THE IMPACT OF FUNCTIONAL CONGRUENCE OR INCONGRUENCE OF VOLUNTEER REWARD MESSAGES ON TASK SATISFACTION

by

Laura C. Phillips

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Capella University

December 2005

THE IMPACT OF FUNCTIONAL CONGRUENCE OR INCONGRUENCE OF

VOLUNTEER REWARD MESSAGES ON TASK SATISFACTION

by

Laura C. Phillips

has been approved

December 2005

APPROVED:

JIM MIRABELLA, D.B.A., Faculty Mentor and Chair

GEORGE ECKER, Ph.D., Committee Member

MONTY LYNN, Ph.D., Committee Member

ACCEPTED AND SIGNED:

____

JIM MIRABELLA, D.B.A.

____

Kurt Linberg, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Business and Technology

Abstract

As nonprofit organizations continue to rely on volunteers to provide a substantial portion of their workforce, increased attention is being focused on volunteer motivation and the specific motivators which lead to initial and repeat volunteer involvement. This study examines volunteer satisfaction and interest in repeat involvement. In particular, it attempts to assess the role of rewards in these outcomes by determining volunteers' functional styles and assessing the relative impacts of functionally matched and functionally mismatched rewards. In the study, subjects participated in a service-learning activity as part of a college course. Following their participation, each received a personalized note of thanks from his or her respective organization; half these notes were functionally matched to the recipient's primary motivational need, while the other half were mismatched. Participants then completed a survey which assessed their task satisfaction and willingness to volunteer again. The hypotheses were tested using *t* tests, Chi Square, and analysis of covariance. The study found no difference in task satisfaction or interest in future volunteer opportunities between participants receiving matched messages and participants receiving functionally mismatched messages. Initial task interest and the mandatory or voluntary nature of the study were examined as potential moderating variables with mixed results.

Acknowledgments

I appreciate having this opportunity to thank a number of people whose help and cooperation made it possible for me to complete this project. First, I would like to thank Jim Mirabella, my mentor and committee chair for his guidance and encouragement and for his willingness to talk when I needed to talk and let me work on my own when I just needed time to work. I also want to thank my other committee members, Monty Lynn and George Ecker for their insightful comments and prompt readings of my drafts. Your inputs made this dissertation a better product.

Thanks also to the professors at Abilene Christian University who partnered with me in this project by allowing their students to participate in the study: Tim Coburn, Darryl Jinkerson, Mark Phillips, and Jeffrey Wherry. Without their assistance, there would have been no study. I appreciate Brek Horn, Abilene Christian University's women's volleyball coach, for her willingness to get involved in one of the service-learning projects and for her support in this endeavor. I also want to thank Nancy Coburn, the director of Abilene Christian University's Volunteer and Service-Learning Center, for her help during brainstorming sessions and for her cooperation throughout the project.

Finally, I want to thank my husband, Mark, and my children, Allison and Matthew, for their patience and understanding while I was in school. They were supportive and encouraging and willing to pick up some of the slack at home. I would not have been able to complete this program without their blessing.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iii

List of Tables vii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Introduction to the Problem. 1

Background of the Study 2

Statement of the Problem 6

Purpose of the Study 7

Research Questions 7

Significance of the Study 8

Definition of Terms 9

Nature of the Study 11

Assumptions and Limitations 14

Organization of Remaining Chapters 16

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE 17

Theories of Volunteer Motivation 17

Extrinsic Rewards 31

Application of Rewards to Volunteers 43

Measuring Effectiveness of Rewards 48

Application of Theory in a Service-Learning Environment 72

Summary 76

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 80

Purpose of the Study 80

Research Foundations 80

Research Design 81

Sample 85

Data Collection Procedures 87

Operationalization of Study Constructs 90

Proposed Method of Analysis 96

Assumptions and Limitations 103

Summary 111

CHAPTER 4: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 112

Response Rate 112

Demographics of Participants 113

Factor Analysis of Volunteer Functions Inventory 113

Initial Interest Measure 119

Knowledge of the Sport (Business Students Only) 120

Task Satisfaction 120

Hypothesis Testing 122

Summary 139

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 140

Theoretical Positioning of the Study 140

Summary of the Results 141

Implications of the Results and Suggestions for Future Research 144

Limitations of the Study 149

Conclusion 150

REFERENCES 152

APPENDIX A: Text of Recruiting Video 169

APPENDIX B: Volleyball Rules and Terminology 171

APPENDIX C: Thank-you Notes for Volleyball Service Learning Project 173

APPENDIX D: Thank-you Notes, Developmental Psychology Service Learning Project 176

List of Tables

Table 1: Factor pattern matrix (principal-axis factor analysis, oblique rotation) 115

Table 2: Mean values for each of the six VFI factors (on a seven-point scale) 117

Table 3: Reliability statistics for VFI factors 118

Table 4: Reliability statistics for factors produced in five-factor principal-axis factor analysis, oblique rotation 119

Table 5: Crosstab of letter message and interest in future participation 123

Table 6: Moderating effect of volleyball knowledge on the relationship between letter message and self-reported task satisfaction 126

Table 7: Moderating effect of volleyball knowledge on the relationship between letter message and willingness to sign up for future service 126

Table 8: Moderating effect of initial interest on the relationship between letter message and self-reported task satisfaction 128

Table 9: Moderating effect of initial interest on the relationship between letter message and willingness to sign up for future service 128

Table 10: Crosstab of initial task interest and willingness to sign up to help in the future for recipients of mismatched reward messages 129

Table 11: Moderating effect of mandatory service on the relationship between letter message and self-reported task satisfaction 132

Table 12: Moderating effect of mandatory/voluntary participation on the relationship between letter message and willingness to sign up for future service 133

Table 13: Crosstab of mandatory/voluntary participation and willingness to sign up to help in the future for recipients of matched reward messages 133

Table 14: Crosstab of mandatory/voluntary participation and willingness to sign up to help in the future for recipients of mismatched reward messages 134

Table 15: Distribution of gender and credit hours by sample 136

Table 16: Relationship between demographic variables and willingness to volunteer again 138

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

According to the National Center for Charitable Statistics, in 2004 the number of nonprofit organizations in the United States was almost 1.4 million (*Number of nonprofit organizations in the United States, 1996-2004*, 2004). While these organizations include a significant number of paid employees (9.7 million in 1997), they also rely on a significant volunteer work force to accomplish their organizational objectives ("Nonprofits' share of economy growing," 1997). In 1998, the number of U.S. volunteers aged 18 or over topped 109 million, and these individuals provided approximately 16 billion hours of formal volunteer labor over the course of the year. These volunteers account for 56% of the adults in this country (*Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey, 1999*, 1999). While the volunteer rates determined using the Current Population Survey (CPS) are generally lower than those calculated by the Independent Sector's research, CPS data also indicates a significant level of volunteering among American youth. In 2003, the nationwide volunteer rate for 16-18 year olds was 32%, while the rate for the 19-24 year old group was 20% (Helms, 2004).

While the nonprofits' reliance on volunteer labor is not new (e.g., 80.0 million or more U.S. adult volunteers each year since 1989), the pressure to recruit and maintain volunteers has continued to grow (*Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey, 1999*, 1999; Wilson, 2000). The reasons for this increasing demand are two-fold. First, apprehension over the possibility that "civic life is declining in modern

societies" elevates worries that volunteerism rates will decline (Wilson, 2000, p. 217). In addition, government initiatives promoting volunteerism, such as Bush's National and Community Service Act of 1990 and Clinton's National and Community Service Trust Act, are seen by critics as veiled attempts by the government to decrease its role in providing social services to the public (Austin & Hasenfeld, 1985; Olsen, 1986; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). According to this position, as governments pull out of social service delivery, a compensating increase in volunteer labor is required just to maintain the same level of social services (Olsen, 1986; Stukas & Dunlap, 2002). The ongoing and ever expanding need for volunteers, coupled with the low exit barriers associated with volunteering, make the study of volunteer motivation both timely and important.

Background of the Study

Why do people do what they do? The quest for understanding motivation has fueled academic research for decades. Discovering the key to motivating individuals and groups has profound potential for organizational leaders of all types, as they strive to align the goals of individuals with the goals of the organization. Theories of motivation have existed since the early 1900's when Frederick Taylor's theory of scientific management gave support to the idea that a worker's efforts and commitment to the organization were given in exchange for the wage they received (Wilkinson, Orth, & Benfari, 1986).

Since that early date, more sophisticated theories have tried to include some of the nuances of human behavior. Douglas McGregor, Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, David McClelland, and John Morse and Jay Lorsch have all contributed to the background of

motivation theory (Wilkinson et al., 1986). While each of the theories posited by these researchers strive to explain intuitively how individuals are motivated, they remain rather vague descriptions of motivation. They do not explain to managers how their paid employees or volunteer workforce will react to specific attempts to improve motivation and increase commitment to organizational goals. Not content with theoretical discussions of motivation, academic researchers in multiple disciplines seek to empirically test how specific variables impact different aspects of motivation in a variety of circumstances.

Within the study of motivation theory, the concepts of both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation have received a considerable amount of attention. The study of extrinsic motivation initially focused on rewards and motivation in the for-profit arena, with much of the research taking place within the domain of economics (Benabou & Tirole, 2003; Lazear, 2000a, 2000b). While researchers acknowledge that nonmonetary rewards can be important factors in worker motivation (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Merchant, Stede, & Zheng, 2003), they have focused their empirical studies almost exclusively on the effects of monetary rewards, possibly because the nonquantitative nature of nonmonetary rewards makes data collection difficult (Merchant et al., 2003). Unfortunately, since nonprofit organizations are limited to nonmonetary rewards, this gap in the extrinsic reward research limits the applicability of this existing research to the study of volunteers.

Beyond the concern about a lack of research investigating nonmonetary rewards, the diversity of outcomes within the extrinsic reward research that examined paid employees makes simply exporting motivation research from the for-profit environment to the nonprofit world seem inadvisable because of a variety of differences between volunteers and paid

workers. Even though the number of individuals volunteering each year is substantial (109 million adults in 1998), volunteers are not representative of the general U.S. population (Allen & Rushton, 1983; Auslander & Litwin, 1988; Smith, 1994). In addition, since most volunteers also have paying jobs, they may need their volunteer work to fulfill only those motivational needs that are not being met at work. Because of the differences in the population of paid workers and the population of volunteers, researchers have developed numerous theories of motivation that are specifically designed for unpaid workers.

The simplest and most basic of these theories focused on the dichotomy of altruism and egoism. Altruism, on one hand, describes behavior that takes place without any expectation of external reward, while egoistic behavior is prompted by an individual's self-interest (Batson, Ahmad, & Tsang, 2002; Bierhoff, 1987; Schervish & Havens, 1997, 2002). The external rewards that can be garnered through egoistic volunteerism are varied and are compatible with many of the extrinsic rewards studied in the for-profit environment. Even though altruistic helping behavior does not look for an external reward, individuals behaving altruistically can be seeking and can receive important intangible benefits, such as an increase in self-esteem or the good feelings that come from helping others (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, & Copeland, 1998).

Even though these theories provided a starting point for the study of volunteer motivation, they are too simplistic and are, therefore, unable to describe the complexity of volunteers' motivations. Additional theories were developed, each of which focused on one or more aspects of volunteer motivation. Some of these theories include identification theory (Schervish & Havens, 1997, 2002), social resources theory (Auslander & Litwin, 1988;

Smith, 1994), exchange theory (Wilson, 2000), and expectancy theory (Miller, 1985). Each of these theories emanates from a unique theoretical perspective and each provides some insight into the behavior of volunteers. Their unidimensional nature, however, inhibits their ability to describe the full range of volunteer motivations.

In the mid-1980s, Omoto and Snyder (1985) applied functional theory to the motivations of AIDS volunteers. Functional theory, which suggests that individuals can undertake the same actions for very different reasons (Katz, 1960), originated in the late 1950s and has subsequently been applied to numerous studies of prejudice and stigmatism, social and political issues, marketing, communication, sports and leisure, and human resources. Functional theory is inherently multidimensional and therefore able to capture a variety of different motivations. Following its application to AIDS workers, Clary et al. (1998) developed an inventory that has broader application and can be used to study the motivations of all volunteers. The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) is a 30-item survey that examines volunteer motivations according to six functional needs. These functional needs include (a) values, (b) understanding, (c) career, (d) social, (e) protective, and (f) enhancement (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). While all volunteer samples have not placed the functions in the same order or rated them at the same absolute level of importance, each sample has demonstrated the existence of six unique functions with adequate internal reliabilities (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Ferrari et al., 1999; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Switzer, Switzer, Stukas, & Baker, 1999). Identifying the motivational functions of volunteers and testing the reliability of the VFI is a critical first

step. With that step having been accomplished, efforts can now focus on applying this tool to the organizational issues of nonprofits.

The study of the motivation of volunteers has long been the subject of academic research, and a substantial amount of progress has been made regarding the identification and classification of those varied motives. With that extensive background already developed, researchers are now in a position to apply the theory in ways that will help nonprofits as they continually strive to recruit and retain volunteers.

Statement of the Problem

In an effort to keep their volunteers satisfied and to increase retention, nonprofit managers are continually trying to find symbolic rewards that increase volunteer commitment and have a favorable impact on performance. Some of these symbolic rewards include (a) thank-you letters, (b) prizes, (c) publicity, (d) appreciation dinners, and (e) conferences (Cnaan & Cascio, 1999). While the list above includes just a few broad categories, nonprofits have used an amazing array of specific rewards. In their study, Cnaan and Cascio (1999) used multiple regression to assess the impact of specific demographic, personality, and situational variables on volunteer satisfaction, organizational commitment, and tenure. While they found that symbolic rewards do play a role in the three outcomes, none of the regression equations contained more than two of the seventeen symbolic rewards they included in their analysis (Cnaan & Cascio, 1999).

Since research has demonstrated that individuals have a variety of motivational needs, it seems likely that when a large and diverse group of volunteers is considered (e.g., 510

participants from 105 human service organizations in the above example), their differing motivational needs would mitigate the overall impact of any particular extrinsic reward on the outcome variables. Unless researchers systematically match and mismatch rewards with volunteers' individual functional preferences, it will be difficult to determine whether rewarding volunteers in a functionally-relevant manner can favorably impact the outcome variables of interest.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of functionally matching and mismatching the message of a specific symbolic reward with the individual functional preferences of volunteers. The effects will be determined by measuring the participants' task satisfaction and fulfillment at the conclusion of the activity as well as their interest in volunteering to participate in the study activity after the conclusion of the experimental period. The moderating effects of initial task interest and the mandatory or voluntary nature of the service activity on the two outcome variables will also be examined.

Research Questions

Research Question One: Is there a difference in the task satisfaction/fulfillment of a volunteer who receives a functionally matched reward message and the task satisfaction/fulfillment of a volunteer who receives a functionally mismatched reward message.

Research Question Two: Does the functional matching or mismatching of the reward message make a difference in the rate at which participants sign up to participate in a similar volunteer activity that takes place after the initial service activity has concluded?

Research Question Three: Does an individual's initial interest in the community service activity moderate the relationship between the matching or mismatching of the reward message and the two outcome variables (self-report and behavioral)?

Research Question Four: Does an individual's prior knowledge of the nonprofit environment moderate the relationship between the matching or mismatching of the reward message and the two outcome variables (self-report and behavioral)?

Research Question Five: Is the relationship between the matching or mismatching of the reward message and the two outcome variables (self-report and behavioral) moderated by whether the service task is mandatory or voluntary?

Significance of the Study

Recruiting and retaining volunteer workers is an ongoing challenge for nonprofit managers (Wilson, 2000). Recruiting and training new workers can be both time-consuming and expensive (Thatcher, Stepina, & Boyle, 2002) and may stretch thin the already tight resources of nonprofit enterprises. Nonprofit organizations frequently provide symbolic rewards to their volunteers to show appreciation and to help keep those volunteers satisfied and involved with the nonprofit (Cnaan & Cascio, 1999). Unfortunately, since not everyone values any particular reward equally, nonprofits cannot simply rank the effectiveness of the possible rewards and stick to the ones that are at the top of the list. Instead, a reward that

might be highly valued to one volunteer, such as media publicity, could actually be de-motivating to another.

By examining the effect of rewarding volunteers in a way that meets their individual motivational needs, this study can give nonprofit organizations another tool to help them more effectively satisfy and retain volunteers. While in some cases, nonprofit managers might choose to ascertain the functional needs of their volunteers and reward the volunteers in accordance with those needs, that solution would probably be too costly for large nonprofits. If this study demonstrates that functionally matched rewards are more effective than other rewards, nonprofits could utilize this information by either making sure that over time they use rewards that meet a variety of functional needs or by letting volunteers choose the manner in which they are appreciated from among a number of functionally differentiated symbolic rewards.

Definition of Terms

Extrinsic rewards are rewards offered to an individual by someone else (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000).

A *functionally matched reward* is a reward that is congruent with the recipient's primary functional need as derived from the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

A *functionally mismatched reward* is a reward that is congruent with the recipient's lowest functional need as derived from the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

Intrinsic motivation is the desire to engage in an activity simply for the satisfaction or enjoyment that comes from the activity itself (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Henderlong & Lepper, 2002).

Intrinsic rewards come from within the individual performing the task and can include being proud of an accomplishment or simply enjoying the task itself (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000).

Job satisfaction has been defined as the "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1300) or as "one's affective attachment to the job" (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 261).

Motivational functions is the term given to the different reasons individuals hold a particular attitude or engage in a certain behavior (Katz, 1960). Individuals engaging in the same behavior may have different motivations for doing so and would therefore have varying functional profiles.

Organizational commitment describes an employee's attachment to the organization for which he works. It is comprised of three dimensions: (a) affective, (b) continuance, (c) normative. Of these three dimensions, affective commitment has been the most frequently studied (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Service-learning refers to community service projects that are coordinated efforts between the school and the community. To be a service-learning project, the community service activity should not only meet real service needs within the community but also be an integral part of the course curriculum, allowing students to apply what they learn in class to the real world (Kessinger, 2004).

Nature of the Study (Methodology)

Research Design

In this study the functional profiles of students participating in a university sponsored service-learning activity at a local nonprofit organization will be determined using the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). In an experimental design, half of the participants will receive a thank-you note from the nonprofit that contains a message that is congruent with the individual's highest-rated functional need while the other half will receive a thank-you note that contains a message that matches the individual's lowest-rated functional need. The two groups of students will be selected randomly from among the participants.

The notes will be delivered through the normal postal system during the week following completion of the service activity, and the dependent variables will be measured through a survey that is administered in class one week following completion of the activity. Two dependent variables will be measured. The first outcome variable is a self-report measure of task fulfillment/satisfaction taken from a study that examined the impact of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation (Arnold, 1985). The second dependent variable is a behavioral indicator of task interest measured by the percent of participants willing to sign up to engage in a similar service activity in the future.

Sampling

Two samples of students will be utilized for this study. The first sample consists of undergraduate business students in two sections of a statistics course, three sections of a strategic management course, and one section of an introduction to management course at a

private U.S. university. These students will be offered the opportunity to engage in a service-learning project for the university's volleyball team, collecting and analyzing data from a home volleyball match. In exchange for their participation in the activity, the statistics and introduction to management students will receive extra credit while the strategic management students will receive credit for a required course project. (The service learning project will be one option for this project.) They will be recruited via video featuring highlights from the previous season and an appeal by the women's volleyball coach.

The second sample is made up of undergraduate psychology students enrolled in a developmental psychology course at the same university. These students are required to spend 10 hours in community service at any one of a number of local nonprofit organizations over the course of the semester. Students in the second sample will be recruited for participation in the study at the beginning of the semester when they are being introduced to the service-learning component of the course. While the courses included in the study were chosen because they either already contained a service-learning component or the faculty were willing to add a service project, the two experimental groups will be selected randomly from among the participants.

Data Collection

Prior to engaging in the service-learning activity, participants will complete, in class, the 30-item Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998), a 7-item assessment of their initial interest in the activity (Arnold, 1985), and 1 item measuring prior knowledge of the sport of volleyball (Sample 1 only). At this time, students will also provide some demographic data, such as gender and classification. At the conclusion of the study, an

additional 6-item survey will be used to measure the participants' satisfaction with the volunteer activity (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, Study 5). Students will also be given the opportunity, at that time, to sign up to participate in a similar activity in the future. The follow-up survey will also be conducted during a regular class meeting.

Data Analysis

Following extraction of the six factors of the VFI using principal-axis factor analysis, internal reliabilities will be calculated for each VFI factor as well as for the initial interest and task satisfaction/fulfillment scales. Each participant's functional profile will be computed by determining his average score for each factor. This calculation is necessary to determine each individual's highest and lowest functional need, which will, in turn, establish the message of the thank-you note he receives following his participation in the service activity. Since task satisfaction/fulfillment is measured using scale data, an independent samples *t* test will be used to test the main effect for this dependent variable. The other dependent variable, interest in participating in a similar volunteer activity in the future, is categorical in nature. Therefore, Chi Square will be used to analyze the relationship between the content of the thank-you note and future interest (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).

To determine whether initial task interest and/or prior knowledge of the sport of volleyball moderate the primary relationship, the participants must be divided into subgroups of high and low interest and high and low knowledge. The subgroups will be determined using a median split of the data (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). To determine whether the mandatory or voluntary nature of the service project moderates the primary relationship, the relationships will be reexamined using the business students and the psychology students as

the two independent subgroups. Again, independent samples *t* tests will be used for hypotheses in which satisfaction/fulfillment is the dependent variable, while Chi Square will be used when interest in future volunteering is the dependent variable (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

A number of assumptions are inherent in this study of volunteer motivation. With regard to demographic variables, it is assumed that, based on prior volunteer motivation research, neither gender nor classification will impact study results. Other research utilizing the VFI suggests some of the functions may not receive a most important or least important rating by any of the participants. This lack of diversity within the profiles, however, should not affect the ability of matched or mismatched messages to affect the dependent variables.

While it is expected that participants will not share the contents of their thank-you notes with other participants, comparison of the contents is not expected to affect outcomes of the study. In addition, the reward provided by the thank-you notes is expected to be salient enough that matching and mismatching the messages will result in differing levels of task satisfaction/fulfillment. The service projects in this study are designed to be completed individually; therefore, the small amount of group interaction that could take place at the service activity should not have a significant impact on the relationships being considered. Prior knowledge of the volleyball (Sample 1) and mandatory vs. voluntary service are not expected to impact the primary relationship being studied; nevertheless, their potential

impact as moderators is being examined. Even though the behavioral measures of task satisfaction for the two samples differ in terms of specificity and temporal proximity to the service-learning activity, these differences are not expected to impact the study results. Finally, differences in the level of emotional involvement associated with the various volunteer activities are not expected to impact the study outcomes.

Limitations

As is true of any research design, the results from this study are subject to a number of limitations. Some of these limitations are the result of simplifications necessary to create an experimental design in which the number of potentially confounding variables is minimized. For example, while nonprofits often use long-term volunteers, the volunteer experiences used in the study were short and focused on the initial interactions between the participants and the nonprofit organizations. In addition, only one type of symbolic reward was examined. Additional limitations in the generalizability of the findings are the result of the sample used in the study. While university students are often found among the ranks of volunteers, they, by no means, comprise the full range of unpaid workers utilized by nonprofit organizations. The study results might vary if a broader sample were used. In addition, study results based on participants who were encouraged to participate as a part of a required course could differ from results that would result from a sample of individuals that volunteered outside of the service-learning environment. Finally, the number of participants may not be sufficient to provide the desired level of statistical power, further limiting extrapolation of the results to the entire volunteer population.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

The following chapter contains a review of the relevant literature. Topics covered include (a) several theories of volunteer motivation, with a particular emphasis on functional theory, (b) prior research on extrinsic rewards and the application of rewards to volunteers, (c) a study of potential outcome variables, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, and (d) a discussion of service-learning and its applicability to this study. Chapter three contains a more detailed description of the methodology, while chapters four and five present the analysis of data and the study conclusions, respectively.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theories of Volunteer Motivation

Since the labor contributed by volunteers is essential to the effective functioning of nonprofit organizations in the United States (see Introduction), nonprofit managers have a vested interest in keeping their volunteers motivated. Research in the area of volunteer motivation has resulted in a number of theories including altruism (Simmons, Klein, & Simmons, 1977), egoism (Schervish & Havens, 1997), identification theory (Schervish & Havens, 1997), social resources theory (Auslander & Litwin, 1988), exchange theory (Wilson, 2000), expectancy theory (Miller, 1985), and functional theory (Clary & Snyder, 1999).

Altruism and Egoism

Much of the early work addressing motivations of volunteers (and philanthropists) centered on the debate between altruistic and egoistic motives, both of which are founded within the perspective of "rational utilitarianism" and are found at opposite ends of the same scale (Schervish & Havens, 1997; 2002, p. 49). Altruistic helping behavior can be defined as an action in which the helper initiates the act voluntarily without expecting a reward from external sources (Bierhoff, 1987). Altruism explains helping behaviors through the motivational lens of selflessness, putting aside one's own personal interests to cater to the interests of others (Schervish & Havens, 1997). Much of the altruistic research revolves around heroism (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981) and blood and organ donation (Simmons et al., 1977; Simmons, Marine, & Simmons, 1987; Titmuss, 1971). Another

frequently cited example of altruistic behavior is tipping in out-of-town restaurants you do not expect to ever visit again (Frank, 1996).

The emotion of empathy, identifying with the need of another person, is commonly suggested to be the source of altruistic behavior. Empathy is typically directed toward specific individuals, which may make it difficult to use altruism as a motivator for helping intangible groups such as the poor. Another potential concern of altruistic behavior is that empathic motivation to help an individual can actually lead to behavior that is at odds with the common good (Batson et al., 2002).

Even though, at some times, altruism has been considered a primary motivator of charitable behavior, at other times its very existence has been challenged (Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998). Current academic opinion rests somewhere in between these two extremes. Studies have shown that altruistic behavior is linked to feelings of sympathy for another individual (Batson, 1990). Another explanation of how altruism impacts behavior is that it does not, by itself, drive an individual to action, but instead helps him act in a manner that is consistent with his personal set of norms (Clary & Snyder, 1991). The altruistic framework appeals to the part of man that wants to believe people are noble, that they can and will act out of selflessness, putting the needs of others ahead of their own.

At the opposite extreme from altruism is the motivator labeled egoism; it is defined as acting in a way that promotes an individual's self-interest. It has been called "the most obvious motive for acting for the common good" (Batson et al., 2002, p. 434) as well as the only motive powerful enough to make a difference (Hardin, 1977). The benefits that an individual can receive from egoistic helping behavior include monetary compensation,

recognition, avoidance of fines or punishment, reduced guilt, increased self-esteem, improved position at work, and many more. Although egoism is a powerful motivator, it is also unpredictable. Since the goal is an increase in self-benefits rather than the common good, when an opportunity comes along that more effectively meets the egoistic goals, the individual's contribution to the community project will typically be terminated (Batson et al., 2002).

While altruism and egoism both contribute to an understanding of volunteer motivation, they do not adequately reflect the multifaceted nature of an individual's initial or ongoing decision to contribute their time to an organization. Additional theories have been posited in an attempt to better explain this phenomenon.

Identification Theory

This theory, initially applied to philanthropic giving, has since been expanded to encompass organizational volunteer activities as well as helping individuals through informal one-on-one interactions (Schervish & Havens, 1997, 2002). Identification theory attempts to expand the discussion of volunteer motivations beyond the somewhat simplistic early debate of altruistic versus egoistic motivations for helping (Batson et al., 2002). Through both interviews and empirical analysis, Schervish and his colleagues determined that an individual's decision to give time or money was directed not by pure altruism or self-interest but by identifying in some way with the organization's cause (Schervish & Havens, 1997; Schervish, O'Herlihy, & Havens, 2001).

