variables.

Table 11 illustrates all of the relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment</td>
<td>.033 (.599)</td>
<td>-.071 (.264)</td>
<td>-.091 (.151)</td>
<td>-.038 (.550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>.043 (.496)</td>
<td>.169** (.007)</td>
<td>-.155* (.014)</td>
<td>.223** (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently a volunteer?</td>
<td>-.003 (.959)</td>
<td>.061 (.339)</td>
<td>-.078 (.216)</td>
<td>.132* (.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer</td>
<td>.095 (.132)</td>
<td>.058 (.356)</td>
<td>.003 (.957)</td>
<td>-.006 (.928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours volunteering</td>
<td>.035 (.583)</td>
<td>.166** (.008)</td>
<td>.045 (.478)</td>
<td>.027 (.666)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)

The first and second research questions asked, “What Internet usage conditions are related to high levels of personal contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteerism?” and “Under what usage conditions is Internet use related to lower life contentment, social mistrust, and withdrawal from civic volunteerism?” To begin answering these related questions, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient was calculated to first measure the relationships between total time spent online and the social capital variables, regardless of the specific gratifications sought for using the Internet. Table 12 describes the bivariate correlations between the five social
capital variables and total time spent online. Results from the analysis show that there a significant positive relationship between interpersonal trust and total time spent online \((r=.155, p=.014)\). Other than this relationship, the analysis revealed no significant relationship between overall time spent online and the social capital variables.

**Table 12: Correlation matrix between social capital variables and total time spent online (N=252)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total time online (in hours)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment</td>
<td>.031 (.619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>.155*.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently a volunteer</td>
<td>-.034 (.593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours volunteering</td>
<td>.116 (.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer</td>
<td>.028 (.656)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)**  
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)*

A correlation coefficient was also conducted to understand the relationships between demographic variables and time spent online. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to observe the relationship between total time spent online, gender, age, and grade point average in college classes (GPA). The purpose of this is to observe whether the age, gender, and GPA of the respondent is related to the time he/she might spend online. Analysis showed that age \((r=.189, p=.003)\), gender \((r=.198, p=.002)\), and year in school \((r=.334, p<.001)\) were all positively correlated with total time spent online. GPA was negatively correlated with total time spent online \((r=-.170, p=.007)\).
Table 13: Summary of correlations between time spent online and age, gender, GPA, and Year in School (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time online</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.189** (.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.198** (.002)</td>
<td>.101 (.110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>-.170** (.007)</td>
<td>-.461** (.000)</td>
<td>-.176** (.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>.334** (.000)</td>
<td>.189** (.003)</td>
<td>.169** (.007)</td>
<td>-.569** (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

To continue answering the research questions, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to include the specific gratifications sought by Internet use, and the role of the gratifications in the prediction of the individual level social capital variables. Each of the social capital variables was individually regressed on the five gratifications variables (the predictors). Table 14 summarizes the results of the multiple regression analyses for gratification predictions for life contentment, while table 15 summarizes the results of the multiple regression analysis for gratification predictions for interpersonal trust.
Table 14: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting life contentment (N=252)

Dependent variable: Life contentment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-1.466</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .042 (.022)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

Table 15: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting interpersonal trust (N=252)

Dependent variable: interpersonal trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.764</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .063 (.044)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

The only relationship between gratifications for using the Internet and interpersonal trust was the relationship between the information gratification and
trust, which is positive and statistically significant ($\beta = .159, p = .021$). The other gratifications, however, are not significantly related to life contentment or interpersonal trust. Tables 16, 17, and 18 summarize the results of the multiple regression analyses for the gratifications predicting volunteerism (current volunteer behavior, hours spent volunteering each year, and likelihood to volunteer in the coming year, respectively).

**Table 16: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting whether participants current volunteer (N=252)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-1.747</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.512</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$(Adj. $R^2$)</td>
<td>.018 (.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
Table 17: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting hours of volunteer work each year (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.915</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .021 (.001)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

Table 18: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting likelihood to volunteer in the next year (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-1.444</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²(Adj. R²) .022 (.002)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

The above regressions indicate that there are no statistically significant relationships between the gratifications sought by going online and volunteer behavior.
IV. Volunteer motivations

Clary et al.’s (1994) original volunteer function inventory (VFI) scale contained 32 items. To ensure all items loaded on a single factor, participant responses to the items were subjected to a principle components factor analysis with Varimax rotation. A total of five factors with Eigenvalues greater than the absolute value of 1.0 emerged from the factor analysis conducted on Clary et al.’s (1994) scale. To further determine which factors would be retained and which items were considered to load strongly on each factor, Stacks (2002) criteria was once again applied, where (1) ‘good’ factors are produced by at least two items that ‘load’ at +/- .60 and (2) do not ‘load’ on other factors greater than +/- .40 (p.140). Only the factors adhering to Stacks’ criteria were retained. A total of one factor and seven items did not adhere to the criteria and were dropped from further analysis.

