Differences in Personal Goals and Attitudes Among Volunteers

Richard A. Sundeen

Using data from a national survey, this article analyzes the relationship between volunteering and attitudes regarding personal goals, the role and responsibility of government, the charitable responsibility of individuals, and confidence in charitable and noncharitable institutions. It focuses on the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers and between volunteers to organizations operating under three different auspices (public, for-profit, and nonprofit) and in eleven different types of volunteer activities. The findings reveal that, when controlling for sociodemographic characteristics and social roles, statistically significant differences in personal goals and attitudes exist between volunteers and nonvolunteers, as well as among volunteers found in the three sectors and in various types of activities.

In 1989 over half the adult population of the United States volunteered to various nonprofit and public organizations that provide important goods and services (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1990). Furthermore, in 1990 the "independent sector" nonprofit organizations are estimated to have used 5,784,000 volunteers, or two-thirds the number of their paid employees (Greene, 1992, p. 24). Between 1982 and 1988, a significant increase occurred in local governments' use of volunteers to provide services (Ferris, 1990). When one considers the extent of volunteering in the United States and the significant dependence on a volunteer labor force by various nonprofit and government organizations, it is apparent that we must increase our understanding of volunteers, including the values and attitudes they bring to these organizations.

A considerable amount of empirical research devoted to the development of predictive models of volunteer behavior has begun to accumulate. It has underscored the importance of sociodemographic characteristics and social roles, such as income, marital status, gender, parenthood, age, level of education, ethnicity, and place of residence (Sundeen, 1988, 1990a). This study assumed that individuals' attitudes and values, as well as their

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

roles and statuses, contribute to the explanation of volunteer behavior. For example, Smith (1983) developed a comprehensive model for explaining participation in organized voluntary action that includes social background, roles, and personal factors, such as personality and attitudes relevant to voluntary action. Also, the findings of Wandersman, Florin, Friedmann, and Meier (1987) and Clary and Snyder (1990) supported the use of attitudes in the study of volunteer behavior. Furthermore, the attitudinal and value substratum of volunteer activity does not appear to be unidimensional; that is, volunteering for different types of activities and to different types of organizations is related to varying combinations of attitudes, values, and demographic characteristics (Hougland and Christenson, 1982; Sundeen, 1990a; Williams and Ortega, 1986).

This review suggests a research framework that focuses on how an individual's attitudes and values affect the decision to volunteer, while controlling for the effects of roles, statuses, and sociodemographic characteristics. Presumably, attitudes and values vary with the type of volunteer organization and the activity. The use of cross-sectional data makes it impossible to attribute cause to volunteers' attitudes, but the analysis does contribute to our understanding of relevant attitudes held by volunteers.

Conceptual Framework, Methods, and Variables

In recent years, scholars have reemphasized the significance of the historical connection between participation in voluntary associations and the concepts of citizenship and civic participation. For example, Cooper (1991, p. 13) distinguished between the legal definition of citizenship and the ethical tradition of citizenship in the United States, the latter being the "values, norms, and traditions which encourage the sharing of authority and active participation in collective life for the common good." Tracing the evolution of this American tradition of ethical citizenship through the growth of voluntary associations, Puritan thought, antifederalism, and Jeffersonian tradition, Cooper pointed out that participation in government and voluntary associations is one of the mainstays in forming "civic habits and skills."

Without focusing specifically on volunteer behavior, Bellah and others in *Habits of the Heart* (1985, p. viii), provided an initial framework for understanding it, especially in the larger context of civic participation. Summarizing ideas from Tocqueville, they suggested that, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, civic participation reflected the prevailing dominance of "biblical" and "republican" traditions—that is, a religious tradition that valued the "creation of a community in which a genuinely ethical and spiritual life could be lived" and a political tradition committed to political equality through citizen participation (pp. 28-31). Today, however, with urbanization, industrialization, and concomitant mod-

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

ern forms of expressive and utilitarian individualism, this integration of religious and political values as the basis of community involvement may no longer be dominant. Nevertheless, these values may still play a role, independently at times, in shaping volunteer participation.

In the United States, Christian and Judaic religious beliefs have long been associated with certain aspects of volunteer behavior related to charitable acts (Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1990; Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1988, p. 7). Wuthnow (1989) argued that American religion has also encouraged civic involvement as a means of resisting encroachment by the state, beyond the desire to do charitable works based on religious convictions.

It also appears that some types of charitable behavior may flow out of values reflecting civic and humanitarian concerns as well as self-interest, rather than a set of doctrinal beliefs. For example, McCarthy (1982), in a study of Chicago's philanthropic elite during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, wrote of "civic stewardship—the notion that successful citizens owe a dual obligation of time and money to communities in which they have prospered." Also, Wuthnow (1991, p. 301) concluded that compassion for others, which is frequently expressed through formal and informal volunteer participation, "provides the diffuse webs of association that tie [the larger society] together."

Finally, a commitment to democratic political values (Hougland and Christenson, 1982) and feelings of political competency (Florin, Jones, and Wandersman, 1986) also underlie volunteer participation. For example, Florin, Jones, and Wandersman (1986) found high participation related to "cognitive social learning variables," including perceived self-competency relevant to participation and political influence, an esteem for one's residential environment and a sense of community, and a feeling of obligation toward participation in public affairs. A recent study on citizenship and politics found the precondition for involvement in the public life of communities to be the belief by citizens that "they can have a say, . . . they can create and see change, . . . they have a stake in change, and they can create a sense of community" (Harwood Group, 1991, pp. 45-46).

Besides these personal religious, charitable, and political values reflecting connections with public life, volunteers are likely to express specific attitudes and expectations regarding the charitable practices of other individuals and organizations. As a means of maintaining cognitive consistency, those who participate in volunteer activities might be more likely to expect similar behavior of others. Specific attitudes relevant to charitable practices and organizations may also be associated with volunteer participation. For example, since the 1930s, the United States has increasingly relied on government programs to assist in providing for the welfare of its citizens. In response to this trend, many perceive the "voluntary sector" as a desired alternative to government activities, despite the fact that a large proportion of the revenues of nonsectarian nonprofit organizations comes from public

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

funds. According to Wuthnow (1989, p. 98), the expansion of the state has concerned religious groups, which associate it with the growth of "civil privatism," or the erosion of participation in voluntary associations, including churches. Esteem for the nonprofit sector as an alternative to the public sector may be expressed in positive attitudes toward various nonprofit and voluntary organizations and less supportive attitudes toward public and private sector organizations. These positive attitudes are more likely to be found among volunteers.