Identification theory has been described as relational in nature because an individual's connection to the organization's cause is often a second- or third-hand encounter. As the

number of relationships increases, the number of causes with which an individual relates increases as well. In a multivariate study of charitable giving, communities of participation (i.e., connection to various groups) were found to be more strongly correlated with philanthropy than any other category of variables (Schervish & Havens, 1997). Individuals are routinely confronted with ways to contribute time and money to worthwhile organizations. Schervish and Havens (2002) suggest that individuals are not trying to decide whether or not they should invest themselves in helping behaviors. Instead, they are trying to decide how to allocate their precious resources among the options available, and out of all the choices, they are most likely to choose organizations which have personally impacted either them or someone they know.

Social Resources Theory

Social resources theory takes the position that an individual's participation in voluntary associations is positively related to his social participation and network of social resources. As an individual's participation in church, recreation activities, sports, political activities and interaction with neighbors and friends increases, so does his involvement in volunteer activities (Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, & Craft, 1995; Smith, 1994). In a multivariate study, the three highest predictors of the number of types of voluntary organizations with which a person is involved were education, income, and sociability. In fact, sociability entered the regression equation before other much studied and highly significant variables such as race, marital status, employment status, and age (Auslander & Litwin, 1988). Booth and Babchuk (1969) also found that personal contacts were strongly related to association with voluntary organizations. Although theoretically different, the

relationship between social participation and involvement in voluntary organizations is consistent with the identification theory finding that communities of participation are significantly related to philanthropy (Schervish, 1997).

A number of mechanisms have been proposed to explain how an increase in social resources impacts an individual's level of volunteering. For example, some studies have shown that social connections produce trust and that trust facilitates making the choice to contribute time (Brady, Schlozman, & Verba, 1999). (Other studies have demonstrated that a lack of trust in the current system is what motivates individuals to get involved (Kohut, 1998; Oliver, 1984).) Another possibility is that individuals get involved because they do not want to disappoint their friends or because the social tie motivates them to pull their own weight (Wuthnow, 1991). Finally, as the number of an individual's social connections increases, the chances that he will be asked to participate in a volunteer activity also increases (Brady et al., 1999).

One challenge associated with the social resources theory is that the direction of the causal link is unknown. In other words, is voluntary participation driven by an increased number of social relationships and interactions or does participation in voluntary organizations result in the increase in social participation (Smith, 1994)? Another issue with this theoretical perspective is that it is much easier to identify social resources after the fact—once the volunteering has occurred. Since some connection that can be labeled a social resource can almost always been found, it is difficult to disprove the theory (Wilson, 2000).

Exchange Theory

Exchange theory is based on the utilitarian understanding that individuals expect to receive reciprocation for their actions. An individual that donates time and energy to a volunteer activity anticipates receiving roughly equal benefits from engaging in that activity (Wilson, 2000). These benefits can come in the form of learning new skills, making new friends or spending time with old ones, psychological satisfaction from helping others, etc. Exchange relationships can be comprised of either social or economic exchanges (Deckop, Mangel, & Cirka, 1999). In economic exchange relationships the terms of reciprocity are clearly defined and the time lag between the action and its accompanying economic exchange is generally short (i.e., an employee knows that at the end of the week he will be paid for the hours worked during that week). Social exchange relationships, on the other hand, contain an element of trust that allows for greater flexibility in the relationship. The value of the relationship itself offsets temporary imbalances in what each member of the relationship is receiving from the exchange (Blau, 1964).

According to social exchange theory, one outcome of the reciprocal relationship between an individual and an organization is perceived organizational support (POS), which is the individual's general feelings about how much the organization cares about them and values their contributions (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). This theory posits that being treated fairly and receiving rewards are antecedents of POS and contribute to an individual reciprocating with actions that are beneficial to the organization (Shore & Shore, 1995).

The use of exchange theory to explain volunteerism has also been criticized for a number of reasons. Theorists have focused on easily quantifiable investments such as number of hours spent or the value of lost income as sum of the volunteer's inputs into the exchange relationship, ignoring more qualitative resources that volunteers contribute to the organization (Wilson, 2000). Also, volunteers, in an attempt to balance the relationship in their own minds, may unconsciously place a value on their enjoyment of the task that equals the perceived gap between what they contribute to the relationship and what they receive (Wuthnow, 1991).While exchange theory assumes that individuals operate out of self-interest, other theories suggest that helping behaviors are a way for an individual to express his perceived identity as someone who helps other people (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Schervish & Havens, 1997). Finally, exchange theory suggests that individuals make a rational choice about their behavior without inputs from others. Again, other theories claim that the choice to volunteer is related to personal acquaintances and societal norms (Auslander & Litwin, 1988; Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Smith, 1994).

Expectancy Theory

According to expectancy theory, individuals participate in volunteer activities when they expect that their involvement will produce outcomes that are meaningful to them (Lawler, 1973). This theory was adapted to help explain the well-documented relationship between sociodemographic variables and volunteering by suggesting that individuals in different sociodemographic groups place different values on the rewards received from volunteer activities (Anderson & Moore, 1978). Unfortunately, empirical research has only provided weak support for expectancy theory (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Mitchell, 1985;

Wahba & House, 1974), possibly because this theory suggests that the presence of desirable outcomes will motivate participation even if those outcomes are obtained through other activities (Miller & Palmer, 1984). Therefore, the applicability of expectancy theory to volunteerism depends, to some extent, on the ability of the volunteer experience to provide desirable outcomes or rewards that individuals are not receiving in their paid work environment or other extracurricular activities. Research has demonstrated that individuals whose jobs are not meeting their needs for growth have a greater expectation for their volunteer activities to meet these psychological needs than do individuals whose growth needs are met at work (Miller, 1985).

Functional Theory

Background

Functional theory suggests that individuals hold certain attitudes or engage in particular behaviors because those attitudes and actions meet specific psychological functions and that different individuals can hold the same attitudes or participate in the same behaviors for very different functional reasons (Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). Functional theory originated within the field of psychology and was only applied to volunteers in the last decade (Omoto & Snyder, 1995).

Unlike previous theories of motivation the functional approach proposed by Katz (1960) and Smith et al. (1956) focuses strictly on psychological variables as factors of attitude change. In the past, external factors that were used in the study of attitude changes include exposure to a topic via mass media or contact with an individual that might elicit attitudes of prejudice. Focusing on psychological, rather than experiential, factors increases

the likelihood that human behavior observed in functional studies could be extrapolated to the general public. In addition, this approach allows a single attitude to serve multiple functions, reducing the problem of oversimplification inherent in earlier theories. Finally, early theories neglected to identify the circumstances under which attitudes would change. Since functional theory allows for multiple sources of motivation, it is better equipped to handle the complexities of human behavior (Katz, 1960).

Functional theory enjoyed instant popularity because it has an intuitive feel; according to Snyder (1993) it "has that 'natural' feel to it that . . . characterizes all good psychological thinking" (p. 262). A half century ago, Boring (1950) suggested that "it is as natural to be a functionalist as it is to want to predict, to be more interested in the future than the past, to prefer to ride facing forward on the train" (p. 551). Because of its intuitive application to the formation and changing of attitudes, the functional approach as outlined by Katz (1960) and Smith et al. (1956) was fashionable in the psychology literature in the late 1950's and early 1960's (Herek, 1987). For the two decades that followed, however, it was largely ignored (Ennis & Zanna, 1993; Herek, 1987; Shavitt, 1989). Reasons for its neglect include a lack of specificity (Shavitt, 1989) and inadequate methodology (Ennis & Zanna, 1993).

To effectively utilize functional theory to shape an individual's attitudes, researchers and practitioners must be able to (a) identify an individual's functional perspective prior to observing the desired attitude, (b) understand the types of functions a particular object can fulfill, and (c) understand what type of message is required to make the functional needs of the individual and the functional appeal of the object compatible. Over the last 20 years,

academic researchers invested a considerable amount of effort trying to accomplish these three objectives. This work has been facilitated by methodological improvements that enable researchers to measure motivational reasons for individuals' attitudes (Shavitt, 1989).

Research utilizing functional theory

Areas of research. A search of the Social Sciences Citation Index shows that since 1981, Katz's (1960) article on functional theory has been cited in 309 other scholarly research articles, an average of 16.3 articles each year (*SD* = 5.0). Interest in the topic has not waned with the passing of time. The average number of citations per year for the 2000-2004 period (21.0) is as high as the yearly average for any other consecutive five years included in the index.

Although over 100 of the articles that referenced Katz's (1960) functional theory would probably be classified as basic psychological research, the theory has also been used in applied research in a number of areas. Functional theory has been applied to attitudes of prejudice and stigmatism (over 60 articles) with regard to homosexuality (Herek, 2002; Wyman & Snyder, 1997), AIDS victims (Brandyberry & MacNair, 1996; Pryor, Reeder, Vinacco, & Kott, 1989), disabled individuals (Popovich, Scherbaum, Scherbaum, & Polinko, 2003), race (Pedersen, Griffiths, Contos, & Walker, 2000; Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2003), gender (Feather, 2004), age (Kearney, Miller, Paul, & Smith, 2000; Snyder & Miene, 1994), obesity (Crandall & Martinez, 1996), immigrants (Hernes & Knudsen, 1992), head lice (Maunder, 1985), and women managers (Buetell, 1984). In addition to studies that examine the functions of attitudes that individuals have toward these out-groups, research has been conducted to examine the impact that prejudice toward out-groups has on the health workers

that care for them. Functional theory has also been applied to attitudes relating to a variety of social and political issues (over 60 articles) such as voting (Shah, Domke, & Wackman, 1996), eating meat (Worsley & Skrzypiec, 1998), abortion (Wang & Buffalo, 2004), the environment (Bright & Manfredo, 1997), military actions (Hanze, 2001), unemployment (Feather, 1985), eating disorder treatment (Martz & Bazzini, 1999), wearing bicycle helmets (Ressler & Toledo, 1997), adolescent cigarette smoking (Chassin, Presson, & Sherman, 1990), and sexual harassment (Terpstra & Baker, 1986).

Over 50 articles have been published in the area of marketing covering topics such as the length of time between repeat purchases (Grewal, Mehta, & Kardes, 2004), the complexities of consumer behavior (Mannetti, Pierro, & Livi, 2002), and the impact of consumer's social identity on his purchase behavior (Reed, 2002). While the marketing topics are varied, the most common application of functional theory to marketing is in the realm of promotion and advertising (Aaker, 1997; Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000; Garst & Bodenhausen, 1997; Shavitt, 1990; Smith, Haugtvedt, Jadrich, & Anton, 1995; Snyder & DeBono, 1985). A logical application of functional theory to marketing research is the implication of advertising that is matched or mismatched to either the functions exhibited by the target consumer group (Snyder & DeBono, 1985) or to the functions implicit in the attitude object itself (Ennis & Zanna, 1993; Shavitt, 1990).

In the last 25 years, functional theory has also been used in the communication literature (11 articles), to study the motivations of volunteers (12 articles) as well as for research in the sports and leisure (8 articles) and human resources (5 articles) fields. It is

apparent that since researchers began measuring functions and attitudes, functional theory has been a useful tool in furthering understanding how attitudes are formed and changed.

Comparisons between the study of volunteers and the other areas of functional research. The area of motivations to volunteer is a natural application of functional theory.

> For example, just as some attitudes may permit people to express deeply held values, so too might volunteer service be motivated by underlying values that dictate that one should make humanitarian contributions to society. Also, just as some attitudes may provide a sense of understanding of the world, so too may volunteering serve the function of satisfying volunteers' intellectual curiosity about other people and their problems. Volunteering may also serve a more social function by providing people with opportunities to make friends and to develop social ties through their work. Finally, volunteer service may help some people cope with inner conflicts and anxieties or work through personal problems just as some attitudes are thought to do. Thus, prior functional theorizing provides a heuristic point of departure for identifying possible motivations for . . . volunteerism. (Omoto & Snyder, 1995, p. 673)

Within the domain of functional research, the motivation to volunteer seems most similar to the studies that have applied functional theory to human resources (Dulebohn, Murray, & Sun, 2000; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Piderit, 2000; Pratkanis & Turner, 1994). While most of the other areas of functional research (i.e., prejudice/stigmatism, social issues, marketing, communication, sports/leisure) consider attitudes and the influence those attitudes have on an individual's behavior, functional theory within the domains of human resources and volunteerism consider attitudes and their consequences within the context of an organization. The practical questions at hand involve how to recruit individuals, how to increase their participation or their tenure, and how to improve their satisfaction with the task. In light of these very real issues, functional theory has been applied to the topic of motivating volunteers.

Functional theory in research on volunteers. As mentioned above, functional theory has been applied in at least a dozen articles examining the attitudes and actions of volunteers (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Reeder, Davison, Gipson, & Hesson-McInnis, 2001). Application of functional theory to volunteers began, from a theoretical perspective, in the early 1990's but standardized measures of the motivations of volunteers were generally absent from the literature (Clary & Snyder, 1991). Even though the effect of attitude variables on volunteer motivation had been studied "once or twice," the chasm between sociological research (on volunteering) and psychological research (on personality and attitudes) may have inhibited utilization of these variables to better explain the motivations of volunteers (Smith, 1994, p. 256).

The first published functionally-derived motivational inventory was used to study the motivations of AIDS volunteers. The items on the inventory were initially generated by the researchers based on their experience with AIDS volunteers and the tenets of functional theory. These items were supplemented by input from the staff at an AIDS organization. Factor analysis yielded an inventory of 25 items that loaded on five factors (values, understanding, personal development, community concern, esteem enhancement). Tests of the psychometric properties of this inventory further validated its utility and applicability to the study of the motivations of AIDS volunteers (Omoto & Snyder, 1995).

Development of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) followed in an attempt to produce a measurement tool that could be applied to a wider range of volunteers. Volunteer work was proposed to fulfill six psychological functional needs (values, understanding, career, social, protective, and enhancement) and items for the VFI were initially derived from

the authors' interpretations of these functions in conjunction with both quantitative and qualitative findings from earlier work on the motivations of volunteerism (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). Following significant testing, Clary et al. (1998) determined that the VFI is not only robust across varied volunteer opportunities and diverse samples, but it is also easy to administer and useful for addressing organization questions regarding commitment and satisfaction.

In the last few years, the VFI has also been used to study gender differences among volunteers (Fletcher & Major, 2004; Switzer et al., 1999), satisfaction among volunteers in a university service learning program (Chapman & Morley, 1999), and volunteer motivations in older adults (Okun, Barr, & Herzog, 1998; Okun & Schultz, 2003). Other studies of the motivations of volunteers that do not explicitly draw on Katz's functional theory are also finding multiple motivations for participating that are similar to those found using functional theory (Fischer & Schaffer, 1993; Peterson, 2004; Reeder et al., 2001).

Comparing Functional Theory with Other Volunteer Motivation Theories

Functional theory has been applied in a variety of disciplines over a number of years, including the study of volunteers, but how does it compare theoretically with the other volunteer motivation theories outlined earlier? Each of the other theories discussed above contains elements of the functions identified by Clary et al. (1998). The *communities of participation* variable cluster from the identification model is similar to the social function as is the majority of the social resource theory (Auslander & Litwin, 1988; Schervish & Havens, 2002; Wuthnow, 1991). Exchange theory has its roots in Katz's (1960) utilitarian function as do both the career and understanding functions in Clary et al.'s (1998) nomenclature. In both

cases, individuals are making their choice to participate in a volunteer activity based on a rational analysis of what they put into the organization and what they will receive in return (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Wilson, 2000). Finally, in expectancy theory participants are motivated to the extent that expected rewards are personally meaningful to them (Miller, 1985). Similarly, the basic tenet of functional theory is that individuals are motivated by the expectation of having their functional needs met and that those needs vary from person to person (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). The motivations defined in identification theory, social capital theory, exchange theory, and expectancy theory are different, but in each case they are encompassed by one or more of the functions included in Clary et al.'s (1998) application of functional theory. This broad scope, accompanied by its robust psychometric properties, suggests that functional theory surpasses other motivation theories in its ability to deal with the multifaceted nature of volunteer motivations.

Extrinsic Rewards

Background

Although rewards from jobs are expected by the party administering the task as well as the individual conducting it, the types of rewards utilized by organizations vary considerably. Organizations use rewards to try to get the most from their workforce—the most products produced, the most commitment to the organization, the most knowledge shared, the most teamwork, the highest quality products, and so on (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Guzzo, Jette, & Katzell, 1985; Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998; Lazear, 2000a; Young, Worchel, & Woehr, 1998). Rewards can be classified and grouped in many ways. At the

most basic level, rewards can be classified as either intrinsic or extrinsic in nature. Houston (2000) defines extrinsic rewards as "those offered to an employee by someone else" (p. 715). Defined in this way, extrinsic rewards include a variety of both monetary and nonmonetary rewards such as pay, benefits, bonuses, promotions, recognition, job security, award trips, and increased autonomy. Intrinsic rewards, on the other hand, come from within the individual performing the task and can include being proud of an accomplishment or simply enjoying the task itself.

While both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are important, organizational policies can only be used to directly manipulate extrinsic rewards. The belief that extrinsic rewards increase both effort and performance is a central premise of economic theory (Benabou & Tirole, 2003) that is supported by empirical research (Gibbons, 1997; Lazear, 2000a). Popular belief in the motivational power of extrinsic rewards is echoed in the business world and demonstrated by numerous organizational examples of profit-sharing, gain-sharing, skill incentive systems, merit incentive systems, and discretionary bonus systems (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Duke, 1989; Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998).

While economists tend to view reward and incentive systems as an antecedent to performance (Lazear, 2000a, 2000b), behavioral scientists have theorized a different causal path with performance influencing job satisfaction through the mediating variables of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and the perceived fairness of those rewards (Hackman, Lawler, & Porter, 1982). Organizational commitment is yet another suggested outcome of judiciously implemented reward systems (Kessler, 1995). With so much emphasis on the impact of rewards on desirable outcomes in organizations with a paid workforce, it is prudent

to examine the transferability of these incentives to the volunteer workforce utilized by nonprofit organizations. The following sections will examine the types of incentives utilized by for-profit enterprises, the scholarly research examining their effectiveness, the controversy within the academic world regarding the appropriateness of extrinsic rewards as motivators, and the applicability of extrinsic rewards to the volunteer workforce in light of that discipline's motivational research.

Monetary Rewards

Money is an extremely versatile reward. Organizations use financial incentives to try to influence customer service (tips at restaurants), sales volume (commission-based salary), knowledge sharing (suggestion boxes in factories), organizational outcomes such as profits or market share (profit sharing), production output (piece-rate pay schemes) and creative research or marketing ideas (bonuses), just to name a few (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998; Lazear, 2000a; Merchant et al., 2003). Financial incentives can be structured as the underlying basis of an employee's compensation, as with piece-rate or commission wages, or it can be a discrete reward system that is seen as an addition to an employee's regular compensation package, as with a research-related bonus or suggestion box award.

While the impact of monetary rewards has been studied in great depth, with varying results, the very definition of a volunteer dictates that this type of reward is rarely used as an extrinsic motivator for unpaid workers. The research on nonmonetary rewards used with a paid workforce, as part of an overall compensation package, is of greater interest and relevance.

Nonmonetary Rewards

The academic literature on incentive systems mentions numerous nonmonetary rewards that can be used as incentives with a paid workforce. These rewards include recognition of achievement, flexible working environment, job security, promotion, symbolic or token gifts, training opportunities, increase in status/prestige, autonomy, opportunity for personal growth, and social interaction (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Duke, 1989; Guzzo et al., 1985; Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998; Houston, 2000; Kuratko, Hornsby, & Naffziger, 1997; Mamman & Rees, 2004; Young et al., 1998). Even though the importance and prevalence of nonmonetary rewards is widely touted in the academic literature, very little empirical research has been conducted to ascertain the effectiveness of various reward options. Much of the research that has been done compares reward preferences in different contexts, ignoring the larger question of whether they work at all. Examples include contrasting the motivational preferences of private employees to those in the public sector (Duke, 1989; Houston, 2000; Young et al., 1998) and identifying the impact of transporting American reward systems overseas (Palich, Hom, & Griffeth, 1995; Welsh, Luthans, & Sommer, 1993). In other cases, studies acknowledge the importance of nonmonetary rewards but use only monetary rewards to simplify the study (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002). In a paper calling for greater cross-fertilization between academic disciplines, Merchant et al. (2003) comment on the dearth of research addressing nonmonetary rewards as part of a complete incentives package.

> Neither behavioral nor economics-based papers do a good job looking at the entire incentive plan (e.g., salary increases, various bonus components, promotions, nonmonetary incentives such as prizes or awards) and how the different components might complement or substitute for each other. (p. 271)

One possible reason for the lack of research examining the effectiveness of nonmonetary rewards may be that their value is difficult to quantify, making data collection a challenge. Most of the incentives research coming from the field of economics focuses on short-term bonus plans because that information is more accessible (Merchant et al., 2003).

Even though the impacts of monetary rewards in certain situations have been carefully examined, it seems illogical to assume that varying reward options, such as substituting a nonmonetary reward, would work equally well with all individuals in all situations. In fact, Guzzo et al.'s (1985) meta-analysis regarding the impacts of intervention programs on productivity demonstrates the importance of contexts using pay as the extrinsic motivator. Of the 11 types of intervention programs they considered, "financial incentives" was one of only two categories that had a nonsignificant relationship with productivity. This category also had the greatest variance in its relationship with the dependent variable. In some cases, the correlation between financial incentives and productivity was very strong; in others the effects were nonexistent. These results led the researchers to conclude that the financial incentives can be a successful motivator, but the results are heavily dependent on the circumstances in which they are used and the specific details of the program (Guzzo et al., 1985). Other researchers have reached this same conclusion and, in some cases, have extended it to include nonmonetary rewards as well (Hatry, Greiner, & Gollub, 1981; Whyte, 1955).

The popularity and importance in the business world of incentive systems that include nonmonetary rewards is further evidenced by a number of practitioner-targeted how-to

articles found in other "scholarly journals." Although some of these works appear in peer-reviewed journals, they are geared to a less academic audience and include more real-world examples and anecdotal support for their suppositions. These articles are full of intuitive statements such as recognizing an employee's efforts will encourage future positive activities and improved performance (Hahn, Butz, Gavin, Mills, & Welter, 2004) and unintended consequences of a reward system can cause more harm than the benefits achieved through implementation (Spitzer, 1996). Although these articles are motivating and provide a prescription for motivating a workforce, they are not grounded in theory or empirical research. Right now a gap exists between commonsense, anecdotally-derived guidelines for implementing incentive programs and rigorous academic testing of these same guidelines. As is evidenced from the literature, even ideas that are as intuitive and widespread as assuming a positive link between pay and job satisfaction should be subjected to controlled studies before being assumed as fact (Malka & Chatman, 2003).

The disconnect between consultant-prescribed incentive systems and academic research substantiating their effectiveness creates discomfort when considering the vast amounts of time and money that organizations invest in incentive systems. As one ponders the issues of correctly matching rewards with the desired behaviors and selecting rewards that leverage the organization's performance, other academicians suggest that incentive plans as a whole are detrimental to an organization's efforts (Kohn, 1993a, 1993b). Researchers on both sides of the controversy can offer evidence to support their position or refute the claims of researchers holding the opposing view.

Controversy Regarding the Use of Reward Systems

Problems with Using Rewards to Motivate Employees

Compliance versus motivation. "By definition, the primary goal of an incentive system is motivation" (Merchant et al., 2003, p. 252). Rather than produce commitment or lasting motivation, critics of rewards suggest that they produce temporary compliance and that when the reward is removed, individuals will revert back to their previous pattern of behavior (Kohn, 1993b). In addition, when behavior is altered to comply with an incentive plan, unwanted and unexpected side effects can create new organizational problems. For example, a freight company that rewarded the number of containers shipped found that even though their shipping numbers increased, 55% of the containers were not full when shipped (Spitzer, 1996). Similarly, when individual rewards are given for implementation of suggestions, information that should be shared with work teams may be withheld, delaying development of improvements (Kerrin & Oliver, 2002). Changing the shipping incentive program to reward minimizing empty space in the company's containers would likely result in very different shipping rates, and both incentive plans have the potential to negatively impact the company's profits when compared to the absence of a shipping incentive program.

Even though a salary is an important part of an individual's job in the for-profit environment, research has not demonstrated its unequivocal utility as a motivational tool (Guzzo et al., 1985; Kohn, 1993b; Shapira, 1987; Spitzer, 1996). Since numerous studies on the motivational impact of monetary manipulations have produced mixed results, it is safe to presume that the impact of nonmonetary rewards needs to be empirically examined as well before their effect on long-term motivation can be known.

Rewards viewed as controlling. Rewards are sometimes viewed as thinly disguised bribes, just a positive spin on the organization's latest attempt to manipulate employee behavior (Kohn, 1993b). A significant body of research has demonstrated that the introduction of an extrinsic reward can actually reduce an individual's intrinsic interest in a task (Deci et al., 1999; Frey & Oberholzer-Gee, 1997). Laboratory studies have demonstrated a delicate balance between the positive message of competence and the negative impact of perceived loss of autonomy that results when a reward is offered for participation in or completion of a task. As the controlling aspects of the reward increase, so do the negative effects on intrinsic motivation when the reward is subsequently removed (Deci et al., 1999; Kunz & Pfaff, 2002; Pierce, Cameron, Banko, & So, 2003). Another theoretical interpretation of the controlling aspect of extrinsic rewards is that the offer of a reward signals to the recipient that the task is undesirable, lowering his inherent interest in the activity (Benabou & Tirole, 2003). If an individual's intrinsic interest in a task is diminished by the presence of a reward, the motivational benefits of the reward are limited to the period of time for which it is offered. It is not uncommon for incentive plans to be short term in nature (Merchant et al., 2003); these temporary attempts to motivate employees would, according to behavioral theory, be particularly susceptible to post-reward decreases in task interest and performance.

Competition versus cooperation between employees. Rewards also have the potential to adversely impact relationships between the individuals or teams "competing" for the rewards as well as between the workers and the individual or group responsible for selecting the reward recipient (Kerrin & Oliver, 2002; Kohn, 1993b). If the organization is distributing

a limited number of rewards, such as bonuses for the most productive work teams, the teams have a disincentive to share information or help each other (Mohrman, Mohrman, & Lawler, 1992). Similarly, if rewards are given to individuals for suggestions regarding process improvements but not given if the improvements are developed within work groups or improvement workshops, the reward system encourages individuals to withhold their ideas from group discussions in the hopes of receiving compensation for their ideas (Kerrin & Oliver, 2002). Interestingly enough, the very act of recognizing the winners of awards, which is itself a reward, can increase the feelings of competition felt by employees who did not perform as well or who were not chosen. In the case of a subjectively selected award, those not selected could extend their lack of cooperation to the individual choosing the reward recipients (Kerrin & Oliver, 2002; Kohn, 1993b).

The selected method of distributing awards can also contribute to attitudes of competition between workers. While equal distribution of rewards can enhance cooperation when the participants are highly interdependent or have similar tasks and responsibilities, if participants make unequal contributions, equality of rewards can actually inhibit group performance (Young, Fisher, & Lindquist, 1993). Therefore, if awards are distributed selectively (in an attempt to encourage and reward exceptional performance), the incentive system can have a demotivating effect on average or below average performers and inhibit their interest in cooperating with their coworkers. On the other hand, if the rewards are distributed equally to everyone, those individuals or teams that are above average performers have little incentive to put forth the extra effort required to excel.