Next, the items contributing to each retained factor were subjected to a reliability analysis. Reliability for the four factors ranged from .850 to .898 (Cronbach’s alpha). According to Stacks (2002), these are considered ‘great’ estimates of reliability. While the original volunteer function inventory (Clary et al., 1994) showed six factors emerging, this factor analysis revealed four factors. Once the items and factors that did not adhere to the criteria were deleted, a total of four factors emerged from the original adapted VFI scale. The factors retained from the adapted VFI scale were labeled: career ($\alpha=.850$), social ($\alpha=.880$), values ($\alpha=.898$), protection ($\alpha=.874$). Table 19 summarizes the four volunteer motivation factors that emerged from the factor analysis.
Table 19: Rotated Principle Components Factor Pattern Matrix for VFI Items (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Scale and Items (Eigenvalue)</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective (4.855)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps forget about it</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. By volunteering, I feel less lonely.</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Volunteering helps me through my own personal problems.</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values (5.613)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I’m serving</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel compassion toward people in need.</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel it is important to help others.</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career (4.146)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social (3.605)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My friends volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People I’m close to want me to volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People I know share an interest in community service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working</td>
<td></td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands on experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I can explore my own strengths.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Volunteering makes me feel important</td>
<td></td>
<td>.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Volunteering makes me feel needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 illustrates the descriptive statistics for the items retained from the adapted original VFI scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and individual scale items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career motivation (Cronbach's alpha = .850)</strong></td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social motivation (Cronbach's alpha = .880)</strong></td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My friends volunteer</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. People I'm close to want me to volunteer</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. People I know share an interest in community service</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values motivation (Cronbach's alpha = .898)</strong></td>
<td>5.329</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I'm serving</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Volunteering allows me to gain new perspective on things</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. I feel compassion toward people in need</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Volunteering helps me learn new things through direct, hands-on experience</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I feel it is important to help others</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. I can do something for a cause that is important to me</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The other two factors that emerged in the original VFI, understanding and enhancement, were not significant with the current sample. Out of five items belonging to “understanding” in the original VFI, two were discarded because they did not have a primary factor of greater than 0.6. The other three items loaded with the “value” motivation and were therefore included in that factor for future analysis. Out of six possible items belonging to the original “enhancement” function, three were discarded because they did not have a primary factor of greater than .6. The final two questions loaded with the “protective” function, and were therefore included in that factor for future analysis.

A correlational analysis was conducted to determine whether significant relationships exist between the motivations for volunteering extracted from the factor analysis. Table 21 illustrates the correlation analysis, reporting the Pearson Correlation and significance (two-tailed) of the correlation between the motivations.
Table 21: Correlation matrix between motivations (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Protective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

The correlation analysis revealed six positive and significant relationships between the motivations. The motivations significantly related to each other include: social and career ($r=.503, p<.001$), social and values ($r=.497, p<.001$), social and protective ($r=.573, p<.001$), values and career ($r=.361, p<.001$), values and protective ($r=.581, p<.001$), and protective and career ($r=.479, p<.001$). This implies that the motivation variables explain a portion of the same variance. This is to be expected in this model.

The third and final research question of the study asked, “What is the relationship between Internet usage, interpersonal trust, life contentment, volunteer behavior, and motivation to volunteer?” To begin answering this question, correlation analyses was conducted to observe the relationships between demographic information and motivations for volunteering. The results are shown in Table 22.
Table 22: Correlation matrix between motivations and gender, age, GPA, and year in school (N=252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Year in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>.011 (.867)</td>
<td>-.354** (.000)</td>
<td>.238** (.000)</td>
<td>-.321** (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.113 (.073)</td>
<td>-.154* (.015)</td>
<td>.101 (.111)</td>
<td>-.133* (.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.397** (.000)</td>
<td>.097 (.126)</td>
<td>-.087 (.170)</td>
<td>.096 (.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.248** (.000)</td>
<td>-.098 (.120)</td>
<td>.109 (.083)</td>
<td>-.108 (.088)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

The correlation analysis shows a statistically significant relationship between the values motivation and gender ($\beta$=.397, $p<.01$), the social motivation and age ($\beta$= -.154, $p=.015$) and year in school ($\beta$= -.133, $p=.035$). Finally, there are statistically significant relationships regarding the career motivation: career and age ($\beta$= -354 ($p<.01)$, career and GPA ($\beta$=.238, $p<.01$), and career and year in school ($\beta$= -.321, $p<.01$).

The second part of answering the research question was determining the relationships between time spent online daily and volunteer motivations. Regression analyses were conducted to observe whether total time spent online is predictive of particular motivations for volunteering. Each motivation was individually regressed with total time spent online. Results from the four separate
regressions showed that total time online was predictive of the ‘values’ motivation for volunteering (β=.196, p=.002). Though there is no significant prediction of the ‘protective’ motivation from total time online, the prediction was approaching significance (β=.112, p=.052). The other two motivations for volunteer work, ‘career’ and ‘social’ were not predicted by total time spent online per day. Tables 23 through 26 illustrate the results of the regression analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23: Summary of linear regression analysis for total time spent online predicting ‘career’ motivation for volunteer work (N=252)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable: career motivation for volunteer work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj. R²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 24: Summary of linear regression analysis for total time spent online predicting ‘social’ motivation for volunteer work (N=252)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable: social motivation for volunteer work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj. R²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
The next step in answering the third research question was to determine whether particular gratifications sought from Internet use are predictive of motivation for volunteer work. Four separate multiple regressions were conducted to determine these relationships. Each motivation was regressed on the five gratification predictor variables. Tables 27 through 30 summarize these multiple regression analyses. Results from the multiple regressions show that the boredom (β=.160
and entertainment ($\beta=.166, p=.043$) gratifications are significantly predictive of the ‘career’ motivation for using the Internet ($R^2=.290$; Adjusted $R^2$, .084; $p<.05$). The surveillance gratification ($\beta=.182, p=.009$) is statistically significantly related to the ‘values’ motivation for volunteer work ($R^2=.064$; Adjusted $R^2=.049$; $p<.01$). Finally, the escape gratification ($\beta=.199, p=.011$) is significantly related to the protective motivation for volunteer work ($R^2=.113$; Adjusted $R^2=.099$; $p<.05$).

### Table 27: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting ‘career’ motivation to volunteer (N=252)

**Dependent variable: career motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ (Adj. $R^2$).085 (.067)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
### Table 28: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting 'social motivation to volunteer (N=252)

Dependent variable: social motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (Adj. R²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

### Table 29: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting 'values motivation to volunteer (N=252)

Dependent variable: values motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.179*</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.652</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (Adj. R²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
Table 30: Summary of multiple regression analysis for uses of the Internet predicting ‘protective’ motivation to volunteer (N=252)

Dependent variable: protective motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.201*</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .120 (.102)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

The final step in answering the third research question was to observe the relationship between the social capital variables and the specific motivations for volunteer work. The purpose of this final analysis is to understand how individual-level social capital can be predictive of motivations behind volunteer work. In making this observation, the social capital variables were individually regressed on the motivation for volunteering variables (predictors). The multiple regression analyses are illustrated in tables 31 through 34.
### Table 31: Summary of multiple regression analysis for social capital variables predicting ‘career’ motivation for volunteer work (N=252)

