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Abstract

This doctoral thesis sought to expand the work on functionalist theory and how it relates to the motivation of nonprofit volunteers. In doing so, this study attempts to understand what motivates people to do volunteer work and how this information might help nonprofit leaders recruit and retain volunteers. Information from this study may provide an enhanced understanding of the current volunteer base of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi and allow for new messaging and programming that will aid the desired growth within the Society.

The survey consisted of three sections: First, is an opt-out question that determined volunteer status; second, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) developed Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, and Haugen (1998); and third, a selection of demographic questions that will be used to better categorize volunteer motives. The 30-item VFI scale was applied to measure the motivation of the 2011-2012 volunteers of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

The results of this research may provide practitioners that are recruiting and retaining volunteer campus organization advisors (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi chapter officers) at higher education institutions the opportunity to revise their recruitment strategies to better develop messaging that is directed towards specific volunteers based on their motivational factors. Results may also assist similar nonprofit organizations in providing valuable programs and services.

Keywords: honor societies, motivation, volunteers, functional theory, The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Volunteerism is considered to be any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group, or organization (Wilson, 2000). Although volunteerism has existed for centuries, formalized volunteer programs have come about only recently (Ellis, 1985). As the significance of volunteer work in America continues to grow each year, nearly all nonprofit organizations are reliant on volunteers. For that reason, the recruitment and retention of volunteers has become a chief focus for nonprofit organizations if they are going to continue to provide their important services.

Higher education nonprofit organizations, such as honor societies, have the same need for volunteers. Honor societies call for the assistance of unpaid helpers, in the form of faculty, staff, administration, students, and alumni, to carry out their important work on the campuses of colleges and universities. Despite the continuous need for volunteer assistance, the value of engaging in service within higher education has changed over time. There was once a time that in order to obtain promotion and tenure in most universities, faculty must provide evidence of teaching, research, and service (Heeney, Gould, & DeSpain, 2000). The suggestion of most promotion and tenure processes was that each of the three components was equally important; except, over time, the role of faculty engaging in service became less beneficial for gaining tenure and promotion. In addition, faculty members who volunteer to serve as advisors for campus organizations have learned that advising is not among their primary responsibilities of instruction, service and research (Meyer, 2008).

Faculty involvement with students is considered a determining factor in college students’ satisfaction, persistence, intellectual and personal development (Floerchinger, 1992); however, the benefits of serving students as a student organization advisor are “extrinsic to the faculty
reward system” (Cuyjet, 1996, p. A34). Coplin and Rosch (2007) indicated faculty members are rewarded more for research and teaching than for service as a student organization.

The function of service at a college or university has shifted over the last century, and it goes beyond the faculty. Today most higher education service initiatives are focused primarily on community service projects and the implementation of service learning experiences. Heeney, Gould, DeSpain (2000), found service in higher education is now being equated with serving on committees inside and outside of the university, volunteering in the community, and providing requested materials. This shift has caused many campus organizations, such as honor societies, to have a more difficult time recruiting and retaining volunteers to serve as local and national officers.

**Background of the Problem**

The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi has a proud 115-year history of honoring academic excellence. The mission of the Society is “to recognize and promote academic excellence in all fields of higher education and to engage the community of scholars in service to others” (Phi Kappa Phi, 2012b, p. 1). To help carry-out this mission, Phi Kappa Phi has a rich tradition of mobilizing both members and nonmembers to serve as volunteers. Annually 1,200-1,800 faculty, staff, administrators, and students from the higher education community will volunteer their time to recognize “the best and the brightest” students on their college or university campus. However, in recent years, the national staff and board of directors have noticed a trend in the number of volunteers to be declining.

Volunteers play an enormous role within all honor societies and particularly at Phi Kappa Phi. According to the Bylaws (August 2010), each of the Society’s chapters are required to have a mixture of faculty, staff, administrators, students and alumni who serve in the position of
The elective chapter officers shall include a minimum of a President, a President Elect, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and at least two Student Vice Presidents. Other offices may be held by faculty, administrators, professional staff, or alumni as the chapter may prescribe, such as a Public Relations Officer or Member-at-Large (Bylaws, August 2010). In addition, members also volunteer as committee members and/or elected as members of the Society’s Board of Directors (Bylaws, August 2010).

Throughout Phi Kappa Phi’s 115 year history, there has been little empirical research conducted. The information that does exist has been limited to a few research studies that were outsourced to consulting groups for a variety of organizational objectives. Sinclair, Townes, and Company (1995) conducted a qualitative feasibility study to determine the potential for success of a fundraising campaign. SSA Consultants (2000) performed a mixed-method study of the organization that primarily focused on new member satisfaction, operational practices, staffing structure, and benchmarks for key operational practices. The Schapiro Research Group (2004) administered a quantitative survey to members in order to better understand the perceived value of Phi Kappa Phi’s member benefits (such as discounts, professional development opportunities and Society-based publications). The most recent scientific research was directed by the Schapiro Research Group (2005) and it was solely focused on surveying members in order to assess the readership of the Society publication, the Phi Kappa Phi Forum, and to identify the membership’s evaluation of and preferences for the magazine. Research on the subject of Phi Kappa Phi’s volunteers has been limited to some informal surveys conducted by the national staff.

Luebke, Nalley, Snyder, Ravin, and Mosley (2001) in A Century of Scholarship: One Hundred-Year History of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, describe the Society’s volunteers
as people who have maintained a consistency of purpose and have been dedicated in their commitment to the society’s mission of promoting honor and excellence in all fields of higher education. Yet, the leadership of Phi Kappa Phi has also experienced the external challenges of recruiting and retaining local and national volunteers. Over the years, the lack of participation at some institutions has lead to a number of chapters being placed on inactive status, and certain inactivity has even resulted in the charter being withdrawn.

Phi Kappa Phi is comparable to many higher education campus organizations; the shift in the role of service at colleges and universities has resulted in some problems with recruiting and retaining volunteers. In addition, seeing as the majority of Phi Kappa Phi members are initiated as juniors, seniors, or graduate students, it is imperative to maintain a relationship with them as they progress through their careers. Increased and sustained volunteer work is needed to carry-out the various duties of the Society, and there is a lack of knowledge of what causes people to do this volunteer work and how their motivation might link with continued volunteering. If these types of nonprofit organizations are going to maintain their position within higher education, the leaders of these organizations will need to better understand the motivation of the people who volunteer on both the local and national level.

**Statement of the Problem**

Nonprofit organizations must be able to recruit and retain volunteers if they are going to be able to meet the needs for their services. A review of the literature found limited research on the motivation to volunteer (Clary, et. al, 1998) and there is no known research on what motivates people to volunteer for an honor society. Therefore, the problem is that while increased and sustained volunteer work is needed (such as within the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi), there is insufficient knowledge of what motivates people to do this type of volunteer
work. In order for a college or university to better identify employees to serve as advisors for these types of campus organizations, they may need to determine what motivates a person to volunteer. By addressing this problem of practice, colleges and universities may be better able to identify employees to serve as volunteers. In addition, this study may also provide nonprofit organization leaders with information that will help them to better tailor their messages and organizational activities to support the recruitment and retention of their volunteer workforce.

**Statement of the Purpose**

To facilitate the Society’s mission, it is necessary for the national office to better understand why members engage in volunteer work at both the local and national level. This quantitative study sought to examine the motivation of faculty, staff, administration, and students, who volunteer as chapter officers, committee members, and board of directors for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Comparisons will be made between those who plan to continue volunteering and those who do not, as well as to compare the motivational differences among occupations and specific faculty levels.

Although there is no known research on what motivates people to volunteer for an honor society, some recent studies have been conducted to understand what motivates individuals to volunteer for the Rotary Club (Favreau, 2005), as student organization advisors at four-year institutions (Meyer, 2008), as tutors for nonprofit tutoring programs (Gonzalez, 2009), and as leaders of local and national FFA alumni associations (Gossen, 2011). This study sought to influence higher education volunteer choice decisions by uncovering the motivation of honor society volunteers. The outcomes of this study may also provide information that will lead to improved volunteer recruitment and retention processes for higher education administrators and leaders of similar membership-based academic nonprofit organizations.
Research Questions

The desire to understand the motivation of honor society volunteers lead to four primary research questions. The specific research questions to be answered in this exploratory doctoral thesis were:

1. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer?
2. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level?
3. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group?
4. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study was to better understand the motivation to serve as volunteers for a collegiate honor society. This study compared local and national volunteers, and determined if there were differences in motivation based on demographic characteristics, volunteer positions, professional positions, and faculty rank. This information may be used to help recruit and retain volunteers for a variety of volunteer-based organizations and to help colleges and universities to create incentive and rewards programs to recognize individuals who volunteer to advise campus organizations. In addition, nonprofit membership-based organizational leaders also may utilize the information as a tool for developing recruiting and
retention plans. In summary, the information from this study may be valuable for various types of volunteer and service organizations.

**Definitions of Terms**

The following definitions are provided for words, terms, or phrases found within the study to ensure a standardized understanding of the terminology:

*Active Chapter/Society Member* – Chapter/society dues have been paid for the current year (Bylaws, August 2010).

*Board of Directors* – the Board of Directors in partnership with the Executive Director govern the affairs of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi with an emphasis on: (1) Outward vision; (2) Strategic leadership; (2) Policy development and oversight; (3) Collective proactive decision-making; and (4) Future goals and objectives (PKP, 2004). The 2010-2012 Board of Directors was made up of President, President Elect, Past President, Executive Director (non-voting member), Vice President for Member and Marketing Benefits, Vice President for Chapters Relations, Vice President for Fellowships and Awards, Vice Presidents for Finance, two Vice Presidents for Students, and two Vice Presidents at Large are appointed (Bylaws, August 2010).

*Chapter Officers* – members and non-members who serve as local officers (President, Vice-President/President Elect, Secretary, Treasurer, Student Vice Presidents, Past President, Scholarship and Awards Officer, Public Relations Officer, or Chapter Administration), for a chapter of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. The Society Bylaws specify that only active members may vote or hold office (except for the position of Chapter Administration) (Bylaws, August 2010).
Committee Members – Standing committees and councils are those that have continuous existence. All standing committees and councils are advisory to the Board. In 2010-2012, there were the following standing committees and councils: Executive, Chapter Relations, Investment, Marketing and Member Benefits, Fellowship and Awards Council, Bylaws, Council of Students, and others (special workgroups and ad hoc committees are those that do not have continuous existence) (Bylaws, August 2010).

The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi – Founded in 1897 at the University of Maine, Phi Kappa Phi is the nation's oldest, largest, and most selective collegiate honor society for all academic disciplines (Phi Kappa Phi, 2012b). The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi is also identified as Phi Kappa Phi and the Society.


Proposal Organization

The remainder of this thesis proposal was designed to establish a foundation, assess and discuss the present literature, and describe the research design for this study. First, the theoretical framework section proposes the functional theory of motivation as the method for explaining volunteer motivation and helps refine the assumptions therein. Second, the proposal established both the assumptions and limitations to this study. Third, the proposal reviewed the literature on honor societies, volunteerism, and motivation theory. Finally, a research design was proposed, which includes a description of the participants, methodology, and protection of human subjects.
**Theoretical Framework**

“The idea that an individual would make significant personal sacrifices for another person, particularly when that person is a stranger, has long fascinated students of social behavior” (Clary, et al., 1998, p. 1516). Phi Kappa Phi has both members and nonmembers who annually volunteer their time to serve in a variety of local and national positions within the organization. “Given the increasing demand for volunteers, researchers have begun to explore how volunteerism is instilled in emerging professionals. A better understanding of the motives that underlie professional volunteerism may be useful in recruiting and training professionals to give back to their communities” (Fletcher & Major, 2004, p. 110). Clary et al. (1998) declares that people volunteer for different personal reasons to satisfy different psychological functions. This position is based on the framework of the functional theory of motivation.

**Functionalism.** Functionalist theory is the primary line of psychological theory that provides the foundation for this doctoral thesis. The functional theory of motivation is based on the work of Katz (1960) and Smith, Bruner, and White (1956). They are well known for their work on the study of attitudes in the field of personality and social psychology (Clary, et al., 1998). In the decades that followed the early work on the theory of functionalist psychology, researchers looked beyond observable behavior by studying the variety of processes that occurred as a person engaged in a particular behavior (Brennan, 1998). According to Brennan (1998), the issue of why people do what they do, has remained a core question for researchers of functionalist theory.

Katz’s (1960) research was focused on the how and why of people’s attitudes by considering it from the functionalist perspective. This research focused on linking motivation to attitudes; the conclusion was that people came to embrace certain attitudes because those
attitudes somehow served the needs of the people. Snyder (1993) researched the issue of volunteer behavior in the context of functionalist theory and how it directly linked to the work of Katz (1960).

**Functionalist Theory of Motivation.** The fundamental premise of motivation, rooted in functionalism, was that different people engaged in seemingly the same volunteer tasks may actually be engaging in the volunteer behavior for very different reasons; the function served by the behavior for one individual might vary considerably from another individual (Snyder, 1993). This perspective is particularly important in this study due to its ramifications for recruiting and retaining volunteers. Clary et al. (1998) considered the functional theory of motivation to be consistent with the premise that to successfully recruit and retain volunteers it may not be sufficient to only consider demographics and what observable activities people do who volunteer; it may be equally important to investigate why they volunteer.

The functional perspective concerning motivations to volunteer is chiefly concerned with the “why” of volunteerism (Whitt, 2006). By understanding why people engage in volunteer activities for a specific organization (such as Phi Kappa Phi), it may help organizational leaders facilitate recruitment and retention efforts. Motivation is a concept used to describe the forces acting on or within an individual to initiate or choose a behavior (Beck, 1978; Petri, 1981). Research in this area suggests that recruitment motives and retention motives are distinctly different (Amar, 2001; Andrews, 1995; Messer-Knode, 2007). Also, being able to recognize the motives of individuals who volunteer is critical to the understanding of volunteer recruitment (Dunlap, 2000).

The people who volunteer at Phi Kappa Phi generally do not engage in a short-term or spontaneous altruistic behavior. According to the Society’s bylaws (August 2010), the terms of
chapter officers shall be for two years, except for the student vice presidents whose terms shall be for one year (often as a result of graduation). In addition, chapter officers may also be re-elected. This long-term helping is called “planned helping,” which calls for sorting out priorities and is a very cognitive decision (Clary, et al., 1998). This form of volunteering is considered to be a long-term altruistic behavior. There are common threads in planned helping: (1) the helper must seek out the opportunity to help; (2) the helper arrives at this decision after a period of deliberation; (3) the helper provides assistance over time; and (4) the helper’s decisions about beginning to help and about continuing to help are influenced by whether the particular activity fits with the helper’s own needs and goals (Clary & Snyder, 1999).

Katz (1960) and Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) proposed four psychological functions affecting a person’s actions: knowledge, value expressive, ego defensive, and utilitarian. First, the “knowledge” function is based on an opportunity to understand the world in which people live (Katz, 1960). Second, the “value expressive” function is to help people express their values and convictions (Katz, 1960). This is centered on a personal belief of what is right and wrong and a concern for the needs of others (M. Smith, et al., 1956). Third, the “ego defensive” function addresses the negative influence of undesirable truths affecting the ego (Katz, 1960). This occurs when people attempt to defend decisions that may have had negative consequences. The final one is the “utilitarian,” this function provides a way for individuals to make choices for participating in activities after rationally weighing the pros and cons of such a decision and the impact that may have on future decisions (Katz, 1960).

Smith et al. (1956) identified the “social adjustive” function which addresses attitudes for fitting into or meeting the expectations of important social groups. The researchers proposed that social pressure can be exerted in one of two ways: First, people can either feel the need to
perform some service to fit in or get along with a social group; or second, people choose to participate in activities because it allows them to expand their social circles or provides an avenue by which they can join a new desirable social group (Smith et. al, 1956).

Anchored in the work of these early researchers and their connection to other popular theories of social psychology, Clary et al. (1998) set out to address the multidimensional nature of attitudes. In describing this connection, Clary et al. (1998) explained:

Part of the appeal of these earlier functional theories was the diversity of motivations that they could embrace, a diversity reflecting to some extent the functional theorists' (e.g., Katz, 1960) invoking of the themes of the grand psychological theories of human nature in the functions they proposed (e.g., the defensive function captures elements of psychodynamic theory, the knowledge function is reminiscent of Gestalt psychology, the expressive function has the flavor of self-psychology about it, and the utilitarian and adjustive functions are reminiscent of the behaviorist perspective on human nature) (p. 1517).

The functional approach to understanding volunteer motivation is prevalent in the field of psychology. A key principle of this approach is that people engage in various activities for purposeful, goal-oriented reasons (Fletcher & Major, 2004). According to Clary et al. (1998), functionalist theory provided the framework the authors used to develop the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) survey instrument. The VFI was selected for this thesis since it has been tested extensively to help explain the motivation of generic relevance to volunteerism (Clary, et al., 1998).

Clary et al. (1998) employed the functional application of attitudes by Katz (1960) and Smith et al. (1956) to construct a tool for measuring motivational functions based on attitudes as
they relate directly to the behavior of volunteering. The result was a set of six motivational functions served by volunteerism: values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement. In summary, the VFI is an instrument rooted in the functional approach that matches the motivational characteristic of volunteers to the opportunities afforded by their environment. The VFI is explained in detail in chapter two, as well as some of the research to which the instrument has been applied in previous studies.

Assumptions of the Study

For this doctoral thesis, the underlying paradigm was postpositivism. According to Creswell (2009), this knowledge claim reflects the assumption that deterministic philosophy about research in which causes probably determines effects or outcomes. The problems studied by the postpositivist viewpoint reflect issues that need to “identify and assess the causes that influence the outcomes, such as found in experiments” (Creswell, 2009, p. 231). This type of research makes use of a quantitative process to reduce phenomena into a small set of ideas to test (specific variables) and research questions to answer (Creswell, 2009). Postpositivist studies seek to “approximate the truth rather than aspiring to grasp it in its totality or essence” (Crotty, 1998, p. 29). In addition, this study has been conducted based on the assumption that the data obtained from the sample population is accurate. Every effort will be made to verify such accuracy.

Limitations of the Study

This study attempts to include all Phi Kappa Phi volunteers for a specific period of time, and was limited to the roster of people who volunteered in 2011-2012 (July 1 – June 30). All volunteer chapter officers, committee members and board of directors for 2011-2012, will be asked to voluntarily complete an electronic questionnaire using Survey Monkey™. Chapter
officer lists are annually submitted to the national office by the chapters and the current roster of committee members and board of directors were selected in August of 2010 for the 2010-2012 biennium. The national office has electronic mailing addresses for all current volunteers.

The limitations listed below are the factors that may have effected the results of the study but are beyond the control of the researcher:

1. Chapter officers, committee members, and board of directors may or may not agree to participate in the study.

2. Some volunteer members and nonmembers may not be identified for this study. This can occur when a local chapter does not submit a roster of their current chapter officers, who consequently, will not be coded appropriately in the organizations database.

3. There may be some people who volunteered but were not designated as chapter officers, and consequently, will also not be included in the survey.

4. Survey fatigue may also be a limitation. To combat this concern, the researcher will attempt to keep the length of the survey from being too lengthy in an effort to avoid triggering reduced responses.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Introduction

Volunteerism is a principal factor in the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi’s ability to carry out its mission of honoring academic excellence on the campuses of colleges and universities. However, there is no empirical research that exists on this topic. The intent of chapter two is to present a synopsis of the prior research that is relevant to this doctoral thesis. Since the only research that does exist on Phi Kappa Phi volunteers is limited to a few unscientific surveys conducted by members of the national staff, the review of literature will provide a framework for this study and is presented in four sections. The first section is an overview of the history of honor societies in higher education, the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, and role of volunteers in campus organizations. Second, an examination of the literature on volunteering and volunteer motivation is discussed. The third section is a review of the findings from the literature on motivation theory and retention theory that help frame this proposal. Finally, the selection of a theoretical framework for this study is presented.

History of Honor Societies

According to an address given at the Association of College Honor Societies (ACHS) meeting in 1966 by Dr. Robert W. Bishop, national president of Omicron Delta Kappa (ODK) stated:

“The honor society movement really began in 1885 at Lehigh University with the establishment of Tau Beta Pi, in engineering. In rapid succession other honor societies came into being: Sigma Xi, in scientific research at Cornell, in 1886; Phi Kappa Phi, in all academic fields of University scope at the University of Maine, in 1897; Phi Beta Kappa, founded in 1776 at the College of William and Mary, as a social and literary
fraternity, officially became an honor society in the arts and sciences in 1898, as the result of rapid expansion of education into new fields” (Warren, 2000, p. 1).

Today, there are numerous collegiate honor societies that recognize academic achievement on the campuses of colleges and universities. Each honor society serves a specific function, such as honoring academic achievements based on academic discipline, rank, or service. Despite the fact that these honor societies have impressive histories of honoring high academic achievement, there is little knowledge of their function within higher education.

**Association of College Honor Societies (ACHS).** The collegiate honor society movement grew rapidly from 1900-1925. During this time, 37 honor societies were created for the purpose of honoring students for a variety of reasons and disciplines (Warren, 2000). However, this growth caused problems with the perception of honor societies in the academic community. In an effort to overcome this crisis, Phi Beta Kappa (Liberal Arts), Tau Beta Pi (Engineering), Sigma Xi (Scientific Research), Phi Kappa Phi (All Academic Fields), Alpha Omega Alpha (Medical), and Order of the Coif (Law), formed a council that was called the Association of College Honor Societies (ACHS). This council was originally established to function as a credentialing association for honor societies, whose main purpose was to prepare a roll of distinction, admitting no organization unless it was clearly entitled to a place in ACHS (Warren, 2000).

According to ACHS (2012), the idea that underlies the honor societies in American colleges and universities is threefold: First, they exist primarily to recognize the attainment of scholarship of a superior quality; second, a few societies recognize the development of leadership qualities, character, and good campus citizenship in addition to a strong scholarship
record; and third, to the degree that they make this recognition a thing to be coveted, they encourage the production of superior scholarship and leadership.

In order to accomplish these objectives, honor societies must define and maintain a truly high standard of eligibility for membership and achieve sufficient status. By doing so, that membership becomes something to be highly valued. In addition, if the significance of membership is valued and respected over a wide area; the society with a number of chapters at accredited institutions is stronger and will be admired outside the college (ACHS, 2012).

The growth of honor societies mirrored the expansion and specialization of higher education in America. When Phi Beta Kappa was organized in 1776, there was no thought given to its field, since all colleges then in existence were for the training of men for the service of the church and the state (ACHS, 2012). However, as higher education expanded into new fields, Phi Beta Kappa was pushed to operate in the field of liberal arts and sciences. Phi Beta Kappa made this change officially in 1898, even though the trend was evident much earlier. During the 1880s, Phi Beta Kappa witnessed the establishment of discipline-specific honor societies, such as Tau Beta Pi in the field of engineering and Sigma Xi in scientific research (ACHS, 2012).

**The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.** One of the original honor societies began in 1897, when a forward-thinking student by the name of Marcus L. Urann, was looking for something that would serve as an inspiration to all students of high academic rank. Urann assembled a group of ten students, two faculty members, and the school president together with the purpose of creating change at the University of Maine (O'Steen, 1985). The group sought to form an honor society that was different from the few others then in existence; one that recognized and honored excellence in all academic disciplines. As a result of Urann’s vision, a community of scholars was born and it became the oldest, largest and most highly selective all
discipline honor society (PKP, 2012a). The expansion of Phi Kappa Phi was a result of the presidents of three state universities (University of Maine, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Tennessee). These presidents thought that these institutions should have their honor society; later, Phi Kappa Phi was wisely extended to include any institution of university scope, accepting into membership superior students of all schools of which they have a chartered a chapter (ACHS, 2012).

The Society grew quickly over the years. Chapters of Phi Kappa Phi have been chartered on campuses of over 320 colleges and universities in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. The Society annually inducts over thirty-thousand undergraduate, graduate, and professional school graduates of high academic rank, along with accomplished faculty, professional staff, and alumni (PKP, 2012a). Since its inception in 1897, more than 1.5 million members have joined the ranks of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

In the present day, Phi Kappa Phi is headquartered in Baton Rouge, Louisiana and has 20 full-time employees who make up the paid national staff. The staff’s primary responsibilities are to conduct the day-to-day operations of the society as well as support the members, chapters and volunteers. The volunteer base of the Society annually has 1200-1800 members and non-members who volunteer to serve as the chapter officers, committee members, and board of directors. In an effort to reduce the volunteer load, the staff facilitates programs that are designed to minimize the time and effort it takes chapters to invite and initiate new members. Additionally, Phi Kappa Phi also offers local and national volunteers a variety of training opportunities in order to help them carry-out the duties of their position.

Phi Kappa Phi is devoted to being more than a membership-based organization that recognizes high academic achievement. This ongoing commitment is demonstrated by the
Society’s scholarships and awards programs. Each biennium $1,000,000 is awarded to outstanding students, Phi Kappa Phi members and chapters through the Society's various awards competitions: the Fellowship, Phi Kappa Phi Scholar and Artist, Study Abroad Grants, Literacy Grants, and the Love of Learning Awards (PKP, 2012c). This comprehensive scholarship and awards program allows the Society to have an impact on undergraduates, graduate and professional students, as well as professionals seeking to continue their education.

The importance of campus organizations. Campus organizations play an important role within higher education. Research on the literature supports the conclusion that college students benefit from engaging in campus organizations (Meyer, 2008). Although the research on campus organization advisors is limited, the role of an advisor is indispensible in ensuring learning occurs within the organization (Dunkle & Schuh, 1998). Similar to Phi Kappa Phi, most student organization have “advisors” or “chapter officers” who are members of the college faculty, administration, staff, or students, but some can also be community members (Cuyjet, 1996).

The early development of student organizations in America can be traced back to the American colonial period (mid 1600s) when student activism concentrated on the debate and discussion of certain issues (Croft, 2004). Small groups of organized students gathered to discuss topics such as religion, discipline and governance, and literacy. In addition, sports clubs were formed in the “European tradition, representing such interests as bridge, chess, rugby and sailing” (Dunkle & Schuh, 1998, p. 31). As mentioned earlier, the first Greek letter organization, Phi Beta Kappa, began as a literary society on the campus of William and Mary in 1776 (Dunkle & Schuh, 1998). Phi Beta Kappa quickly expanded and sparked the establishment of other student groups.
This formalized student involvement emerged into the model of extracurriculum. Extracurricular activities function as a way for students to respond to the traditional, strictly classical course of study and reflect the desire for the development of the whole student, personality, and spirit (Nuss, 1996).

**Campus organization volunteers.** Klopf (1960) identified the various selection methods for securing a student organization volunteer. The first method is to look for faculty or staff members who may have a special interest in a particular organization. For example, someone who works in an honors program or college would most likely have an interest in volunteering for an honor society given that is the organization that will likely promote and award the academic achievement of their students. The second approach is to search for community members not employed by the college or university. In this case, a Phi Kappa Phi member from another chapter may be living in a different community after graduation and might be interested in getting involved with a local chapter. The third approach is to have the advisor determined by a college administrative appointment. This situation occurs frequently within Phi Kappa Phi, when an administrator assigns someone from the faculty or staff to serve as a chapter officer.

In some cases, college staff members view their advisor responsibilities as part of their primary job responsibilities. Cuyjet (1996) considered the role of staff at a campus activities office to be one that provides advice, consultation, partnership, leadership and technical assistance to student organizations and programming groups. A study by Hudson (1993) revealed that staff who are hired to advise student organizations most frequently have the roles of educator, resource person, reflector and fact finder. The limitation to this study was it surveyed only individuals who specifically listed student organization advising as part of their job description. DeSawal (2007) stated that professional staff that are hired to advise student
organizations learn from undergraduate experiences, graduate school training, and on-the-job knowledge.

As stated in chapter one, faculty, staff and administrators who volunteer to serve as advisors may determine advising to be not among their primary responsibilities of their jobs. As a result, the present study is different since the primary objective is to research the motivation of individuals who volunteer to serve an honor society and particularly, at the local and/or national level for Phi Kappa Phi. There were 1439 individuals who volunteered for the Society in 2011-2012. At the beginning of the survey, participants will be asked to self-identify as either a volunteer or a paid advisor. Those who identify as a paid advisor will be thanked for their participation and the survey will end. This distinction is made since the researcher holds this sorting to be essential to the credibility of this study.

Research indicates higher education may be a lacking a rewards system for individuals serving as campus organization advisors. Rainwater (2000) conducted a study of faculty advisors for the American Society of Civil Engineers student chapter. Results indicated over 80% of the respondents noted there was little recognition from the academic department for being an advisor, and only 10% of the respondents indicated their teaching or research loads were reduced. In addition, 40% also indicated that they considered their role as an advisor as rewarding, while another 30% did not mind being the advisor. Croft’s (2004) insists the incentive for faculty to serve as campus organization advisors to be their enjoyment of interaction with students outside of the classroom.

**Campus Organizations.** Dunkel and Schuh (1998) estimate that today there are thousands of different organizations that exist on college and university campuses and these groups involve hundreds of thousands of students. These groups can include: athletic
organizations, fraternities and sororities, honor societies, social, special interest, cultural, religious, political, governance, service, media, and academic societies and clubs. This array of student organizations demonstrates the demand of this generation of college students and the enormous need for volunteer advisors.

Croft (2004) states that advising student organizations at a college or university can be one of the most rewarding experiences in an educator’s career due to the influence that the advisor can have on student learning and development. McKaig and Policello (1984) found “the role of the advisor can be an integral element in the success of a student organization and is ensuring that the educational potential of the extracurricular is realized” (p. 45). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2003) states: “the role of campus activity advisor is certainly linked to the quality of student’s involvement experience and thus a student development” (p. 51). Gwost (1982) describes the role of organizational advisors as:

A representative and liaison between organization and student body; an interpreter and contact between the organization and other identities (e.g., university administrators, entertainment industry, and other campus organizations); an information resource regarding organizational procedures, group processes and programming concerns; a resource providing history and continuity between changing organization leaders; a teacher of programming skills and philosophy; a supervisor and legal representative for the university; a counselor, mediator, consultant, and friend (p. 35).

Campus organizations are often numerous and range in size, purpose, and structure (Love, 2003), and not all faculty understand the needs of students. Horowitz and Friedland (1970) revealed that many faculty members based their knowledge about student life upon their own college experiences. Love (2003) believes that regardless of what method is used to select a campus
organization advisor, the advisor needs to understand his or her role within that group.

Advising is not limited to providing advice; research shows advising a campus student organization is the balance of counseling, coaching and planning (Evans, Evans, & Sherman, 2001; Schmidt & Blaska, 1977; Stroup, 1964; Williamson, 1961). Klopf (1960) describes the function of an advisor as trainer, consultant, and participating member. Schaffer and Martinson (1966) described the role of advisor as a liaison between the formal classroom and informal out-of-classroom experience. Steiner (2003) found advisors play a supportive role that often provides insight, suggestions and administrative assistance to the organization.

Hoppis (2005) determined that the level of advisor involvement directly influences the success of a student organization. An advisor who spends time attending meetings, working with student leaders, and participating in the organizations activities is more successful than an advisor that is not directly involved (Hoppis, 2005). A student organization advisor who facilitates the involvement of student leaders (such as the involvement of Student Vice Presidents at Phi Kappa Phi) is likely to have more time to prepare for meetings and accomplish organizational goals.

In summary, the research on campus organization volunteers demonstrates that membership in campus organizations, such as honor societies, has a positive impact on student attachment to the university, career choice and persistence (Meyer, 2008). Because of these benefits, the role of the advisor is vital to the success of the organization. In addition, this is also true for honor societies due to FERPA laws protecting student information. Due to the many functions of the advisor, this study attempts to define the motivation for faculty, staff, administration, and students who volunteer at Phi Kappa Phi. The next section reviews the literature on volunteerism and volunteer motivation.
Volunteerism and Volunteer Motivation

The United States has long been known for its rich tradition of volunteerism, and there are two basic types of volunteering: managed and unmanaged (Butcher, 2010). Managed volunteering takes place through a variety of organizations in the nonprofit, profit, and private sector, and they tend to be more organized. An example of managed volunteering is collegiate honor societies, because of their highly organized structures that take place within higher education. In contrast, unmanaged volunteering often takes place between friends, family, and neighbors. This type of volunteerism is often spur-of-the-moment, such as helping watch a child while a parent runs an errand, or simply helping a neighbor during a time of need. For the purpose of this study, the literature review will focus on managed volunteering, specifically focusing on the nonprofit sector.

Volunteerism. Regardless of the type, volunteerism serves an important function within society. According to the Corporation for National and Community Service (2011), the number of people who engaged in volunteer work in 2010 was about 62.7 million Americans, or 26.5 percent of the adult population, and they gave 8.1 billion hours of volunteer service worth $173 billion. Even with this large quantity of volunteers and their financial worth, the need for more volunteers continues to grow, specifically within the nonprofit sector.

Nonprofit organizations serve countless purposes within society by offering their services. An integral part of many nonprofit organizations is volunteer management, and many nonprofits depend on a volunteer workforce for key tasks (M. A. Hager & Brudney, 2004; Netting, O'Connor, Thomas, & Yancey, 2005). Yet the leaders of these organizations often struggle because the nature of volunteer work implies that people serve “out of the goodness of their heart,” rather than depending on the organization for a paycheck (Adams, Schlueter, &
Garner and Garner (2011) suggest the relationship between volunteers and nonprofits are mutually beneficial; except when something goes wrong, volunteers may be less inclined to address the problem than a paid member of the staff, and may simply leave rather than work with the organization to fix the problem.

From an organizational perspective, larger nonprofit organizations typically combine volunteer labor with paid labor and capital to produce a desired output (Handy & Brudney, 2007). This mixed labor force allows them to carrying out organizational mission and provide services. Other kinds of donations, of money and in-kind goods and services, further allows nonprofits the ability to sell their output at below market prices, or give it away free (Handy & Brudney, 2007). For example, as a result of donations to Phi Kappa Phi’s Foundation, the Society awards more than $1,000,000 each biennium to outstanding students, Phi Kappa Phi members and chapters through the Society's various awards competitions (PKP, 2012c).

Despite the importance of volunteering, the determinants of above-average participation in volunteerism are still largely unknown. Clary et al. (1998) described the characteristics of a volunteers as:

Volunteers are people who (a) often seek out opportunities to help others; (b) may deliberate for considerable amounts of time about whether to volunteer, the extent of their involvement, and the degree to which particular activities fit with their own personal needs; and (c) may make a commitment to an ongoing helping relationship that may extend over a considerable period of time and that may entail considerable personal costs of time, energy, and opportunity (p. 1517).

There is a strong need for nonprofits to attract people who are willing to engage in volunteer work. In the United States, a national study found 80% of charities use volunteers
These volunteers are an integral part of the labor force for many nonprofit organizations, because they are regarded as co-producers alongside the paid labor (J. L. Brudney, 1990). Their willingness to volunteer serves a crucial function for nonprofits to be able to offer their services.

**Recruiting and retaining volunteers.** In order to attract volunteers, some organizations adopt a marketing approach to the recruitment and retention of their volunteers (Wymer, 1999). This methodology views volunteer opportunities like a marketplace in which various "employing organizations" (i.e., nonprofit or public organizations who utilize volunteers) compete against one another for "customers" (i.e., volunteers). Wright, Larsen, and Higgs (1995) believes nonprofit organizations that utilize volunteers are their most important group of customers in that those needing services are plentiful but the supply of volunteers is scarce.

Wymer and Samu (2002) suggest that volunteer work represents an exchange between the "seller" (the organization utilizing volunteers) and the "buyer" (the volunteer) whereby the seller receives the volunteer's labor and the volunteer receives some form of psychosocial benefit. Karl, Peluchette, and Hall (2008) believe successful marketers understand the importance of serving their customers better than competitors, and it is vital for organizations to understand their "customers" and what their needs or motives are for volunteering.

Volunteer motivation has a wealth of existing research. Karl, Peluchette, and Hall (2008) offer an summary of the many motivations for volunteering:

Many individuals volunteer for altruistic reasons (i.e., a desire to help others or do something to benefit society or the community); a sense of duty or obligation to reciprocate for services received by friends or family members; personal development or career enhancement (i.e., gain new skills and useful experience); the desire to feel useful,
productive, or to occupy spare time; and social rewards (i.e., sense of belonging, meet new people) (p. 73).

The recruitment and retention of volunteers has been a developing problem for nonprofit organizations. Looking at it from a public relations perspective, Morton (2006) suggests it is important for an organization to segment their publics in order to better understand the typical volunteer. