Volunteerism and Social Capital: A Functional Approach

Arthur A Stukas, Maree Daly

La Trobe University

and Martin J Cowling

People First - Total Solutions

ABSTRACT

Volunteerism is often promoted as particularly likely to contribute to social capital, the bonds of trust and reciprocity created in social networks. However, volunteer work may only lead to such beneficial outcomes when certain conditions are met. A functional approach to volunteerism (Snyder, Clary & Stukas 2000) suggests that individual outcomes, such as volunteer satisfaction and retention, are more likely when volunteers are able to meet their important goals and motives for their service in their actual activities. In a small survey of Australian volunteers, we examined whether social capital outcomes, such as generalised trust in others and psychological sense of community, were similarly related to the matching of motivation and available benefits. Our results support such a contention and we discuss its implications and the need for future empirical research on the creation of social capital.

In recent times, lower rates of community participation have been a source of concern worldwide (Lyons & Fabiansson 1998, Putnam 2000) though Australia looks brighter (Volunteering Australia 2004). Declining participation represents a potential loss of community connections and social networks. Such a loss could be disastrous for society. As Robert Putnam (2000) suggested, the decline of participation in community groups, and instead an increase in solo activities such as 'bowling alone', is likely to be related to increases in alienation, crime, and other social ills. But what is the connection between social participation and the easing of social problems? For Putnam (2000) and others (Stolle & Rochon 1998, for an alternative perspective see Portes, 1998), social connections between individuals, and the networks they comprise, represent more than just a series of relationships. Instead, these connections are a valuable commodity, a form of capital, in this case, social capital, that may be leveraged to combat social ills. More specifically, Putnam (2000) defined social capital as 'connections among individuals - social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them' (p. 19). He suggested that social capital has both individual and collective aspects; it can be both a private good and a public good. Societies may leverage social networks to solve social problems just as individuals can use their own networks to solve their personal problems. Social networks allow for concerted social action and cooperation toward goals. For Putnam (2000), the value of social connections (and social capital broadly) lies in their ability to generate trust between people and to enforce the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), which encourages people to return favours and

thereby enhances cooperation. However, the essence of social capital theory lies not in the specific feelings of trust or concern about reciprocity that two people may feel toward each other, but instead in the generalisation of such feelings beyond the specific individuals known to a host of other friends and associates and more distant network members not yet known (Putnam 2000). Thus, social capital theoretically ensures support for strangers in need with a safety net made up of trust and mutual obligations; these factors alone may help to reduce social ills (although the mechanisms by which this occurs have yet to be clearly elucidated).

But can trust actually be generalised beyond friends and acquaintances to strangers? Yamagishi and Yamagishi (1994) defined trust as an 'expectation of goodwill and benign intent' (p. 131). They distinguished 'knowledge-based trust', which develops from interactions with specific other people and the evidence of their benign intent, from 'general trust' (hereafter referred to as generalised trust), which is a 'belief in the benevolence of human nature in general' (p. 139). As such, generalised trust is a cognitive bias toward positive expectations about treatment from others with whom one has no prior experience. Believing that others in one's society will act to help, rather than to harm people in need (including the self) because of their genuine goodwill makes connections between people a positive force for society; such trust-based connections are the key ingredient in social capital. Although generalised trust was originally considered an individual difference by Yamagishi and Yamagishi (1994) who

reported cultural differences in trust, we believe as Putnam (2000) suggested, that generalised trust can be an outcome of successful participation in society, and in particular, successful participation in volunteer activities. Indeed, recent research on trust in close personal relationships suggested that engaging in 'pro-relationship behaviours' (i.e. acting in a helpful supportive manner) with close others can increase not only their trust in us, but our trust in them as well (Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster & Agnew 1999). Similarly, we suspect that acting in a helpful and supportive manner toward others through volunteer work may help to build both interpersonal trust and generalised trust at the societal level.