**Dependent variable: career motivation for volunteer work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current volunteer behavior</td>
<td>-.152*</td>
<td>-2.011</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent volunteering per year</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-1.349</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer in the coming year</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .076 (.057)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

### Table 32: Summary of multiple regression analysis for social capital variables predicting ‘social’ motivation for volunteer work (N=252)

**Dependent variable: social motivation for volunteer work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment</td>
<td>.137*</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current volunteer behavior</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-1.933</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent volunteering per year</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer in the coming year</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>5.025</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .242 (.227)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
### Table 33: Summary of multiple regression analysis for social capital variables predicting 'values' motivation for volunteer work (N=252)

**Dependent variable: values motivation for volunteer work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>3.195</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current volunteer behavior</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.942</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent volunteering per year</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer in the coming year</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>5.643</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .245 (.230)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

---

### Table 34: Summary of multiple regression analysis for social capital variables predicting 'protective' motivation for volunteer work (N=252)

**Dependent variable: protective motivation for volunteer work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life contentment</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>.120*</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current volunteer behavior</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.926</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent volunteering per year</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to volunteer in the coming year</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (Adj. R²) .139 (.121)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)
Results from the multiple regression analyses showed many significant relationships. Whether the respondent was currently a volunteer and their likelihood to volunteer in the coming year were significantly and positively related to the ‘career’ motivation for volunteer work ($R^2=0.076$; Adjusted $R^2=0.057$, $p<0.05$). There was a positive and significant relationship between the ‘social’ motivation for volunteering and life contentment ($\beta=0.137, p=0.018$) and likelihood to volunteer in the coming year ($\beta=0.324, p<0.001$). The regression showed a negative relationship, however, between the ‘social’ motivation and whether respondents are currently volunteers. This relationship was approaching significance ($\beta=-0.133, p=0.054$). It can be inferred from this relationship that people who enter the realm of volunteer work to be with friends and family are generally happy with their lives, and likely to volunteer in the coming year. Conversely, there are fewer current volunteers in the present sample who are motivated to volunteer by social concerns.

Multiple regression analysis showed that respondents who are motivated to volunteer by values are satisfied with their lives ($\beta=0.182, p=0.002$), trusting of others ($\beta=0.140, p=0.014$), and likely to volunteer in the coming year ($\beta=0.362, p<0.001$). There were no further significant relationships regarding current volunteer behavior or hours spent volunteering with regard to the ‘values’ motivation.

A separate multiple regression showed that respondents who are motivated to volunteer to facilitate guilt reduction (protective) are trusting of others ($\beta=0.120, p=0.049$) and likely to volunteer in the coming year ($0.282, p<0.001$). There were no
further statistically significant relationships with regard to the ‘protective’ motivation for volunteering.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

I. Theoretical Implications

The present study had two main goals. The first goal was to determine the impact of patterns of Internet use on individual-level social capital indicators (life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior). The second was to observe participants’ self-reported motivations for volunteering in relation to both Internet use patterns and individual-level social capital variables. The first and second research questions asked, “What Internet usage conditions are related to high levels of life contentment, interpersonal trust, and civic volunteerism among college students” and “What Internet usage conditions are related to lower levels of life contentment, social mistrust, and withdrawal from civic involvement?” Findings revealed that total time spent using the Internet does not directly influence life contentment or volunteerism. Respondents who spend more time online, however, are more trusting of others. Proponents of the “mean world” hypothesis contend that total time spent online will be negatively related to contentment, trust, and volunteerism (e.g. Putnam, 1995a, 1995b; Gerbner et al., 1980). In regards to the Internet, like-minded scholars argue that time spent online removes people from their communities (e.g. Nie and Erbring, 2000; Kraut et al., 1998, Putnam, 2000). Additionally, displacement theory contends that new communication replaces old
communication, and when Americans do not interact with each other, social capital declines. The present study found no support for these hypotheses. The study demonstrated that there is no direct prediction of life contentment and volunteerism simply from observing the total time respondents spend online during an average day.

In response to Putnam’s critiques that media use diminishes social capital, the present study finds that this hypothesis is not entirely accurate. Rather, it shows that Putnam’s theories don’t necessarily apply to the evolving media landscape that the Internet represents. Activities performed online can vary greatly, from reading news stories, to playing games, to communicating and connecting with friends, to mobilizing voters for a presidential election. Clearly, these activities are not equal with regard to social capital production. Putnam and his cohorts would benefit from looking specifically at what respondents do online, rather than simply viewing time displacement or cultivation effects.

While there were not many results regarding total time spent online, Kraut et al. (1998) contended that theories about social effects of Internet use must consider more than just the attributes of the technology, but the way in which people use it. Like other technologies of the past, the Internet has been maligned as an evil of a healthy democratic society (Uslaner, 1998). The uses and gratifications approach to media use is the theory by which researchers can understand how and why people use media. Traditional media studies have found that social capital is more strongly related to the surveillance and information gratifications than the entertainment,
escape, and boredom gratifications. Results showed that people who use the Internet to obtain information have higher levels of trust. Approaching significance was a relationship between surveillance and trust in others. Individuals who use the Internet for information exchange probably encounter more mobilizing information and experience more opportunities for recruitment in civic life. According to Uslaner (1998), “The linkage of Internet use with trust is the key question for determining whether the Net is good or bad” (p.11). Considering the amount of information available to motivated Internet users, “citizens who are armed with such information may be able to exert greater control over their environments, encouraging participation and enhancing trust and contentment” (Shah et al., 2001). Despite these findings, however, the variables for volunteerism and life contentment were not predicted by any of the gratifications variables. The present study does not offer support for previous studies reporting that people who use the Internet for surveillance and information are more likely to be involved in civic activity (e.g. Norris, 1996; Norris & Jones, 1998; Corrado & Firestone, 1996; Pavlik, 1996). While this could be an accurate representation with regard to new media, it should be noted that close to 46 percent of respondents were college freshmen from one large college lecture class. The homogeneity of respondents could explain why results from the present study are not consistent with other hypotheses about gratifications’ relationship with individual-level social capital indicators.