It is assumed that these attitudes not only distinguish between volunteers and nonvolunteers but also between volunteers in various kinds of organizations and activities. For example, Sundeen (1990a) has shown that volunteers for various activities under the auspices of local governments differ from volunteers for the same activities under the auspices of nonprofit-nonreligious and nonprofit-religious organizations. In addition, volunteers participate in various types of activities, frequently reflecting their differing life course needs and interests—for example, parents who volunteer for educational activities (Sundeen, 1990b).

Our understanding of why individuals volunteer for certain activities may also be increased by the analytical distinction made by Smith (1991) between "extra-" or public benefit voluntary organizations and "intra-" or member benefit organizations. Although the distinctions between the two are not precise, public benefit organizations tend to exist for the purpose of serving a segment of the public that is in need, such as the poor, sick, or illiterate; member benefit organizations tend to exist for the benefit of their members, although they still might provide some service or good used by others. Also, according to Smith, public benefit organizations tend to rely less on volunteers than member benefit organizations do and tend to rely more on a paid staff, donations, and fees. Consequently, one might expect that public benefit activities would also be associated with stronger charitable purposes or values among volunteers and that member benefit activities would be associated with promoting organizational or member interests. Furthermore, compared with volunteers for member benefit activities, volunteers for public benefit activities would more likely be receptive to government assistance (in order to help their clients), less likely to expect others to volunteer (to the extent that they do not depend on volunteer assistance), and more likely to expect others to make charitable contributions.

To summarize, the conceptual rationale for this study is that differences in significant personal values regarding religion, charity, and politics, as well as attitudes toward the roles and responsibilities of government, individuals, and charitable institutions, distinguish between volunteers and nonvolunteers and between volunteers to various kinds of organizations and for various kinds of activities.

Research Procedures. Data for this analysis came from in-home inter-

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

views with a representative sample of 2,775 adult Americans (eighteen years of age and older) regarding volunteer and charitable-giving behavior. The survey was conducted by the Gallup Organization from March 8 to 22, 1988 (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1988, p. vi). Blacks, Hispanics, and persons from affluent households (incomes over $50,000) were oversampled to ensure enough respondents in these three groups for reliable statistical analysis. Also, the survey researchers used weighting procedures to ensure that the sample was representative of the age, education, marital status, occupation, size of household, region of residence, and household income of the adult population in the United States. The interview schedule recorded the demographic characteristics, attitudes, and behavior regarding volunteer and charitable activities. These results were used in this study to operationalize the independent and dependent variables. The appendix contains a list of the variables, including single items and summative scales, and their descriptive statistics.

As described in the following section, the dependent variables in this study are nominal variables—namely, whether or not one volunteered in the previous year. To identify the covariates with the dependent variable, a logistic regression model for a binary form of dependent variable was employed (the SAS Logist procedure). This model indicates the likelihood of an individual volunteering in the various forms of the dependent variable. For the purposes of this study, a probability level of .10 was considered statistically significant.

Dependent Variables: Whether or Not One Volunteers. The Gallup survey defined volunteering as "*not* just belonging to a service organization, but working in some way to help others for no monetary pay" (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1988). The dependent variables for this study consist of fifteen dependent variables grouped into three categories indicating whether or not one volunteered. The first category (ALLVOLS) indicates whether or not a respondent volunteered to at least one activity in the twelve months prior to the interview (46 percent of the sample volunteered). The second set of dependent variables represents volunteering under three organizational auspices. To determine whether volunteers to government (GOVERNMENT), nonprofit-nonsectarian (NONPROFIT NONSECTARIAN), and nonprofit-religious (NONPROFIT RELIGIOUS) organizations possess unique sets of attitudes and values, each group of sector volunteers was compared to all other volunteers using logistic regression models for each sector type. For the third set of dependent variables, the first dependent variable (ALLVOLS) was disaggregated into its component types of eleven volunteer activities, and a separate regression procedure was used for each activity. That is, each volunteer was assumed to participate in one or more of the eleven activities. The logistic regression, with one of the activities as a dependent variable, was used to indicate the likelihood of the volunteer participating in that activity. The eleven activities are health

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

(HLTH); education (EDUC); religious organizations (RELG); social services and welfare (SOSW); civic, social, and fraternal associations (CVSF); community action (COMT); recreation (RECR); arts, culture, and humanities (ARTS); work-related organizations (WORK); political organizations (POLT); and fundraising (FUND). Examples of each type are listed in Exhibit 1.

Independent Variables: Personal Goals and Attitudes. The Gallup survey instrument included attitudinal response items covering three broad areas: specific personal goals, attitudes toward the role and responsibility of government and individuals in providing for the economic and social needs of citizens, and confidence in an array of American institutions.

Exhibit 1. Examples of the Eleven Volunteer Activities

Health: hospitals, rescue squads, mental health clinics, blood donation stations, nursing and personal care facilities, visiting nurse associations, crisis counseling, hot lines

Education: elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, libraries, information centers, auxiliary organizations such as PTAs and alumni groups

Religious Organizations: churches, temples, religious community centers, schools operated by religious organizations, convents, monasteries, Church World Service, missionary organizations

Social Services and Welfare: community and neighborhood centers, senior citizen centers, Meals on Wheels, day-care centers, job counseling and training, homes for the aged, aid for the homeless, legal aid societies and courts, Red Cross, Salvation Army, Goodwill Industries, Lighthouses for the Blind, Alcoholics Anonymous

Civic, Social, and Fraternal Associations: Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, 4-H Clubs and other youth organizations, citizens' unions, veterans' organizations and auxiliaries, animal humane societies

Community Action: antipoverty boards, environmental and consumer organizations, advocacy organizations

Recreation: Little Leagues, membership clubs in such areas as swimming, boating, skiing, aviation, target shooting, and hunting

Arts, Culture, and Humanities: theaters, operas, symphony orchestras, dance groups, public TV, historical preservation societies, art galleries and museums, zoos, botanical gardens

Work-Related Organizations: labor organizations, professional associations (lawyers, medical personnel, engineers, and the like), chambers of commerce, industrial standard committees

Political Organizations: political party clubs (Democratic, Republican, other)

Fundraising: major fundraising campaigns for multipurpose human welfare services (such as United Way, Catholic Charities, Protestant Welfare Agencies, and United Jewish Appeal), health services (such as American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, Muscular Dystrophy, and March of Dimes), and education (such as United Negro College Fund)

Source: Adapted from Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1988, p. 74.