But what makes for successful participation in volunteer activities? Just as there are some activities that may be satisfying to some volunteers and not to others, it may also be the case that some activities are more likely to lead some volunteers (and not others) to develop trust in other people. One theoretical perspective on why certain volunteers prosper in and benefit from certain activities (and not others) is the functional approach to volunteerism (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen & Miene 1998; Snyder, Clary & Stukas 2000). The functional approach is situated on two basic premises: first, that different volunteers may choose the same activity for different reasons, goals, motivations or functions (or for more than one reason); and second, that knowing these underlying motivations is key to recruiting volunteers and to retaining them. The functional approach's 'matching principle' holds that environments or activities that allow volunteers to satisfy their motivational goals (i.e. that afford benefits

5

that 'match' the initial motivations of volunteers) should produce greater satisfaction and intentions to continue volunteering than activities that do not allow for goal satisfaction (Clary et al. 1998; Snyder et al. 2000).

Empirical studies have demonstrated that potential volunteers prefer recruitment messages that highlight their own primary motivations for volunteering rather than other motivations (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene & Haugen 1994; Clary et al. 1998). Also, volunteers who found themselves in activities that provided benefits that matched their primary motivations have reported greater satisfaction and higher intentions to continue volunteering, compared to those reporting benefits that failed to match these motivations (Clary et al. 1998; Tschirhart, Mesch, Perry, Miller & Lee 2001). Typically, the effects of the matching of motives and benefits on outcomes have been assessed for each function separately, using Clary et al.'s (1998) Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) which assesses six motivations to volunteer. Recent studies have also documented how the matching of more than one important function with relevant benefits may lead to even greater volunteer satisfaction and future intentions to volunteer (Worth, Snyder & Clary 2005; Tschirhart et al. 2001).

Although the functional approach to volunteerism takes an individualistic approach to studying the volunteer, derived as it is from psychological theory (Katz 1960; Smith, Bruner & White 1956) it is important to see such individual processes in the larger community or societal context. The same logic that holds

for individual outcomes, such as satisfaction and sustained volunteerism may hold for social capital outcomes, such as generalised trust in other people. That is, the quality of the volunteer activity, in terms of how well it satisfies a volunteer's motives and goals, may help to determine the extent to which social capital is built. Simply put, those volunteers who find their activities satisfying may be more likely to see society as a place where people are responsible, trustworthy, and ready to help those in need, just as they themselves do. Those volunteers who find their activities unsatisfying may feel that others similarly might prefer not to volunteer and that society therefore cannot count on people to help those in need.

Recently, Omoto and Snyder (2002) suggested that a psychological sense of community (with community based on either geographical location or mutual interests) might provide both a context for volunteerism and an outcome of volunteerism. That is, a sense of community might encourage people to volunteer and a heightened sense of community might result from the activities engaged in with other volunteers. Indeed, Omoto and Snyder (1995) previously included 'community concern' in their inventory designed to assess the motivations of volunteers who provide service to the community affected by AIDS. Omoto and Malsch (2005) suggested that a psychological sense of community in itself can provide numerous benefits as well as obligations for those who feel attached to a community, such as emotional safety, social support and acceptance. We suspect that one of the outcomes of feeling that one

belongs to a coherent community is the feeling that one can trust and be trusted by other members of the community. For that reason, we think generalised trust and psychological sense of community may go hand in hand and that they are core components of social capital. However, we know of no research to date that has examined these components of social capital as potential outcomes of volunteerism. In our research we surveyed a modest number of Australian volunteers to examine the potential links between volunteers' motives, volunteer activities, and outcomes such as satisfaction, intentions to volunteer in the future, generalised trust and psychological sense of community. We have taken a social psychological perspective and assessed all variables at an individual level rather than a societal level. In keeping with the functional approach (Snyder et al. 2000) we predicted that volunteers who reported higher importance of certain motives to volunteer and that their service activities allowed them to meet these motives would score higher on all outcomes than volunteers who reported that they had been unable to meet their more important motives or had been able only to meet less important motives.

METHOD

Participants

We obtained permission to conduct our research from two Victorian non-profit organisations (along with ethics approval from La Trobe University), chosen because they were known to utilise the services of a large number of volunteers. Volunteer coordinators invited a subset of their regular volunteers to participate;

however, this was not a random or representative sample. We received surveys

from 52 volunteers (out of 90 contacted; 57.8%) from 'Organisation A', an

organisation focused on helping families in poverty, and 33 volunteers (out of

100; 33%) from 'Organisation B', an organisation focused on helping individuals

with chronic illness and their caregivers. The 85 volunteers (66 female, 19 male)

varied in age (19 to 84 yrs; $M = 50.4$, $SD = 16.8$), education level (33.7% high

school or less, 45.8% all or partial university/TAFE qualification, 20.5% all or

partial postgraduate degree) and employment (23.5% full-time; 23.5% part-time,

$M = 16.1$ hrs/wk, $SD = 7.0$; 53% not employed). These volunteers contributed

from 1/2 hr to 20 hrs/wk to these organisations ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 3.66$; 10

volunteers indicated that they participated irregularly or only for certain events,

such as toy drives). Many volunteers (43.5%) also reported volunteering

elsewhere (28.2% at more than one other organisation) for an additional ½ hr to

13 hrs/wk ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 3.05$; 1 irregularly). Overall, these volunteers reported

having volunteered from 2 months to 49 yrs (Median = 5 yrs, $M = 8.60$, $SD =$

10.18) of their lifetimes.

Measures

Table 1 lists means and standard deviations, with sample items, for each scale.

Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary et al. 1998)

Participants assessed the importance of 30 reasons for volunteering, using 7-

point scales ranging from 'not at all important' to 'extremely important'. These

reasons were averaged into six motive scales of five items each representing the six major functions of volunteerism:

- *Values* (alpha = .87; 3 missing cases): to express humanitarian and prosocial values through action

- *Understanding* (alpha = .83; 5 missing cases): to gain greater understanding of the world, the people in it, and oneself

- *Enhancement* (alpha = .80; 4 missing cases): to boost self-esteem, to feel important and needed by others, and to form new friendships

- *Protective* (alpha = .71; 4 missing cases): to distract oneself from personal problems or to work through problems in the context of service

- *Social* (alpha = .76; 5 missing cases): to satisfy the expectations of friends and close others

- *Career* (alpha = .94; 5 missing cases): to explore career options and increase the likelihood that a particular career path can be pursued.

Functional Benefits

Participants indicated the extent to which their volunteer activities allowed them to satisfy their goals or motivations by responding to 15 items, on 7-point Likert scales (with 'not at all' to 'an extreme amount' at the poles) tied directly to the six scales of the VFI. These items assessed Values benefits (2 items; alpha = .57; 3 missing cases), Understanding benefits (4 items; alpha = .80; 2 missing cases), Enhancement benefits (2 items; alpha = .76; 3 missing cases), Protective benefits (2 items; alpha = .82; 5 missing cases), Social benefits (2 items; alpha =

.68; 4 missing cases) and Career benefits (3 items; alpha = .92; 5 missing cases).

Satisfaction

Participants responded to six items (alpha = .90) on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' to 'an extreme amount', to report their satisfaction with their current volunteer activities. One volunteer failed to complete any of the satisfaction items.

Future Intentions

Participants responded to four items (alpha = .91; adapted from Stukas, Snyder & Clary 1999) on 7-point scales, ranging from 'not at all likely' to 'extremely likely'. This scale assessed their predicted likelihood of continuing to volunteer at the same organisation in the future. Six volunteers left at least one of the four items blank.

Generalised Trust Scale (Yamagishi & Yamagishi 1994)

Participants responded to six items (alpha = .84), on 7-point Likert scales ranging from 'extremely disagree' to 'extremely agree'. This scale assessed generalised trust in other people. One volunteer failed to complete all of the items. Psychological Sense of Community (text heading 3) Participants responded to four items (alpha = .82), on 7-point Likert scales ranging from 'extremely disagree' to 'extremely agree'. This scale assessed their beliefs about whether

volunteerism contributes to a psychological sense of community and forges trust.

The items were: 'My volunteer work has made me feel more a part of our

community'; 'When necessary, people in our community work together to try to

improve conditions'; 'People in our community care about each other' and

'Volunteer work helps to build trust in our community'.