The third research question asked, “What is the relationship between motivations to volunteer and patterns of Internet use, life contentment,
interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior?” The present study supports the functional approach to volunteer motivations proposed by Clary et al. (1991, 1992, 1998). This theory is based on the functional approach to motivations, which states that people maintain their behaviors if the behaviors fulfill one or more individualistic need (Clary et al., 1992). In creating the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI), Clary et al. (1992) posited that individuals will volunteer if they perceive volunteering as fulfilling one or more of six motivational functions: (1) values (volunteering to express altruistic values), (2) understanding (volunteering to understand the population being helped), (3) career (volunteering to gain career related benefits), (4) social (volunteering reflects the normative influence of friends, family, or social group), (5) protective (volunteering to facilitate guilt reduction associated with being more fortunate than others), and (6) enhancement (volunteering for ego-growth and development). The VFI was developed to assess each of these proposed functions, and was employed by the present study to ascertain the motivations to volunteer of respondents. The analysis revealed only four of the aforementioned motivations: values, career, social, and protective.

This research question asked about the relationships between Internet usage conditions, social capital, and motivations for volunteering. There is no answer to this research question in previous theory, so the result from the present study cannot be compared to any other theoretical framework comparing volunteer motivations and social capital variables, as well as Internet use. Analysis from the present study showed that people who spend more time online are more likely to
volunteer because they are motivated by their personal values. Additionally, more females are motivated by their values than males. The relationship between the protective motivation and total time spent online was approaching significance. These results indicate that individuals who spend more time online in a given day have motivations for volunteering that have to do with personal values and a desire to reduce guilt felt by being more fortunate. A possible explanation for these results could be that respondents who spend time online could be exposed to material that furthers their personal values or teaches them about the worlds wrongs that can be helped by volunteer work, thus developing their values that volunteering is important. Time spent online could also give respondents insight into their own fortune, and therefore make them more willing to volunteer out of protecting themselves from guilt.

Respondents who use the Internet for entertainment and out of boredom were likely to be motivated to volunteer by career ambitions. Respondents who use the Internet to survey the world around them, on the other hand, were most likely to volunteer as a reflection of their personal values. Finally, respondents who use the Internet to escape are motivated to volunteer by the prospect of reducing their own personal guilt for being more fortunate than others. At the time of the study, no research had been conducted involving media use and volunteer motivation, however the findings from the present study are insightful for a number of reasons. A surveillance gratification for going online could result in more consumption of news and information, which could lead to increased knowledge and understanding
of the world, and therefore values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others. Previous analyses showed that younger students were more likely to use the Internet for entertainment gratifications. Likewise, younger students (as evidenced by both age and year in school) were more motivated to volunteer out of career ambitions. Perhaps the younger students are more likely to volunteer for career reasons, in hopes of discovering their future profession, whereas the older students have a clearer understanding of their career path, and therefore are not attracted to volunteerism for its career benefits. Further evidence for this possibility is shown in the relationship between GPA and the career motivation. It is possible that participants with higher GPAs are more ambitious and therefore more driven by career ambitions.

By using the VFI on various samples, Clary and associates (Clary et al., 1998; Snyder & Stukas, 1996) have also found support for the use of the functional approach as a predictive model within the volunteerism domain. While the predictive utility of the functional approach in relation to social capital indicators is not the focus of the present study, it is interesting to compare these results to previous studies that measure predictive power. In these studies, the values, career, social, and understanding functions were significant predictors of self-reported volunteering behavior.

Results showed that individuals who are motivated to volunteer out of career ambitions are less likely to be current volunteers. However, people motivated by career ambitions are likely to volunteer in the coming year. This could be because
the sample was comprised of college students who are currently exploring career options and hoping to expand their resumes. Jenner (1982) found that 15 percent of his respondents viewed volunteering as a means of preparing for a new career or of maintaining career-relevant skills. According to Clary et al. (2000), “career-oriented considerations may be more salient for younger people” (p.377). The age range of respondents in the present study is indicative of a group of individuals who will soon begin careers, many for the first time.

The social motivation for volunteering was predictive of all three individual-level social capital indicators: they exhibit greater life contentment, greater interpersonal trust, currently volunteer, and are likely to volunteer in the coming year. This is consistent with Greenslade and White’s (2005) study where they found the social motivation to be the only significant predictor of volunteer behavior: individuals are more likely to volunteer if volunteering reflects the normative influence of friends and family. Respondents who are primarily motivated to volunteer by social interaction are content with their lives, trusting of others, and likely to become volunteers in the coming year. However, they are most likely not current volunteers. The social function concerns relationships with others, and research has shown that people who engage in more human interaction are more trusting and also more content with their lives (Uslaner, 1998).

In the present study, respondents who are motivated to volunteer by their values have higher life contentment, interpersonal trust, and are likely to volunteer in the coming year. The literature shows that concern for others is often
characteristic of those who volunteer (Anderson & Moore, 1978) and distinguishes volunteers from nonvolunteers (Allen & Rushton, 1983) though present findings do not necessarily reflect this assertion. Finally, respondents motivated to volunteer to facilitate guilt reduction (protective motivation) are trusting of others and also likely to volunteer in the coming year.

These results indicate that most of the respondents, regardless of their own personal motivation for volunteering, report that they are likely to volunteer in the coming year. This is an enlightening finding, and one that could possible reflect the renaissance of volunteerism that has graced the country in recent months. Another explanation could be one of response bias. According to Donaldson and Grant-Vallone (2002),

“In general, research participants want to respond in a way that makes them look as good as possible. Thus, they tend to under-report behaviors deemed inappropriate by researchers or other observers, and tend to over-report behaviors viewed as appropriate” (p.247).

Respondents in the present study may have indicated that they intend to volunteer simply because it is “appropriate.” Therefore, this self-reported indication of likelihood to volunteer may not be entirely accurate of actual intention in the coming year.
II. Methodological Implications

The first methodological implication relevant to the present study relates to the gratification measures used by Vincent and Basil (1997). In reference to the review of the literature, the uses and gratifications theory implies that audiences use media to fulfill their various needs. Five assumptions accompany this theory: (1) the audience is an active participant in the communication process, (2) users are goal-oriented in their media usage, (3) mass media competes with other sources to gratify the needs of users, (4) many goals about media use can be taken from self-reported audience data, and (5) value judgments about the cultural significance of mass communication should be put on hold until further study (Blumler & Katz, 1974). The scale was intended to measure the main motivations for Internet use. The uses and gratifications theory has numerous typologies devoted to its study. For the purposes of this research, Vincent and Basil’s (1997) scale was chosen. The scale was particularly attractive because it is directed toward college students’ media use and was employed in other similar studies (e.g. Diddi & LaRose, 2006). In the original (Vincent & Basil, 1997) study, which was used in its entirety in the present study, included 22 items, which factored into four gratification items. Results of the present study showed five components rather than four. The items comprising the fifth “information” gratification logically fit together because they both have to do with politics: (1) The Internet helps me judge what political leaders are really like, and (2) I use the Internet so I can keep up with what the government is doing. This was considered a factor separate from “surveillance” because it applied specifically
to politics, rather than simply surveillance. Methodologically, a future study could potentially benefit from acknowledging that metrics have changed since the proliferation of the Internet. Perhaps, as evidenced in part by the present study, traditional gratifications measures are not as relevant to the Internet and its increasing diversity of activities as they are to television and other forms of traditional media.

The second methodological implication stems from the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985). Among the most widely used measures in psychology to assess global life satisfaction, this scale was chosen for its reliability. Additionally, the scale is comprehensive and allows interpretation on the part of the individual respondent. According to Pavot and Diener (1993), “the scale does not assess satisfaction with life domains such as health of finances but allows subjects to integrate and weight these domains in whatever way they chose” (p.164). The original scale contained five items that factored into a single ‘life contentment’ variable. A principal component factor analysis was conducted prior to creating the ‘life contentment’ variable. The analysis revealed that all five items met the present study’s criteria for retention, and were then used in the creation of the variable that would be used for analysis. The reliability coefficient of the ‘life contentment’ variable was lower than Diener et al.’s (1985) original coefficient, but still reliable. Therefore, this instrument showed reliability as a “promising instrument in terms of measuring change in subjective well-being and intervention
outcomes” (Pavot & Diener, 1993, p.170) and was shown to accurately represent the overall life contentment of respondents.

The third methodological implication of this study had to do with the interpersonal trust variable. The reviewed literature showed that Rosenberg’s (1956) Faith in People Scale has been used with only minor variations in many major surveys (e.g. Bahr & Martin, 1983; Hjoat, Mangione, Nasca, Cohen, Gonnella, Erdmann, & Veloski, 2001). Additionally, the scale uses items meant to understand the respondent’s feelings about people in general, rather than items that could be constructed as political in nature (Rosenberg, 1956). While the original scale only included two forced-choice statements (“Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?”) this was broken down into five items for the present study (Burnes & Kinder, 2000) to achieve a similar effect that was more understandable for the respondents. The questions were chosen to measure ‘generalized trust’ (trust in strangers). A review of the literature dictated that generalized trust dictates a more accurate reading of healthy society than particularized trust (trust in family and friends.) According to Brehm & Rahn (1997), “Generalized trust allows people to move out of familiar relationships in which trust is based on knowledge accumulated from long experience with particular people. If outcomes in a democracy are inherently uncertain (Przeworski, 1991), such global trust may be necessary in order for people to support democratic arrangements.”
A factor analysis was conducted before the interpersonal trust variable was created. The factor analysis revealed two components, each comprised of three items. Both had Eigenvalues of greater than 0.1, however the second component was discarded due to low reliability (Chronbach’s α=.397). The final variable, labeled “interpersonal trust” contained three items: (1) Generally speaking, can people be trusted? (2) People try to be fair, (3) People try to be helpful. The reliability coefficient of the interpersonal trust variable was .726 (Chronbach’s α). This is less than Rosenberg’s (1956) original reliability coefficient (Chronbach’s α=.92), but still considered “good” by Stacks’ (2002) criteria.

Finally, the fourth methodological implication has to do with the VFI. This scale was chosen for the present study because it has been shown to be a reliable indicator of volunteer motivations. Additionally, it has been shown to determine the motivations of volunteers and non-volunteers alike. This was an attractive aspect of the VFI for the current study because the convenience sample by nature didn’t allow to researcher to use strictly volunteers as respondents. Still, the VFI has been replicated and cross-validated on a large sample of university students, many of whom were not active volunteers (Clary et al., 1998). The functional approach to volunteerism implies that motivations underlying volunteer behavior can be measured. The original factor analysis done by Clary et al. (1998) identified six components, which suggested six factors underlying responses to the VFI (Kim & Mueller, 1998). However, the present study only revealed four motivations for volunteering, excluding two of Clary et al.’s six original motivations. The reliability
coefficients of the four motivations were very similar to the reliability coefficients in Clary et al.’s original study.

III. Practical Implications

As the Internet becomes more and more omnipresent, especially among young people, concerns about its impact arise. Putnam (1995) postulated that communities with "healthy stocks of social capital are better able to avoid coercive solutions to collective goods problems than those with weak stocks of social capital. According to Brehm & Rahn (1997), “the collective manifestation of social capital must be sustainable at the level of individual civic engagement and in individual attitudes towards others (p.1017). Indeed, concerns about the impact of media use carry over from Putnam’s (1995a, 1995b) original fears about the impact of television on social capital. Recent data has shown that social capital among America’s youth has eroded. This study provided little to no support of the assertion that Internet use erodes social capital. The study shows that the Internet is not only a haven for people who do not trust others. Rather, the Internet can be a great opportunity to rebuild lost community and trust. This study did offer some evidence that individual reasons for using the Internet are more indicative of individual level social capital than actual time spent online. It offers further explanation that media use should not be viewed simply as positive or negative, but should rather be explored further to understand the role in which the particular media plays in an individual’s life.
There are practical implications for the functional approach to volunteerism. First, because individuals see volunteerism in terms of their personal motivations, volunteer organizations could use this information for persuasive messages. By administering the VFI to assess motivations of current and potential volunteers, they could strategically promote their organizations in ways that appeal to particular motivations. Second, the functional approach can serve to place volunteers in a position to match their motivation, such that volunteers who serve in a capacity that matches their motivation will be more content and more likely to continue volunteering.