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

From these, four sets of attitude items were derived. Where statistically feasible, summative scales were constructed from these items; in other cases, single items were used (see the appendix for a description of these items and variables). One might assume that personal goals influence the selection of volunteer activities. However, it is possible that involvement in the activities shapes the personal values and goals expressed by the volunteer. Remember that the data are cross-sectional rather than longitudinal.

Personal Goals. This category includes indicators of the importance to respondents of three broad personal values and goals: personal charity, including giving time and making contributions to charitable or religious organizations (PERSONAL CHARITY); commitment to religion and spiritual life (RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT); and involvement in public affairs and politics (PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT). It was hypothesized that volunteers would rank the importance of each of these three goals higher than nonvolunteers would. Volunteers who rank religious goals higher were expected to volunteer most often to religious organizations, and volunteers who rank charitable goals higher were expected to volunteer most often to nonprofit-nonsectarian organizations. It is intuitively appealing to expect volunteers who rank public involvement higher than other values to volunteer to government organizations, but one cannot rule out the possibility of their volunteering to nonprofit-nonsectarian organizations as well.

As for comparing participation in the eleven volunteer activities, volunteers who rank the importance of religious goals higher than other goals were expected to favor religious activities. On the other hand, volunteers who rank the importance of personal charity higher than other goals were expected to favor activities that tend to provide specific public goods or services for others, such as health, social, and educational services. Those who rank the importance of public involvement higher than other goals were expected to favor participation in nonreligious activities that are relatively more member centered, such as civic, social, and fraternal activities; community action; work-related activities; and political activities. The distinction, similar to that between public and member benefit organizations, is problematic for at least two reasons. First, some member or mutual benefit activities are likely to benefit others, as recreational activities often do. Second, the data set contains insufficient detail regarding the nature of the activities, making precise distinctions for classifying the activities difficult. Consequently, it is not possible to use the public and member benefit distinction as a framework for predicting the personal goals of volunteers involved in arts, fundraising, or recreation.

Role and Responsibility of Government. This category, covered by one scale consisting of three items, indicates one's attitudes toward the responsibilities of government to care for citizens (WELFARE STATE). The higher the score, the more the respondent favors a welfare state. Assuming that the voluntary sector is frequently seen as an alternative to government

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

activities, one could conclude that respondents who hold a pro-welfare state position are not likely to be volunteers. Furthermore, an inverse relationship between a pro-welfare state position and participation in religious sector organizations was predicted; that is, the lower the WELFARE STATE scale score, the greater the likelihood that the volunteer participates in a religious organization rather than in either of the other two sectors.

Volunteers were expected to be generally more committed to the nonprofit sector than to either the private or public sector. Therefore, it was considered unlikely that any volunteer activity would be positively associated with a pro-welfare state position. Those areas where a negative relationship might exist—that is, those least supportive of a welfare-state ideology—include religious activities (for reasons discussed above) and activities or clients that would not benefit from (or be impaired by) government assistance, such as civic, social, and fraternal; recreation; political; and work-related activities.

Charitable Responsibility of Individuals. This category consists of two separate items indicating the respondent's level of agreement regarding the responsibility of individuals to volunteer to help people elsewhere (INDIVIDUAL VOLUNTEERING) and to give what they can to charity (INDIVIDUAL GIVING). (These two items were not combined into a single index of expected personal stewardship because of the relatively low zero-order correlation between them.) One would expect higher scores to be associated with volunteers rather than with nonvolunteers out of the need to maintain a degree of cognitive consistency in one's expectations of others and self. However, of the three sectors, government agencies are least dependent on volunteer labor or contributions; therefore, volunteers with higher scores on these two items were not considered likely to be volunteers to government agencies. Furthermore, volunteers in activities that depend most highly on volunteers—such as civic, social, and fraternal; religious; arts; and recreation activities—were considered more likely to agree with the expectation of volunteering; those volunteers in activities depending most highly on financial donations—such as fundraising, arts and culture, and religious activities—were considered more likely to agree with the expectation of making a contribution.

Confidence in Charitable and Noncharitable Institutions. This category includes two scales indicating the respondent's level of confidence in four charitable institutions (CONFIDENCE CHARITABLE) and four institutional representatives of government, business, and labor (CONFIDENCE NONCHARITABLE). Assuming that volunteers participate freely in charitable organizations and value them as an alternative or third sector, one would expect persons with higher levels of confidence in charitable institutions and lower levels of confidence in the public and for-profit sectors to be more likely to volunteer. Those who exhibit less confidence in charitable organizations were expected to be more likely to participate in government

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

organizations. A theoretical basis for predicting an association between the eleven activity types and the level of confidence in charitable or political and economic organizations does not appear to exist.

Control Variables. Because the purpose of this research was to focus specifically on the relationship between attitudes and volunteer behavior, it was necessary to control for the effects of other variables. Therefore, along with the attitudinal indicators, the model includes the following ten control variables, which are the sociodemographic and role variables generally associated with volunteering: annual income (INCOME), marital status (MARRIED), gender (FEMALE), number of children under eighteen in the household (CHILDREN), age over or under forty-five (YAGE) or age forty-five or older (OAGE), race (NONWHITE), level of education (EDUCATION), residence in or out of central city (SMSACC), and size of respondent's city (CITYSIZE). Prior research has shown that volunteering is positively associated with socioeconomic status, including income and education (Palisi and Palisi, 1984; Smith, 1983; Sundeen, 1988); the middle span of adult life (Florin, Jones, and Wandersman, 1986; Rohs, 1986; Tomeh, 1973); marriage (Florin, Jones, and Wandersman, 1986; Sundeen, 1988); and children living in the household (Rohs, 1986; Sundeen, 1988). Evidence regarding the relationship between race and volunteer behavior is mixed. Although nonwhites are less likely than whites to report participation in voluntary associations (Hayghe, 1991), when controlling for the effects of income, education, and other relevant variables, the differences tend to disappear (Sundeen, 1988, 1990b). Finally, residence in the central city (Sundeen, 1990b) or in a city with a population greater than 100,000 (Sundeen, 1988) is negatively associated with the likelihood of volunteering. Because this article focuses on the attitudinal items, the findings regarding the control variables are not discussed.

Findings

Volunteers Versus Nonvolunteers. Volunteers have statistically significant higher mean scores than nonvolunteers on all of the variables except WELFARE STATE, in which mean scores are lower to a statistically significant degree. However, when controlling for demographic and other attitudinal variables, only certain personal goals and attitudes do make a difference in whether or not one volunteers. The ALLVOLS column of Table 1 indicates that the model chi-square is significant at the probability level of less than .001 and that three of the hypothesized relationships are statistically significant. First, with respect to personal goals, volunteering and giving (PERSONAL CHARITY) is more important among volunteers than nonvolunteers, but the other two personal goals make no difference in discerning between the two groups. Second, as hypothesized, the expectation that individuals should volunteer time to help others (INDIVIDUAL VOLUNTEER-

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

ING) is positively associated with volunteering, but no relationship exists between expecting individuals to make contributions (INDIVIDUAL GIVING) and volunteering. Third, respondents who place less confidence in the noncharitable institutions (CONFIDENCE NONCHARITABLE) are more likely to be volunteers; trust in charitable institutions (CONFIDENCE CHARITABLE) is not related to volunteering. Finally, there are no differences in attitudes toward the role and responsibility of government (WELFARE STATE) between the volunteers and nonvolunteers.

Differences Among Volunteers in Three Sectors. If the motivational and attitudinal substructure of volunteering is unidimensional, we would expect

Table 1. Logistic Regression Results: All Volunteers and Volunteers in Three Sectors

Variables	*ALLVOLS*	*Nonprofit Nonsectarian*	*Nonprofit Religious*	*Government*
Personal Goals and Attitudes (Independent Variables)				
INTERCEPT	-4.30[d]	-0.45	5.3[d]	-0.37
	(0.55)	(0.84)	(0.9)	(0.8)
PERSONAL CHARITY	0.24[d]	-0.02	0.24[d]	0.06
	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
RELIGIOUS	0.09	-0.15	0.51[d]	-0.09
COMMITMENT	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.09)
PUBLIC	0.08	0.25[c]	-0.07	0.17[b]
INVOLVEMENT	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.09)
WELFARE STATE	3.56E-3	-0.02	-0.09[b]	-0.03
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
INDIVIDUAL	0.15[c]	0.16[b]	0.06	-0.07
VOLUNTEERING	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)
INDIVIDUAL GIVING	-0.03	-0.02	0.10	-0.10
	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)
CONFIDENCE	0.03	0.04	0.09[b]	0.01
CHARITABLE	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
CONFIDENCE	-0.09[c]	-0.08[b]	-0.03	-0.01
NONCHARITABLE	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Sociodemographic and Role (Control) Variables				
INCOME	2.37E-6[d]	5.28E-6[a]	2.15E-6	4.5E-6
	(2.223E-6)	(3.05E-6)	(3.27E-6)	(3.00E-6)
MARRIED	0.51	-0.14	0.25	0.26
	(0.14)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)
FEMALE	0.05	2.57E-3	0.05	-0.15
	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.16)
CHILDREN	0.07	-0.12[a]	0.11	0.04
	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
YAGE	-0.02	4.57E-3	-0.29	5.86E-3
	(0.15)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.20)

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

Table 1. *(continued)*

Variables	*ALLVOLS*	*Nonprofit Nonsectarian*	*Nonprofit Religious*	*Government*
Sociodemographic and Role (Control) Variables (continued)				
OAGE	-0.16	-0.19	0.09	-0.52[b]
	(0.16)	(0.24)	(0.26)	(0.24)
NONWHITE	-0.28[a]	-0.23[a]	0.40	-0.42
	(0.17)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.28)
EDUCATION	0.34[d]	0.11[a]	0.07	0.03
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
SMSACC	-0.01	0.33[a]	-0.18	-0.26
	(0.14)	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.20)
CITYSIZE	-0.07[d]	-0.04[a]	0.07[b]	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Model χ^2	250.911[d]	52.19[a]	113.583[d]	35.74[d]
N	1421	636	636	636

Note: Cell entries are parameter estimates, with standard errors given in parentheses.

[a] $p \leq .10$.

[b] $p \leq .05$.

[c] $p \leq .01$.

[d] $p \leq .001$.

similar statistically significant relationships between attitudes and volunteering, regardless of sector. However, the last three columns of Table 1 reveal a different pattern of attitudes in each of the sectors. First, as expected, volunteering to government organizations is positively associated with the personal goal of involvement in public affairs and politics (PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT). However, statistically significant relationships with any other attitudinal variables do not exist. Second, volunteering to a nonprofit-nonsectarian organization is also positively associated with PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, rather than with the expected goal of PERSONAL CHARITY. Furthermore, these volunteers are also more likely to be positively associated with CONFIDENCE CHARITABLE and negatively associated with CONFIDENCE NONCHARITABLE. In contrast, the importance levels of the other two personal goals—PERSONAL CHARITY and RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT—are statistically associated with participation in religious organizations. Also, volunteers to religious organizations are more likely to have a negative association with WELFARE STATE and a positive assessment of charitable institutions (CONFIDENCE CHARITABLE).

Differences Among Volunteers in Eleven Types of Activities. Table 2 presents the relationships between the independent variables and volunteer participation in each of the eleven types of activities. Each column contains the results of comparing the volunteers for one specific activity with all

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

Table 2. Logistic Regression Results: Volunteer Participation in Eleven Activities

Variables	*HLTH*	*EDUC*	*RELG*	*SOSW*	*CVSF*	*COMT*	*RECR*	*ARTS*	*WORK*	*POLT*	*FUND*
Personal Goals and Attitudes (Independent Variables)											
INTERCEPT	-3.41[d]	-5.97[d]	-5.49[d]	-3.61[d]	-2.94[c]	-4.77[d]	0.88	-5.07[d]	-6.88[d]	2.66[b]	2.41[c]
	(0.99)	(1.0091)	(0.99)	(1.03)	(0.99)	(1.43)	(1.00)	(1.36)	(1.37)	(1.24)	(0.93)
PERSONAL	0.09	0.12	0.16[b]	0.13[a]	0.01	0.15	0.04	0.11	0.17[a]	0.07	0.17[b]
CHARITY	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.07)
RELIGIOUS	0.08	0.04	0.71[d]	0.05	-0.03	-0.30[b]	0.04	-0.18	-0.05	0.06	-0.17[a]
COMMITMENT	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.09)
PUBLIC	0.09	0.18[b]	-0.11	0.21[b]	0.39[d]	0.28[b]	0.08	0.28[b]	0.10	0.74[d]	0.10
INVOLVEMENT	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.08)
WELFARE	-0.01	0.04	0.06[a]	0.04	-0.06	5.71E-3	-0.06	0.01	-0.09[a]	-0.08[a]	-0.02
STATE	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
INDIVIDUAL	-0.04	0.17	0.07	0.20	0.22[a]	0.10	-0.16	0.45[b]	-0.02	-0.04	3.13E-3
VOLUNTEERING	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.10)
INDIVIDUAL	0.09	-0.13	-0.06	-0.10	-0.15	-0.18	-0.05	-0.13	0.14	-0.09	0.02
GIVING	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.11)
CONFIDENCE	0.02	4.01E-3	0.10[b]	0.05	-0.01	0.17[b]	0.03	-0.01	0.05	-0.03	0.08[b]
CHARITABLE	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)
CONFIDENCE	0.01	0.03	-4.50E-3	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.07	0.06	0.11[a]	-0.03
NONCHARITABLE	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)

Sociodemographic and Role (Control) Variables

INCOME	2.02E-6	5.67E-6[a]	4.14E-6[b]	2.04E-7	-1.224E-6	1.00E-5[b]	9.33E-6[c]	6.15E-6	8.54E-6[b]	6.97E-6	6.08E-6[a]
	(3.371E-6)	(3.267E-6)	(3.41E-6)	(3.545E-6)	(3.502E-6)	(4.60E-6)	(3.50E-6)	(4.31E-6)	(4.15E-6)	(4.31E-6)	(3.21E-6)
MARRIED	-0.27	0.03	0.34	-0.06	0.38	-7.78E-3	0.11	-0.24	-0.04	0.40	0.12
	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.38)	(0.27)	(0.34)	(0.35)	(0.36)	(0.24)
FEMALE	0.39[b]	0.61[d]	0.22	0.24	0.42[b]	0.05	-0.98[d]	0.21	-0.69[c]	-0.09	0.31[a]
	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.29)	(0.20)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.25)	(0.18)
CHILDREN	-0.17[b]	0.32[d]	0.26[d]	-0.17[a]	0.05	0.05	0.23[c]	-0.20	0.09	-0.30[b]	-0.13
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.08)
YAGE	-0.09	-0.12	-0.35	-0.71[c]	-0.57[b]	-0.16	0.33	-0.42	-0.26	-0.24	-0.30
	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.35)	(0.24)	(0.35)	(0.30)	(0.34)	(0.22)
OAGE	-0.54[a]	-0.64[b]	0.45[a]	-0.42	-0.33	-0.67	-0.74[b]	-0.01	-0.78[b]	0.05	-0.28
	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.42)	(0.32)	(0.36)	(0.38)	(0.34)	(0.25)
NONWHITE	0.07	0.33	0.58[a]	-0.53	-0.29	1.10[c]	-0.46	-0.05	0.87[b]	0.89[b]	0.25
	(0.30)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.38)	(0.35)	(0.44)	(0.38)	(0.37)	(0.29)
EDUCATION	0.15[b]	0.29[d]	0.10	0.03	0.18[b]	-0.02	-0.03	0.24[b]	0.51[d]	0.02	0.08
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.06)
SMSACC	-0.04	-0.32	-0.30	0.30	-0.07	0.29	0.15	0.04	0.08	0.24	-0.07
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.34)	(0.25)	(0.32)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.22)
CITYSIZE	-0.01	5.37E-3	0.02	-0.01	-0.05	-7.07E-3	-0.03	-0.04	-0.05	-0.02	-0.05[a]
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Model χ^2	30.44[b]	97.77[d]	133.95[d]	39.77[c]	65.61[d]	45.08[d]	68.65[d]	40.61[c]	66.59[d]	67.22[d]	43.56[d]
N	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636	636

Note: Cell entries are parameter estimates, with standard errors given in parentheses.

[a] $p \leq .10$.

[b] $p \leq .05$.

[c] $p \leq .01$.

[d] $p \leq .001$.

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

other volunteers. Volunteers for different types of volunteer activities, like volunteers in the three sectors, possess distinctive patterns of attitudes. Each of the models has a statistically significant chi-square, and none of the volunteer activities has the same combination of statistically significant differences.

For example, volunteering to civic, social, and fraternal (CVSF), political (POLT), and arts, culture, and humanities (ARTS) activities is statistically related to the personal goal of PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT. Apparently these volunteers value primarily a "participatory" orientation, in which the role of citizen is embedded. This role seems compatible with civic and political activities, but the linkage with arts, culture, and humanities activities does not have a theoretical or intuitive basis. Furthermore, volunteers to ARTS and CVSF are more likely to expect others to volunteer some of their time. It is likely that civic, social, and fraternal organizations depend heavily on volunteer participation for their existence and that, therefore, their volunteers expect similar behavior from others. Also, the revenue crisis of many local museums and art galleries may foster an expectation for free labor by volunteers. In contrast, volunteers to political organizations (POLT)—although participatory—express stronger negative views regarding the welfare state and have greater confidence in large noncharitable institutions. In light of these relationships, one could speculate that volunteers to political organizations, although not supportive of a welfare state ideology compared to other volunteers, do not have strong third sector ties either.

A second personal goal orientation emerges among volunteers to education (EDUC) and social services and welfare (SOSW) activities. Volunteer participation in these activities is associated with PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT and PERSONAL CHARITY, suggesting that they value a "participatory-charitable" personal goal orientation; that is, their involvement has a "value-added" dimension—that of helping or charitable behavior, as well as civic involvement. For example, tutoring in a school, helping in a mental health clinic, or helping a fraternal group remodel a job center for the homeless might reflect these values.

Volunteering to community action (COMT) is associated positively with PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT and negatively with RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT. The inverse relationship with a strong commitment to religion and spiritual life implies that volunteers involved in social-action projects, such as antipoverty boards, have a more secular orientation. This secularism, in combination with their civic participation, yields a "participatory-secular" personal goal orientation. However, they still reveal a commitment to the nonprofit sector in their positive association with CONFIDENCE CHARITY, which possibly results from being more familiar and involved with local charitable and nonprofit organizations in the course of their activities.

In contrast, volunteering to religious (RELG), fundraising (FUND), and work-related (WORK) activities is not associated with involvement in public

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

affairs and politics; instead, they are all statistically related to PERSONAL CHARITY. Volunteers to work-related activities have a "charitable" personal goal orientation and are less likely to favor public assistance or welfare programs to assist citizens. On the other hand, volunteers to religious and fundraising activities are both associated with commitment to religious and spiritual life (RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT), although in different directions. Participants in religious activities are more likely to value religion and spiritual life (a "religious-charitable" personal goal orientation). When combined with confidence in charitable institutions and a negative association with welfare state ideology, this orientation portrays them as the group of volunteers most strongly identified with and trusting of the nonprofit sector and organized charity. Those volunteering for fundraising activities have the positive association with PERSONAL CHARITY and a negative relationship with RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT, which suggests a "charitable-secular" goal orientation. Furthermore, fundraisers have a positive association with confidence in charitable institutions (CONFIDENCE CHARITABLE), possibly because of a drive toward cognitive consistency—for example, "If I raise funds for these organizations, they must be trustworthy." At any rate, their confidence in charitable institutions is not out of a sense of religious devotion.

Finally, with regard to the classification of volunteer activities by whether they are oriented toward public or member benefits, the results are mixed. Two of the public benefit activities (education and social services) are associated only with the personal goals of PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT and PERSONAL CHARITY. This result is consistent with the rationale of becoming involved in order to provide goods or services to others. Although there is no consistency among the personal goals of the four member benefit activities, three (political, work-related, and religious) are negatively associated with WELFARE STATE, suggesting support of the third sector and opposition to public policies that redirect resources to other groups and would not benefit their own members.

Conclusion and Implications

The findings regarding personal goals, attitudes, and values have both theoretical and practical implications. They contribute to the development and refinement of general theoretical models that attempt to explain volunteer behavior by using personal and social system variables; they also contribute to the current discussion on the values associated with citizenship. Furthermore, they suggest the importance of conceptualizing volunteer behavior in terms of its specific context and the need to focus on volunteering for specific types of activities or in specific sectors.

These findings confirm the hypothesis that certain attitudes and values related to charitable behavior do make a difference in predicting volunteer

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

behavior. When one controls for sociodemographic variables, volunteers are found to be more likely than those who do not volunteer to assign greater importance to personal charitable behavior, including giving time and making contributions. Also, volunteers are more likely to expect people to volunteer their time to others and less likely to trust noncharitable institutions, such as big business, labor, and government. Despite these differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers, differences in the importance of other personal goals are not statistically significant. Therefore, questions remain about the personal values that motivate citizen participation and normative citizenship. At least on an aggregate level, those citizens who participate in volunteer activities are not more committed than nonvolunteers to the religious or political values that might be expected of active citizens, given the "biblical" and "republican" traditions of civic participation. Possibly these two value currents no longer run as deeply through American culture as they once did and have therefore declined as the basis for volunteering. On the other hand, given the wide spectrum of volunteer activities in this study, personal charity (giving time and contributing money to charities, institutions, and religious organizations) may reflect a similar but less politically oriented ethic of volunteer participation.

Although the intent of this study was to focus on the attitudinal variables and not the control variables representing roles and statuses, it should be pointed out that those who are most likely to engage in normative citizenship at the broad level of volunteer behavior in organized activities tend to be white, have higher educational and income levels, and reside in smaller cities. This finding certainly raises the question of whose interests are being represented in collective efforts to contribute to the common good.

The findings also underscore the multidimensionality of factors related to volunteering. Although volunteers differ from nonvolunteers, they are not a homogeneous group, especially when comparing the personal goals of volunteers in different sectors or activities. This study identified six personal goal orientations based on public involvement, religious commitment, and personal charity, which have underlying linkages with specific kinds of volunteer experience. Also, the findings portray volunteers to government agencies as having the fewest attitudinal differences from all other volunteers and those who participate in nonprofit-religious organizations as possessing the most distinctive set of attitudes, which appear to champion the charitable, nongovernmental system.

In contrast to the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers, the differences among the volunteers in the three sectors and to the eleven activities provide a richer context for understanding the multifaceted values of normative citizenship. Extralegal citizenship roles, which may be tied to specific types of activities, result from the interactions among values, attitudes, roles, statuses, interests, and residential characteristics. Participation in a "community of limited liability" (Suttles, 1972) draws the local resident

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

into specialized issues or segments of the community based on overlapping neighborhood boundaries and life cycle needs. Similarly, normative citizenship through volunteer participation rests on commitment to distinct activities related to specific personal values and statuses and volunteer opportunities.

The distinction between public- and member-oriented activities—particularly with respect to personal goals, expectations of others to volunteer, and attitudes toward the welfare state—is potentially useful for increasing our understanding of volunteering. Further research is needed to clarify the distinctions between public and member benefit activities and then to examine their relationships with personal goals and attitudes toward the voluntary sector.

The attitudes and values of volunteers can have implications for human resource development policies and plans for recruitment, training, placement, appraisal, and role behavior of volunteers. The findings suggest that the existence of a variety of volunteer organizations and activities enables volunteers to pursue their personal goals and shapes their goals and attitudes. Understanding whether volunteers value religious commitments, in contrast to some more secular civic virtues or some combination of personal charitable goals and civic or religious commitments, would certainly assist in assessing the ways in which volunteers are recruited and rewarded. The language and symbols of organizations can be designed to reflect these values. For example, one organization might emphasize the importance of doing God's work in attempting to attract volunteers; another might stress service to the less fortunate or one's political obligations as a citizen. Furthermore, personal goal orientations may also play a role, similar to the role of goals in expectancy or to path goal models of leadership and motivation. Being aware of the volunteer's personal goal orientations gives the manager the opportunity to demonstrate the connection between the efforts of volunteer employees, the achievement of organizational goals (or first-level outcomes), and the fulfillment of volunteers' personal goals (or second-level outcomes). For example, a volunteer might be motivated to exert extra effort that will aid in accomplishing organizational goals, which in turn will enable the volunteer to be involved in local public affairs. The manager's function is to make the path to fulfillment of that goal as smooth as possible (Luthans, 1992).

Managers must also be sensitive to the potential impact on their organization of attitudinal and value differences. For example, attitudinal differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers, including clients, may lead to discriminatory behavior against certain clients or program activities, thus undermining program effectiveness (Brudney, 1990, p. 82). Personal goal differences among the volunteers in different types of activities may create intergroup or interpersonal conflict. Value differences between volunteers and paid staff, although not addressed in this study, are also an

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

area of potential conflict. For example, a professional social worker and a volunteer in an agency providing assistance to the poor might hold different attitudes regarding the role and responsibility of individuals (as opposed to government) in providing assistance. Managers sensitive to such value and attitudinal differences could create mechanisms within the organization to allow for airing and resolving conflicts.

Future research in this area could further refine attitudinal and value items and develop a means of distinguishing between public and member benefit volunteer activities. There is also a pressing need for longitudinal studies comparing volunteers' and nonvolunteers' attitudes and behavior over time. The question is whether individuals decide to volunteer as a consequence of previously held values or whether the attitudes and values associated with volunteering are a consequence of being socialized by the volunteer experience. The answer is likely to be complex.

Appendix

Dependent Variables (Indicators of Volunteer Behavior).

Totals may exceed 100 percent because of multiple volunteering:

ALLVOLS: 1 when respondent volunteers to at least one volunteer activity, 0 otherwise (*N* of volunteers = 636, or 42.22 percent of sample)

NONPROFIT NONSECTARIAN: 1 when respondent volunteers to at least one activity under the auspices of a nonprofit nonsectarian organization, 0 otherwise (n = 311, or 48.89 percent of all volunteers)

NONPROFIT RELIGIOUS: 1 when respondent volunteers to at least one activity under the auspices of a nonprofit religious organization, 0 otherwise (n = 337, or 52.98 percent of all volunteers)

GOVERNMENT: 1 when respondent volunteers to at least one activity under the auspices of a local, state, or federal government, 0 otherwise (n = 257, or 40.41 percent of all volunteers)

HLTH: 1 when respondent volunteers to health activity, 0 otherwise (n = 154, or 24.21 percent of all volunteers)

EDUC: 1 when respondent volunteers to education activity, 0 otherwise (n = 209, or 30.43 percent of all volunteers)

RELG: 1 when respondent volunteers to religious activity, 0 otherwise (n = 359, or 56.44 percent of all volunteers)

SOSW: 1 when respondent volunteers to social services and welfare activity, 0 otherwise (n = 138, or 38.01 percent of all volunteers)

CVSF: 1 when respondent volunteers to civic, social, or fraternal activity, 0 otherwise (n = 163, or 25.62 percent of all volunteers)

COMT: 1 when respondent volunteers to community action activity, 0 otherwise (n = 59, or 9.27 percent of all volunteers)

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

RECR: 1 when respondent volunteers to recreation activity, 0 otherwise (n = 151, or 23.74 percent of all volunteers)
ARTS: 1 when respondent volunteers to art and culture activity, 0 otherwise (n = 72, or 11.32 percent of all volunteers)
WORK: 1 when respondent volunteers to work-related activity, 0 otherwise (n = 86, or 13.52 percent of all volunteers)
POLT: 1 when respondent volunteers to political activity, 0 otherwise (n = 85, or 13.37 percent of all volunteers)
FUND: 1 when respondent volunteers to fundraising activity in any field, 0 otherwise (n = 189, or 29.71 percent of all volunteers)

Independent Variables (Attitude Scales and Items)

PERSONAL CHARITY: range = 2–10, $\bar{x}$ (mean) = 6.73, SD = 1.83, alpha = .75
a. Giving time through volunteer work to charitable and religious organizations: 1 = not at all important . . . 5 = absolutely essential.
b. Making contributions to charities, institutions, religious organizations, or causes you agree with: 1 = not at all important . . . 5 = absolutely essential.

RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT: range = 1–5, $\bar{x}$ = 3.92, SD = 1.20
Making a strong commitment to your religion or spiritual life: 1 = not at all important . . . 5 = absolutely essential.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: range = 1–5, $\bar{x}$ = 2.57, SD = 1.18
Being involved in public affairs and politics: 1 = not at all important . . . 5 = absolutely essential.

WELFARE STATE: range = 4–20, $\bar{x}$ = 11.46, SD = 2.71, alpha = .68
a. The government has a basic responsibility to take care of people who can't take care of themselves: 1 = strongly disagree . . . 5 = strongly agree.
b. The government should guarantee that every citizen has enough to eat and a place to live: 1 = strongly disagree . . . 5 = strongly agree.
c. The government is spending too much money on programs to help the poor: 1 = strongly agree . . . 5 = strongly disagree.

INDIVIDUAL VOLUNTEERING: range = 1–5, $\bar{x}$ = 3.76, SD = 1.01
People should volunteer some of their time to people elsewhere: 1 = strongly disagree . . . 5 = strongly agree.

INDIVIDUAL GIVING: range = 1–5, $\bar{x}$ = 3.79, SD = .99
It is the responsibility of people to give what they can to charity: 1 = strongly disagree . . . 5 = strongly agree.

CONFIDENCE CHARITABLE: range = 4–16, $\bar{x}$ = 9.98, SD = 2.56, alpha = .74
Indicate level of confidence ranging from 1 (very little) to 4 (great deal) in the following organized charitable institutions: charities providing health or social services, federated campaign (United Way), community foundations, and private foundations.

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

CONFIDENCE NONCHARITABLE: range = 4–16, $\bar{x}$ = 8.60, SD = 2.62, alpha = .67

Indicate level of confidence ranging from 1 (very little) to 4 (great deal) in the following organized institutions: the military, Congress, organized labor, and big business.

Control Variables

For nominal variables, $\bar{x}$ represents the relative frequency of the variable.

INCOME: range = $5,000–$133,000 annual income (based on eleven income categories), $\bar{x}$ = $37,979, SD = $30,891

MARRIED: 1 when respondent is married, 0 otherwise; $\bar{x}$ = .66, SD = .47.

FEMALE: 1 when respondent is female, 0 otherwise; $\bar{x}$ = .49, SD = .50.

CHILDREN: range = 0–10 children under eighteen years old living in respondent's home; $\bar{x}$ = .91, SD = 1.33.

YAGE: 1 if age is equal to or less than thirty-five, 0 otherwise; $\bar{x}$ = .36, SD = .48.

OAGE: 1 if age is equal to or greater than fifty-five, 0 otherwise; $\bar{x}$ = .31, SD = .46.

NONWHITE: 1 when respondent is black or other nonwhite (not including Hispanic), 0 otherwise; $\bar{x}$ = .17, SD = .37.

EDUCATION: range = 1–8 (1 = grades 1–4 and 8 = college or university graduate); $\bar{x}$ = 5.8, SD = 1.70.

SMSACC: 1 when respondent resides in central city of SMSA, 0 otherwise; $\bar{x}$ = .36, SD = .48.

CITYSIZE: range = 1–11 (1 = open country and 11 = population one million or more); $\bar{x}$ = 8.66, SD = 3.88.

References

Bellah, Robert, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven Tipton. (1985). *Habits of the Heart.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brudney, Jeffery. (1990). *Fostering Volunteer Programs in the Public Sector.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clary, E. Gil, and Mark Snyder. (1990). *A Functional Analysis of Volunteers' Motivations.* Paper presented at the Independent Sector 1990 Spring Research Forum, Boston.

Cnaan, Ram A., and Robin S. Goldberg-Glen. (1990). *Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services.* Unpublished manuscript.

Cooper, Terry L. (1991). *An Ethic of Citizenship for Public Administration.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ferris, James M. (1990). *Changing Patterns of Local Service Delivery: 1982–1988.* Unpublished manuscript.

Florin, Paul, Eric Jones, and Abraham Wandersman. (1986). Black Participation in Voluntary Associations. *Journal of Voluntary Associations, 15* (1), 65–86.

Greene, Stephen G. (1992). The Non-profit World: A Statistical Portrait. *Chronicle of Philanthropy, 4* (7), 24.

Harwood Group. (1991). *Citizens and Politics: A View from Main Street America.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016

Hayghe, Howard V. (1991, February). Volunteers in the U.S.: Who Donates Time? *Monthly Labor Review,* pp. 17-25.

Hodgkinson, Virginia, and Murray Weitzman. (1988). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States.* Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hodgkinson, Virginia, and Murray Weitzman. (1990). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey.* Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hougland, James G., and James A. Christenson. (1982). Voluntary Organizations and Dominant American Values. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 11* (4), 7-26.

Luthans, Fred. (1992). *Organizational Behavior* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

McCarthy, Kathleen. (1982). *Noblesse Oblige.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Palisi, Bartolomeo, and Rosalie Palisi. (1984). Status and Voluntary Associations: A Cross-Cultural Study of Males in Three Metropolitan Areas. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 13,* 32-42.

Rohs, Frederick R. (1986). Social Background, Personality, and Attitudinal Factors Influencing the Decision to Volunteer and Level of Involvement Among Adult 4-H Leaders. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15* (1), 87-99.

Smith, David Horton. (1983). Synanthrometrics: On Progress in the Development of a General Theory of Voluntary Action and Citizen Participation. In David Horton Smith and Jon Van Til (eds.), *International Perspectives on Voluntary Research.* Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Smith, David Horton. (1991). Four Sectors or Five? Retaining the Membership Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 20* (2), 137-150.

Sundeen, Richard A. (1988). Explaining Participation in Coproduction: A Study of Volunteers. *Social Science Quarterly, 69* (3), 546-568.

Sundeen, Richard A. (1990a). Citizens Serving Government: The Extent and Distinctiveness of Volunteer Participation in Local Public Agencies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 19* (4), 329-344.

Sundeen, Richard A. (1990b). Family Life Course Status and Volunteer Behavior: Implications for the Single Parent. *Sociological Perspectives, 33* (4), 483-500.

Suttles, Gerald. (1972). *The Social Construction of Communities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tomeh, Aida K. (1973). Formal Voluntary Organizations: Participation, Correlates, and Interrelationships. *Sociological Quarterly, 43,* 89-122.

Wandersman, Abraham, Paul Florin, Robert Friedmann, and Ron Meier. (1987). Who Participates, Who Does Not, and Why? An Analysis of Voluntary Neighborhood Organizations in the United States and Israel. *Sociological Forum, 2* (3), 534-555.

Williams, J. Allen, and Suzanne Ortega. (1986). The Multidimensionality of Joining. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15* (4), 35-44.

Wuthnow, Robert. (1989). *The Struggle for America's Soul.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Wuthnow, Robert. (1991). *Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Richard A. Sundeen is professor and associate dean in the School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Downloaded from nvs.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on September 15, 2016