Reduction in risk-taking and creativity. Several studies have found that when individuals are rewarded for meeting performance measures, they are more likely to select simple, nonchallenging tasks and less likely to try new activities or explore new ways of doing things (Condry, 1977; Locke, 1968; Pittman, Emery, & Boggiano, 1982). Kohn (1993) goes so far as to assert that "the number one casualty of rewards is creativity" (p. 62). That statement is very likely true when rewards are based on throughput, as was often the case during the era in which Pittman et al. (1982), Condry (1977), and Locke (1968) published their studies on this topic. Since that time additional research has explored the possibility of providing rewards specifically for generating creative ideas (Eisenberger & Rhoades, 2001). Just as study subjects limited their risk-taking and creative activity to maximize their productivity rewards, Eisenberger and Rhoades (2001) found that rewarding specifically for creative behavior increased subject creativity in both laboratory and work settings. The common denominator in both cases is that rewards "motivate people to get rewards" (Kohn, 1993b, p. 62). If creativity is not explicitly rewarded, traditional incentive systems are likely to stifle innovative thinking.

Differing theoretical perspectives. As shown above, most of the empirical work examining the impact of rewards on performance has been conducted using monetary incentives and much of the research in this arena resides in the economics and accounting literature. For the past two decades, the predominant theory underlying the incentives research in these disciplines has been agency theory (Merchant et al., 2003). In agency theory, one party, designated as the principal, delegates work to another party, who is referred to as the agent. The basic underlying assumption of agency theory is that the agent

and the principal have "diverging goals" (Deckop et al., 1999). Proponents of agency theory believe that even if trust and organizational commitment exist, their impact on behavior is too small have a beneficial impact on organizational issues. Thus, extrinsic incentive programs are considered a necessary tool to align the goals of the agent with those of the principal (Merchant et al., 2003).

Behavioral theorists who oppose the use of incentive systems to improve performance come from a theoretical perspective in which the goals of individuals can be in agreement with the goals of the organization or the individual's supervisor. When the two parties experience goal congruence, the principal does not have to use controlling rewards to force cooperation from the agent (Deckop et al., 1999; Merchant et al., 2003; Romzek, 1990). In fact, under this stewardship theory, even when the individual's interests diverge from those of the organization, he places a higher value on the organizationally-centered behaviors than on individualistic behaviors (Davis, Schoorman, & Donaldson, 1997). A similar perspective is found in social exchange theory. In this theory, the amount of trust in the relationship is sufficient to allow for temporarily unequal exchanges, unlike relationships built strictly on economic exchanges in which immediate quid pro quo reciprocation is required (Blau, 1964). Although some research in economics acknowledges the "hidden cost" of rewards, researchers that emphasize the negative effects of rewards are predominantly found in the behaviorist camp (Benabou & Tirole, 2003; Frey & Oberholzer-Gee, 1997).

Problems with Not Using Rewards

Both the proponents of incentive systems and those who challenge their usefulness in the work place have been vocal in expressing their opinions and supporting those opinions

with empirical research. Despite decades of controversy, not even the behavioral scientists who oppose reward systems as motivators have suggested that employees in a for-profit environment will work without receiving any type of extrinsic compensation. "Obviously people are unlikely to produce without some expectation that they will receive economic benefits in exchange for effort" (Crewson, 1997, p. 508). This statement demonstrates the behaviorist's placement of the economic benefits of employment as a "hygiene" or "maintenance" need in Herzberg's (1966) two factor theory (Young et al., 1998). The behaviorist sees an employee's salary as required to avoid job dissatisfaction and hostility but not capable of providing motivation or satisfaction (Wilkinson et al., 1986). It is essentially the ante required for an organization to get in the game.

For nonprofit organizations working with a volunteer workforce, salary cannot be used as a tool to meet those most basic hygiene needs. Do volunteers also require a basic level of extrinsic rewards to avoid dissatisfaction in their relationship with a nonprofit organization? If so, how well do the nonmonetary rewards used by for-profit companies apply to the theories of volunteer motivation found in the nonprofit literature and can these nonmonetary motivators be utilized by nonprofits to meet maintenance needs? Even beyond their application to meeting volunteer's maintenance needs, can these extrinsic rewards be used to motivate volunteers, increase their satisfaction with their volunteer experience or enhance their organizational commitment to the nonprofit they serve?

Application of Rewards to Volunteers

In addition to donating time to a nonprofit organization, most volunteers are also paid employees (Smith, 1994). This dual role means that virtually all of the personality profiles and demographic variable groupings that are found in the volunteer workforce are also present among paid employees. Even so, individuals with certain demographic characteristics or personality traits are more highly represented in the volunteer workforce (Allen & Rushton, 1983; Auslander & Litwin, 1988; Smith, 1994). This subset of individuals may have different fulfillment needs than the general population of paid workers.

In an empirical study of public-service motivation (PSM), respondents had trouble discriminating between the public and nonprofit sectors (Gabris & Simo, 1995). Individuals that work in the public sector are thought to be motivated by a "sense of service" that is not present in individuals working for private organizations (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Perry & Wise, 1990). Public service employees also have rated the importance of rewards categories differently than private employees, placing greater value on nonmonetary rewards (Crewson, 1997). The similarities between the public and nonprofit sectors combined with the differences between the reward preferences expressed by public and private employees makes direct transfer of the reward research findings for private enterprises to volunteers without studying them specifically with volunteers seem naive.

Volunteers are also different from paid employees because they accept their assignment with no expectation of monetary compensation. In cases where goal congruence between the individual and the organization is high, the volunteer might even resent an offer of monetary compensation because that payment would reduce the funds available to meet

the organization's primary objectives. The incentive preferences of volunteers may also be different from paid employees because, since most volunteers have a paying job elsewhere, they may have many of their reward needs met at their primary workplace.

In spite of these differences, all of the more recent theories of volunteer motivation discussed above (i.e., identification theory, social capital theory, exchange theory, expectancy theory, and functional theory) suggest that volunteers, like paid workers, participate with the expectation of receiving something of benefit in exchange for their efforts. Opinions on the impact that extrinsic rewards have on performance and motivation vary widely between academic disciplines and sometimes even within disciplines (Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Deci et al., 1999; Lazear, 2000a). In spite of the disagreements, the research on incentives is fairly consistent on a number of factors. One of these areas of agreement is that if the rewards are salient and valuable to the workers, they provide motivation while the reward system is in place (Kohn, 1993b), even though the behavior that the reward system motivates is not always what management intended or expected (Spitzer, 1996). Researchers also agree that an individual's basic hygiene needs must be met to avoid dissatisfaction with and hostility toward the organization (Crewson, 1997; Herzberg, 1966; Wilkinson et al., 1986). In organizations with a paid workforce, some basic level of salary and benefits constitute two of the primary hygiene needs. These rewards are not available to organizations that utilize a volunteer workforce. One issue, which has not yet been answered in the literature, concerns what, if any, basic rewards are required to meet the hygiene needs of a volunteer.

Once the basic hygiene needs of the volunteer are met, the issue becomes what is the effect of additional nonmonetary rewards on the motivation and satisfaction of the volunteer? Does providing incentives or rewards to volunteers benefit the organization or are they detrimental to performance? Does their impact on a volunteer vary based on the volunteer's functional needs? Even researchers that believe extrinsic rewards are generally harmful agree that the negative results can be minimized or even eliminated in certain circumstances. One of the primary contributors to the damaging effects of extrinsic rewards is that they are viewed by the recipients as controlling or manipulative (Deci et al., 1999; Kohn, 1993b; Lepper, Keavney, & Drake, 1996). On the positive side, rewards also have the ability to convey a positive message to the recipient regarding their performance or effort (Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Deci et al., 1999). Therefore, to have an overall positive effect on motivation or subsequent, a reward must be administered in a way that minimizes the controlling aspect and maximizes its ability to convey positive information to the recipient. In support of this broad rule, verbal rewards and unexpected rewards, in general, have been found to enhance subsequent intrinsic motivation when they are perceived as sincere (Deci et al., 1999; Henderlong & Lepper, 2002; Tang & Hall, 1995). Finally, a productive reward should not foster competition among the potential recipients (Kohn, 1993b). Creating an incentive system that rewards exceptional contributions or performance without demotivating those individuals who were not chosen can be a challenge.

With those basic guidelines in mind, the discussion will now consider a variety of nonmonetary reward options available to organizations utilizing volunteer workers and ascertain their usefulness with regard to the functional theory of volunteer motivation. Four

basic categories of rewards are (a) recognition, (b) job enrichment, (c) social opportunities, and (d) informational program communication.

The methods available for recognizing the contributions of volunteers are virtually limitless but some commonly used methods include appreciation dinners, a write-up in the organization's newsletter, a certificate or plaque, token gifts such as movie passes, and preferred parking (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Hahn et al., 2004; Klubnik, 1995; Spitzer, 1996). Recognition, in whatever form it is expressed, qualifies as something given by the organization to the volunteer in exchange for his effort or performance. The ability of this recognition item to motivate the volunteer depends on the value that particular reward has for the volunteer. Recognition can provide benefits under the social function of functional theory. In this case, recognition has value to the volunteer if the method of recognition makes the volunteer's friends and acquaintances aware or reminds them of the volunteer's participation in the organization. To the extent that recognition of the volunteer's efforts reaffirms his vision of himself as a caring, helpful individual, it helps meet the values function of functional theory. Recognition can also meet the career functional need because of its value on a resume. In addition, to the extent that recognition helps an individual feel good about himself or demonstrates to him that he has the ability to help the people around him, it meets the enhancement function.

Job enrichment is a more organizationally complex method of reward than recognition, but it is frequently mentioned in literature as an important benefit to employees (Guzzo et al., 1985; Kohn, 1993b; Perry & Wise, 1990). Job enrichment rewards could include increased involvement in decision making, participation in training programs or other

opportunities to learn new skills, rotation of tasks, and increased autonomy (Gross & Friedman, 2004; Mamman & Rees, 2004; Miller, 1985). As the activities increase the volunteer's breadth of interaction with other volunteers and organizational staff, motivational benefits can accrue under the social function of functional theory. Job enrichment activities can also improve fulfillment of the understanding, career, and enhancement functions.

Rewards that are classified as social opportunities include activities which encourage and facilitate interaction between the volunteers and organizational staff, the organization's clients, celebrities, or just with other volunteers. These activities increase the volunteer's connection to the organization and provide opportunities for interactions that are valued under the social function of functional theory.

Providing information to volunteers about a program's success or specific benefits that program clients receive because of the volunteer's efforts helps an individual feel good about himself and value his contributions, meeting the enhancement function. It can also help him fulfill the protective function by redirecting his focus from his own problems to the needs and concerns of others. Finally, by reminding volunteers how much others need their help, program specific communication can renew their desire to reach out to those in need, which addresses the values function.

Research linking the effectiveness of advertising appeals to the individual's functional profile has been conducted in both the marketing and volunteer motivation fields (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Snyder & DeBono, 1985). These studies demonstrate that advertising messages that are targeted to match an individual's primary functional need increase the attractiveness of the product or volunteer opportunity. In a similar vein, it is

intuitive that rewards would not be valued equally by individuals with different functional profiles—that their attractiveness to the volunteer would vary according to the reward's ability to meet the individual's functional needs. Although, it has surface appeal, the idea that functional needs are fulfilled to different degrees by various nonmonetary rewards has not been empirically tested.

Measuring Effectiveness of Rewards

Overview

As instruments designed to measure the motivations of volunteers are refined and validated, research in the area of volunteer motivation can move beyond simply measuring motivations and increasingly focus on applying those measures in a nonprofit setting. In fact, this search for application has already begun, with researchers striving to correlate motivational profiles with outcomes such as commitment, frequency of volunteering, longevity, satisfaction, intent to continue, number of volunteer hours worked, organizational commitment, and impact on the organization (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Okun et al., 1998; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Ryan, Kaplan, & Grese, 2001; Zweigenhaft, Armstrong, Quintis, & Riddick, 1996). As researchers try to evaluate the relative importance of contextual variables (e.g., task ambiguity, job scope, routinization of tasks) to individuals with differing motivations or the impact of organizational interventions (e.g., incentive program, training) on those individuals, a choice must be made regarding which outcome variable or variables to measure.

In the for-profit world, researchers have produced a substantial body of literature exploring the constructs of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, both as antecedents and as consequences of other variables of interest. The idea that an increase in the satisfaction or commitment of an organization's workforce will translate into positive organizational outcomes has great intuitive appeal and has been hypothesized by academics and embraced by managers, even when empirical support for these relationships has been disappointingly small (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Moorman, 1993). While the moderate relationship between job satisfaction/organizational commitment and the hypothesized consequences of performance or productivity has less practical significance than originally postulated, they are still used as measures of the effectiveness of organizational interventions (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Ryan et al., 2001). The empirical link between both job satisfaction and organizational commitment and turnover may account for some of their continued use as outcome measures (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993). In addition, even though extensive research studies have not shown a strong link between either job satisfaction or organizational commitment and performance, managers still often interpret an increase in job satisfaction or organizational commitment as a favorable outcome (Moorman, 1993).

While managers would generally prefer to oversee a satisfied and committed workforce, in some cases, the variable of most interest is whether or not the employee remains with the organization. Recruiting and training new employees is time consuming and expensive (Thatcher et al., 2002) and retention can be the primary goal of organizational interventions. When retention is the principal outcome of interest, intent to leave may be a

more suitable outcome measure because it is more closely related to turnover than either job satisfaction or organizational commitment (Griffeth et al., 2000).

The following sections will examine the research that has been conducted on the constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to leave. It will also consider the empirical relationships between the three variables. Based on this assessment of the literature as well as an examination of fundamental differences in paid and volunteer workers, recommendations will be made regarding the usefulness of each construct as a way to measure the effectiveness of providing participants with functionally-relevant rewards.

Job Satisfaction

Background

Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory of motivation suggests that events and job characteristics address either hygiene needs or growth needs. According to this theory, meeting hygiene needs can alleviate dissatisfaction among employees, but organizations must fulfill growth needs to promote satisfaction within their workforce (Herzberg, 1966). In his much-cited work on job satisfaction, Locke (1976) outlines several criticisms of Herzberg's (1966) theory including Herzberg's focus on needs rather than values. Locke (1976) contends that even when individuals have similar needs, each will have a unique set of values which varies in both content and intensity and which contributes significantly to how that individual responds emotionally to his job. Within this theoretical framework, job satisfaction is defined as the "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1300), and even thirty years later, this definition continues to be used in the job satisfaction literature (Parker & James M

Kohlmeyer, 2005; Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & Chermont, 2003). Job satisfaction has also been described simply as "one's affective attachment to the job . . . either in its entirety (global satisfaction) or with regard to particular aspects (facet satisfaction)" (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 261).

Job satisfaction has been measured in a number of ways, using numerous instruments. In general, research studies examine either global satisfaction only or global satisfaction along with facets of job satisfaction, such as satisfaction with pay, coworkers, and supervision. In some studies a single item was used to assess global job satisfaction (Berg, 1999). Other job satisfaction instruments ranged from two to twenty items. Although a job satisfaction measure is sometimes created specifically for a study (Applebaum, Wunderlich, Greenstone, & Grenier, 2003), most researchers use a scale from a previously published project. Even though most of the researchers use existing job satisfaction measures, there seems to be no convergence on a particular measurement tool. Three commonly used tools are the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), and the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955).

Job satisfaction and performance

Research on attitudes and their link to productivity in the workplace began more than 70 years ago (Kornhauser & Sharp, 1932), and enough studies were conducted on the topic over the next three decades to prompt a series of summary reviews in the 1950s and 1960s (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964). These research summaries demonstrated only a small correlation between satisfaction and

performance, leading Brayfield and Crockett (1955) to conclude that based on the empirical evidence, employee attitudes do not "bear any simple . . . or for that matter, appreciable . . . relationship to performance on the job" (p. 408). In his analysis of 20 studies, Vroom (1964) reported a median correlation between satisfaction and productivity of 0.14. Faced with mounting evidence against a substantial link between job satisfaction and performance, research in this field shifted slightly to focus on (a) the direction of causality between the two variables and (b) the search for variables which moderate the relationship between satisfaction and performance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985).

The advent of meta-analytic techniques in the early 1980s provided researchers with the incentive to perform a more rigorous review of research in this field and include studies conducted since Vroom's 1964 analysis (Glass, McGaw, & Smith, 1981; Hunter, Schmidt, & Jackson, 1982). In spite of the psychometric and methodological advances that had been made and the inclusion of 200 additional satisfaction-performance correlations, the average correlation in the Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) meta-analysis was only 0.146, almost identical to Vroom's (1964) results. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) also computed average correlations between nine subgroups of job satisfaction and performance. Average correlations for the subgroups of satisfaction (pay, promotion, supervision, work, coworkers, intrinsic, extrinsic, overall satisfaction reported using the Job Descriptive Index and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and satisfaction reported using miscellaneous other measures) and performance were also calculated and the average correlations ranged from 0.06 for pay satisfaction to 0.28 for overall satisfaction measured with the Job Descriptive Index and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Smith et al., 1969; Weiss et al., 1967).

After calculation of estimates of statistical artifacts that contribute to variation between studies was taken into account, the substantial remaining variance suggests that moderating variables might account for the wide range in correlations between studies. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985), however, did not find much evidence to support this conclusion. Even though the meta-analysis included only studies that related job satisfaction to performance, the studies included enough methodological and measurement differences to make aggregation across all studies potentially meaningless. In an attempt to improve the interpretability and usefulness of the findings as well as examine the impact of differing research designs, Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) split the studies based on nine different research design characteristics. These nine characteristics include (a) multidimensional versus unidimensional measures of performance, (b) longitudinal versus cross-sectional assessment of performance data, (c) qualitative versus quantitative performance measures, (d) self-report versus supervisor's assessment of performance, (e) archival performance data versus assessment of performance using measures specifically developed for experimental use, (f) subjective versus objective performance measures, (g) global versus facet satisfaction measures, (h) use of psychometrically-tested and well-documented versus study-specific satisfaction measures, and (i) white-collar/professional versus blue-collar samples. Although these differences in research design did result in statistically significant differences in observed correlations between job satisfaction and performance, the relationship has little practical significance ($R^2 = 0.137$) (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985).

In spite of the minimal link between job satisfaction and performance, or perhaps because of it, research on the construct of job satisfaction has continued with job satisfaction

being considered either as a consequence of other independent variables or as an antecedent of additional constructs of interest. In addition, researchers have conducted correlational studies linking job satisfaction to constructs other than performance.

Job satisfaction as a consequence

Research studies that utilize job satisfaction as the outcome variable explicitly or implicitly assign value to the construct of job satisfaction. Based on the research outlined above, this value should be captured by something other than performance measures; some studies, however, continue to assume a practically significant relationship between satisfaction and performance (Applebaum et al., 2003).

Variables that have been studied as antecedents to job satisfaction include organization-based self-esteem (Pierce & Gardner, 2004), met-expectations of new employees (Irving & Meyer, 1994), personality traits such as affect, self-esteem, extraversion, and neuroticism (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Thoresen et al., 2003), formal mentoring relationships (Raabe & Beehr, 2003), high performance work practices (Berg, 1999), and various job context variables such as professional growth opportunities, challenging work, job complexity, and management practices (Applebaum et al., 2003; Judge & Bono, 2000). Some of the studies found moderate correlations between the independent variable(s) of interest and job satisfaction (Applebaum et al., 2003; Berg, 1999; Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Thoresen et al., 2003), others had mixed results or found that their data did not support a link between the expected variables (Berg, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge et al., 1998; Raabe & Beehr, 2003). For example, while Raabe and Beehr (2003) found no significant correlation between the mentor relationship and job satisfaction, they

did find satisfaction to be significantly correlated with both supervisor and coworker relationships.

While Berg (1999) also examined job satisfaction as the dependent variable in his study, he did not assume that increased job satisfaction had direct or mediated economic benefits. Instead, knowing that high performance work practices have economic benefits (Berg, Appelbaum, Bailey, & Kalleberg, 1996; Ichniowski, Shaw, & Prennushi, 1997; MacDuffie, 1995), he wanted to assess the impact of those practices on job satisfaction. Do high performance work practices boost performance at the expense of worker satisfaction? In this study, only three high performance work practices had a significant impact on job satisfaction: on-the-job learning, work/family balance, and employee-management relations, and in all three cases the relationship was positive.

Job satisfaction as an antecedent

When job satisfaction is treated as the independent variable in a study, turnover is frequently the chosen dependent variable, and it is typically hypothesized to be correlated with job satisfaction through either a direct link or mediated by a series of variables which constitute a withdrawal process (Carsten & Spector, 1987; Griffeth et al., 2000; van Breukelen, Vlist, & Steensma, 2004). In an early meta-analysis, the mean weighted correlation coefficient for the job satisfaction-turnover relationship, adjusted for unreliability, was found to be -0.24 (Carsten & Spector, 1987). In two subsequent meta-analyses Griffeth and his colleagues found a correlation coefficient for the same relationship of -0.19 (Griffeth et al., 2000; Hom & Griffeth, 1995). These results demonstrate that, much like the studies that considered job satisfaction as a consequence, the relationship between satisfaction and

turnover is statistically significant, but only explains a small portion of the variance in the dependent variable.

In an effort to find outcomes with favorable economic impact on an organization, studies that positioned job satisfaction as the independent variable have also used service effort (Testa, 2001) and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Moorman, 1993) as the outcomes measured. When service effort was used as a measure of performance, Testa (2001) found a correlation of 0.22 between satisfaction with the company and service intention. Organ (1977) suggests that the link between satisfaction and performance has continued to elude researchers because they were using the wrong measures of performance and that the extra-role activities associated with OCB were a better measure of satisfaction-motivated performance. While preliminary studies found a "more robust" relationship between job satisfaction and performance when performance is measured in terms of OCB (Organ, 1988), more recent research suggests that cognitively-oriented satisfaction measures better predict OCB than affectively-oriented satisfaction instruments and that affective measures of satisfaction fail to explain any additional variance in OCB, which suggests that a cognitive measure such as perceptions of fairness might more successfully predict OCB than job satisfaction (Moorman, 1993). Therefore, once again the link between job satisfaction and performance is found to have little practical significance.

Job satisfaction as a mediator

In numerous studies, job satisfaction was positioned as a mediator between various exogenous variables and either turnover or turnover intentions (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Eby, Freeman, Rush, & Lance, 1999; Parker & James M Kohlmeyer, 2005; Shafer,

Park, & Liao, 2002; Thatcher et al., 2002). Job satisfaction was found to mediate the relationship between intrinsic motivation and turnover (Eby et al., 1999). The relationship between task variety and turnover intentions was also mediated by job satisfaction, while the relationship between task significance and turnover intentions was partially mediated by satisfaction (Thatcher et al., 2002). While the hypothesized mediated relationships between both organizational-professional conflict in the accounting profession (Shafer et al., 2002) and perceived organizational support (Allen et al., 2003) and turnover intentions were found to be significant, the mediated relationship between perceived discrimination and turnover intentions was not (Parker & III, 2005).

Summary of job satisfaction findings

Over the last 70 years, social science researchers have found statistically significant relationships between job satisfaction and performance as well as with other outcome variables such as organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and turnover. Direct relationships in which job satisfaction is the outcome variable of interest have also been found with personality traits, job context variables, and organization-based self-esteem, to name a few. Finally, job satisfaction has demonstrated a mediating effect between variables such as organizational-professional conflict, perceived organizational support, task variety and significance, and intrinsic motivation and outcomes related to turnover. In spite of these numerous statistically significant findings, in practical terms, job satisfaction explains only a trivial amount of variance. The wide range of correlations found in the studies suggests the possibility of moderator variables. While including moderators helps explain additional variance, the fragmentation of the path makes it difficult to find practical ways to take

advantage of the significant relationships. The search for organizational processes to boost job satisfaction is further complicated by findings that suggest that a significant portion of satisfaction is predicted by genetic disposition (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989). Overall, job satisfaction has a significant role in a number of organizational processes, but the presence of moderating conditions and the length of the path between the independent variables and the dependent variables of interest limit the ability of organizations to achieve measurable economic benefits through improvements in job satisfaction.

Organizational Commitment

Background

Organizational commitment is another frequently studied construct that attempts to describe an employee's attachment to the organization for which he works. This construct has been found to consist of three dimensions that are generally labeled as (a) affective, (b) continuance, (c) normative (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Numerous studies have utilized factor analysis to demonstrate that these three constructs are reasonably distinct (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1992; Shore & Tetrick, 1991) and that they are uniquely correlated with proposed antecedents of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer, Bobocel, & Allen, 1991). The three factors of commitment also had dissimilar relationships with on-the-job behavior and job performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989; Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990).

Of the three dimensions, affective commitment is the most frequently studied dimension (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). This particular dimension is defined as

> the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors:

> (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p. 27)

Employees that stay with an organization because of affective commitment do so because they want to remain with the organization (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Even though Meyer and Allen put a considerable amount of effort into developing and testing the psychometric properties of a measurement tool to assess the three dimensions of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1984) and some researchers have employed the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS) generated by this research team (Irving & Meyer, 1994; Shafer et al., 2002), most of the studies examined in this analysis still utilize a version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) to measure affective commitment (Allen et al., 2003; Parker & III, 2005; Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Thatcher et al., 2002; van Breukelen et al., 2004).

Continuance commitment, the second most frequently studied dimension of organizational commitment, addresses an individual's need to remain with an organization (Meyer et al., 1993). Continuance commitment has as its foundation the theory of "side-bets" (Becker, 1960). According to this theory, individuals become attached to the organization because of (a) investments in the organization (e.g., pension plans) that they would lose if they left or (b) a lack of equivalent alternatives elsewhere. Benefits such as excellent health care coverage or on-site day care facilities that are not replicated at other potential employers can increase an employee's tie to the organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 1993).

Although survey instruments are available for measuring continuance commitment (Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) and Meyer and Allen's (1984) Continuance Commitment Scale), this dimension is rarely utilized when studying the relationship of organizational commitment with other organizational variables of interest such as job satisfaction, job context variables, or withdrawal variables. Research that has studied the relationship of continuance commitment with these variables has demonstrated that, while it may indeed increase the employee's likelihood of remaining with the organization, it is often adversely related to performance and promotability (Meyer et al., 1989).

The third dimension of organizational commitment is known as normative commitment. "Normative commitment reflects employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization" (Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998, p. 32). This final type of organizational commitment may form as an individual is assimilated into the company culture and is exposed to the expectation of loyalty to the company (Weiner, 1982) or as the employee accrues benefits from the organization and feels obligated to repay the organization with contributions such as increased loyalty, dedication to performance objectives, or organizational citizenship behaviors (Scholl, 1981). This dimension is not often studied in the organizational behavior or psychology disciplines (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Similar to research regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment has been studied as an outcome of other variables (e.g., mentoring relationships, extent to which job expectations match experiences, and personality traits) as well as an antecedent (e.g., turnover intentions and turnover). It has also, in numerous studies, been considered as a mediating construct. The following sections will discuss the role that organizational

commitment has played in the management and psychology research and some of the fundamental findings.

Organizational commitment as a consequence

As is the case with job satisfaction, organizational commitment is assumed, by researchers and managers alike, to be a desirable outcome of intervention activities. The relationship between personality traits or organizational activities and organizational commitment has been examined in a number of studies, which have often included job satisfaction and turnover variables as additional outcomes of interest (Irving & Meyer, 1994; Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Raabe & Beehr, 2003).

In a study designed to test the met-expectations hypothesis, Irving and Meyer (1994) determined that organizational commitment of new employees is significantly impacted by their early experiences on the job rather than by their expectations or by the interaction of their expectations and experiences. Raabe and Beehr (2003) determined that while formal mentoring and supervisor relationships had no impact on organizational commitment, relationships between coworkers did predict additional variance in organizational commitment. In both of these cases, while the research teams found significant correlations between the antecedents and organizational commitment, the significant correlations with organizational commitment were not associated with the expected antecedent variables. Therefore, while relationships between antecedents and organizational commitment seem intuitive, the actual relationships often vary from what is expected.

In the area of personality traits, Thoresen et al. (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of studies that correlated organizational commitment with positive and negative affect. The

mean corrected correlation for organizational commitment and positive affect was .35, while the relationship with negative affect was -.27. The strength of the relationship between job satisfaction and negative affect was stronger (-.34) than the relationship between organizational commitment and negative affect, while the difference in the relationship between the two outcome variables and positive affect was not significant. In a review of studies examining the relationship between organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) and organizational commitment, Pierce and Gardner (2004) found correlations ranging from .12 to .64. The wide range of variance explained (1% - 41%) is similar to the results obtained in bivariate correlations between OBSE and job satisfaction. The moderate size of the correlations implies the presence of other antecedents to both job satisfaction and organizational commitment while the disparity of the results suggests the possibility of unidentified moderators (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). While these issues have fueled job satisfaction and organizational commitment research in recent years, they also create a fragmented view of the satisfaction and commitment landscape, making it more difficult for managers to apply the research to their organizational settings.

Organizational commitment as an antecedent

As is the case with job satisfaction, when organizational commitment is included in a study as an endogenous variable, turnover is frequently the outcome variable selected (Griffeth et al., 2000; van Breukelen et al., 2004). The results from these studies are mixed. When examining turnover through the theoretical lens of planned behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), van Breukelen et al. (2004) considered the impact of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover along with the basic predictors from the theory of

planned behavior (i.e., attitude towards leaving, subjective norm about leaving, perceived behavioral control). While both job satisfaction and organizational commitment had significant bivariate correlations with turnover, when they were added to the regression equation after inclusion of the predictors from the theory of planned behavior, only job satisfaction significantly explained additional variance in turnover.

In contrast, the meta-analysis conducted by Griffeth et al. (2000), which considered both job satisfaction and organizational commitment to be proximal predictors of turnover, suggests that organizational commitment (ρ = -.23) is a better predictor of turnover than job satisfaction (ρ = -.19). The weighted average correlation between organizational commitment and turnover may be inflated, however, by the popularity of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1982) as a measure of commitment. Several of the fifteen factors included in this questionnaire contain references to turnover intentions, potentially confounding the commitment-turnover relationship (Bozeman & Perrewe, 2001). While more recent research projects frequently utilize a nine-item version of the OCQ which omits the withdrawal-related items, studies included in the Griffeth et al. (2000) meta-analysis that used OCQ to assess commitment are more likely to have used all 15 items, artificially increasing the relationship between commitment and turnover.

Organizational commitment has often been studied as an antecedent to voluntary organizational turnover. While this construct typically demonstrates a statistically significant relationship with turnover, its ability to explain variance in voluntary turnover in addition to the variance accounted for by other variables in the withdrawal process is uncertain. It is also

not clear whether job satisfaction or organizational commitment is better able to predict voluntary turnover in organizations.

Organizational commitment as a mediator

Most studies which position organizational commitment as a mediating variable utilize structural equations modeling to test the fit of the posited model and the statistical significance of the hypothesized paths. In these studies, social scientists have demonstrated that organizational commitment mediates the relationship between perceived discrimination and turnover intentions (Parker & III, 2005), intrinsic motivation and turnover (Eby et al., 1999), organizational-professional conflict and turnover intentions (Shafer et al., 2002), as well as perceived organizational support and turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2003). Organizational commitment has also been shown to partially mediate the relationship between task significance and turnover intentions (Thatcher et al., 2002).

The relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is less clear. In one of the models considered (Allen et al., 2003), the two constructs are shown as reciprocal in nature, which is supported by empirical findings (Farkas & Tetrick, 1989; Lance, 1991; Williams & Hazer, 1986). Other models show (a) no link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Shafer et al., 2002), (b) organizational commitment completely mediating the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Parker & Kohlmeyer, 2005; Thatcher et al., 2002) or (c) organizational commitment partially mediating the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover (Eby et al., 1999).

Summary of organizational commitment findings

While researchers generally agree that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct, most of the studies examined in this paper limited the scope of the research to affective commitment. Affective commitment is most frequently measured using the Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) or either a 9-item or 15-item version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979). Using these measurement tools, organizational commitment has been found to be an outcome of early work experiences (Irving & Meyer, 1994), relationships with coworkers (Raabe & Beehr, 2003), positive and negative affect (Thoresen et al., 2003), and organization-based self-esteem (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Multiple studies have also shown organizational commitment to be an antecedent to turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000; van Breukelen et al., 2004) as well as a mediator in the turnover process.

Even though organizational commitment has been shown to have a significant relationship with numerous other organizational constructs, in each case the relationship only accounts for a modest amount of the variance associated with the dependent variable. The probable existence of other variables that influence these models as well as additional moderators in the process diminishes the applicability of the findings. Overall, research has demonstrated the complexity of the organizational processes that involve both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. As these variables continue to receive interest in research projects, the challenge for future research will be to balance the search for greater understanding of the subtle relationships between organizational commitment (and job

satisfaction) and various constructs with finding ways to apply the knowledge in a meaningful way to assist managers in their operational tasks.

Turnover

Turnover Intentions

Turnover intentions is a well-studied construct that has frequently been used as an antecedent or indicator of turnover; in addition, both organizational commitment and job satisfaction have been examined in conjunction with turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2003; Griffeth et al., 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Thatcher et al., 2002; van Breukelen et al., 2004) as they are considered to be two of the most significant constructs in turnover research (Hom & Griffeth, 1995). While no single scale has become the standard for assessing turnover intentions and ad hoc measures continue to be used, most measures of turnover ask survey participants to evaluate the probability that they would leave the company within a specified time frame, such as six months or a year. If a multi-item measure is used, additional questions typically substitute a different time period or rephrase the question in terms of remaining with the company, rather than leaving (Tett & Meyer, 1993).

While the majority of the research considers turnover intentions as a mediator between attitudinal constructs, such as job satisfaction or organizational commitment, and turnover, some research studies investigate the withdrawal process in further detail (Griffeth et al., 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993; van Breukelen et al., 2004). In using the theory of planned behavior, van Breukelen et al. (2004) included the three constructs of attitude towards leaving, subjective norm about leaving, and perceived behavioral control as precursors to turnover intentions and partial mediators between the job satisfaction/organizational

commitment and turnover intentions. Of all the variables considered in the turnover chain, turnover intentions was most strongly correlated with turnover ($r = .59$). Furthermore, when turnover intentions was entered in the first step of the regression analysis, none of the other variables were able to explain any additional variance (van Breukelen et al., 2004). Similarly, in their meta-analysis, Griffeth et al. (2000) found that turnover intentions are a better predictor of turnover ($\rho = .38$) than either job satisfaction ($\rho = -.19$) or organizational commitment ($\rho = -.23$). Turnover intentions also outpredicted the construct of withdrawal cognitions, which includes items such as search intentions and thoughts of quitting (Griffeth et al., 2000). This recent meta-analysis confirms the pattern found by Tett and Meyer (1993) ($\rho_{\text{turnover intentions}} = .45$, $\rho_{\text{job satisfaction}} = -.25$, $\rho_{\text{organizational commitment}} = -.33$).

Based on a significant body of literature, it appears that while both job satisfaction and organizational commitment are significant predictors of turnover intention, intention is the strongest predictor of actual turnover, and, in fact, accounts for all of the explained variance when the predictors are systematically entered into a regression equation (Griffeth et al., 2000). Related to this finding is the conclusion that, of the variables being considered, turnover intention is most proximally related to turnover in the withdrawal process. As the distance between the predictors and turnover increases, the ability of the variables to predict turnover is mediated by turnover intention. In spite of the overwhelming agreement regarding the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover, intent to leave and withdrawal cognitions still only account for a small amount of the variance in turnover (27%) suggesting that turnover intentions may not be an adequate surrogate for actual turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Factors Unique to Turnover of Volunteers

While it is useful to consider the research that has been conducted regarding the constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions and reflect on its applicability to a volunteer workforce, inherent differences in paid and unpaid workers can reduce the ability of this research to provide useful estimates of a volunteer's future impact on a nonprofit organization. For example, meta-analysis has demonstrated that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover is moderated by unemployment rates, as is the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover (Carsten & Spector, 1987). As unemployment rates increased, the ability of job satisfaction and turnover intentions to predict turnover decreased. Validating this finding is the statistically significant, although small, relationship between perceived job alternatives and turnover ($\rho = .12$) (Griffeth et al., 2000). Since volunteering is typically an optional activity, a lack of alternative volunteer opportunities should not impact a volunteer's decision to quit. While the irrelevance of this moderating variable could improve the predictive ability of job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a volunteer setting, the unending supply of volunteer opportunities coupled with the optional nature of volunteering removes one of the obstacles to voluntary turnover in nonprofits.

The discretionary nature of volunteer work impacts the antecedents of turnover in other ways. As mentioned in the discussion of job embeddedness, turnover of paid employees can be precipitated by off-the-job events (Mitchell et al., 2001). This occurrence may be even more likely in a volunteer setting. While many individuals volunteer for organizations because of a personal connection with the organization or its cause (Schervish

& Havens, 2002), many others volunteer because of their membership in a primary organization (e.g., a job requires participation in a local United Way organization, the Lions organization partners with Canine Companions for Independence (*Lions Project for Canine Companions for Independence*, 2005), and a fraternity provides drivers for a Meals on Wheels route (*Volunteer opportunities*, 2003)). In these cases, an individual's ongoing participation in volunteer activities may be better explained by his commitment to the primary organization than by commitment to the nonprofit benefiting from the volunteer hours. An individual that becomes inactive or leaves the primary organization will probably discontinue volunteer activities that were conducted through that organization, regardless of his level of job satisfaction.

Demographics also play a role when an individual is choosing a volunteer opportunity. Examples include parents coaching youth sports teams, helping with scout troops, or assisting in the public schools. An illustration of geographically-driven participation would be community members helping clean up a park that is close to their neighborhood. In these cases, turnover might be better predicted by tracking the relevant demographics than by measuring attitudinal constructs. While the factors that contribute to predicting turnover in the workplace are also expected to have an impact on turnover of volunteers, other issues unique to volunteering may impact the strength of the relationships between these constructs.

Summary of Outcome Measures

During the last several decades, a substantial amount of research has been conducted on the constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions.

While the research in these areas have identified statistically significant relationships between personality and job context variables and the three measures of interest, the relationships have typically only explained a small amount of the variance. All three of these measures have also been found to correlate with turnover, although turnover intentions, as the most proximal variable, has consistently outpredicted both job satisfaction and organizational commitment in this area. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions have demonstrated a mediating effect as well. While job satisfaction and organizational commitment mediate the relationship between organizational antecedents (e.g., mentoring relationships) and turnover intentions, turnover intentions mediates the relationship between job satisfaction/organizational commitment and turnover.

As nonprofit managers try to determine the effectiveness of their organizational intervention strategies, they need to consider not only the research that has been done in for-profit organizations but also characteristics of volunteers that make them unique employees. The multitude of volunteer opportunities available, combined with the nonmandatory nature of volunteering, reduces an individual's feeling of being stuck in an organization. In addition, rather than participating in a volunteer activity because of a feeling of commitment to the nonprofit organization, volunteers may participate because of their commitment to another organization or because they have an interest in volunteering that is driven by their inclusion in a particular demographic group.

In light of those differences and current research findings, the most appropriate outcome measure for nonprofit research depends on the purpose of the organizational intervention and the objectives of the study. If an organization is primarily concerned about

turnover of volunteers, turnover intentions has been shown to consistently provide the highest correlation with actual turnover. If nonprofit management is most interested in providing a more fulfilling volunteer experience, job satisfaction is probably the most appropriate outcome to measure. When job satisfaction is used as the outcome variable, a multi-item scale should be used because the "use of multiple observations cancels out random error around an individual's true score, thereby providing more reliable measurement" (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 263). While increased satisfaction may indicate improvement in a volunteer's morale or demonstrate greater enjoyment of the volunteer experience, nonprofit managers should not assume that an increase in job satisfaction will result in improved performance of the volunteer or other quantifiable benefits.

Finally, while a link between organizational commitment and economically beneficial outcomes has not been consistently demonstrated, this particular outcome measure may also have application in the study of volunteers. Since research has shown that individuals are more likely to invest their volunteer time and philanthropic giving in organizations with which they identify (Schervish & Havens, 2002), fostering organizational commitment could result in benefits to the nonprofit even after a volunteer relationship is terminated. Since workers are known to quit for off-the-job reasons as well as work-related issues, a high level of organizational commitment to a nonprofit could influence future volunteer or donation decisions, particularly for nonprofits with a wide geographic presence. Nonprofits also have the potential to retain a consistent number of volunteers (although not necessarily the same individuals) by improving the organizational commitment of key members of corporations, civic groups, churches, and college organizations. While the outcomes of these proposed

relationships have intuitive appeal, they need to be tested empirically, rather than assuming their validity.

Research on the constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions has been extensive and has included numerous other organizational variables. While many statistically significant relationships have been identified, the strength and consistency of those correlations are disappointingly low. In spite of this deficiency, these three outcome variables are potentially useful for nonprofit managers in some applications. The decision regarding which outcome measure is most appropriate will depend on the specific goals of the program being implemented as well as the nonprofit management's objectives.

Application of Theory in a Service-Learning Environment

Service-Learning Background

While the term "service-learning" originated in the 1960s and service-learning programs have been found on college campuses from the late 1960s until the present, the definition of the term service-learning has varied through time and across programs (Kessinger, 2004). In fact, over 140 different definitions of service-learning have been identified (Eyler & Giles, 1999). The National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) established a set of "principles of good practice" in the late 1980s to provide guidance for the growing number of educators and administrators trying to implement service-learning into their classrooms (Kessinger, 2004). One of the outcomes of this work along with the work of other groups, such as the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform (ALSER), is a

consistent belief that service-learning differs from community service because, in addition to benefiting the community, service-learning has a direct connection to the curriculum being taught in the classroom (Chapman & Ferrari, 1999; Kessinger, 2004).

Are Service-Learners Volunteers?

Participants in a service-learning activity typically perform tasks that are similar to those provided by traditional volunteers, such as tutoring children, helping at a day care center, working with prison inmates, serving as an aid at a hospital, providing tax assistance for individuals with special needs, and assisting public schools with special projects or curriculum (Ferrari et al., 1999; Strupeck & Whitten, 2004; Werner, Voce, Openshaw, & Simons, 2002). The list of potential service-learning projects is long and varied and limited only by the imagination of the instructor. While the tasks which service-learners and traditional volunteers undertake are comparable and neither group receives monetary compensation for their efforts, service-learners are usually required to participate in the community service activity, differentiating them from the conventional perception of a volunteer. If the community service activity is mandatory, can the motivations of the participants be studied using the theoretical framework of volunteer motivation found in the literature?

Service-learning participants are not the only group of individuals who are required to participate in community service, as prison inmates have also been subjected to mandatory involvement (McIvor, 1992). In addition, community service is sometimes expected by an individual's employer (Clary & Snyder, 2002). Even though the participants in both the service-learning and employer-specified programs experience some level of coercion, the

nonprofit organizations they serve would probably still consider these individuals to be a part of their "volunteer" workforce.

Academic research has demonstrated that when organizational interventions are perceived as controlling, they can have an adverse impact on the participant's intrinsic interest in the activity (Deci et al., 1999). This undesirable side-effect appears to be more pronounced for participants that perceive the activity to be inherently interesting from the outset (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973). Similarly, if an individual begins to identify his participation in a service activity with being required to participate or being rewarded for his involvement, his intention to choose future involvement may be diminished (Batson, Coke, Jasnoski, & Hanson, 1978; Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998; Kunda & Schwartz, 1983).

To ascertain the impact of community service requirements on individual's intentions to volunteer in the future, Stukas, Snyder, and Clary (1999) conducted a pair of studies in a university environment. When taken together, the results of these studies suggest that a community service requirement does not weaken the future volunteer intentions of all students, but only those who did not envision immediate volunteer participation in the absence of a service requirement. In other words, "only those individuals who would not otherwise be volunteering . . . or who feel that it would take external control to get them to volunteer . . . may find their future intentions undermined by a requirement to volunteer" (Stukas et al., 1999, p. 63). The reasons for this planned abstinence are unknown but could include a lack of interest, time, or other assets.

While the perception of external control (or lack of autonomy) has a detrimental effect on some service-learning participants, this impact can be minimized by providing

participants with choices regarding their involvement (Stukas et al., 1999; Werner et al., 2002). In the Stukas et al. (1999) study, even though the students in the choice condition were strongly encouraged to select the community service option using an "induced-compliance technique," their perception of having freely chosen the service activity freely was significantly higher than the students who were required to complete the service activity. Therefore, offering students a choice of activities that includes a nonservice option places the ability to choose the community service alternative in their own hands, increasing their perception of the voluntary nature of the activity and making the application of volunteer motivation theory applicable to service-learners.

In fact, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) has been use to study the motivations of service-learners in a number of cases (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Ferrari et al., 1999; Stukas et al., 1999). In each case, the results obtained with the VFI were psychometrically consistent with those achieved in samples of traditional volunteers (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Ferrari et al., 1999; Switzer et al., 1999). Although the ordering of the six motivational functions assessed in the VFI varied between samples, functional theory itself suggests that individuals and, similarly, groups of individuals would have different functional preferences (Katz, 1960). These variations, therefore, are to be expected when samples are drawn from different populations (e.g., older volunteers, undergraduate students, medical school students, doctoral graduates in the field of psychology, general adult population) and are not necessarily attributed to the mandatory nature of service-learning experiences. In addition, the differences in the ordering of functional needs do not suggest

that groups of service-learners are an inappropriate sample for studying volunteer motivations.

Summary

Since most nonprofit organizations are highly dependent on volunteer labor to assist in providing their services, keeping their volunteers motivated is of strategic importance to those organizations. While a number of theories regarding volunteer motivation (e.g., altruism, egoism, identification theory, social resources theory, exchange theory, expectancy theory) have been examined over the years, functional theory provides a multidimensional approach which encompasses each of the other theories (Katz, 1960). It, therefore, provides a comprehensive view of the varied motivations of volunteers. In addition, functional theory has been applied to the study of volunteer motivations utilizing a variety of populations and the Volunteer Functions Inventory is an instrument that is both easy to administer and psychometrically sound (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

In the for-profit world, rewards are routinely utilized by organizations with the hope that those rewards will motivate employees. The types of rewards used include both monetary and nonmonetary compensation. Businesses use on-going rewards such as salaries and short-term reward such as bonuses and incentive programs (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Duke, 1989; Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998). Reward programs can be designed to enhance productivity, teamwork, creativity, or other organizational goals (Eisenberger & Rhoades, 2001; Hoffman & Rogelberg, 1998; Lazear, 2000a; Spitzer, 1996). Even while rewards

strategies are studied and tweaked by human resource departments around the world, academics continue to disagree about their impact and effectiveness.

Economists, who tend to view rewards through the lens of agency theory, have demonstrated that rewards can indeed impact productivity (Benabou & Tirole, 2003; Lazear, 2000a). In most of their studies, however, they are examining tasks in which removing the reward is not an option and where the task itself would typically be considered uninteresting. These two factors are critical when comparing this economic research to the reward research produced by the behaviorist camp, because the underlying assumptions are fundamentally different. The behaviorists, who support the detrimental effect of rewards, examine the intrinsic motivation of an individual to participate in an interesting task once the reward has been removed (Deci et al., 1999; Lepper & Greene, 1978). The fact that volunteering is typically a discretionary activity with few exit barriers increases the chances that volunteers will select tasks they find interesting. In addition, the expectation of formal extrinsic rewards is less pervasive among volunteers, because monetary rewards, the basis of compensation among for-profit enterprises, are not an option and nonmonetary reward systems are less understood and utilized even among for-profit organizations. Because of these volunteer characteristics, the possible adverse impact of extrinsic rewards on motivation is a concern.

The idea that rewards can undermine intrinsic interest in a task has fueled decades of controversy. In spite of the theoretical and empirical differences between cognitive evaluation theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan, Mims, & Koestner, 1983), which supports the undermining hypothesis, and the theory of learned industriousness (Eisenberger, 1992; Pierce et al., 2003), which denies this concern, the two camps have agreed on a number of

theoretical ideas and empirical conclusions. First, rewards consist of a controlling component and an informational component. In most cases, as the informational component becomes more salient (increasing intrinsic motivation), so does the controlling component (offsetting or even overwhelming this increase). Because unexpected rewards contain only the informational component, they were found to increase intrinsic motivation under both cognitive evaluation theory and the theory of learned industriousness (Deci et al., 1999). In addition to minimizing the controlling component of the reward, sincerity in reward administration also helped minimize the undermining of intrinsic motivation in study participants (Kohn, 1993a; Lepper, Woolverton, Mumme, & Gurtner, 1993).

These basic reward guidelines are useful for maintaining, and hopefully enhancing, the motivation of volunteers in general, but functional theory suggests that not all individuals volunteer to fulfill the same functional needs (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). Therefore, while utilizing rewards that maximize the informational message of individual competence and minimize the perception of external control is significant, it should also be important to reward the volunteer in a functionally-relevant manner. Past research has demonstrated that individuals prefer volunteer recruiting materials that match their functional preferences; theory implies that functionally matched rewards would be preferred as well (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

The effectiveness of rewarding volunteers with functionally-matched incentives can be measured using a variety of outcome variables, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or turnover intentions. All three of these variables have been studied extensively in an organizational context. While they have each been found to be significantly

related to turnover, the magnitude of the correlation suggests that a number of other factors also affect turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Similarly, even though job satisfaction and organizational commitment both have a significant correlation with variables such as performance or organizational based self-esteem, the relationship explains only a small portion of the variance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Since researchers have not identified superior outcome measures, these variables are still frequently used to gauge the effectiveness of organizational interventions.

In the case of service-learning volunteers, the participants typically have a more limited number of settings in which they can serve (sometimes only one choice is given) and the duration of their involvement is specified and relatively short. Because of these restrictions, job satisfaction may be a more appropriate outcome measure than organizational commitment. In addition, since students' choices are limited, job satisfaction may be moderated by the individual's initial interest in the service opportunity. Furthermore, since service-learners are often engaging in a new area of service, measuring participants' intent to continue volunteering after the required service period ends seems to be a more relevant way to measure their future service plans than intent to leave. Even though the service-learning environment is somewhat unique, the fact that the volunteer task is new to the participants provides an excellent opportunity to assess the impact of functionally matched and mismatched rewards on their satisfaction with the volunteer experience as well as determine how the rewards impact their interest in volunteering after the required period of service is over.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used to assess the differential effect of functionally matching or mismatching an extrinsic reward with volunteers' specific motivational profiles. It will first address the purpose of the study, the research foundations, and the research design to be employed. This discussion will be followed by a description of the sample, the intended data collection procedures, and the operationalization of relevant constructs. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of the data analysis techniques that will be utilized.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of functionally matched and mismatched reward messages on participants' satisfaction with the volunteer task as well as on their interest in re-engaging in the volunteer activity.

Research Foundations

Prior research has demonstrated that promotional materials designed to recruit volunteers are more effective when the persuasive message matches the primary functional need of the individual being recruited as measured by the Volunteer Function Inventory which was administered to a group of undergraduate psychology students (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, Study 4). In a separate study of individuals engaged in ongoing volunteer service at a community hospital, Clary et al. (1998) asked individuals to identify the

functional nature of the benefits they received in a broad sense (Study 5). For example, participants were asked to rate the extent to which their volunteer experience allowed them "to explore possible career options" (career function) or learn "how to deal with a greater variety of people" (understanding function) (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, p. 1529). The results of this study indicate that individuals whose primary functional need was either values or understanding did experience greater satisfaction with the volunteer experience when they reported receiving functionally relevant rewards. While the results were in the predicted direction for the remaining four functions, they were not statistically significant (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

This project seeks to expand the body of knowledge by taking the specific nature of the functional message used in the recruiting study and applying it to the study of functionally-matched extrinsic rewards and their impact on volunteer satisfaction and interest in re-engagement in the volunteer task.

Research Design

An experimental study will be used to assess the impact of functionally matching and mismatching the reward message participants receive. The outcome will be measured using both self-report and behavioral indications of task satisfaction/fulfillment. By using an experimental study, rather than volunteers already involved in community service, the variables associated with prior involvement with both the nonprofit organization and the volunteer task itself, which could confound the study results, are removed. In addition, the independent variable, in this case the specific message contained in the extrinsic reward, can

be manipulated to ensure that half of the participants receive a reward that contains a message that matches their most important functional need, while the other half receive a reward whose message matches their least important functional need (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).

Because the task in which the participants will be engaged is not a contrived laboratory exercise but a genuine service-learning project with an external client that will benefit from the students' involvement, some of the limitations associated with laboratory studies can be avoided. These limitations include the artificial nature of the activity and low generalizability (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991; Secord, 1986). At the same time, since the participants will be randomly assigned to the two reward groups, the high internal validity of laboratory experiments can be achieved as well (Cooper & Schindler, 2003; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991; Wuebben, Straits, & Schulman, 1974). Finally, because the purpose of the study is to ascertain the impact of functionally matching or mismatching the message of the extrinsic reward with the individual's motivational needs, rather than the impact of receiving or not receiving an extrinsic reward, a no-reward control group is not relevant.

In this research design, students will participate in a service-learning activity that will result in real benefits to the organization being helped and that will effectively supplement the course curriculum. During the week following the conclusion of their volunteer participation, each student will receive a thank-you note from the organization they helped. The note will arrive in their campus mailbox, rather than being distributed in class, to make it a more personal expression of appreciation as well as to limit the chances of students comparing their notes or discussing them with other class members.

Thank-you notes were selected as the reward for this study because, in addition to providing each participant with a clear functional message, the rewards are equivalent across the functional groups. While other rewards other rewards might be more salient and might more completely fill an individual's functional need, equivalence across the groups would be lost. For example, highlighting an individual's participation in the local newspaper should meet the motivational need of an individual whose primary function is Social. Similarly, the opportunity to interact on the volunteer site with potential future clients could be a powerful motivator for an individual whose primary function is Career. These rewards are so diverse, however, that it is difficult to compare them in terms of strength and relevance. Thank-you notes are an appropriate choice for the study rewards because, even though each participant receives a comparable reward, the reward message can be varied to reflect each of the six volunteer functions.

While each note will be identical in terms of external appearance, the messages will vary. The half of the students that are randomly selected to be in the functionally-matched group will receive a thank-you note that expresses appreciation in terms of the student's primary motivational need. For example, a student whose top functional need is identified as Understanding would receive a note that mentions various ways in which the student gained knowledge through the volunteer experience. The other half of the students will receive a thank-you note that stresses the benefits associated with the student's lowest motivational need. The message contained in the notes for each individual functional need will be identical. In other words, the students in the functionally-matched group whose primary functional need is Career will receive the same thank-you message as the students in the

functionally-mismatched group whose lowest functional need is Career. In each case, the functional benefits are presented in a favorable manner; the only difference between the matched and mismatched groups is the students' affinity for the motivation.

A copy of the thank-you notes used with the sample of business students can be found in Appendix C. An example of the thank-you notes used with the psychology students for each motivational function can be found in Appendix D. For the psychology students the top paragraph of each note would reflect the organization with which the note's recipient worked.

While allowing the students to complete the surveys anonymously would help minimize the potential for response bias, the functional inventories must be matched with individual students in order to know which thank-you letter message each should receive. Even though the participants will be assured that their responses on the surveys will in no way impact their grade in the class, to increase the protection of their privacy, no names will be placed on the surveys themselves. Instead, each survey will be numbered; when the initial assessment is completed and placed in the collection envelope, the student will be asked to print their name next to their survey number on a separate piece of paper. The students will be informed that the surveys and the identification sheet will be filed separately and that the identification sheet will only be used if it is necessary to match their initial assessment with a follow-up survey. Students will follow the same procedure with their follow-up survey.