In relation to the present study, comparing motivation to volunteer with demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and year in school can help with both volunteer recruitment and retention. For example, younger students (as evidenced by both age and year in school) are more likely to be motivated by career ambitions. Similarly, by matching specified motivations of particular demographic groups to persuasive materials, nonprofit organizations can hope to attract new volunteers and retain their existing volunteers. It is also interesting to the note the relationship between volunteer motivations and uses of the Internet. Though there may not be an overtly practical implications for nonprofit organizations that arise out of these analyses, it is interesting to observe how individuals’ reasons for using the Internet can correspond with motivations for volunteer helping. Indeed, there is evidence that points to informational and surveillance motives as tied to political knowledge and awareness of civic opportunities (e.g. Eveland et al., 2003; Shah et
al., 2001; McCleod et al., 1996; Davis, 1999; Jones, 1995). This was supported in the present study with statistically significant relationships between the surveillance gratification and the social and values motivation for volunteering. It is also interesting to note the idea that the reasons for which people volunteer could influence, or could be influenced by, individual level social capital variables. While the present study does not elaborate on the direction of causation in the model, there were relationships between the motivations for volunteering and life contentment, interpersonal trust, current volunteer behavior, and likelihood to volunteer in the future.

Additionally, results from the gratifications sought by Internet use can also be helpful to nonprofit organizations. With the appropriate resources, nonprofit organizations could attract potential volunteers based upon how they use the Internet. For example, if a large potential volunteer base uses the Internet for entertainment or boredom, online games could be created to attract Internet users to the brand, and thus to volunteer. Further analysis on motivations of these individuals to volunteer could tailor persuasive messages even further. For example, if an individual uses the Internet for entertainment and is motivated to volunteer by career ambitions, a persuasive message could include some form of entertainment, as well as a message that volunteering could help future career prospects.
IV. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The present study uses survey data to understand the process by which Internet use influences life contentment, interpersonal trust, and civic volunteerism. It also looked at the way in which volunteer motivation is influenced by Internet use and related to individual level social capital indicators. As is the case with nonexperimental data, it is difficult to clarify the causal direction between Internet use and social capital. Future research will need to investigate theories and empirical evidence for this causal direction. Additionally, because civic volunteerism takes time to burgeon, cross-sectional data have their limits in establishing the influence of Internet use on volunteerism and the other social capital variables. A panel or longitudinal design would be preferable to address this concern. Future studies could use a longitudinal design to track uses of the Internet and individual level social capital variables as they change with respondents’ age and year in school.

The present study showed a lack of statistically significant results regarding Internet use gratifications and the individual level social capital variables. Past studies have shown strong relationships between gratifications for Internet use and individual level social capital indicators. A review of the literatures indicates that there should be statistically significant relationships between these variables, though this study failed to produce significant results. There are a number of possible reasons for the lack of statistically significant relationships between these in the present study. Unlike other previous, the Internet is currently a widespread
medium, especially among the sample used in the present study, so therefore the lack of results produced by the present study should not be attributed to lack of familiarity with the Internet. An observation of descriptive statistics for the gratifications for Internet use showed many abnormal distributions. For example, a histogram of the surveillance variable, used to create a group frequency distribution, showed an abnormal distribution (skewness= -1.005; kurtosis= 1.905).

Another limitation of the current study is the demographic make-up of the respondents. This study used data collected from a non-probability convenience sample, comprised completely of college students from a single large, public, Midwestern university. All of the findings, therefore, were based on responses from a non-representative sample. Though the present study was aimed specifically at college students, participant responses in the present study may differ significantly when compared to a probability sample comprised of participants varying in geographic location. It is also important to note that 45.3 percent of the total respondents in the present study indentified themselves as college freshmen, compared to sophomores (16.7 percent of total respondents), juniors (7.4 percent of total respondents), seniors (5.8 percent of total respondents), and graduate students (22.5 percent of graduate students.) Though this study was aimed at responses from college students, the study employed responses from many more first-year students than any other year. Therefore, responses to the present study may also differ significantly when compared to a probability sample comprised of participants varying in age and year in college. Although constraints prevented the
present study from obtaining a more representative sample, future studies using a non-probability sample could consider a quota sampling method to ensure all age groups are more equally represented.

Finally, while the results of the present study indicate that total time spent online is not indicative of decreased social capital, it is important to note that other daily activities of respondents were not measured. The displacement hypothesis indicates that people spend time with media as a substitute for face-to-face interactions and interpersonal group activities. Since the other activities of the respondents were not measured, this research cannot speak to the time displacement hypothesis. A future study could attempt to measure time-based motivation to participate, which will indicate whether people feel that they have time to fit volunteer activities into their weekly schedule (e.g. Moy et al., 1999). This would be a good indicator of whether the time displacement hypothesis is accurate for a college student population.

Future studies could use a different typology of uses and gratifications, different from Vincent and Basil’s (1997) typology used in the present study. The main reason for this would be that perhaps a different scale would provide further insight into the impact of gratifications for using the Internet on individual level social capital variables. Vincent and Basil’s (1997) original scale contained 22 items, adapted from previous instruments and largely based on studies of television use. Future studies should employ a new gratifications measure, adapted from other studies based on new media such as the Internet, rather than traditional media such
as television. The Internet as a new medium can inspire new gratifications that were not present in traditional media. This could possibly include interpersonal communication, spot news consumption, commerce, and games. For this reason, a new scale should be adapted to encompass all of the gratifications not apparent in traditional media.

While this study attempted to gage the general gratifications sought by Internet use, future studies should ask respondents specifically how they spend their time online. For example, respondents should answer questions about time spent with news sites, reading sports sites, browsing shopping sites, using social networking (e.g. Facebook and Twitter), chatting with friends, playing online games, watching videos (e.g. YouTube and online television), and reading blogs. It would be interesting to compare the time they spend on these particular activities with their activity in the civic and political sector, as well as other individual level social capital variables such as interpersonal trust and life contentment. These findings could beneficial to both general scholarly knowledge as well as nonprofit organizations looking to attract and retain volunteers.