Procedure

We delivered surveys to the volunteer coordinators at the organisations who

subsequently delivered them to the volunteers with reply-paid envelopes

provided so surveys could be returned anonymously. Surveys were completed in

early 2004.

RESULTS

Data Transformations

A number of the variables had skewed distributions in this sample. The Career,

Social, and Protective VFI scores and the Career and Protective benefits scores

were positively skewed (i.e. more low scores than high scores) whereas the

Values VFI scores and the Values and Understanding benefits scores were

negatively skewed (i.e. more high scores than low scores). Therefore, to return

the scales to normal distributions necessary for statistical analysis, these scores

were linearly transformed (using square-root, inverse, and logarithmic

transformations depending upon the extent of the skew; Tabachnick & Fidell

1996) and then all scales were standardised (converted to z-scores so that

distributions have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one) to make differently transformed scales and untransformed scales compatible.

Descriptive Results

Table 1 presents the untransformed means and standard deviations for each of the six VFI scales, the six functional benefits scales and the four outcomes. Each VFI scale score was significantly correlated with its relevant functional benefits scale score: Values ($r = .57$, $p < .000$); Understanding ($r = .73$, $p < .001$); Enhancement ($r = .78$, $p < .001$); Protective ($r = .69$, $p < .001$); Social ($r = .30$, $p = .008$); and Career ($r = .83$, $p < .001$). There were no significant differences on the six VFI scales or the six functional benefit scales between volunteers from the two organisations.

The four outcomes were significantly correlated with each other: Satisfaction and Intentions ($r = .50$, $p < .001$), Satisfaction and Trust ($r = .51$, $p < .001$), Satisfaction and Sense of Community ($r = .62$, $p < .001$), Intentions and Trust ($r = .28$, $p = .012$), Intentions and Sense of Community ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), and Trust and Sense of Community ($r = .81$, $p < .001$). For theoretical reasons, we have kept these measures separate in our analyses, but it is important to note that volunteers who were satisfied and felt that they would continue to volunteer in the future also felt greater generalised trust toward others and a sense that volunteerism builds the community.

Tests of the Matching Principle

To test our hypotheses, derived from the functional approach, that volunteers who felt that their activities allowed them to satisfy their most important motivations would be higher on all outcomes than those who did not find a match, we considered z-scores above zero as high scores and z-scores below zero as low scores for both motives and benefits scales. We used planned contrasts to test whether volunteers who scored high on motives and high on benefits reported receiving higher outcomes than volunteers who either scored low on motives and benefits or experienced a mismatch of motives and benefits; this is the same analysis conducted by Clary et al. (1998). Satisfaction and Sense of Community proved skewed (i.e. more high scores than low scores) and were subjected to square-root transformations; however, the patterns of results were similar whether these outcomes were transformed or not. Thus, we present the analyses based on the untransformed outcomes (see Table 2 for cell means and standard deviations). All contrasts were examined without assuming equal variances because sample sizes were different across the four conditions, due in part to the distributions of motive and benefit scores (i.e. the proportion of high and low scorers changes for each combination of motive and benefit) and due in part to a handful of missing cases on each measure. Although these statistical tests are generally robust to violations of homogeneity of variance (and our results remain substantially similar without this safeguard), we felt it best to take a conservative approach; thus, the degrees of freedom for these tests reflect the

harmonic mean cell sizes. For simplicity's sake, we report only the significant results.

The pairing of high motive importance and high benefits mattered most when it came to the Values and Understanding functions, with all four outcomes significantly greater than when such a match did not exist: Values (Satisfaction $t(68.05) = 3.99$, $p < .001$; Intentions $t(60.05) = 3.52$, $p = .001$; Trust $t(73.23) = 1.99$, $p = .050$; Community $t(67.20) = 5.34$, $p < .001$) and Understanding (Satisfaction $t(59.34) = 2.79$, $p = .007$; Intentions $t(39.79) = 2.49$, $p = .017$; Trust $t(57.03) = 2.64$, $p = .011$; Community $t(57.02) = 4.36$, $p < .001$).

The matching principle found somewhat less support in the analysis of outcomes for the Enhancement, Protective and Social functions. Perhaps this reflected their lesser importance to the volunteers in this sample, with only certain outcomes greater for those volunteers reporting a high motive/high benefit match as compared to volunteers without such a match: Enhancement (Intentions $t(26.89) = 2.09$, $p = .046$; Community $t(51.55) = 1.91$, $p = .062$), Protective (Satisfaction $t(36.11) = 3.37$, $p = .002$; Intentions $t(29.31) = 1.95$, $p = .061$; Trust $t(37.14) = 1.99$, $p = .054$), and Social (Satisfaction $t(32.20) = 1.69$, $p = .100$; Trust $t(37.13) = 1.98$, $p = .056$; Community $t(42.39) = 2.72$, $p = .009$). Given the general lack of importance of the Career function (mean < 2.00) and a general lack of perceived Career benefits (mean < 2.00), no significant effects of a high motive/high benefit match were found for our four outcomes.

Number of Matches

Finally, we examined whether the number of high motive/high benefit matches was related to our outcomes. As can be seen in Table 3, linear trends suggest that as the number of matches increased, so too did scores on each of the four outcomes. Indeed, when volunteers with no matches were compared to those with 1 or 2 and to those with 3 or more matches, our results suggest that having 1 or 2 matches is enough for the highest levels of satisfaction, future intentions and generalised trust (i.e. no different from the outcomes of those volunteers with more matches). Volunteers who reported 3 or more matches had significantly higher scores on our psychological sense of community measure than those who reported 1 or 2 (who had significantly higher scores than those who reported no matches). Examined continuously, the total number of high motive/high benefit matches was significantly correlated with Satisfaction ($r = .45$, $p < .001$), Intentions ($r = .35$, $p = .002$), Trust ($r = .33$, $p = .003$), and Sense of Community ($r = .48$, $p < .001$).

DISCUSSION

Volunteers in our study who perceived that their most important motives for volunteering were matched with opportunities to have these motives fulfilled (i.e. functional benefits) reported greater satisfaction and higher intentions to volunteer in the future. They also reported higher levels of two indicators of social capital, generalised trust and psychological sense of community, than volunteers

who did not find their primary motives matched in their work. These findings replicate published North American research supporting the functional approach to volunteerism and its matching principle with regard to volunteer satisfaction and future intentions (Clary et al. 1998). Thus we suggest that organisations may enhance their ability to recruit and retain volunteers by assessing the motives of potential volunteers and then ensuring that available activities fulfil these motives by providing relevant benefits. More importantly, our findings also extend research on the functional approach to include new outcomes that have implications for societal harmony and cohesion. If volunteers report greater generalised trust and psychological sense of community when they are able to meet their motives for service, then care and attention to making the volunteer experience a successful one for each volunteer seems even more important. Thus communities and societies may increase social capital (and potentially decrease social ills such as alienation and crime; Putnam 2000) by encouraging volunteerism and seeking to increase the rate and frequency of successful volunteering experiences.

Naturally our pattern of results may reflect the particular characteristics of the volunteers we surveyed. Our participants varied substantially, in age and volunteer experience among other things, but our sample was too small to properly examine such individual differences along with our other aims. Given our small sample size and non-random recruitment procedures, readers are warned against generalising our results too widely. These particular volunteers

saw their service primarily as a way to express their important prosocial values and to gain a greater understanding of other people and the world around them. Consistent with the functional approach, it is for these two motivations that our matching results were the strongest, with significant effects on both individual and social capital outcomes when relevant benefits were also seen to be available. However enhancement, protective and social motivations were also important to some of these volunteers and, for those who also found matched benefits, a number of outcomes were higher. For example, volunteers who found that they were able to live up to the social expectations of people close to them through volunteering, reported greater trust in other people and agreed more that volunteerism builds a sense of community. Few of our volunteers cited career advancement as an important goal to be met by their service (which is different to some other samples, particularly student samples, Clary et al. 1998). Nevertheless, when we added up the number of important motives for which volunteers reported matches with functional benefits, we found that the total number of matches was correlated with all four outcomes. Volunteers who are able to satisfy a greater number of important goals through volunteer work may be even more likely to contribute to positive outcomes for both self and society as compared to those who satisfy fewer (or no) goals.

Although it is tempting to conclude from these results that volunteer activities which provide opportunities to satisfy important motivations can help to create social capital, our findings can just as easily be interpreted as suggesting that

people who already feel greater trust toward others and a psychological sense of community are more likely to find volunteer work that allows them to satisfy their primary motives. There is no way to determine the direction of the effect (or whether the variables are causally related) in our cross-sectional correlational study. We note too, that our short self-designed measure of psychological sense of community was highly correlated with Yamagishi and Yamagishi's (1994) measure of generalised trust, suggesting that they may be tapping the same underlying construct. Nevertheless, in this sample, volunteers who felt more favourably toward their volunteer work and toward people in their communities also saw more important benefits (both desired and received) to be gained from volunteerism. Finding that these measures go together according to the predictions of the functional approach is a good first step toward understanding the links between volunteerism and social capital.

Future research is necessary on several fronts. First, researchers must determine the direction and strength of the pathways between volunteerism and social capital. The relationship between volunteerism and social capital is not likely to be a simple one (Onyx & Leonard 2000). Participating in community service has often been touted as likely to make a contribution to social capital (Stukas & Dunlap 2002; for an alternative perspective see Cox 2000), but it is just as easy to argue that bountiful social capital may lead to the initiation of volunteerism (Portes 1998). Perhaps, ultimately, rates of volunteerism and levels of social capital will be found to form a feedback loop, such that the relationship

between them is bidirectional with increased volunteerism and social capital going hand in hand (Brady, Schlozman & Verba 1999). Longitudinal studies are needed to test this hypothesis.

Second, researchers must determine the mediators of the link between volunteer activity and social capital. We have suggested that generalised trust may develop as a product of acting in a trustworthy manner, but this needs to be tested empirically. Researchers could assess the influence of successful volunteering on volunteers' self-perceptions as helpful and trustworthy and then determine whether such self-perceptions contribute to a belief that others in society are just as likely to be helpful. Putnam's (2000) hypothesis that social capital is built through individual relationships also deserves careful examination. Volunteers may develop mutually beneficial relationships both with other volunteers and with the recipients of their service and specific feelings of trust and concerns about reciprocity may be generalised from these close relationships to beliefs about others in society. Studies that examine affect, behaviour and cognition in actual social interactions in volunteer settings may be necessary to determine how trust between individuals and a broader sense of community develop over time through volunteer work.

Third, researchers must determine further moderators of the link between volunteer activity and social capital. We found here that being able to satisfy important motives through service activities may help to determine whether

generalised trust develops, but there may be other variables that also determine when volunteer work is likely to be successful at generating social capital and when it is not. For example Stolle and Rochon (1998) reported that members of more diverse community organisations in the United States, Germany and Sweden had higher levels of social capital, including generalised trust and reciprocity, than members of less diverse organisations. Perhaps volunteer organisations and activities that create connections between individuals from diverse social and cultural groups may be able to contribute a more valuable resource for multicultural societies such as Australia. Studies that look broadly at organisational differences and narrowly at relationships and interactions between people of different backgrounds are needed.

In conclusion, we believe that volunteerism and other forms of community service may help to mend the sense that connections between people in society are potentially fraying. To best achieve this goal, sensitivity to the needs and goals of all who come together to enhance the community may be necessary from government, business and the community. To ensure that volunteering has the effect of improving social capital volunteer activities need to be designed with the greatest care and attention paid to the differing motivations of volunteers and the consequent benefits they seek. A good first step would be greater appreciation by all of the contributions of volunteers to the health and well-being of our communities and our society.

REFERENCES

Brady H, Schlozman KL and Verba S 1999, 'Prospecting for participants: Rational expectations and the recruitment of political activists', *American Political Science Review,* vol. 93, pp. 153-169

Clary EG, Snyder M, Ridge RD, Copeland J, Stukas AA, Haugen J and Miene P 1998, 'Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 74, pp. 1516-1530

Clary EG, Snyder M, Ridge RD, Miene P and Haugen J 1994, 'Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* vol. 24, pp. 1129-1149

Cox E 2000, 'The 'light and dark' of volunteering' in J Warburton and M Oppenheimer (eds), *Volunteers and Volunteering,* The Federation Press, Sydney

Gouldner AW 1960, 'The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement', *American Sociological Review,* vol. 25, pp. 161-178

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

Lyons M and Fabiansson C 1998, 'Is volunteering declining in Australia?', *Australian Journal on Volunteering,* vol. 3 no. 2, pp. 15-21

Omoto AM and Malsch AM 2005, 'Psychological sense of community: Conceptual issues and connections to volunteerism-related activism', in AM Omoto (ed) *Processes of community change and social action,* Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ

Omoto AM and Snyder M 1995, 'Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* vol. 68 no. 4, pp. 671-686

Omoto AM and Snyder M 2002, 'Considerations of community: The context and process of volunteerism', *American Behavioral Scientist,* vol. 45, pp. 846-867

Onyx J and Leonard R 2000, 'Women, volunteering and social capital', in J Warburton and M Oppenheimer (eds) *Volunteers and Volunteering*, The Federation Press, Sydney

Portes A 1998, 'Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology', *Annual Review of Sociology,* vol. 24, pp. 1-24

Putnam RD 2000, *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*, Simon & Schuster, New York

Smith MB, Bruner JS and White RW 1959, *Opinions and personality,* Wiley, New York

Snyder M, Clary EG and Stukas AA 2000, 'The functional approach to volunteerism', in G Maio and J Olson (eds) *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes,* Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ

Stolle D and Rochon TR 1998, 'Are all associations alike? Member diversity, associational type, and the creation of social capital', *American Behavioral Scientist,* vol. 42, pp. 47-65

Stukas AA and Dunlap MR 2002, 'Community involvement: Theoretical approaches and educational initiatives', *Journal of Social Issues,* vol. 58, pp. 411-427

Stukas AA, Snyder M and Clary EG 1999, 'The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer', *Psychological Science,* vol. 10 no. 1, pp. 59-64

Tabachnick BG and Fidell LS 1996, *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed), Harper-Collins, New York

Tschirhart M, Mesch DJ, Perry JL, Miller TK and Lee G 2001, 'Stipended volunteers: Their goals, experiences, satisfaction, and likelihood of future service', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* vol. 30 no. 3, pp.422-443

Volunteering Australia 2004, 'Snapshot 2004: Volunteering report card', retrieved on 15 September 2005 from

http://www.volunteeringaustralia.org/documents/snapshot2004reportcard2_000.pdf

Wieselquist J, Rusbult CE, Foster CA and Agnew CR 1999, 'Commitment, pro-relationship behavior and trust in close relationships', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* vol.77, pp. 942-966

Worth KA, Snyder M and Clary EG 2005, 'New approaches to investigating the matching of motives to experiences in the volunteer process' paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, New Orleans, LA

Yamagishi T and Yamagishi M 1994, 'Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan', *Motivation and Emotion,* vol. 18, pp. 129-166

bios

Arthur A. Stukas is a senior lecturer in social psychology in the School of
Psychological Science, La Trobe University. Dr Stukas and Michelle Dunlap
recently co-edited an issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* on 'Community
Involvement: Theoretical Approaches and Educational Initiatives'.

Maree Daly is a PhD candidate in the School of Psychological Science, La Trobe
University. In addition to her research on volunteerism, Maree is researching
changes that occur to the self-concept across the transition to motherhood and
associated changes in psychological well being.

Martin J. Cowling is a leading consultant with almost 20 years of volunteer
management experience. Martin has successfully built volunteer programs in
Australian organisations and provides consultation and training in the UK, USA,
Australia and New Zealand.

Table 1

Sample Items and Descriptive Statistics for Measures

_____

Scale	Sample Item	M	SD
Volunteer Functions Inventory			
Values	I feel it is important to help others.	5.77	1.14
Understanding	Volunteering lets me learn through direct 'hands on' experience.	4.29	1.41
Enhancement	Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.	3.53	1.37
Protective	Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.	2.49	1.12
Social	People I'm close to want me to volunteer.	2.22	1.12
Career	Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.	1.79	1.37
Functional Benefits			
Values Benefits	I show my concern for the people who are helped.	5.71	1.22
Understanding Benefits	I learn more about the cause for which I work.	5.02	1.32
Enhancement Benefits	I feel important.	3.64	1.66
Protective Benefits	I feel less lonely.	2.18	1.45
Social Benefits	I live up to the expectations of my friends or family by volunteering.	3.24	1.70
Career Benefits	I am able to add important experience to my resume.	1.85	1.54
Outcomes			
Satisfaction	I enjoy my volunteer experience.	5.75	1.03

Future Intentions	I will be a volunteer for 'Organisation A' one year from now.	4.81	1.75
Generalised Trust	Most people are basically honest.	5.26	0.87
Sense of Community	People in our community care about each other.	5.12	1.02

_____

Note. All items were responded to on 7-point scales and all scores were created by averaging items together.

Table 2

Satisfaction, Future Intentions, Generalised Trust, and Sense of Community as a Function of VFI and Functional Benefit Scores (Significant Results Only)

	VFI Score							
	High				Low			
	High Benefits		Low Benefits		High Benefits		Low Benefits	
VFI Scale/Outcomes	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Values	n = 35		n = 11		n = 13		n = 21	
Satisfaction**	6.23	0.75	5.50	0.93	5.94	0.84	4.90	1.12
Intentions**	5.66	1.16	4.88	1.67	4.62	1.75	3.80	2.06
Trust*	5.49	0.73	5.71	0.64	5.05	0.76	4.67	1.00
Community**	5.68	0.64	5.27	0.48	4.79	0.97	4.24	1.11
Understanding	n = 30		n = 11		n = 12		n = 26	
Satisfaction**	6.18	0.77	5.55	0.93	6.14	1.05	5.09	1.06
Intentions*	5.54	1.30	4.08	1.98	5.77	0.99	4.06	1.88
Trust*	5.63	0.82	5.26	0.65	5.40	0.73	4.74	0.93
Community**	5.67	0.66	4.95	0.75	5.11	1.00	4.44	1.12
Enhancement	n = 29		n = 9		n = 8		n = 34	
Intentions*	5.48	1.23	4.07	2.03	5.47	1.35	4.42	1.93
Community†	5.38	0.85	5.28	0.74	4.81	0.74	4.84	1.21
Protective	n = 34		n = 8		n = 8		n = 29	
Satisfaction**	6.22	0.83	5.73	0.91	5.27	1.17	5.28	1.05
Intentions†	5.27	1.43	4.41	1.50	4.21	2.11	4.71	1.92
Trust†	5.44	0.76	5.33	0.42	4.77	0.99	5.07	1.02
Social	n = 18		n = 17		n = 14		n = 29	
Satisfaction†	6.08	0.91	5.58	0.92	5.89	1.05	5.48	1.15
Trust†	5.57	0.68	5.34	0.87	5.25	0.97	4.90	0.86
Community**	5.56	0.66	5.28	0.83	5.06	1.07	4.64	1.13
Career	n = 22		n = 6		n = 7		n = 43	
No Significant Results								

Contrasts comparing High Motivation/High Benefits to all other groups:
**p < .01; *p < .05; †p < .10

Table 3

Outcomes as a Function of Total Number of High Motive/High Benefit Matches

| | Total Number of Matches | | | |
| | | | | Linear |
Outcomes	**0**	**1-2**	**3 or more**	**Trend F**
n	17	29	31	df (1, 74)
Satisfaction	4.75_a (1.06)	5.80_b (0.89)	6.16_b (0.85)	24.13***
Intentions	3.84_a (2.26)	4.89_b (1.48)	5.46_b (1.32)	10.30**
Trust	4.54_a (0.88)	5.32_b (0.85)	5.48_b (0.71)	13.11***
Community	4.18_a (1.04)	5.04_b (1.00)	5.56_c (0.65)	26.52***

***$p < .001$ **$p < .01$
Note: Different subscripts in a row denote significant mean differences ($p < .05$).