Sample

For this study, two different student samples will be used. The students in both samples are enrolled at private university in the U.S. where the primary researcher is an instructor for the computer lab portion of the statistics course offered through the school of business at the university.

Sample 1

The first group consists of undergraduate business students enrolled in one of two sections of a statistics course, one of three sections of a strategic management course, or one section of an introduction to management course. Each course is required for business majors. In the statistics and introduction to management courses, students will be recruited to participate in this activity in addition to their regular class assignments. In exchange for their participation, they will receive extra credit. In the strategy courses, students are required to complete a project and the service-learning activity is one of the options for that project. To get credit for participating in this activity, students must complete a short survey at the beginning and at the conclusion of the study. They must also attend a volleyball game at which they collect data, calculate relevant statistics, and present their conclusions to the university's volleyball coach to assist her in developing her game strategy. The statistics and management courses currently have approximately 150 students registered for the fall semester.

Sample 2

The second sample consists of students enrolled in two sections of developmental psychology. These two sections of the course include a required service-learning component

that accounts for a substantial percent of the semester grade. As a part of that service-learning requirement, students spend 10 hours volunteering at a local nonprofit organization. The students are allowed to choose the nonprofit with whom they wish to work from an approved list of organizations. By being able to choose from a variety of volunteering options, the students can select an activity that is congruent with their academic and career interests. In addition, they can find an organization that meets their location and scheduling needs. At the present time, approximately 65 students are enrolled in the psychology course.

Using Student Samples

The use of student subjects in this study is appropriate because student samples have been used a number of times in the study of volunteer motivation and in each case factor analysis of the data collected has resulted in extraction of the same six motivations present in the general population of adult volunteers as well as samples of older volunteers and individuals with doctoral degrees in psychology (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Ferrari et al., 1999; Switzer et al., 1999). More specifically, the motivational functions of service-learners in courses with a required service component have been compared to those in similar courses without a service-learning component (Chapman & Morley, 1999) as well as to students who participated in the same volunteer activity but without receiving course credit for their involvement (Ferrari et al., 1999). When the demographics and self-report measures of the students in the mandatory and nonmandatory volunteer groups were compared, there were so few significant differences that the two groups were combined for data analysis (Ferrari et al., 1999).

Mandatory Volunteers

To address the concerns about the mandatory nature of service-learning, Stukas, Snyder, and Clary (1999) examined the impact of giving the students a choice about their participation. In their experiment, even those in the free-choice option were strongly encouraged to participate in the volunteer activity. In spite of this outside pressure, the individuals in the free choice group were significantly more likely to feel that they had freely selected the community service option and also reported a higher level of interest to volunteer in the future (Stukas et al., 1999).

In sample 1 of the present experiment, business students are allowed to choose whether or not they participate in the service activity. It is not required for their courses and nonparticipation will not adversely impact their grade. In addition, they will not be subjected to coercion, which should further increase their feeling of empowerment as they decide whether or not to participate. In sample 2, the psychology students are required to participate in the service-learning activity, but they are given a number of choices regarding how and where to spend their volunteer hours. Because of this freedom to choose, the service-learners in this project can be studied as volunteers with regard to their motivational needs.

Data Collection Procedures

Sample 1

Early in the semester, students will be introduced to the extra credit activity. As a part of this introduction, they will watch a short video in which the university volleyball coach will briefly explain their use of statistics in making strategic decisions and the benefits that

will accrue to her organization with the additional information that can be accumulated and analyzed by the business students. This introduction will serve to validate the realism of the project as well as help categorize it as a true service project in the minds of the students. To avoid introducing a bias toward one or more of the volunteer functions that might affect which students agree to participate or which might impact initial task interest, when the coach briefly touches on benefits to the students who are involved, she will mention benefits associated with each of the six motivational functions. The script from the video introduction is included in Appendix A.

Students that agree to participate in the service project will also be asked to participate in the accompanying research project. Students that agree to participate will be given time in class to complete the 30-item Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998)and an assessment of their initial interest in the activity (7 items) (Arnold, 1985). They will also indicate via a single item their knowledge of the sport of volleyball and provide some demographic data, such as gender and classification. The data gathered from the interest and knowledge portions of the survey will be used to determine whether students' satisfaction with the service activity is moderated by either initial interest or previous experience with the sport.

Prior to the data collection activity, students will receive a Word document containing an overview of basic volleyball rules and terminology (see Appendix B). In addition to this advance training, a member of the research team will be at each volleyball game to explain the data collection procedures as well as answer any questions about either the data collection activity or the game itself that may come up during the match. Following the game, each

student will receive a copy of the data that was collected. Participants will have one week following data collection to complete their statistical analysis. This part of the activity is an individual assignment, and students are expected to do their own work. Students will complete the satisfaction/fulfillment assessment (Clary & Snyder, 1999, Study 5) when they turn in their analysis. They will also be given the opportunity to sign up to help with a similar project in the future. The item on the second survey that will be used to measure their interest in helping in the future includes the following statement: "ACU is expected to host the Lone Star Conference volleyball tournament in mid-November. We are looking for some individuals to collect data and compute the related percentages for the ACU matches during that tournament. If you are interested in working one of the conference tournament matches here in Abilene, please indicate that interest below. We will contact you with specific dates and times when they have been determined, and you can check your actual availability at that time." Interested students then checked a box labeled "I would like to be contacted about possibly collecting data for ACU at the conference tournament, if it is hosted in Abilene."

Sample 2

Students will complete the preliminary survey as part of their introduction to the service-learning project. This survey packet will include the 30-item Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998), an assessment of their initial interest in the activity (7 items) (Arnold, 1985), and some items regarding demographic data, such as gender and classification. The survey is identical to the one used with the business students except the psychology students do not have a question about their level of volleyball knowledge. Students are given two deadlines for completing the project. If they turn in their

volunteer time sheets by the first date, they will receive extra credit to be applied to the assignment. The satisfaction/fulfillment survey will be given in class one week after each deadline to those students turning in time sheets. The thank-you notes will be sent to the relevant group of students immediately after each deadline so that they will receive them before the satisfaction/fulfillment survey (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, Study 5) is administered. Each of the psychology students will have completed all of their required service-learning volunteer hours prior to completing the follow-up survey. In addition to the satisfaction/fulfillment instrument, the follow-up survey includes an item that will be used to measure participants' interest in helping in the future This item includes the following statement: "The organization with whom you worked this semester is looking for volunteers for the spring semester. If you would be interested in volunteering next semester, even on a limited basis, please indicate that interest below." Interested students then checked a box labeled "I am interested in volunteering for this organization again next semester, if my schedule permits."

Operationalization of Study Constructs

This section addresses the variables used in this project, the survey instruments that will be used for data collection, and justification for the instruments selected.

Independent Variables

The independent variables in the study are comprised of the participants' motivational profiles. Each subject's motivational profile will be assessed using the 30-item Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). This inventory has repeatedly

produced a six-factor solution, with the six motivations being identified as Values, Understanding, Career, Social, Enhancement, and Protective. This six-factor solution has consistently emerged even though the inventory has been utilized in a variety of sample groups, such as undergraduate students, adult volunteers, medical students, older volunteers, and graduates of doctoral psychology programs (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Ferrari et al., 1999; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Okun et al., 1998; Switzer et al., 1999). In a study to test whether or not the six-factor model provided the best fit with the data, one research group compared the results of employing unidimensional, two-factor, multifactor, and second order factor models (Okun et al., 1998). Once again, the six factor model emerged as the most appropriate expression of the data.

In the six samples for which internal consistency measures were reported the scales had Cronbach's alpha coefficients as follows: Values $\alpha = .80 - .89$, Understanding $\alpha = .78 - .84$, Career $\alpha = .71 - .89$, Social $\alpha = .80 - .87$, Enhancement $\alpha = .83 - .90$, and Protective $\alpha = .79 - .87$ (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Okun et al., 1998; Switzer et al., 1999). The temporal stability of the VFI over a period of one month was tested as well, and the test-retest correlations are as follows: Values = .78, Understanding = .77, Career = .68, Social = .68, Enhancement = .77, and Protective = .64 (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

With only 30 7-point Likert scale items, the VFI is short and easy to administer. In addition, it has been used in a number of different cases by a variety of researchers as they study volunteer motivations. The psychometric properties of the VFI have been examined and the instrument has been found to be reliable and robust across a wide range of samples.

Dependent Variables

Task satisfaction. While a number of the available job satisfaction instruments, such as the Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), have undergone thorough psychometric testing and have been used in numerous research projects, they deal with satisfaction in the workplace, which could be quite different from satisfaction as it relates to a single volunteer experience. Therefore, the satisfaction measures used in this study will come from a previous study on volunteer motivations and satisfaction (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, Study 5).

The six questions that make up this scale are measured on a 7-point Likert scale, so they are consistent in form with the items from the VFI. The six items included in this measure, with very slight wording changes on two items to reflect the difference in the volunteer activities, are "How much did you enjoy your volunteer experience?" "How personally fulfilling was your volunteer experience?" "How worthwhile was your volunteer experience?" "How important was your contribution to the project?" "To what extent did you accomplish some 'good' through your work?" "Based on your experience, how likely are you to volunteer for this type of volunteer activity in the future?" The internal consistency coefficient for this scale in the prior study was .85 (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998).

Behavioral measure. In addition to the self-report measure of satisfaction and fulfillment, a behavioral measure of posttask interest will be included. At the conclusion of the task satisfaction survey, participants from Sample 1 will be given the opportunity to sign up to collect data and compute statistics for the team at the conference tournament, which is expected to be hosted by the university approximately three weeks after the last regular

season home game. Volunteering for the conference tournament is not required for the service-learning portion of the course. In addition, no course credit or extra credit will be received by those individuals that participate. Since self-report measures of interest do not always agree with behavioral measures (Deci et al., 1999), capturing this additional data will provide information that goes beyond what the students profess their interest to be and demonstrates whether or not that interest really translates into future service intentions. At the same time, because of unavoidable schedule conflicts, the behavioral measure should not be used as the only dependent variable. Using both measures provides a more complete picture of the participants' posttask interest in the volunteer activity. For Sample 2, students will be asked to indicate their interest in participating in a similar volunteer experience during the next semester.

Potential Moderators

Initial task interest. Research studies that focus on the impact of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation have demonstrated that the effect of the reward is moderated by task interest, with rewards undermining intrinsic motivation for interesting tasks but not for uninteresting tasks. If the task is uninteresting, administration of a reward does not impact intrinsic motivation (Daniel & Esser, 1980; Deci et al., 1999; Hitt, Marriot, & Esser, 1992). The results were the same regardless of whether intrinsic motivation was measured with a self-report tool or by examining free-choice behavior (Deci et al., 1999). While the self-report outcome variable in this study is satisfaction/fulfillment, rather than postreward task interest, there are enough similarities between the research on the impact of extrinsic rewards and this current project to consider the possibility of initial interest as a moderating variable.

In each case, initial task engagement is associated with an extrinsic motivator (in this case extra credit for Sample 1 and course credit for Sample 2), while subsequent participation is not. In addition, in their meta-analysis, Deci et al. (1999) indicate the measure used to describe self-reported interest varied between studies, with some studies using a single item measure and others using a multi-item scale. In some cases, the items addressing task interest were mixed in a single scale with items addressing task enjoyment or satisfaction, which increases the similarity with the self-report outcome used in this study. Therefore, if task interest moderates the effect of extrinsic rewards on postreward intrinsic motivation, it is possible that it also moderates the ability of functionally matched and mismatched rewards to differentially effect task satisfaction/fulfillment.

Unfortunately, the literature does not indicate a standard measure for task interest. Instead, according to Deci et al. (1999) most of the studies used ad hoc measures that fit their particular study objectives. Since the purpose of measuring initial task interest in this study is to examine its moderating impact on task satisfaction and fulfillment of the volunteer experience, the items used to assess initial interest should be broad enough to convey the participants' overall affective expectations of the task. The scale used in this study was adapted from a study of the effects of performance, perceived competence, and extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation (Arnold, 1985). To assess initial task interest, participants will rate their affective expectations of the activity as they relate to seven adjective pairs. Each pair is separated by a seven-point scale and the pairs are as follows: (a) unpleasant, pleasant, (b) dull, exciting, (c) significant, pointless, (d) challenging, trivial, (e) boring, interesting, (f) satisfying, unsatisfying, and (g) tedious, fun. In Arnold's (1985) previous use

of this scale, also with university students, it exhibited an internal reliability score (Cronbach's alpha) of .77.

Knowledge of the sport (Sample 1 only). While an individual's knowledge of the sport of volleyball could impact his affective expectations of the volunteer experience and therefore indirectly impact that potential moderating variable, it could also impact the participants' satisfaction with the experience in a more direct manner. The purpose of providing each participant with information regarding the basic rules of volleyball is to minimize the impact of this potential moderator. Nevertheless, data will be collected regarding each participant's perception of their knowledge of the game to test for the presence of this moderator. If no significant impact is found, the participants will be grouped for the analysis without regard to their knowledge of volleyball.

Since no measures were found to assess the participants' knowledge of volleyball, a single item was created to be used in this study. The item, "How well do you understand the basic rules of competitive volleyball?", will be scored on a seven-point scale and be anchored by "very well" and "not very well."

Mandatory volunteerism. Even though the psychology students have the opportunity to select from among a number of service options, their participation in a community service activity is required. Participation by business students, on the other hand, is optional. While research has indicated that giving service-learning students a choice regarding their service opportunities mitigates their feeling of being controlled or manipulated (Stukas et al., 1999), there are still concerns that requiring community service can have a negative impact on future interest in volunteering (Sobus, 1995; Stukas et al., 1999). Because of these differing

opinions, the potential moderating impact of requiring community service will be considered. If the differences between the two groups are statistically insignificant, they will be treated as a single sample.

Proposed Method of Analysis

This section will outline the steps that will be taken to analyze the data after it has been collected.

Demographic Data

Descriptive statistics will be computed for the demographic data (age and classification) and the results will be included in the analysis portion of the study.

Volunteer Functions Inventory

Following completion of the VFI by the participants, the data collected will be subjected to principal-axis factor analysis, which is the most common method of factor extraction, to extract the six factors that have consistently emerged in both volunteer motivation theory and practice (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Okun et al., 1998; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Because prior studies have demonstrated a significant interscale correlation ranging from .34 to .41, utilization of an oblique rotation is expected (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Even though the factors have repeatedly shown high internal reliability, Cronbach's alpha will also be computed for the current sample.

Because the VFI has produced the same six motivational factors in a number of studies, several of which utilized student samples, it is assumed that the data collected with

the VFI in this study will also produce equivalent factors when subjected to analysis. A six factor solution will be specified as in other studies (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Switzer et al., 1999). Factor loadings are available for two of the studies which utilized the VFI (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, Study 1, Study 2). In each case one item did not load on the expected factor, and in one case an item had equivalent loadings on two factors. If similar discrepancies occur in this study, they will be handled in a manner that is consistent with prior research.

In addition to considering the psychometric functionality of the VFI, the functional profile for each participant will be computed by averaging his scores for each factor. This calculation is necessary to determine each individual's highest and lowest functional need, which will, in turn, establish the message of the thank-you note he receives following his participation in the service activity.

Initial Interest

Even though the internal reliability for the initial interest scale was acceptable in the Arnold (1985) study ($\alpha = .77$), Cronbach's alpha will also be computed for the present study. Each individual's initial interest score will be computed by averaging their responses on the seven items. To determine whether initial interest in the activity moderates the participants' satisfaction with the task or their willingness to sign up for future service, the data from the initial interest scale will be subjected to a median split (Stukas et al., 1999).

Knowledge of Volleyball

The data from this variable will also be subjected to a median split so that the moderating effects of the participants' knowledge of volleyball can be ascertained.

Hypothesis Testing

The first two hypotheses address the relationship between the congruence of the reward message and the two dependent variables: task satisfaction/fulfillment and signing up for additional service opportunities. Since individuals have a variety of motivations for participating in volunteer activities, a particular reward or reward message should be valued differently by individuals to whom the related functional need is important and those to whom it is not.

H1: The task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals who are rewarded with a functionally matched message will differ from the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals who are rewarded with a functionally mismatched message.

H2: Interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals who receive a functionally matched reward message will differ from the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals who receive a functionally mismatched reward message.

In each case the participants are divided into two independent samples (i.e., functionally matched and functionally mismatched messages). The dependent variable specified in hypothesis 1 (task satisfaction/fulfillment) is measured using scale data; therefore, an independent samples *t* test is the appropriate statistical analysis (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). For hypothesis 2, the dependent variable produces nominal data; therefore, a Chi Square test is most appropriate (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).

Hypotheses three, four, and five each deal with moderating variables. Since it has been demonstrated that receiving an extrinsic reward can undermine intrinsic motivation for interesting tasks but has no impact on intrinsic motivation for uninteresting tasks, this study addresses the potential presence of initial task interest as a moderating variable by

hypothesizing that the outcome variables will be different for individuals with high and low initial task interest.

H3a: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low initial task interest will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high initial task interest.

H3b: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low initial task interest will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high initial task interest.

H3c: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low initial task interest will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high initial task interest.

H3d: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low initial task interest will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high initial task interest.

Similarly, to test the possibility that prior knowledge of the game of volleyball might confound the results associated with the main effects being tested in hypotheses one and two, hypothesis 4 suggests that the outcomes might vary between the individuals who have a high prior knowledge of the game of volleyball and those individuals who do not.

H4a: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

H4b: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

H4c: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

H4d: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

The final hypothesis concerns the potential difference in outcome variables between the psychology students who are participating in mandatory community service, which constitutes a major part of their semester grade, and the business students who are choosing to volunteer their time in exchange for extra credit, which is a beneficial but not required. Subgroups for this analysis are determined simply by which course each student is taking, which means that the cells may have unequal numbers.

H5a: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that choose to volunteer.

H5b: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that choose to volunteer.

H5c: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that choose to volunteer.

H5d: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that choose to volunteer.

Again for each of the hypotheses that has task satisfaction/fulfillment as the dependent variable (parts *a* and *b* of H_3, H_4, and H_5), scale data for two independent groups of participants are being compared, making the independent samples *t* test the appropriate statistical analysis (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). For each of the hypotheses that has interest in an additional service opportunity as the dependent variable (parts *c* and *d* of H_3, H_4, and H_5),

nominal data for two groups of participants are being compared, making Chi Square the appropriate statistical test (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).

Sample Size and Power Analysis

The calculation of sample size is a complex endeavor, which should include consideration of the acceptable levels of Type I and Type II error (alpha and beta, respectively), as well as the anticipated effect size (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Effect size has been defined as "the degree to which the phenomenon is present in the population" (Cohen, 1988, p. 9). Because calculating effect size is a challenging task, researchers frequently turn to a general set of guidelines that Cohen (1988) specifically developed for the type of results usually found in sociobehavioral research. According to these guidelines, a small effect size corresponds to a difference between means of .2 of a standard deviation, while medium and large effect sizes correspond to a difference between means of .5 and .8 of a standard deviation, respectively (Cohen, 1988).

Since it was not possible to estimate the expected satisfaction scores or standard deviation of those scores with any accuracy prior to collecting data, an approximation of effect size was computed from a prior volunteer motivation and satisfaction study (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998, Study 5). In this study a 2 x 2 between-subjects factorial design was used for each VFI function to determine the impact of functionally-relevant benefits on satisfaction. For each of the six functions, Clary et al. (1998) reported the mean satisfaction and standard deviation for individuals who rated a particular function as important (above the mean) and who perceived that they received benefits that met this functional need as well as the mean satisfaction and standard deviation for individuals who rated a particular function

as unimportant (below the mean) and who perceived that they received benefits that met this functional need. In the present study, the comparisons of interest are between meeting an individual's most important functional need and meeting an individual's least important functional need. In the Clary et al. (1998) sample, the most important functional need was Values (M = 6.04, *SD* = 0.86) and the least important functional need was Career (M = 1.42, *SD* = 0.98). The group that identified Values as important and that perceived receiving benefits consistent with this function reported an average satisfaction score of 40.0 (*SD* = 2.4). The group that identified Career as unimportant and that perceived receiving benefits consistent with this function reported an average satisfaction score of 38.3 (*SD* = 4.5). The corresponding effect size is 0.5.

The standard deviation of the satisfaction scores between the Clary et al. (1998) sample and the sample from the present study should be comparable because the same measure of task satisfaction is being used in both studies. The effect size in the present study, therefore, could be even larger than the one found in the Clary et al. (1998) study because in the Clary et al. (1998) study, the individuals included in the group representing the most important functional need only had to rate Values above the mean in terms of importance. Similarly, the individuals included in the group representing the least important function need only had to rate Career below the mean in terms of importance. In the present study, each functionally matched participant will receive a benefit that corresponds to his primary motivational need, while each mismatched participant will receive a benefit that corresponds to his least important motivational need, which could potentially spread the average satisfaction scores for the two groups.

In addition, in the Clary et al. (1998) study the functional benefits identified in the study were vague (e.g., "I learned more about the cause for which I worked" for the Understanding function) and could have occurred at any point in the respondents' tenure with the organization. In the present study, the functional message of the reward will be clear and the reward will be received only a few days before satisfaction is assessed, increasing the salience of the reward. This increased specificity of the reward message could also increase the disparity between the matched and mismatched satisfaction figures. Based on these factors, an effect size in the range of .6 is expected. For a two independent samples *t* test with this effect size, to achieve a power of .8 with a statistical significance level of .05, a sample of size of 45 per group is required (Pezzullo, 2005). The expected sample of students is sufficient to achieve a statistical power of .80 for hypotheses one and two. For hypotheses three, four, and five, however, a total sample size of 180 is needed to achieve a power of .8. While it is likely that the number of participants in this study will be less than 180, the expected sample size is comparable to that used in other studies in this field (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Ferrari et al., 1999; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Switzer et al., 1999).

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

Privacy of thank-you note contents. Since the thank-you notes will be delivered through regular campus mail, students will not typically be with other study participants when they read their notes. In addition, it is assumed that they will not usually compare the

contents of the notes or discuss the notes with their classmates. The impact on study results, even if they do share the contents of their thank-you notes, is expected to be insignificant.

Strength and salience of reward. As discussed above, thank-you notes were selected as the reward for this study because of the advantages they have over other rewards. At the same time, thank-you notes have their own set of limitations. Implicit in this study is the assumption that the students will read the thank-you notes and that the functional message the notes contain is strong enough to influence the participants' satisfaction with the volunteer task.

Group dynamics

The service projects conducted in each sample are individual in nature. Each participant is responsible only for his part of the project. In spite of the individual nature of the project, participants in Sample 1 are allowed to select the game at which they collect data and participants in Sample 2 are allowed to choose the nonprofit at which they volunteer as well as the hours they work. Because of this flexibility, students have the option to sign up to volunteer with their friends. While participating with friends is possible, it is not expected to impact study results.

Knowledge of volleyball (Sample 1). Prior knowledge regarding the basic rules and concepts of competitive volleyball is not expected to impact study results because participants will be exposed to a written overview of the game. In addition, someone associated with the study will be at the volleyball games to answer any questions participants might have about the rules or the data they are supposed to collect. To validate this

assumption, data regarding participants' prior knowledge of the game will be collected and an analysis of the moderating impact of this variable will be calculated.

Demographic variables. Based on prior research of volunteer motivation, demographic variables, such as gender and classification, are not expected to impact study results. Men and women have been shown to rank the six volunteer motivations in a different order in some samples and in those same samples the women's scores for each function were consistently higher than the men's (with the exception of the social function in the Switzer et al., 1999, study) (Fletcher & Major, 2004; Switzer et al., 1999). These distinctions however, do not provide any theoretical indications that functionally matching or mismatching the reward message would impact the task satisfaction/fulfillment of men and women differently.

Mandatory nature of volunteer task. Based on the literature, it is assumed that even though the developmental psychology students are required to participate in ten hours of community service, the fact that they can choose the organization with which they work as well as days and times that are convenient will minimize the controlling aspect of the assignment enough that they can be treated as true volunteers for the purpose of motivation research (Stukas et al., 1999). For the business students, it is assumed that the extra credit students will receive for participating in the research project is a small reward and that its controlling influence is minimal. These students, therefore, can also be treated as volunteers for the purposes of this project.

Difference in behavioral measures for the two samples. Since it is likely that the volleyball conference tournament is expected to be held at the university a few weeks after the last home game, the behavioral measure of interest in future participation can be captured

by measuring students' interest in a specific and temporally proximal repeat service opportunity. The specific nature of the follow-up opportunity, combined with the short time frame, makes the expected correlation between volunteer intentions and actual volunteer behavior fairly high.

In the case of the psychology students, however, the behavioral measure of interest is less concrete. Since volunteer opportunities at the nonprofit organizations are ongoing and not tied to specific events, students will only be asked about their future intentions to volunteer. While their response to this question provides a behavioral indication of the task satisfaction/fulfillment, the expected correlation between interest and actual participation is lower. While these differences in behavioral measures are important to note, it is not expected that they will impact the relationship between the matching or mismatching of messages and the behavioral measure of satisfaction. In other words, while the measures may not be equally good indicators of actual behavior, they should not impact how participants react to manipulation of the independent variable.

Impact of differences in volunteer activities on behavioral measures. In addition to differences in the behavioral measures themselves, it is possible that variations in the volunteer activities could impact the behavioral measure of future interest in volunteering. Emotionally intense activities, such as working with medically fragile children or recovering substance abusers, affect individuals differently. The very nature of the volunteer activities could enhance an individual's interest in future involvement or reduce that desire. Helping the volleyball team is less emotionally charged and therefore the decision to help again in the future is less likely to contain a strong emotional component. While the overall scores on the

behavioral dependent variable could vary between the two samples because of the differences in the activities, within each sample the participants were randomly assigned to receive matched or mismatched messages. Randomization of the experimental treatment should minimize the impact of individual variations in emotional response to the various volunteer activities.

Dispersion of functional profiles among participants. In prior studies, administration of the VFI has resulted in a variety of functional profiles (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998; Ferrari et al., 1999; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Okun et al., 1998; Switzer et al., 1999). While the Values and Understanding functions were in the top half of all eleven samples and the Social and Protective functions were in the bottom half of all eleven samples, the samples resulted in six unique arrangements. Only one study reported any information about the variability of individual participants' motivational profiles. Out of the 85 students that participated in Chapman and Morley's (1999) study, no one rated Protective or Social as his most important motivational function, but the other four functions were the most important motivational function to at least a portion of the group.

Based on these results, it is very possible that in this study some of the functions may not be rated as the most important function by any of the participants, while others are not rated by anyone as the least important function. In this study, individuals in the "matched" group will receive a message that is congruent with their most important function while individuals in the "mismatched" group receive a message that is congruent with their least important function. Since the message each participant receives is based on his personal profile, it is assumed that the relationship between the independent and dependent variables

would be the same even if some of the functions are not rated the most or least important by any of the participants.

Limitations

Number of participants. Although a number of classes with a total anticipated enrollment of about 230 students are being included in this study, participation in the study through the business courses is optional. The number of students who will actually be involved in this study, therefore, is unknown. While it is likely that participation will be high enough that the statistical power associated with testing hypotheses one and two will be acceptably high (.8), the sample size may not be large enough to achieve the desired statistical power for testing the effects of moderating variables.

If statistical analysis indicates that prior knowledge of volleyball does impact the relationship between the matching or mismatching of rewards and task satisfaction/fulfillment, the potentially skewed distribution of this moderating variable could result in some sample size issues when trying to determine the moderating impact of initial interest on the primary relationship. If this is the case, a lack of power would limit the usefulness of this secondary analysis.