With regard to volunteer motivations, future studies can also attempt to validate Clary et al.’s (1994) VFI scale for measuring volunteer motivations. Factor analysis conducted in the present study only extracted four motivations, two less than the original six. Such studies could explore whether the six motivations in the scale are still relevant to college students, or whether the scale should be adapted to a more modern sample.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

I. Overview

The main purpose of this research was to determine the influence of Internet use on individual level social capital variables—life contentment, interpersonal trust, and volunteer behavior. Previous studies have similarly attempted to demonstrate the impact of media use on social capital. The present study sought to observe these relationships among college students, a demographic that has witnessed rising rates of volunteerism, as well as increased familiarity with new media. Employing the uses and gratifications theory, previous studies have shown that individuals who use media to seek surveillance or information gratifications are more likely to exhibit increased individual level social capital. Individuals who use media to fulfill entertainment or escape gratifications, however, are more likely to experience decreased individual level social capital. Therefore, this research has attempted to further the application of scales measuring gratifications sought through Internet use as well as scales measuring individual level social capital by applying them to a demographic for whom rates of social capital seem to be changing. Unlike previous studies, however, this research looked to the motivations of respondents for volunteering. Following previous assertions that personal contentment and interpersonal trust lead to increased volunteer activity, Clary et al.’s (1998) VFI scale was used for the first time in observing participants’ motivations for volunteering in relation to their
media use, as well as individual level social capital variables. No other previous studies have observed the relationships between these variables.

Consistent with previous studies, results from the current study showed no significant relationship between total time spent online, life contentment, and volunteer behavior. The study did find a positive and significant relationship between interpersonal trust and total time spent online. Looking to uses and gratifications of Internet use, this research showed a positive relationship between interpersonal trust and the information gratification for Internet use. Despite this finding, however, no other gratifications for Internet use were significantly associated with the individual level social capital variables. In support of the functional approach to volunteer motivations proposed by Clary et al. (1991), the study found that individuals who spend more time online are motivated to volunteer by their personal values. In regard to gratifications sought by Internet use, individuals who use the Internet for entertainment and out of boredom are likely to be motivated to volunteer by career ambitions, whereas respondents who use the Internet for surveillance were more likely to volunteer as a reflection of their personal values. Finally, individuals who use the Internet to escape from the world are motivated by the prospect of reducing their own personal guilt for being more fortunate than others. Although the findings of the present study cannot be generalized to the entire college student population, they can serve as initial steps for directing future researchers.
studying media use and motivations for volunteering, as well as individual level social capital on a broader basis.

II. Final Conclusions

There is research that points to a decrease in social capital in America. Disturbing for a number of reasons, decreased social capital leads to a population that is less likely to combat common societal problems together. Strong social capital has been linked to better schools, faster economic development, and safer communities. Clearly, the noted decline in social capital is of great concern to scholars. Researchers have worked long and hard to determine the causes and effects of declining social capital in America today. Many scholars have pointed to media use as the culprit for this decrease, and studies have sought to explain the impact of media use on individual level social capital variables, including life contentment, interpersonal trust, and engagement in the community. Rather than vilifying media as the main culprit, this research and other research like it hope to expose the pros and cons of media use in regard to social capital.

We are witnessing a turning point in the history of this country. As we lose some of the most engaged segments of the American population, younger, less civic-minded citizens are replacing them, thus making America less civic and less connected. While there was some recent increase in volunteering (possibly due to mandatory volunteering or “service learning”), civic activity is not what it used to be. There is prevalent optimism that the Obama administration can play a role in
revitalizing social capital in the United States, reigniting both service to the community and political engagement. The administration has been seen as pointing the country in a positive direction with spending and moral signaling. The present study and others like it can help to demonstrate the impact of modern day advancements on the social capital concept, highlighting the impact of media on social capital and motivations for volunteering. Additionally, they can provide insight on using potential volunteer motivations to attract and retain a reliable volunteer base on which the country’s social capital can build. Hopefully, future studies can shine light on the influence of this new mood and the impact it will have on individual level social capital and its influence on the country as a whole.
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APPENDIX A

Consent Form

You are being invited to voluntarily participate in the above-titled study. The purpose of the study is to understand the relationship between Internet use and volunteer work.

If you agree to participate, your participation will involve completing a survey (of 70 questions) that will take you about 20 minutes. You may chose not to answer some or all of the questions. You may stop taking the survey if you feel uncomfortable at any time.

Your name will not appear on your completed survey and no identifying information is being collected as part of this survey.

There are no risks for your participation. There is also no direct benefit from your participation, except that you will be helping with research and contributing to the body of knowledge. There is no cost to you except for your time and you are not compensated monetarily for your participation in this study.

Only the principal investigator will have access to the information that you provide.

You can obtain further information from the principal investigator, Andrea Stark, at (573) 239-1839. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may call the Campus Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri at (573) 882-9585.

By participating in this survey, you are giving permission to the investigator to use your answers for research purposes.

Thank you very much.

Andrea Stark

Master’s candidate, University of Missouri School of Journalism
APPENDIX B

Online Questionnaire

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your Internet use (1 = ‘I completely disagree’ and 7 = ‘I completely agree’)

1. I use the Internet so I can understand the world
2. I use the Internet to find out things I need to know about daily life
3. The Internet makes me want to learn more about things
4. I use the Internet because it helps me learn things about myself and others
5. The Internet shows me what society is like nowadays
6. I use the Internet so I can learn about what might happen to me
7. The Internet helps me judge what political leaders are really like
8. I use the Internet so I can keep up with what the government is doing
9. I use the Internet so I can talk with other people about what's covered
10. The Internet helps me satisfy my curiosity
11. I use the Internet so I can learn what is going on in the country and world
12. The Internet helps me get away from everyday worries
13. The Internet helps me when I want to be cheered up
14. The Internet helps me forget about school/homework
15. The Internet helps me take my mind off things
16. The Internet helps me relax
17. I use the Internet when I have nothing better to do
18. I use the Internet just because it’s there
19. I use the Internet because it passes the time, especially when I’m bored
20. I use the Internet when there’s no one else to talk to or be with
21. I use the Internet because it’s a good thing to do when I’m alone
22. I use the Internet because it’s enjoyable
23. I use the Internet because it’s exciting
24. I use the Internet because it’s thrilling
25. I use the Internet because it amuses me.

26. How much time do you use the Internet on a typical day?

(1) 0-30 min
(2) 31 minutes to 1 hour
(3) 1-3 hours
(4) 3-5 hours
(5) 5-8 hours
(6) More than 8 hours

Please answer the following questions about your volunteer behavior.

27. Are you currently involved in any volunteer activities?

(1) Yes
(2) No

28. How many hours per year do you volunteer?

(1) 0-10 hours
(2) 11-50 hours
(3) 51-100 hours
(4) More than 100 hours
29. Are you a member of a community organization?

(1) Yes
(2) No

30. Are you a member of a political or social justice organization?

(1) Yes
(2) No

31. In the coming year, how likely is it that you will volunteer time in a nonprofit or government organization? (1 = 'not at all likely,' 7 = 'extremely likely')

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 = 'I strongly disagree', 7 = 'strongly agree').

32. In most ways, my life is close to ideal.
33. The conditions of my life are excellent.
34. I am satisfied with my life.
35. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.
36. If I could live my time again, I would change almost nothing.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Some of the Time (4) Most of the Time (5) All of the Time)
37. Generally speaking, would you say that people can be trusted?

38. People will try to take advantage of you if they get the chance.

39. People try to be fair.

40. You can't be too careful in dealing with people.

41. People try to be helpful.

If you have done volunteer work before or are currently doing volunteer work, please indicate how important each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is to you. If you have not been a volunteer before, please indicate how important each of the following reasons for volunteering would be for you (1 = ‘not at all important,’ 7 = ‘extremely important’)

42. Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.

43. My friends volunteer

44. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself

45. People I’m close to want me to volunteer

46. Volunteering makes me feel important

47. People I know share an interest in community service.

48. No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it.

49. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.

50. By volunteering I feel less lonely

51. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.

52. Doing volunteer work relieves me of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.

53. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working
54. Volunteering increases my self-esteem
55. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
56. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
57. I feel compassion toward people in need.
58. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
59. Volunteering allows me to learn new things through direct, hands-on experience.
60. I feel it is important to help others.
61. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
62. Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.
63. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
64. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
65. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
66. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
67. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
68. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
69. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
70. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
71. I can explore my own strengths.

72. Please indicate your year in school:
   (1) Freshman
   (2) Sophomore
   (3) Junior
   (4) Senior
   (5) Graduate student
   (6) I am not a student
73. Please indicate your age:

74. Please indicate your gender:
   (1) Male
   (2) Female

75. Please indicate your cumulative GPA:
   (1) 3.8-4.0
   (2) 3.7-3.4
   (3) 3.3-3.0
   (4) 2.9-2.5
   (5) 2.5-2.0
   (5) Below 2.0
APPENDIX C

Gratifications Sought from Media Use (Vincent & Basil 1997)

Surveillance
--so I can understand the world
--to find out things I need to know about daily life
--it makes me want to learn more about things
--because it helps me learn things about myself and others
--it shows me what society is like nowadays
--so I can learn about what might happen to me
--it helps me judge what political leaders are really like
--so I can keep up with what the government is doing
--so I can talk with other people about what's covered
--it helps me satisfy my curiosity
--so I can learn what is going on in the country and world

Escape
--it helps me get away from everyday worries
--it helps me when I want to be cheered up
--it helps me forget about school/homework
--it helps me take my mind off things
--it helps me relax

Boredom
--when I have nothing better to do
--just because it’s on
--because it passes the time, especially when I’m bored
--when there’s no one else to talk to or be with
--because it’s a good thing to turn on when I’m alone

Entertainment
--because it’s entertaining
--because it’s enjoyable
--because it’s exciting
--because it’s thrilling
--because it amuses me
--it sometimes gives me a good laugh or cry
APPENDIX D

Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larson & Griffin, 1985)

(1=’I strongly disagree,’ 7=’I strongly agree’)

In most ways, my life is close to ideal.
The conditions of my life are excellent
I am satisfied with my life
So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life
If I could live my time again, I would change almost nothing
APPENDIX E

Rosenberg’s (1956) Faith in People Scale

(1) Never  (2) Hardly Ever  (3) Some of the Time  (4) Most of the Time  (5) All of the Time

Generally speaking, would you say that people can be trusted?
People will try to take advantage of you if they get the chance
People try to be fair
You can’t be too careful in dealing with people
People try to be helpful
APPENDIX F

The Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) Clary et al. (1994)

If you have done volunteer work before or are currently doing volunteer work, please indicate how important each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is to you. If you have not been a volunteer before, please indicate how important each of the following reasons for volunteering would be for you (1 = ‘not at all important,’ 7 = ‘extremely important’)

Protective

--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

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

Career

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

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 new things through direct, hands on experience
--I can learn how to deal with a variety of people
--I can explore my own strengths

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
APPENDIX G

Deleted Scale Items

1. Gratifications for media use (Vincent & Basil, 1997)
   - The Internet shows me what society is like nowadays
   - I use the Internet so I can learn about what might happen to me
   - I use the Internet so I can talk with other people about what’s covered
   - I use the Internet to learn what’s going on in the country and the world
   - I use the Internet because it’s enjoyable

2. Trust in Others Scale (Rosenberg, 1956)
   - People will try to take advantage of you if they get the chance
   - You can’t be too careful in dealing with people

3. The Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary et al., 1994)
   - Doing volunteer work relieves me of the guilt over being more fortunate than others
   - Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession
   - I can learn how to deal with a variety of people
   - I can explore my own strengths
   - Volunteering makes me feel important
   - Volunteering increases my self esteem
   - Volunteering is a way to make new friends