Short-term volunteering. Using initial, short-term volunteering experiences helps isolate the effect of the reward intervention on task satisfaction because the results are not clouded by participants' previous experiences with the activity, the organization, their fellow volunteers, or the clients with whom they work. In addition, since the participants' involvement is of known length, asking about their intentions to volunteer in the future is logical at the termination of their obligation. While nonprofit organizations are certainly

interested in early satisfaction for their volunteers, they are also concerned about motivating and retaining their workers on an ongoing basis, and the results of a study based solely on initial experiences may not be transferable to a long-term volunteer relationship.

Type of reward. Thank-you notes were used as the reward for this study because they provide an easy, inexpensive way to convey a specific functional message to all participants in an equivalent manner. The monetary value of each reward was identical as was the method of reward delivery. While these features are valuable from an experimental perspective, using only one type of reward limits the ability of a nonprofit organization to extrapolate the findings of this study to the numerous other types of symbolic rewards they routinely use to motivate and show appreciation to their volunteers (Cnaan & Cascio, 1999).

In this research project, reward distribution occurred only once for each participant. Since each individual volunteered for only a short period of time, receiving only one reward is logical and appropriate. For nonprofits utilizing long-term volunteers, however, the success of rewards could depend not only on the reward's functional message but also on the nonprofit's previous use of rewards. Since unexpected rewards have a more favorable impact on intrinsic motivation than expected rewards (Deci et al., 1999), subsequent rewards might not have the same impact on task satisfaction/fulfillment as the first reward a volunteer receives from an organization.

Using service-learning students. While students, in general, and service-learners, in particular, have been used in a number of studies that utilized the VFI to assess volunteer motivations, the mandatory nature of the psychology students' volunteer experience could limit the generalizability of this study's results. Assuming that the sample size is sufficiently

large, the moderating effect of mandatory service will be examined. If this analysis demonstrates that the results of the two groups are not significantly different, this limitation may have only minimal impact on nonprofits.

Using a student sample. According to The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE), 20% of Americans 19-24 years old volunteer their time (Helms, 2004). These volunteers can be found coaching youth sports teams, mentoring students through Big Brother/Big Sisters, delivering food for Meals on Wheels, raising puppies for Canine Companions for Independence, as well as helping innumerable other nonprofit organizations. While their limited range of demographics and their limited life experiences may make a sample of university students unique and not representative of volunteers as a whole, they are certainly a significant part of the overall volunteer population.

A related limitation that is relevant to this particular study arises from the possible lack of diversity among the participants' functional profiles. Because students at a single university are similar in terms of age, education, and possibly geographic and cultural background, it is more likely that some of the volunteer functions might not be rated by anyone as either the most or least important motivational need. Even though the resulting functional profiles may have less variety than they would be if a more diverse sample was used, this limitation is not expected to have a significant impact on the study results (see assumptions).

Summary

This chapter has addressed a number of methodological issues, such as the study design, the proposed sample, the data collection instruments that will be used along with the planned data analysis procedures.

CHAPTER 4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of reward message on a volunteer's satisfaction with the volunteer experience. Participants in this study consisted of university students who were participating in a service-learning project as a component of one of their courses. Prior to serving their volunteer hours, participants completed a questionnaire that contained the 30-item Volunteer Functions Inventory, an assessment of initial interest in the volunteer task, a one-item measure of their knowledge of the sport of volleyball (business sample only), and some demographic variables.

Response Rate

Business Students

Students in one section of Introduction to Management, three sections of Strategic Management, and two sections of Business Statistics were invited to participate in a service-learning project as a component of their course. In some classes, the assignment was given as an extra credit option; in others, the project was one choice students were given for a required course project. In each case, students were not required to complete the service-learning project; they had other options and nonparticipation would not adversely impact their grade. Out of the 151 unique students in the participating business classes, 96 expressed interest in the project and completed the initial survey. A number of students were eliminated from the study because they did not actually attend a volleyball game. The 88 students who completed the project represent an overall response rate of 58%.

Psychology Students

Students from two sections of Developmental Psychology were also invited to participate in the study. Students in these classes were required to complete 10 hours of volunteer service as a part of their course. These students were allowed to choose the organization with which they worked from among a wide variety of organizations in the area, and the 88 students enrolled in these classes selected 36 different organizations to assist. Of these 88 students, some were dropped from the study because (a) they did not complete the initial survey (5 students), (b) they did not turn in their volunteer hours time sheet by the deadline (23 students), or (c) they did not complete the follow-up survey (5 students). The remaining 55 students represent 62.5% of the students enrolled in these classes.

Demographics of Participants

Of the 143 participants, 88 were enrolled in one of the participating business classes, while the other 55 individuals were taking developmental psychology. The participants ranged from 17 to 40 years old and 51% were male. While over half of the students had 90 credit hours or more (52.4%), the study involved students from each academic classification (freshmen through seniors). An overwhelming majority (93.7%) of the students had participated in at least one volunteer activity prior to this project.

Factor Analysis of Volunteer Functions Inventory

Principal components analysis of the data generated from the 30-item Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998) yielded five factors with eigenvalues

greater than one. Because prior research (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998) has demonstrated a six-factor solution for the VFI, principal axis factor analysis was conducted for both five- and six-factor solutions. Because the factors are correlated (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998), oblique rotation was used (Promax, kappa = 2) to achieve an interpretable factor structure. The factor analysis yielded a fairly clean structure, but no items had factor loadings greater than .4 on the sixth factor. Items with factor loadings greater than .3 on the sixth factor also had a higher loading on one of the first five factors. The Enhancement items, four of which comprised the sixth factor in the original research (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998), were not extracted as a separate factor for this sample. Three of the five Enhancement items loaded with the Protective factor, one loaded with Career, and one loaded with Understanding. The item that loaded on the Understanding factor (Item 29) has been somewhat problematic in prior research, loading with the Understanding factor in other studies (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). The pattern matrix for the five-factor solution is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Factor Pattern Matrix (Principal-Axis Factor Analysis, Oblique Rotation)
Five Factors Specified for Volunteer Functions Inventory

	Factor				
Protective	1	2	3	4	5
7. No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.	0.43				
9. By volunteering I feel less lonely.	0.62				
11. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.	0.53				
20. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.	0.59				
24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.	0.80				
Career					
1. Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.		0.63			
10. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.		0.81			
15. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.		0.61			
21. Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.		0.64			
28. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.		0.71			
Values					
3. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.			0.70		
8. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.			0.73		
16. I feel compassion toward people in need.			0.75		
19. I feel it is important to help others.			0.56		
22. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.			0.62		
Social					
2. My friends volunteer.				0.74	
4. People I'm close to want me to volunteer.				0.76	
6. People I know share an interest in community service.				0.67	
17. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.				0.65	
23. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.				0.63	
Understanding					
12. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.					0.55
14. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.					0.53
18. Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands on experience.					0.76
25. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.					0.55
30. I can explore my own strengths.					0.45
Enhancement					
5. Volunteering makes me feel important.		0.41			
13. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.	0.66				
26. Volunteering makes me feel needed.	0.59				
27. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.	0.68				
29. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.					0.47

Note: Only factor loadings ≥ .40 are shown, $n = 143$.

While a five-factor solution has not previously been reported for the VFI, a number of other studies addressing volunteer motivations have found five-factor solutions (Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Ryan et al., 2001; Strigas & Jr, 2003; Wang & Buffalo, 2004). In addition, when Clary et al. (1998) conducted their exploratory analyses of the VFI, they utilized principal-axis factor analyses in which they specified five- and seven-factor solutions. In the five-factor solution, the Protective and Enhancement items loaded together on a single factor, with the exception of Item 29, which again loaded with the Understanding items. Therefore, a five-factor solution in which the majority of enhancement items loaded with the Protective factor, is not inconsistent with the previous body of volunteer motivation research.

Since follow-up letters were sent to participants based on the six factor solution demonstrated in prior VFI research, some students received thank-you notes that corresponded to the five Enhancement items from the VFI. This occurrence, however, does not appear to have a significant impact on the project. Each thank-you note contained a message that was derived from the five VFI items that corresponded either to their most or least important motivational factor. Of the six factors, Enhancement ranked fourth in overall importance. For a handful of participants who took the VFI, Enhancement was the most important motivational factor; for a few others it was the least important motivational factor. Because participants were randomly selected to receive a letter message that matched either the factor that was the most important to them or the factor that was the least important, not all of the students that ranked Enhancement as highest or lowest received a letter with an Enhancement message. In fact, only 6 of the 143 students who completed the study were randomly selected to receive a thank-you note with an Enhancement message. For this

reason, the failure of the Enhancement items to load as a separate factor did not appear to significantly affect the study.

The order of importance of each of the motivational factors varied from sample to sample in previous research. For this study's sample, Values was the most important motivational factor. It had an overall mean value of 5.86 and was rated as most important by 60.9% of the sample. The Protective function had the lowest mean value (3.57) and was also rated the least important by 49.7% of the sample. Table 2 displays the mean values of each function for the two subsamples as well as for the overall sample.

Table 2
Mean Values for Each of the Six VFI Factors (on a seven-point scale)

	Mean Score		
	Overall	Business Students	Psychology Students
Values	5.86	5.60	6.27
Understanding	5.27	5.12	5.51
Career	4.46	4.19	4.91
Enhancement	4.35	4.20	4.59
Social	4.08	4.06	4.13
Protective	3.57	3.80	3.82

Note: $n_{\text{overall}} = 143$, $n_{\text{business students}} = 88$, $n_{\text{psychology students}} = 55$

Internal reliability scores were computed for each of the six VFI factors as well as for the five factors extracted in the factor analysis. In each case the value computed for Cronbach's alpha is adequate and comparable to the reliability scores for the factors when the VFI is applied to other samples. These values are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3
Reliability Statistics for VFI Factors

	Cronbach's Alpha			
Factor	Overall	Business Students	Psychology Students	Prior Research
Values	.84	.83	.72	.80-.89
Understanding	.89	.90	.86	.78-.84
Career	.88	.84	.91	.71-.89
Enhancement	.83	.81	.85	.83-.90
Social	.89	.90	.87	.80-.87
Protective	.83	.90	.81	.79-.87

Note: $n_{\text{business students}} = 88$, $n_{\text{psychology students}} = 55$, $n_{\text{overall}} = 143$, VFI = Volunteer Functions Inventory
Prior Research includes the following studies: Clary et al., 1998; Switzer et al., 1999; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Okun et al., 1998

Table 4
Reliability Statistics for Factors Produced in Five-Factor Principal-Axis Factor Analysis, Oblique Rotation

Factor	Corresponding VFI Category	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Protective plus 3 Enhancement items	.90
2	Career plus 1 Enhancement item	.88
3	Values	.84
4	Social	.89
5	Understanding plus 1 Enhancement item	.90

Note: n = 143, VFI = Volunteer Functions Inventory

Initial Interest Measure

Initial interest in the volunteer task was measured using participants' affective responses to seven adjective pairs: (a) *unpleasant, pleasant*; (b) *dull, exciting*; (c) *significant, pointless*; (d) *challenging, trivial*; (e) *boring, interesting*; (f) *satisfying, unsatisfying*; and (g) *tedious, fun* (Arnold, 1985). The responses were measured on a seven-point scale, with three of the seven items reverse coded. After adjusting the scores so that the more positive adjective was associated with a high score, the mean scores for the seven items ranged from 4.5 (*challenging, trivial*) to 5.52 (*unpleasant, pleasant*). The scale showed adequate internal reliability (α = .83), which is comparable to the reliability score of .77 that Arnold (1985) reported in a previous study utilizing university students. In addition to having the lowest overall mean score, the adjective pair—challenging, trivial—had an adverse impact on the scale's internal reliability. That adverse impact could be, in part, because for the volunteer

activities used in this study, challenging and trivial do not seem to be opposite ends of the same measure. The term *challenging* seems to address the task's difficulty, while *trivial* seems to address its importance. For this study, all seven items were included in the measure of initial interest, but future work should consider whether the challenging/trivial item should be included as a measure of task interest.

Knowledge of the Sport (Business Students Only)

A one-item measure was used to determine how familiar the business students were with the rules of competitive volleyball. On a seven-point scale, participants rated themselves on the following question: How well do you understand the basic rules of competitive volleyball? For this item a score of one was anchored with the phrase *very well*, while seven was anchored with the phrase *not very well*. The mean score for this variable was 3.6, slightly more knowledgeable than the scale midpoint of 4; the corresponding standard deviation was 1.9. In an attempt to prevent a lack of volleyball knowledge from adversely impacting the participants' volunteer experience, each student received a two-page document outlining the rules and procedures. In addition, each student received personal one-on-one instruction on how to complete his data collection sheet, and a researcher was on-hand at each volleyball match to answer any questions that arose during the data collection process.

Task Satisfaction

Following completion of the volunteer task, students were sent a thank-you note with a message that matched either the individual's most important volunteer motivation or the

individual's least important motivation. Within a week of receiving the thank-you note, participants were asked to complete a 6-item self-report instrument regarding their volunteer experience (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998) as well as a one item behavioral measure of future interest in a similar volunteer activity. The six self-report items were presented using a seven-point scale with the higher values representing greater satisfaction. The overall mean satisfaction level was 5.5 (SD = 1.09), with the business students and psychology students reporting mean satisfaction levels of 5.3 (SD = 1.09) and 5.8 (SD = 1.02), respectively. The difference in means for the two subsamples is significant, $t(139) = 2.87$, $p = .005$. The internal reliability of the self-report measure is sufficiently high ($\alpha = .90$) and comparable to the value reported in earlier research ($\alpha = .85$) (Clary et al, 1998).

For the behavioral measure of task satisfaction, participants were presented with an opportunity to help in a similar way in the near future and asked to indicate their willingness to volunteer again. Seventy-two of the 143 students (50%) who participated in this study indicated that they would be interested in participating in a similar volunteer activity in the future. In the sample of psychology students, 76% of the 55 participants indicated that they would be interested in volunteering for the same organization during the next academic semester. Of the 88 participants from the business classes, only 34% expressed an interest in helping keep statistics at the upcoming volleyball conference tournament. The difference in affirmative responses is consistent with the difference in self-reported task satisfaction and the difference is again significant, $t(141) = 5.36$, $p = .000$. Therefore, even though, the psychology students were participating in “mandatory” volunteer service, they experienced a

higher level of task satisfaction than the business students. This issue is addressed in more detail in conjunction with the discussion regarding Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

H_1: The task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals who are rewarded with a functionally matched message will differ from the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals who are rewarded with a functionally mismatched message.

An independent samples *t* test was used to test the hypothesis that the mean satisfaction levels of the two reward groups, as calculated using the six-item self-report measure, are different. Since the participants were randomly assigned to receive a matched or mismatched letter message, the number in each group was initially the same. As students dropped out of the study for reasons listed above, the split became less even, with 76 students receiving a note containing a message matching their most important motivational function and 65 students receiving a note that corresponded to their least important motivational function. The mean satisfaction level for students receiving a matched message was 5.43, while the mean satisfaction for students receiving a mismatched message was 5.53. The data does not support the research hypothesis stated above ($t(139) = .495$, $p = .621$); therefore, the difference in the mean satisfaction levels for each group was not significant.

Hypothesis 2

H2: Interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals who receive a functionally matched reward message will differ from the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals who receive a functionally mismatched reward message.

Again, the independent variable—matched or mismatched letter message—is categorical, and in this case, the dependent variable is categorical as well. (The students either expressed an interest in future participation or they did not.) Therefore, the Chi Square test is the most appropriate method of analysis. The crosstabulation of letter message and interest in helping again in the future is shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Crosstab of Letter Message and Interest in Future Participation

		Help Again?		
Letter Type		No	Yes	Total
Matched	Count	42	35	77
	Expected Count	38.2	38.8	77.0
Mismatched	Count	29	37	66
	Expected Count	32.8	33.2	66.0
Total	Count	71	72	143
	Expected Count	71.0	72.0	143.0

The students who received a thank-you note with a message that matched their most important motivational function were less likely than expected to sign up to help in the future, while students who received a message that matched their least important motivation

function were more likely than expected to sign up for future volunteer participation. This relationship is again opposite of what theory suggests, but the null hypothesis (that there is no difference in the groups) cannot be rejected, $\chi^2(1, N = 143) = 1.60$, $p = .206$, signifying that the difference in the observed and expected values was not significant.

Hypothesis 3 and 4

Hypotheses three and four deal with the potential moderating effects of initial task interest and volleyball knowledge (business students only) on the relationship between the content of the thank-you notes and task satisfaction. As an initial examination of the relationship, scatterplots of interest versus satisfaction and volleyball knowledge versus satisfaction were constructed. In addition, the correlation coefficients of each relationship were computed. While the scatterplot of knowledge and satisfaction showed no visible relationship, the plot of interest and satisfaction showed a weak positive relationship. The conclusions drawn from the graphical representations of data were confirmed by the correlation coefficients. For knowledge and satisfaction the Pearson correlation coefficient (-.140) was not significant. The correlation coefficient describing the bivariate relationship between initial interest and task satisfaction (.358), however, was significant at the .01 level.

The purpose of examining the potential moderating effect of volleyball knowledge was to make sure that the students' level of knowledge did not impact the relationship between letter message and satisfaction. If there is no statistical support for a moderating effect, then all of the business students can be analyzed as a single group, regardless of their level of volleyball knowledge. Therefore, this relationship will be examined first.

H_{4a}: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

H_{4b}: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

H_{4c}: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

H_{4d}: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low knowledge of volleyball will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high knowledge of volleyball.

To conduct this analysis, the business students were ordered by volleyball knowledge and then a median split was taken. For parts *a* and *b* of Hypothesis 4, independent samples *t* tests were used to determine if the mean satisfaction level was different for participants in the high and low knowledge groups. The results of these *t* tests are shown in Table 6. In neither case could the null hypothesis be rejected. Therefore, volleyball knowledge does not appear to impact an individual's self-reported satisfaction.

To test parts *c* and *d* of Hypothesis 4, a Chi Square analysis was used to determine if knowledge level was related to a student's willingness to sign up for a similar volunteer assignment in the future. The Chi Square statistics for this analysis are presented in Table 7. Because the actual count of students in each knowledge/future participation cell is not significantly different from the expected value, $p_{matched}(.677) > \alpha(.05)$, $p_{mismatched}(.412) > \alpha(.05)$, it can be determined that a student's knowledge of volleyball did not significantly impact his willingness to sign up to participate in a similar project in the future.

Table 6
Moderating Effect of Volleyball Knowledge on the Relationship Between Letter Message and Self-Reported Task Satisfaction

Letter Type	Knowledge Category	Mean Satisfaction	*t*	Sig.
Matched	High	5.13	-.345	.732
	Low	5.25		
Mismatched	High	5.33	-.297	.768
	Low	5.43		

Note: Degrees of freedom for matched message = 45; for mismatched message *df* = 38

Table 7
Moderating Effect of Volleyball Knowledge on the Relationship Between Letter Message and Willingness to Sign-up for Future Service

Letter Type	*df*	*N*	$\chi 2$	Sig.
Matched	1	47	.173	.677
Mismatched	1	41	.672	.412

Since the null hypotheses for all four parts of Hypothesis 4 could not be rejected, the business students who participated in this study can be combined for all other statistical analyses, regardless of their level of volleyball knowledge.

H_{3a}: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low initial task interest will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high initial task interest.

H_{3b}: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with low initial task interest will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals with high initial task interest.

H_{3c}: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low initial task interest will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high initial task interest.

H_{3d}: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with low initial task interest will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals with high initial task interest.

To conduct this analysis, the participants were ordered by their composite score on the initial interest scale and then a median split was taken. For parts *a* and *b* of Hypothesis 3, independent samples *t* tests were used to determine if the mean satisfaction level was different for participants in the high and low interest groups. The results of these *t* tests are shown in Table 8. For students receiving a matched message, the null hypothesis (that there is no difference in task satisfaction for the high and low interest groups) was rejected, $t(72) = 3.131$, $p = .003$. For students receiving a mismatched message, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, $t(63) = .926$, $p = .358$. Students with a high initial interest in the volunteer activity were more satisfied with the activity, but the difference is significant only for students who received a thank-you note containing a reward message that matched their highest motivational factor.

Table 8
Moderating Effect of Initial Interest on the Relationship Between Letter Message and Self-Reported Task Satisfaction

Letter Type	Interest Category	Mean Satisfaction	*t*	Sig.
Matched	High	5.82	3.131	.003
	Low	5.04		
Mismatched	High	5.65	.926	.358
	Low	5.40		

Note: Degrees of freedom for matched message = 72; for mismatched message *df* = 63

To test parts *c* and *d* of Hypothesis 3, a Chi Square analysis was used to determine if initial interest was related to a student's willingness to sign up for a similar volunteer assignment in the future. The Chi Square statistics for this analysis are presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Moderating Effect of Initial Interest on the Relationship Between Letter Message and Willingness to Sign Up for Future Service

Letter Type	*df*	*N*	χ^2	Sig.
Matched	1	75	2.996	.083
Mismatched	1	66	4.982	.026

For students who received a thank-you note containing a functionally matched message, the null hypothesis (that there is no difference in willingness to sign up to help in the future between the high and low interest groups) could not be rejected (see Table 9); initial interest did not significantly impact their willingness to sign up to participate in a similar activity in the future. For students who received a thank-you note containing a functionally mismatched message, however, the null hypothesis was rejected because the computed *p*-value was less than .05, which was selected as alpha (see Table 9). Therefore, initial interest did impact their willingness to sign up to participate in a future volunteer activity, with students in the high interest category being more likely to sign up. The actual and expected counts for the crosstabulation between willingness to help in the future and initial interest for students receiving mismatched reward messages is presented in Table 10.

Table 10
Crosstab of Initial Task Interest and Willingness to Sign Up to Help in the Future for Recipients of Mismatched Reward Messages

		Interest Category		
Help Again?		High	Low	Total
No	Count	10	19	29
	Expected Count	14.5	14.5	29.0
Yes	Count	23	14	37
	Expected Count	18.5	18.5	37.0
Total	Count	33	33	66
	Expected Count	33.0	33.0	66.0

This study provided partial support for Hypothesis 3. While the analysis suggests that initial interest plays a role in the relationship between letter message and task satisfaction, the strength and significance of the relationship depends on the dependent variable examined and the nature of the letter message.

While the statistical analysis provides some support for Hypothesis 3, this hypothesis does not address the issue of how different initial interest levels impact the relationship between letter message and satisfaction. When Hypothesis 3 was constructed, the underlying assumption was that the null hypotheses associated with Hypotheses 1 and 2 would be rejected. If that was the case, then finding support for Hypothesis 3 would further explain the relationship between the three variables. In the absence of support for Hypotheses 1 and 2, a different statistical method needs to be employed to determine if the relationship between interest and satisfaction moderates the relationship between the main dependent and independent variables. Existence of a relationship between initial interest and task satisfaction has been partially supported by testing of Hypothesis 3. In addition, the correlation between the two variables was statistically significant at the .01 level ($r = .358$).

Analysis of covariance was used to determine whether or not the relationship between letter message and satisfaction varies with the level of initial interest. In this analysis, task satisfaction was the dependent variable, the letter message defined the two groups, and initial interest was entered as a covariate. Even when controlling for the effect of initial interest, there is no evidence of a significant relationship between letter message and satisfaction, $F(1) = .077$, $p = .781$. To test the relationship between letter message and willingness to help in the future, while controlling for initial interest, analysis of covariance was used again. Since

the independent variable--willingness to help in the future--is nominal in nature, it was recoded into a dummy variable where *zero* corresponded to "no interest in helping in the future" and *one* corresponded to an affirmative response. Again, there is no significant relationship between letter message and satisfaction, $F(1) = 1.451$, $p = .230$.

Hypothesis 5

H5a: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that choose to volunteer.

H5b: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than task satisfaction/fulfillment of individuals that choose to volunteer.

H5c: For participants receiving a functionally matched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that choose to volunteer.

H5d: For participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that are required to participate in community service will be different than the interest in an additional service opportunity for individuals that choose to volunteer.

For parts *a* and *b* of Hypothesis 5, independent samples *t* tests were used to determine if the mean satisfaction level was different for participants who were required to volunteer (psychology students) and those for whom service was optional (business students). The results of these *t* tests are shown in Table 11. For students receiving a matched message the null hypothesis (that there is not difference in task satisfaction between the mandatory and voluntary service groups) is rejected because the *p*-value is less than alpha (.05) (see Table 11). For students receiving a mismatched message, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected ($p > \alpha$). In both cases, the students enrolled in classes that require community service are more

satisfied with the service activity, but the difference is significant only for students who receive a thank-you note containing a reward message that matches their highest motivational factor.

Table 11
Moderating Effect of Mandatory Service on the Relationship Between Letter Message and Self-Reported Task Satisfaction

Letter Type	Sample Group	Mean Satisfaction	*t*	Sig.
Matched	Mandatory (Psych)	5.83	2.538	.013
	Voluntary (Business)	5.19		
Mismatched	Mandatory (Psych)	5.77	1.450	.152
	Voluntary (Business)	5.38		

Note: Degrees of freedom for matched message = 74; for mismatched message *df* = 63

To test parts *c* and *d* of Hypothesis 5, a Chi Square analysis was used to assess whether the mandatory or volunteer nature of the service project was related to a student's willingness to sign up for a similar volunteer assignment in the future. The Chi Square statistics for this analysis are presented in Table 12. In this case the null hypothesis (that there is no difference in willingness to sign up to help again between the voluntary and mandatory service groups) is rejected for all students, regardless of letter message because the *p*-value is less than alpha (.05) in both cases (see Table 12). Students who were enrolled in the classes that required community service were significantly more likely to sign up to

help in the future than students for whom community service was voluntary, regardless of whether the student's thank-you note contained a matched or mismatched reward message. See Tables 13 and 14 for the crosstabulations associated with Hypotheses 5c and 5d.

Table 12
Moderating Effect of Mandatory/Voluntary Participation on the Relationship Between Letter Message and Willingness to Sign Up for Future Service

Letter Type	*df*	*N*	χ^2	Sig.
Matched	1	77	15.407	.000
Mismatched	1	66	9.363	.002

Table 13
Crosstab of Mandatory/Voluntary Participation and Willingness to Sign Up to Help in the Future for Recipients of Matched Reward Messages

		Sample Group		
Help Again?		Mandatory (Psychology)	Voluntary (Business)	Total
No	Count	8	34	42
	Expected Count	16.4	25.6	42.0
Yes	Count	22	13	35
	Expected Count	13.6	21.4	35.0
Total	Count	30	47	77
	Expected Count	30.0	47.0	77.0

Table 14
Crosstab of Mandatory/Voluntary Participation and Willingness to Sign Up to Help in the Future for Recipients of Mismatched Reward Messages

		Sample Group		
Help Again?		Mandatory (Psychology)	Voluntary (Business)	Total
No	Count	5	24	29
	Expected Count	11.0	18.0	29.0
Yes	Count	20	17	37
	Expected Count	14.0	23.0	37.0
Total	Count	25	41	66
	Expected Count	25.0	41.0	66.0

Statistical analysis provided support for three of the four parts of Hypothesis 5. When they received a reward message that matched their primary functional preference, students in the classes with mandatory community service requirements were more satisfied with the service experience than students in the classes where community service was optional. In addition, students in the classes with mandatory community service requirements were more likely to sign up to help again in the future than were students for whom service was optional, regardless of whether the reward message they received targeted their most or least important motivational function.

Studies using service-learning activities as a venue for studying motivations of volunteers posit that offering choices mitigates the negative impact that requiring service can

have on future intentions to volunteer (Stukas et al., 1999; Werner et al., 2002). They do not, however, suggest that individuals participating in mandatory community service should be more satisfied and more likely to volunteer in the future. The phenomenon observed in this study appears to be a function of differences within the two subsamples.

Nonresponse bias was the first possibility that was examined. A substantial number of the psychology students did not complete the study because they did not turn their volunteer time sheets in on time. It seems plausible that the less satisfied students (who would also be less likely to volunteer for the organization again) might be more likely to miss the deadline. Of the 23 students who missed the deadline for submitting time sheets, 17 completed follow-up questionnaires. Students who turned their time sheets in late were significantly less satisfied with the volunteer experience than those who met the deadline, $t(69) = 2.703$, $p = .009$. The difference in willingness to help again in the future was not significant at the .05 level, χ^2 $(1, N = 72) = 3.448$, $p = .063$, but with only 17 individuals in the late category, the test lacks statistical power.

Two other demographic variables are worth considering in conjunction with the difference in satisfaction and willingness to help in the future between the two subsamples: gender and number of credit hours. While the split between men and women and the split between students with fewer than 90 credit hours and those with 90 or more are virtually even for the entire sample, the splits within the subsamples are skewed (see Table 15).

Table 15
Distribution of Gender and Credit Hours by Sample

Demographic Category		Sample Group		
		Overall	Business	Psychology
Gender	Male	73 51%	47 66%	26 36%
	Female	70 49%	24 34%	46 64%
Credit Hours	Less than 90 hours	68 48%	13 18%	55 79%
	90 or more hours	75 52%	60 82%	15 21%

Gender, credit hours, and timely submission of volunteer hours are first examined for the subsample of psychology students. Independent samples *t* tests show a significant relationship between satisfaction and gender for this subsample, with women being more satisfied than men, $t(69) = 2.700$, $p = .009$. The relationship between satisfaction and the number of credit hours is not significant for this subsample, $t(67) = 1.368$, $p = .176$. When the three independent variables (timeliness of submission, gender, and number of credit hours) are used as inputs to construct a stepwise linear regression model, gender is the only variable that results in a significant slope in the regression equation ($p = .02$). Since late submissions do not have a significant relationship with the psychology student's willingness to help again in the future and do not contribute to the regression equation describing volunteer satisfaction, nonresponse bias does not seem to be a significant factor in the

differences in satisfaction and willingness to help again that exist between the two groups of students.

The remaining demographic variables (gender and number of credit hours) can now be examined for the overall sample. The difference in satisfaction between students with fewer than 90 hours and students with 90 or more hours is significant at the .05 level, $t(139) = 3.409$, $p = .001$, while the difference in satisfaction between men and women is not, $t(139) = 1.758$, $p = .081$. Not surprising, when these two variables are entered into a regression analysis for which satisfaction is the dependent variable, the number of credit hours is the only independent variable with a statistically significant slope, $p = .001$. Students with fewer than 90 hours were more satisfied with their volunteer experience than those with 90 or more hours.

Number of credit hours and gender both had significant bivariate relationships with willingness to help again (see Table 16). In addition, when the stepwise method was used to construct a linear regression model for willingness to help again (with each variable being recoded as a dummy variable with values of 0 and 1), both demographic variables were retained in the equation, $p_{gender} = .02$ and $p_{credit\ hours} = .000$.

Table 16
Relationship Between Demographic Variables and Willingness to Volunteer Again

Demographic Variable	*df*	*N*	χ^2	Sig.
Gender	1	143	10.653	.001
Number of Credit Hours	1	143	35.387	.000

While there is no implication of causality in this analysis of demographic variables, participants with fewer than 90 credit hours are significantly more likely to be interested in volunteering again and have a higher mean satisfaction score than participants with 90 or more hours. Also, female participants are significantly more likely to be interested in helping in the future. Since the psychology subsample has a much higher percent of women and a much higher percentage of students with fewer than 90 hours than the business subsample, it is not surprising that three of the four null hypotheses for Hypothesis 5 were rejected.

The students in the psychology sample had a significantly higher level of task satisfaction (for participants receiving matched letter messages) and willingness to help in the future than the students in the business sample. In addition, the tasks in which the psychology students were involved were more closely tied to the course's content and academic requirements, as well as more humanitarian in nature. These differences might increase the salience of the reward message to this subsample, resulting in the presence of a significant main effect for the psychology students. When Hypotheses 1 and 2 are tested using just the

psychology students, however, no significant relationships are found (task satisfaction: $t(52) = .238$, $p = .813$; intent to help again: $\chi^2(1) = .336$, $p = .562$).

Summary

The statistical analysis provided in the results section demonstrated support for some of the hypotheses and a lack of support for others. The next section discusses conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis as well as suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study, draws conclusions based on those findings, and presents ideas for future research.

Theoretical Positioning of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact that providing rewards that are either congruent or incongruent with the individual's personal motivational preferences has on the individual's task satisfaction and his willingness to volunteer for a similar activity in the future. Since numerous nonprofit organizations rely on volunteers and could not meet the demand for their services without them, recruiting and retention of volunteers is an important issue for those organizations. Prior research has demonstrated that individuals prefer volunteer recruiting materials that are written in a manner that is consistent with their own functional preferences (Clary, Snyder, Ridge et al., 1998). While the university students who participated in the Clary et al. (1998) study tended to prefer the recruiting materials that matched their own functional preferences, the study was only conducted in a laboratory setting. The researchers did not try to assess what impact recruiting with targeted materials had on actual volunteer behavior, or whether students receiving functionally-matched recruiting materials sign up to volunteer more often than students receiving functionally-mismatched materials. The current study took a similar approach, varying the content of a post-volunteer reward message, but took the study one step further—moving it from the lab to a real-life volunteer setting. The goal of the study is to add to the body of knowledge

regarding the relationship between nonmonetary rewards and their impact on individuals' satisfaction and their interest in helping in the future.

Summary of the Results

This study examined the main effects of functionally matched or mismatched reward messages on an individual's satisfaction with a volunteer activity and his interest in participating in a similar activity in the future. Based on the results from this study, there is no difference in the task satisfaction/fulfillment of a volunteer who receives a functionally matched reward message and the task satisfaction/fulfillment of a volunteer who receives a functionally mismatched reward message. Similarly, the nature of the reward message did not affect the likelihood of a student to sign up to participate in a comparable volunteer activity in the future. As expected, an individual's prior knowledge of the nonprofit environment (in this case, the rules of competitive volleyball) did not moderate the relationship between the matching or mismatching of the reward message and the two outcome variables—self-reported satisfaction and willingness to sign up again.

The remaining two research questions address the effect of the following potential moderating variables on task satisfaction/fulfillment as well as on participants' willingness to help in the future: (a) initial interest in the volunteer task and (b) the mandatory or voluntary nature of the service activity. The outcomes regarding these moderating variables were mixed. Of these two variables, initial interest will be addressed first. Prior research on intrinsic motivation found that rewards do not impact intrinsic motivation for uninteresting tasks (Daniel & Esser, 1980; Deci et al., 1999; Hitt et al., 1992). Therefore, it seems plausible

that initial task interest might also moderate the effect that a reward had on both task satisfaction and intentions to participate in the future. Based on the data collected in this experimental study, for those students who received a reward letter containing a message that matches their highest motivational factor, the individuals with a high level of initial task interest are significantly more satisfied with their volunteer experience than participants with a low level of initial task interest. For students receiving a mismatched reward message, the initial interest category was not significantly related to task satisfaction.

The significance of results for the second dependent variable (willingness to help in the future) was reversed. For students receiving a matched reward message, initial interest in the activity was not significantly related to the participants' willingness to volunteer again. On the other hand, for participants receiving a functionally mismatched reward message, the level of initial task interest was significantly related to the behavioral dependent variable, with those individuals in the high interest group showing a greater willingness to volunteer again.

While the results demonstrated a relationship between interest and both dependent variables, there is no significant relationship between letter message and task satisfaction, even when controlling for varying levels of initial interest. In addition, when initial interest is examined as a potential moderator between letter message and willingness to help in the future, no significant relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables. Even though the main effect of a relationship between letter message and the dependent variables was not supported, this research confirms the importance of considering initial task interest when studying task satisfaction, even in a volunteer setting.

As mentioned above, the last research question, which examined the moderating effect of the mandatory or voluntary nature of the activity, had mixed results as well. Prior studies have provided evidence that the controlling aspects of required service-learning activities are mitigated by allowing participants to make some choices regarding the service activity (Stukas et al., 1999).

In this case, students in the mandatory service group were more likely to indicate an interest in helping in the future than were students in the voluntary service group. The relationship was significant regardless of whether the student received a matched or a mismatched letter message. In addition, students in the mandatory service group who received a letter message that matched their primary motivational function had a significantly higher level of task satisfaction than the students in the matched message group who participated in a voluntary service activity. The relationship between service group and satisfaction for participants receiving a mismatched message was not significant.

The two subsamples differed in several ways: (a) one sample consisted of students taking a lower level psychology course while the other consisted of students enrolled in one of several business classes; (b) the majority of the psychology students were women (64%) while the majority of the business students were men (66%); (c) most of the psychology students had completed fewer than 90 hours of undergraduate work (79%) while most of the business students had already completed 90 or more hours (82%); (d) participation in a service-learning activity was required for the psychology students and optional for the business students; and (e) the psychology students could choose from a number of volunteer

activities while the business students that participated had only one choice of volunteer activity.

While gender and number of credit hours were not included as moderating variables in construction of the research questions, both had significant bivariate and multivariate relationships with willingness to help again, with women and underclassmen (<90 hours) being more likely to sign up to help again. Number of credit hours was also significantly related to task satisfaction, with underclassmen (<90 hours) being more satisfied than upperclassmen (90+ hours).

Implications of the Results and Suggestions for Future Research

The goal of this study was to determine if the congruence or incongruence between a reward message and a volunteer's personal motivational preferences impacted his satisfaction with the volunteer task or his interest in participating in a similar task in the future. While some of the relationships involving the moderating variables demonstrated statistical significance, the main effect between the matching or mismatching of the reward message and the two dependent variables (task satisfaction and willingness to help in the future) was not significant.

According to the power calculation, the sample size of 143 in this study was large enough to achieve adequate power for testing the first two research questions. Therefore, the lack of a statistically significant relationship suggests that while the temporal proximity of the thank-you notes and the follow-up assessment was high and the messages were carefully structured to match a particular motivational function, a thank-you note may not be valued

enough as a reward to sway an individual's attitudes or behavior. Research on job satisfaction in the for-profit world has also produced mixed results. While a significant relationship has been found between job satisfaction and a number of antecedents (e.g., personality traits, high performance work practices, and job context variables), the amount of variance explained is small (Applebaum et al., 2003; Berg, 1999; Irving & Meyer, 1994; Judge et al., 1998; Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Thoresen et al., 2003). In addition, research suggests that both off-the-job events (Mitchell et al., 2001) and genetic characteristics (Arvey et al., 1989) can contribute significantly to job satisfaction, further limiting the magnitude of the potential relationship between reward message and task satisfaction.

While the value of a thank-you note was a concern prior to starting the study, it was chosen because equivalence of reward value between the various functions could be assured. Rewards that might be more highly valued, such as TV coverage highlighting a volunteer motivated by the social function or the opportunity for an individual motivated by the career function to meet company recruiters, are hard to compare in terms of value. Therefore, differences in outcome variables could be attributed not just to motivational preferences but also to differences in the value of the rewards. Unfortunately, as with other organizationally-based task satisfaction research projects, numerous factors are related to the dependent variables, and in this case all of the background noise may overwhelm the ability of the letter message to impact satisfaction.

The absence of significant results for the main effects suggests two possibilities for future research. The present study was based, in part, on a lab study measuring differential

preferences of volunteer recruiting materials based on the participants' functional profiles. While the present study took that basic idea into the field, no comparable lab test was conducted. A lab study in which participants were given the VFI and then rated the six types of thank-you notes would provide some baseline data for the present study. If the note preferences were correlated with the participants' functional preferences, it would support the contention that the individual thank-you messages adequately conveyed the appropriate functional message and that the functional messages were different enough to be accurately matched to an individual's own preferred motivational function. A successful lab study would provide further evidence that the value of a thank-you note is not sufficient to impact satisfaction or behavior. If, on the other hand, the lab study also fails to produce significant results, it would suggest that the content of the thank-you notes does not provide a strong enough functional message to precipitate differentiation on the part of the participants.

Another way to potentially test the differential ability of rewards to meet volunteers' functional needs is to conduct a study within the context of a nonprofit organization using the array of volunteer rewards that are already offered to their volunteers. The volunteers' functional preferences and task satisfaction could be compared with the functional needs that are addressed by the nonprofit's existing rewards. According to functional theory, individuals who have functional needs that are being met by the existing reward offerings should be more satisfied with their volunteer activities.

In this study the relationship between initial interest and the outcome variables (satisfaction and interest in helping again) was stronger than the relationship between the letter message and those same variables. It is not uncommon for individuals to participate in

community service work because it is expected or required. Examples of this phenomenon include service-learning activities as well as company-encouraged volunteering. While these sources of "volunteer" labor provide immediate resources for nonprofits, this research suggests that hoping to overcome an initial lack of interest with a few nonmonetary rewards may be an unrealistic expectation. If professors and company executives hope to foster long-term volunteering among their students or employees, they might be better off to provide several service options. If the participants have the flexibility to select an organization or activity that is interesting to them, they are more likely to be satisfied and interested in additional volunteer activities.

Finally, this study demonstrates that demographic variables can be significantly related to both volunteer satisfaction and interest in future volunteering activities. Almost all (93.7%) of the students involved in this study were either currently involved in another volunteer activity or had participated in a volunteer activity in the past. The widespread nature of the participants' volunteer experience provided a false sense of equality regarding their baseline level of interest. In addition, the overall sample was almost evenly split between men and women (51%/49%) as well as between lower- and upperclassmen (48%/52%). The even splits at the aggregate level masked demographic differences within each subsample. These demographic differences are significantly related to the differences in satisfaction and intent to help in the future that are found between the psychology and business students.

A question remains, however, regarding the significant relationship found between the demographic variables (gender and classification) and the dependent variables (task

satisfaction and intent to help again). These relationships could be indicative of demographic differences in volunteer satisfaction or the demographic variables and satisfaction could have a mutual relationship with another variable such as the type of volunteer task or the environment in which the volunteer experience takes place. If demographic differences have a primary relationship with task satisfaction and intent to help in the future, then the task satisfaction of men and their willingness to help again should not be affected by sample group. The same should be true for women as well as for lower- (<90 hours) and upperclassmen (90 hours or more). There are, however, significant differences in task satisfaction and intent to help in the future between women in the business and psychology groups (task satisfaction: $t(67) = 3.294$, $p = .002$; intent to help again: $\chi^2(1) = 12.106$, $p = .001$) and in intent to help between men in the business and psychology groups, $\chi^2(1) = 5.723$, $p = .017$. Regarding classification, intent to help is significantly different between the business and psychology samples for students with less than 90 hours, $\chi^2(1) = 5.961$, $p = .015$. Therefore, future research regarding demographic differences needs to control for both volunteer task and the task environment. A study of the relationship between demographic variables, such as age and gender, and outcome variables, such as satisfaction and tenure, within a single organization which utilizes a wide variety of volunteers would be particularly useful in further explaining these interactions.

Limitations of the Study

Sample

This study utilized a sample of university students enrolled in psychology and business classes at a single private university. Since demographic variables had varying relationships with the outcome variables even within this limited and relatively homogeneous group, caution should be exercised when generalizing the findings to other demographic groups. In addition, the students involved in this study all attend a university at which volunteer involvement is actively encouraged. The implications of using a sample from this type of environment are unknown. Students may resent what they perceive as the university pushing its values onto them or they may have self-selected an environment that matches their personal values and tendencies. Either reaction could make the results of this study less applicable to volunteers in a broader context. To examine this limitation, a similar study could be conducted in a more diverse environment.

Short-term volunteering

The short-term nature of the volunteer activities used in this study was beneficial to the study design because it minimized the affect of a long-term relationship on the outcome variables and it allowed measurement of future intent to help. This short-term involvement, however, may make it difficult to generalize the study results to organizations seeking to increase satisfaction and tenure of volunteers engaged in an ongoing volunteer relationship. Since participants in this study only volunteered for a short and finite period of time, they may internalize reward messages differently from individuals who have an ongoing volunteer relationship with an organization. Examining the ability of existing rewards to meet

volunteers' functional needs within a nonprofit organization, as mentioned above, would provide insight regarding how the relationship between the congruence or incongruence of rewards and satisfaction is similar or different for long-term volunteer activities.

Type of reward

As mentioned earlier, the lack of a significant relationship between the letter message and the participants' task satisfaction and interest in helping again, may mean that thank-you notes are not valued enough by the recipients to affect attitudes or behavior. Other influences, such as friends' opinions, coworker attitudes, and convenience of the volunteer schedule, could have a larger influence on the outcome variables than the message of the thank-you note. It is possible that the thank-you note was appreciated as a reward, without regard to its specific message, and therefore impacted all recipients approximately equally.

Conclusion

While this study did not demonstrate a significant relationship between the functional content of a reward message and a volunteer's satisfaction with the task or his willingness to help again in the future, it did highlight the importance of initial task interest and its association, to some extent, with both outcome measures. This finding has important implications for groups that strongly encourage or require community service involvement. Individuals who are allowed to choose an area of community service that is interesting to them appear to be more satisfied with the task as well as more willing to help again once the required participation period is over.

In addition, this study highlighted the importance of considering demographic differences in volunteers. Even within this demographically homogeneous sample, differences in credit hours obtained and gender were significantly related to satisfaction and willingness to help again. This finding should be examined further in a more demographically diverse sample of volunteers as well as in a setting with less diversity in the volunteer environment and in the tasks being performed.

This study represents a step in the effort to take the study of volunteer motivation from the lab to the real world. As nonprofit organizations strive to recruit and retain volunteers, a better understanding of how variations in motivational profiles are related to the attitudes and behaviors of individuals engaged in service activities within their community will provide valuable knowledge to nonprofit managers and help them as they try to provide crucial services in an economical and efficient manner.

REFERENCES

Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research, 34*(3), 347-356.

Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management, 29*(1), 99.

Allen, N. J., & Rushton, J. P. (1983). Personality characteristics of community mental health volunteers: A review. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 12*(1), 36-49.

Anderson, J. C., & Moore, L. F. (1978). The motivation to volunteer. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 7*(3-4), 120-125.

Applebaum, S. H., Wunderlich, J., Greenstone, E., & Grenier, D. (2003). Retention strategies in aerospace turnover: A case study. *Career Development International, 8*(6), 270.

Arnold, H. J. (1985). Task performance, perceived competence, and attributed causes of performance as determinants of intrinsic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*, 876-888.

Auslander, G. K., & Litwin, H. (1988). Sociability and patterns of participation: Implications for social service policy. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 17*(2), 25-37.

Austin, D. M., & Hasenfeld, Y. (1985). A prefatory essay on the future administration of human services. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 21*, 351-364.

Bartol, K. M., & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organizational reward systems. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 64.

Batson, C. D. (1990). How social an animal? The human capacity for caring. *American Psychologist, 45*, 336-346.

Batson, C. D., Ahmad, N., & Tsang, J. (2002). Four motives for community involvement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 429-445.

Batson, C. D., Coke, J. S., Jasnoski, M. L., & Hanson, M. (1978). Buying kindness: Effect of an extrinsic incentive for helping on perceived altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4*, 86-91.

Benabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Review of Economic Studies, 70*(244), 489.

Berg, P. (1999). The effects of high performance work practices on job satisfaction in the United States steel industry. *Relations Industrielles, 54*(1), 111.

Berg, P., Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., & Kalleberg, A. L. (1996). The performance effects of modular production in the apparel industry. *Industrial Relations, 35*, 356-373.

Bierhoff, H. B. (1987). Donor and recipient: Social development, social interaction and evolutionary processes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 17*, 113-130.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

Booth, A., & Babchuk, N. (1969). Personal influence networks and voluntary association affiliation. *Sociological Inquiry, 39*, 179-188.

Boring, E. G. (1950). *A history of experimental psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Brady, H., Schlozman, K. L., & Verba, S. (1999). Prospecting for participants: Rational expectations and the recruitment of political activists. *American Political Science Review, 93*, 153-169.

Brandyberry, L. J., & MacNair, R. R. (1996). The content and function of attitudes toward AIDS. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(3), 335-346.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 396-424.

Bright, A. D., & Manfredo, M. J. (1997). The influence of balanced information on attitudes toward natural resource issues. *Society and Natural Resources, 10*(5), 469-483.

Buetell, N. J. (1984). Correlates of attitudes toward American-women as managers. *Journal of Social Psychology, 124*(1), 57-63.

Cameron, J., & Pierce, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research, 64*, 363-423.

Campbell, J. P., & Pritchard, R. D. (1976). Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 63-130). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Carsten, J. M., & Spector, P. E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(3), 374.

Chandon, P., Wansink, B., & Laurent, G. (2000). A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing, 64*(4), 65-81.

Chapman, J. G., & Ferrari, J. R. (1999). An introduction to community-based service learning (CBSL). *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*(1/2), 1-3.

Chapman, J. G., & Morley, R. (1999). Collegiate service learning: Motives underlying volunteerism and satisfaction with volunteer service. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*, 19-33.

Chassin, L., Presson, C. C., & Sherman, S. J. (1990). Social psychological contributions to the understanding and prevention of adolescent cigarette-smoking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16*(1), 133-151.

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: the case of volunteerism, *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 119-148). London: Sage.

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

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2002). Community involvement: Opportunities and challenges in socializing adults to participate in society. *The Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 581.

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

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1998). Service-learning and psychology: Lessons from the psychology of volunteers' motivations. In R. G. Bringle & D. K. Duffy (Eds.), *With service in mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology* (pp. 35-50). Washington D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Cnaan, R. A., & Cascio, T. A. (1999). Performance and commitment: Issues in management of volunteers in human service organizations. *Journal of Social Service Research, 24*(3-4), 1-37.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Condry, J. (1977). Enemies of exploration: Self-initiated versus other-initiated learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 459-477.

Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2003). *Business research methods* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Crandall, C. S., & Martinez, R. (1996). Culture, ideology, and antifat attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(11), 1165-1176.

Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*(4), 499.

Daniel, T. L., & Esser, J. K. (1980). Intrinsic motivation as influenced by rewards, task interest, and task structure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 566-573.

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 20-47.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 627.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deckop, J. R., Mangel, R., & Cirka, C. C. (1999). Getting more than you pay for: Organizational citizenship behavior and pay-for-performance plans. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(4), 420.

Duke, L. L. (1989). Greenville, South Carolina and Alexandria, Virginia: Problems and successes using private sector techniques to motivate personnel in the public sector. *Public Personnel Management, 18*(4), 440.

Dulebohn, J. H., Murray, B., & Sun, M. H. (2000). Selection among employer-sponsored pension plans: The role of individual differences. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(2), 405-432.

Eby, L. T., Freeman, D. M., Rush, M. C., & Lance, C. E. (1999). Motivational bases of affective organizational commitment: A partial test of an integrative theoretical model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 463.

Eisenberger, R. (1992). Learned industriousness. *Psychological Review, 99*, 248-267.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Incremental effects of reward on creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(4), 728.

Ennis, R., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Attitudes, advertising, and automobiles: A functional approach. *Advances in Consumer Research, 20*, 662-666.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Feather, N. T. (1985). Attitudes, values, and attributions: Explanations of unemployment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(4), 876-889.

Feather, N. T. (2004). Value correlates of ambivalent attitudes toward gender relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(1), 3-12.

Ferrari, J. R., Dobis, K., Kardaras, E. I., Michna, D. M., Wagner, J. M., Sierawski, S., et al. (1999). Community volunteerism among college students and professional psychologists: Does taking them to the streets make-a-difference? *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*(1/2), 35-51.

Fischer, L., & Schaffer, K. (1993). *Older volunteers*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fletcher, T. D., & Major, D. A. (2004). Medical students' motivations to volunteer: An examination of the nature of gender differences. *Sex Roles, 51*(1/2), 109.

Frank, R. (1996). Motivation, cognition, and charitable giving. In J. B. Schneewind (Ed.), *Giving: Western ideas of philanthropy* (pp. 130-152). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Frey, B. S., & Oberholzer-Gee, F. (1997). The cost of price incentives: An empirical analysis of motivation crowding-out. *The American Economic Review, 87*(4), 746.

Gabris, G. T., & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management, 24*(1), 33-51.

Garst, J., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (1997). Advertising's effects on men's gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles, 36*(9-10), 551-572.

Gibbons, R. (1997). Incentives and careers in organizations. In D. M. Kreps & K. Wallis (Eds.), *Advances in economic theory and econometrics* (Vol. 2). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey, 1999 (1999, 1999). Independent Sector. Retrieved August 6, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://www.independentsector.org/gandv/s_keyf.htm

Glass, G. V., McGaw, B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). *Meta-analysis in social research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Grewal, R., Mehta, R., & Kardes, F. R. (2004). The timing of repeat purchases of consumer durable goods: The role of functional bases of consumer attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Research, 41*, 101-115.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 463.

Gross, S. E., & Friedman, H. M. (2004). Creating an effective total reward strategy: Holistic approach better supports business success. *Benefits Quarterly, 20*(3), 7.

Guzzo, R. A., Jette, R. D., & Katzell, R. A. (1985). The effects of psychologically based intervention programs on worker productivity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 38*(2), 275.

Hackman, J. R., Lawler, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (Eds.). (1982). *Perspectives on organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hahn, J. J., Butz, K. P., Gavin, J. G., Mills, R. S., & Welter, C. J. (2004). Recognizing professional and volunteer activities. *Association of Operating Room Nurses. AORN Journal, 79*(5), 1006.

Hanze, M. (2001). Ambivalence, conflict, and decision making: Attitudes and feelings in Germany towards NATO's military intervention in the Kosovo war. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(6), 693-706.

Hardin, G. (1977). *The limits of altruism: An ecologist's view of survival*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hatry, H., Greiner, J. M., & Gollub, R. J. (1981). *An assessment of local government motivational programs: Performance targeting with and without monetary incentives*. Washington: The Urban Institute.

Helms, S. E. (2004, August 2004). *Youth volunteering in the States: 2002 and 2003*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. Retrieved August 6, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/FactSheets/FS_Vol_state.pdf

Henderlong, J., & Lepper, M. R. (2002). The effects of praise on children's intrinsic motivation: A review and synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(5), 774.

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

Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 66*(1), 40-66.

Hernes, G., & Knudsen, K. (1992). Norwegians attitudes toward new immigrants. *Acta Sociologica, 35*(2), 123-139.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Publishing Co.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.

Hitt, D. D., Marriot, R. G., & Esser, J. K. (1992). Effects of delayed rewards and task interest on intrinsic motivation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 13*(4), 405-414.

Hoffman, J. R., & Rogelberg, S. G. (1998). A guide to team incentive systems. *Team Performance Management, 4*(1), 23.

Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*(4), 713.

Hunter, J. E., Schmidt, F. L., & Jackson, G. B. (1982). *Meta-analysis: Cumulating research findings across studies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 251-273.

Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K., & Prennushi, G. (1997). The effects of human resource management practices on productivity: A study of steel finishing lines. *The American Economic Review, 87*(3), 291-312.

Irving, P. G., & Meyer, J. P. (1994). Reexamination of the met-expectations hypothesis: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(6), 937-950.

Jackson, E. F., Bachmeier, M. D., Wood, J. R., & Craft, E. A. (1995). Volunteering and charitable giving: Do religious and associational ties promote helping behavior? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 24*(1), 59-78.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: the mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(2), 237-249.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(1), 17.

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

Kearney, N., Miller, M., Paul, J., & Smith, K. (2000). Oncology healthcare professionals' attitudes toward elderly people. *Annals of Oncology, 11*(5), 599-601.

Kerrin, M., & Oliver, N. (2002). Collective and individual improvement activities: The role of reward systems. *Personnel Review, 31*(3), 320.

Kessinger, T. A. (2004). Service-learning in the United States: Ten years after the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. *American Educational History Journal, 31*(1), 58.

Kessler, I. (1995). Reward system. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Human resource management: A critical text* (pp. 254-279). London: Thomson Business Press.

Klubnik, J. P. (1995). *Rewarding and recognizing employees*. Chicago: Irwin Professional Publishing.

Kohn, A. (1993a). *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohn, A. (1993b). Why incentive plans cannot work. *Harvard Business Review, 74*(5), 54.

Kohut, A. (1998). *Trust and citizen engagement in metropolitan Philadelphia*. Washington D.C.: Pew Research Center.

Kornhauser, A., & Sharp, A. (1932). Employee attitudes: Suggestions from a study in a faactory. *Personnel Journal, 10*, 393-401.

Kunda, Z., & Schwartz, S. (1983). Undermining intrinsic moral motivation: External reward and self-presentation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 763-771.

Kunz, A., & Pfaff, D. (2002). Agency theory, performance evaluation, and the hypothetical construct of intrinsic motivation. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 27*(3), 275.

Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Naffziger, D. W. (1997). An examination of owner's goals in sustaining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management, 35*(1), 24.

Lawler, E. I. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lazear, E. P. (2000a). Performance pay and productivity. *The American Economic Review, 90*(5), 1346.

Lazear, E. P. (2000b). The power of incentives. *The American Economic Review, 90*(2), 410.

Lepper, M. R., & Greene, D. (1978). Overjustification research and beyond: Toward a means-ends analysis of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. R. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.), *The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation* (pp. 109-148). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28*, 129-137.

Lepper, M. R., Keavney, M., & Drake, M. (1996). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic rewards: A commentary on Cameron and Pierce's meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(1), 5.

Lepper, M. R., Woolverton, M., Mumme, D. L., & Gurtner, J. (1993). Motivational techniques of expert human tutors: Lessons for the design of computer-based tutors. In S. P. Lajoie & S. J. Derry (Eds.), *Computers as cognitive tools* (pp. 75-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lievens, F., & Highhouse, S. (2003). The relation of instrumental and symbolic attributes to a company's attractiveness as an employer. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(1), 75-102.

Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3*, 157-189.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (1st ed., pp. 1297-1350). Chicago: Rand McNally.

MacDuffie, J. P. (1995). Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: Organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 48*, 199-221.

Malka, A., & Chatman, J. A. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic work orientations as moderators of the effect of annual income on subjective well-being: A longitudinal study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(6), 737.

Mamman, A., & Rees, C. J. (2004). How real is the rhetoric? A survey of American HR managers' views about HRM. *International Journal of Management, 21*(1), 115.

Mannetti, L., Pierro, A., & Livi, S. (2002). Explaining consumer conduct: From planned to self-expressive behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(7), 1431-1451.

Martz, D. M., & Bazzini, D. G. (1999). Eating disorders prevention programming may be failing: Evaluation of two one-shot programs. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(1), 32-42.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 171.

Maunder, B. (1985). Attitude to head lice: A more powerful force than insecticides. *Journal of the Royal Society of Health, 105*(2), 61-64.

McIvor, G. (1992). *Sentenced to serve: The operation and impact of community service by offenders*. Aldershot, UK: Avebury.

Merchant, K. A., Stede, W. A. V. d., & Zheng, L. (2003). Disciplinary constraints on the advancement of knowledge: The case of organizational incentive systems. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28*(2,3), 251.

Miller, L. E. (1985). Understanding the motivation of volunteers: An examination of personality differences and characteristics of volunteers' paid employment. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 14*(2/3), 112-122.

Miller, L. E., & Palmer, G. D. (1984). *Information integration theory as an alternative to expectancy theories of work motivation.* Paper presented at the Eastern Accademy of Management.

Mitchell, T. R. (1985). An evaluation of the validity of correlational research conducted in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 192-205.

Mohrman, A. M., Mohrman, S. A., & Lawler, E. E. (1992). The performance management of teams. In W. J. J. Bruns (Ed.), *Performance measurement, evaluation, and incentives* (pp. 217-241). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 759.

Nonprofits' share of economy growing. (1997). *Nonprofit World, 15*(1), 12.

Number of nonprofit organizations in the United States, 1996-2004 (2004). National Center for Charitable Statistics. Retrieved August 6, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/PubApps/profile1.php?state=US

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

Okun, M. A., & Schultz, A. (2003). Age and motives for volunteering: Testing hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. *Psychology and Aging, 18*(2), 231-239.

Oliver, P. (1984). If you don't do it, nobody else will: Active and token contributors to local collective action. *American Sociological Review, 49*, 601-610.

Olsen, M. R. (1986). Integrating formal and informal social care: The utilization of social support networks. *British Journal of Social Work, 16 (supplement)*, 15-22.

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

Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction causes performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review, 2*, 46-53.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Palich, L. E., Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). Managing in the international context: Testing cultural generality of sources of commitment to multinational enterprises. *Journal of Management, 21*(4), 671.

Parker, R. J., & James M Kohlmeyer, I. (2005). Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 30*(4), 357.

Pedersen, A., Griffiths, B., Contos, N., & Walker, I. (2000). Attitudes toward Aboriginal Australians in city and country settings. *Australian Psychologist, 35*(2), 109-117.

Pedhazur, E., & Schmelkin, L. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(2), 525-537.

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review, 50*(3), 367.

Peterson, D. K. (2004). Recruitment strategies for encouraging participation in corporate volunteer programs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 49*(4), 371-386.

Pezzullo, J. C. (2005, August 1, 2005). *Web pages that perform statistical calculations!* StatPages.net. Retrieved August 4, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://fsweb.berry.edu/academic/education/vbissonnette/tables/sampsize.pdf

Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 783-794.

Pierce, J. L., & Gardner, D. G. (2004). Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management, 30*(5), 591.

Pierce, W. D., Cameron, J., Banko, K. M., & So, S. (2003). Positive effects of rewards and performance standards on intrinsic motivation. *The Psychological Record, 53*(4), 561.

Piliavin, J. A., Dovidio, J. A., Gaertner, J. F., & Clark, S. L. (1981). *Emergency intervention*. New York: Academic Press.

Pittman, T. S., Emery, J., & Boggiano, A. K. (1982). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations: Reward-induced changes in preference for complexity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, 789-797.

Popovich, P. M., Scherbaum, C. A., Scherbaum, K. L., & Polinko, N. (2003). The assessment of attitudes toward individuals with disabilities in the workplace. *Journal of Psychology, 137*(2), 163-177.

Pratkanis, A. R., & Turner, M. E. (1994). Of what value is a job-attitude: A sociocognitive analysis. *Human Relations, 47*(12), 1545-1576.

Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., Vinacco, R., & Kott, T. L. (1989). The instrumental and symbolic functions of attitudes toward persons with AIDS. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*(5), 377-404.

Raabe, B., & Beehr, T. A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationships: Differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(3), 271.

Reed, A. (2002). Social identity as a useful perspective for self-concept-based consumer research. *Psychology and Marketing, 19*(3), 235-266.

Reeder, G. D., Davison, D. M., Gipson, K. L., & Hesson-McInnis, M. S. (2001). Identifying the motivations of African American volunteers working to prevent HIV/AIDS. *AIDS Education and Prevention, 13*(4), 343.

Ressler, W. H., & Toledo, E. (1997). A functional perspective on social marketing: Insights from Israel's bicycle helmet campaign. *Journal of Health Communication, 2*, 145-156.

Romzek, B. S. (1990). Employee investment and commitment: The ties that bind. *Public Administration Review, 50*(3), 99-106.

Ryan, R. L., Kaplan, R., & Grese, R. E. (2001). Predicting volunteer commitment in environmental stewardship programmes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 44*(5), 629.

Ryan, R. M., Mims, V., & Koestner, R. (1983). Relation of reward contingency and interpersonal context to intrinsic motivation: A review and test using cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 736-750.

Schervish, P. G. (1997). Inclination, obligation, and association: What we know and what we need to learn about donor motivation. In D. F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Fund Raising* (pp. 110-138). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (1997). Social participation and charitable giving: a multivariate analysis. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 8*(3), 235-260.

Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2002). The Boston area diary study and the moral citizenship of care. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 13*(1), 47-71.

Schervish, P. G., O'Herlihy, M. A., & Havens, J. J. (2001). *Agent-animated wealth and philanthropy: The dynamics of accumulation and allocation among high-tech donors*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College.

Secord, P. F. (1986). Explanation in the social sciences and in life situations. In D. W. Fiske & R. A. Shweder (Eds.), *Metatheory in social science: Pluralism and subjectivities* (pp. 197-221). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shafer, W. E., Park, L. J., & Liao, W. M. (2002). Professionalism, organizational-professional conflict and work outcomes: A study of certified management accountants. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 15*(1), 46.

Shah, D. V., Domke, D., & Wackman, D. B. (1996). 'To thine own self be true': Values, framing, and voter decision-making strategies. *Communication Research, 23*(5), 509-560.

Shapira, Z. (1987). Preference for job attributes: Tradeoffs from present position. *Industrial Relations, 26*(2), 146.

Shavitt, S. (1989). Operationalizing functional theories of attitude. In A. R. Pratkanis & S. J. Breckler & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude structure and function* (pp. 311-338). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shavitt, S. (1990). The role of attitude objects in attitude functions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26*(2), 124.

Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing social climate at work* (pp. 149-164). Westport, CT: Quorum Press.

Simmons, R. G., Klein, S. D., & Simmons, R. L. (1977). *The gift of life: The social and psychological impact of organ transplantation*. New York: Wiley.

Simmons, R. G., Marine, S. K., & Simmons, R. L. (1987). *The gift of life: The effect of organ transplantation on individual family and societal dynamics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Smith, D. H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature-review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23*(3), 243-263.

Smith, M., Bruner, J., & White, R. (1956). *Opinions and personality*. New York: Wiley.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, L. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Smith, S. M., Haugtvedt, C. P., Jadrich, J. M., & Anton, M. R. (1995). Understanding responses to sex appeals in advertising: An individual difference approach. *Advances in Consumer Research, 22*, 735-739.

Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a "functional" personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*(3), 251.

Snyder, M., & DeBono, K. G. (1985). Appeals to image and claims about quality: Understanding the psychology of advertising. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(3), 586-597.

Snyder, M., & Miene, P. K. (1994). Stereotyping of the elderly: A functional-approach. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(1), 63-82.

Sobus, M. S. (1995). Mandating community service: Psychological implications of requiring prosocial behavior. *Law and Psychology Review, 19*, 153-182.

Spitzer, D. R. (1996). Power rewards: Rewards that really motivate. *Management Review, 85*(5), 45.

Strigas, A. D., & Jr, E. N. J. (2003). Motivating volunteers to serve and succeed: Design and results of a pilot study that explores demographics and motivational factors in sport volunteerism. *International Sports Journal, 7*(1), 111.

Strupeck, C. D., & Whitten, D. (2004). Accounting service-learning experiences and the IRS volunteer income tax assistance programme: a teaching note. *Accounting Education, 13*(1), 101.

Stukas, A. A., & Dunlap, M. R. (2002). Community involvement: Theoretical approaches and educational initiatives. *The Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 411.

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

Switzer, C. L., Switzer, G. E., Stukas, A. A., & Baker, C. E. (1999). Medical student motivations to volunteer: Gender differences and comparisons to other volunteers. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*, 53-64.

Tang, S. H., & Hall, V. C. (1995). The overjustification effect: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, 9*, 365-404.

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986). Psychological and demographic correlates of perception of sexual harassment. *Genetic Social and General Psychology Monographs, 112*(4), 459.

Testa, M. R. (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and effort in the service environment. *The Journal Of Psychology, 135*(2), 226-236.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytical findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46*(2), 259.

Thatcher, J. B., Stepina, L. P., & Boyle, R. J. (2002). Turnover of information technology workers: Examining empirically the influence of attitudes, job characteristics, and external markets. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 19*(3), 231.

Thoresen, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Barsky, A. P., Warren, C. R., & Chermont, K. d. (2003). The affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A meta-analytic review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(6), 914.

Titmuss, R. M. (1971). *The gift relationship: From human blood to social policy*. New York: Vintage Books.

Towles-Schwen, T., & Fazio, R. H. (2003). Choosing social situations: The relation between automatically activated racial attitudes and anticipated comfort interacting with African Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(2), 170-182.

van Breukelen, W., Vlist, R. v. d., & Steensma, H. (2004). Voluntary employee turnover: Combining variables from the 'traditional' turnover literature with the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(7), 893.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Wahba, M. A., & House, R. J. (1974). Expectancy theory in work and motivation: Some logical and methodological issues. *Human Relations, 27*, 121-147.

Wang, G. Z., & Buffalo, M. D. (2004). Social and cultural determinants of attitudes toward abortion: A test of Reiss' hypotheses. *Social Science Journal, 41*(1), 93-105.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center.

Welsh, D. H. B., Luthans, F., & Sommer, S. M. (1993). Managing Russian factory workers: The impact of U.S.-based behavioral and participative techniques. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*(1), 58.

Werner, C. M., Voce, R., Openshaw, K. G., & Simons, M. (2002). Designing service-learning to empower students and community: Jackson elementary builds a nature study center. *The Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 557.

Whyte, W. F. (1955). *Money and motivation*. New York: Harper.

Wilkinson, H. E., Orth, C. D., & Benfari, R. C. (1986). Motivation theories: An integrated operational model. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal, 51*(4), 24.

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

Worsley, A., & Skrzypiec, G. (1998). Do attitudes predict red meat consumption among young people? *Ecology of Food and Nutrition, 37*(2), 163-195.

Wuebben, P. L., Straits, B. C., & Schulman, G. I. (1974). Traditional objections to experimentation. In P. L. Wuebben & B. C. Straits & G. I. Schulman (Eds.), *The experiment as a social occasion* (pp. 15-19). Berkeley, CA: Glendessary Press.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wyman, M., & Snyder, M. (1997). Attitudes toward 'gays in the military': A functional perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*(4), 306-329.

Young, B. S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, D. J. (1998). Organizational commitment among public service employees. *Public Personnel Management, 27*(3), 339.

Young, S. M., Fisher, J., & Lindquist, T. M. (1993). The effects of intergroup competition and intragroup cooperation on slack and output in a manufacturing setting. *The Accounting Review, 68*(6), 6-10.

Zweigenhaft, R. L., Armstrong, J., Quintis, F., & Riddick, A. (1996). The motivations and effectiveness of hospital volunteers. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(1), 2

APPENDIX A

Text of Recruiting Video

Hi. I'm Brek Horn, ACU's head volleyball coach, and I'm going to talk to you today about a great opportunity for you to help our ACU volleyball program. I wanted to visit your class in person so I could get to know you a bit and answer any questions you might have, but we have a couple of road trips planned for the beginning of school and I'm expecting a baby in two weeks, and I was afraid the scheduling wouldn't work out very well. A video seemed like the next best option. Besides this way you get to see a glimpse of the girls in action!

Our home season starts September 9th and runs through October 22nd. During that time we will be trying match last year's accomplishment of being undefeated at home. Based on the strength of our returning letter winners and the depth of our freshman class, we have been unanimously picked to repeat as Lone Star Conference South Division Champs.

We will have a new weapon in our arsenal this year thanks to a cooperative effort between the volleyball program and a handful of business classes like this one. You have the chance to gain course credit in exchange for coming to a home volleyball match, collecting data during the match, and computing some statistical analyses on that data. The statistics involved will primarily be means and percentages calculated for different scenarios. While the math is not difficult, we simply do not have enough staff to collect data for the various scenarios we would like to examine. By working together, you can gather information that can benefit us greatly as we decide what to focus on in practice and as we plan our strategy for future matches.

The benefits to the volleyball program are obvious. What do you get out of the arrangement—besides class credit? Well, first of all, you have a chance to help this group of talented and hard-working girls as they represent ACU around the country and you can help them in a way that we are not equipped to do without you. As you participate in this activity, you will learn ways that statistics are used in real life situations as well as learn more about the game of volleyball and the rivalries that occur in this conference. Your experience applying what you learn in class to the real world will help you as you prepare to go to graduate school or enter the work force. Plus, any business-related volunteer experience is nice to have when you start working on that resume!

In addition to collecting data at the game, you'll have the chance to watch a fun and exciting sport with friends from class or even to make new friends with others that are participating in this activity. We know that community service is highly valued within the ACU environment, and helping us is a fun and easy way to participate in a volunteer activity. Plus, since you are receiving course credit, you can temporarily forget about your studies and other pressing duties and enjoy the game without feeling guilty about neglecting your other obligations.

We could sure use your help. The additional information you can provide could be a real boost to our program. We have a good solid program, but we are striving for great! You could help us achieve that goal. We look forward to working with you and getting to know you better during the upcoming season. Go Cats!

APPENDIX B

Volleyball Rules

Basic Volleyball Rules

The Serve

- Server must serve from behind the end line until after contact
- Ball may be served underhand or overhand
- Ball must be clearly visible to opponents before serve
- Served ball may graze the net and drop to the other side for point
- Serve must be returned by a bump or overhand pass only, no blocking or attacking a serve

Scoring

- Rally scoring will be used.
- There will be a point scored on every score of the ball.
- Offense will score on a defense miss or out of bounds hit.
- Defense will score on an offensive miss, out of bounds hit, or serve into the net.
- Game will be played to 30 pts. If a fifth game is necessary, it will be played to 15 points.
- Must win by 2 points.

Rotation

- Team will rotate each time they win the serve
- Players shall rotate in a clockwise manner
- There shall be 6 players on each side.

Playing the Game

- Maximum of three hits per side
- Player may not hit the ball twice in succession (A block is not considered a hit)
- Ball may be played off the net during a volley and on serve
- A ball touching a boundary line is good
- A legal hit is contact with the ball by a player anywhere on the body (even kicking) as long as the ball is not allowed to visibly come to a rest
- If two or more players contact the ball simultaneously, it is considered one play and the players involved may not participate in the next play
- A player must not block or attack a serve
- Switching positions will be allowed only between front line players. (After the serve only)

Basic Violations

- Stepping on or over the line on a serve
- Failure to serve the ball over the net successfully
- Hitting the ball illegally (Carrying, Palming, Throwing, etc.)
- Touches of the net with any part of the body while the ball is in play. If the ball is driven into the net with such force that it causes the net to contact an opposing player, no foul will be called, and the ball shall continue to be in play

- Reaching over the net, except under these conditions
  - When executing a follow-through
  - When blocking a ball which is in the opponents court but is being returned (the blocker must not contact the ball until after the opponent who is attempting to return the ball makes contact)
- Reaches under the net (if it interferes with the ball or opposing player)
- Failure to serve in the correct order
- Blocks or spikes from a position which is clearly not behind the 10-foot line while in a back row position

Libero Basics

- The libero is a defensive specialist that can be identified by wearing a different colored jersey
- She can be freely substituted for any back row player, but can only serve in one place in the rotation.
- The libero can not finger set the ball from in front of the 10 foot line or attack the ball when it is completely above the net.

Volleyball Lingo	**Translation**
"Ace"	When the ball is served to the other team, and no more than one person touches it.
"Sideout"	When the team that served the ball makes a mistake, causing the ball to go to the other team.
"Stuff"	When a player jumps above the height of the net and blocks the ball. The block must end the play.
"Dig"	When a player makes a pass off any attack by the opposing team.
"Kill"	When a team hits the ball and it either ends in a point or a sideout.

APPENDIX C

Thank-you Notes for Business Students

Text of Career Letter

Dear [**Recipient Name**]:

Thank you so much for collecting data at the volleyball match and analyzing that information.

Hopefully, the experience you gained through this project helped you apply what you are learning in class to real-life management decisions. We use information like you produced every day as we try to create an excellent product. As you move into the business world, we anticipate that you will be able to draw on this experience when you are asked to collect and analyze information for other decision-making opportunities. Keep this activity in mind when you are creating your resume. While volunteer experience is always a plus, this activity has the added benefit of being related to your field of study.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you'll come back to cheer us on in the future. We can always use a few more Wildcat fans.

Sincerely,
Brek Horn

Text of Enhancement Letter

Dear [**Recipient Name**]:

Thank you so much for collecting data at the volleyball match and analyzing that information.

We appreciate your help because we simply do not have enough staff to collect and analyze the amount of data included in this service-learning project. Through your efforts we were able to gather information on every aspect of the game that we wanted to track. Your skills with statistics made it possible for the data to be presented in a way that is useful to us. This information will help us better focus our practices as well as plan our strategy for future matches. We hope that you enjoyed the other students who participated at the game with you. We want you to know that, even though our coaching tasks kept us from spending time with you, the volleyball staff is very thankful for your efforts and that we consider you to be a valuable part of our team.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you'll come back to cheer us on in the future. We can always use a few more Wildcat fans.

Sincerely,
Brek Horn

Text of Protective Letter

Dear [**Recipient Name**]:

Thank you so much for collecting data at the volleyball match and analyzing that information.

I hope that while you were at the game helping us out, you were able to leave the pressures of homework behind and for at least a little while forget about the stress of college life. I also hope you were able to enjoy being with the other volunteers that were at the game and that the excitement of the match made you feel like a part of the crowd, rather than just an individual spectator.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you'll come back to cheer us on in the future. We can always use a few more Wildcat fans.

Sincerely,
Brek Horn

Text of Social Letter

Dear [**Recipient Name**]:

Thank you so much for collecting data at the volleyball match and analyzing that information.

ACU has a great tradition of volunteer service; it is valued and appreciated by students and faculty alike. We appreciate you helping us out by providing us some useful information, and we are also pleased that we could benefit from your volunteer efforts. We want to thank you on behalf of the University for giving some of your time and expertise back to the university to improve our community. Our players, the volleyball coaching staff, and the athletic department value your efforts as do the students and fans who enjoy the games.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you'll come back to cheer us on in the future. We can always use a few more Wildcat fans.

Sincerely,
Brek Horn

Text of Understanding Letter

Dear [**Recipient Name**]:

Thank you so much for collecting data at the volleyball match and analyzing that information.

Hopefully, through this hands-on experience you have learned more about how statistics are used in real life to help organizations make decisions. The knowledge you are learning in class is becoming a strength you can apply in an organizational setting. As this experience shows, data and statistics are valuable tools that can help you achieve goals and take advantage of opportunities. We also hope that by participating in this activity, you have developed a better understanding of the game of volleyball and that some of the excitement we feel for the game has rubbed off on you.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you'll come back to cheer us on in the future. We can always use a few more Wildcat fans.

Sincerely,
Brek Horn

Text of Values Letter

Dear [**Recipient Name**]:

Thank you so much for collecting data at the volleyball match and analyzing that information.

We appreciate the time you took out of your busy schedule to come out and help some of your fellow students. Not only did the girls appreciate your presence at the game, but the statistical analyses you are providing will give us valuable information we could not otherwise obtain. We have beaten a couple of Top-10 ranked teams already this season, but those are the highest ranked teams we have beaten in my tenure as coach. Unlike teams that are nationally successful year after year, we are navigating through uncharted waters. Your assistance is critical as we try to raise the level of our program, while continuing to represent ACU and its values throughout the season.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you'll come back to cheer us on in the future. We can always use a few more Wildcat fans.

Sincerely,
Brek Horn

APPENDIX D

Thank-you Notes for Psychology Students

Text of Career Letter

[**Recipient Name**]:

On behalf of the Volunteer Service-Learning Center and the staff at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, I would like to thank you for the hours you donated to help children here in Abilene.

Hopefully, the experience you gained through this project helped you apply what you are learning in class to the real world and gave you a chance to explore job opportunities. The contacts you made while volunteering may be beneficial as you look for internships as well as when you're searching for a full-time job. You should also keep this activity in mind when you are creating your resume. Volunteer experience is always a plus as you try to distinguish yourself from the rest of the applicant pool. Finally, the interpersonal skills you used while working with clients will be valuable tools in the workplace since effectively interacting with a variety of people is critical to success on the job.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that it will be helpful as you prepare for your career.

Sincerely,
Nancy Coburn
Director, Volunteer and Service-Learning Center

Text of Enhancement Letter

[**Recipient Name**]:

On behalf of the Volunteer Service-Learning Center and the staff at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, I would like to thank you for the hours you donated to help children here in Abilene.

Nonprofit organizations routinely rely on volunteers to keep their programs staffed, and your gift of time was desperately needed. It ensured that important services could be provided to grateful recipients. Your interpersonal skills were critical as you worked with clients and others at the site. Those skills multiplied the value of your volunteer time and made your efforts even more effective. By helping, you also enabled ACU to have a hand in helping our community, which assists us in attaining one of our goals.

We hope that you enjoyed the clients, the nonprofit staff, and any other students who worked with you and that you feel good about the contribution you made.

Sincerely,
Nancy Coburn
Director, Volunteer and Service-Learning Center

Text of Protective Letter

[**Recipient Name**]:

On behalf of the Volunteer Service-Learning Center and the staff at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, I would like to thank you for the hours you donated to help children here in Abilene.

I hope that while you were serving your volunteer hours, you were able to leave the pressures of homework behind and forget about the stress of college life. I also hope you enjoyed interacting with the staff and other workers at the nonprofit and that you felt like a part of the team. We have been blessed with so much, and in some cases, the clients with which you worked struggle in ways you might not have experienced. While, from time to time, you may feel guilty because you are more fortunate than others, your gift of time can provide long-lasting benefits to the people you help.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that it blessed you as you deal with the everyday challenges of your life.

Sincerely,

Nancy Coburn
Director, Volunteer and Service-Learning Center

Text of Social Letter

[**Recipient Name**]:

On behalf of the Volunteer Service-Learning Center and the staff at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, I would like to thank you for the hours you donated to help children here in Abilene.

ACU has a great tradition of volunteer service; it is valued and appreciated by students and faculty alike. You and your classmates are working together to create a favorable impression of ACU around our city. In addition, family members and friends will learn of your involvement and your willingness to help others. Just by signing up for a class that contains a service-learning component, you convey to the people you know that you are committed to making a difference in the lives of others.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that others will be encouraged by your example.

Sincerely,

Nancy Coburn
Director, Volunteer and Service-Learning Center

Text of Understanding Letter

[**Recipient Name**]:

On behalf of the Volunteer Service-Learning Center and the staff at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, I would like to thank you for the hours you donated to help children here in Abilene.

Hopefully, through this hands-on experience you learned more about the organization you helped as well as how social services are provided in Abilene. I hope this volunteer experience allowed you to explore your strengths and expand your perspective as you learned more about the individuals with whom you worked. I also trust that interactions with the clients, nonprofit staff, and other volunteers, gave you valuable experience working with diverse personalities.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that the knowledge you gained is a valued part of your academic journey.

Sincerely,

Nancy Coburn
Director, Volunteer and Service-Learning Center

Text of Values Letter

[**Recipient Name**]:

On behalf of the Volunteer Service-Learning Center and the staff at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, I would like to thank you for the hours you donated to help children here in Abilene.

We appreciate the time you took out of your busy schedule to go out into the community and show your concern for people who may be less fortunate than yourself. I hope you were able to work with individuals that touched your heart and that they expressed appreciation for your compassion and your commitment to being involved. Ironically, the individuals who do not know how to adequately express their thanks to you are the people most in need of your assistance. You have given them a gift that they could never purchase and you have touched lives in a unique and priceless way.

We hope you enjoyed the experience and that you have been blessed as much as the individuals you have served.

Sincerely,

Nancy Coburn
Director, Volunteer and Service-Learning Center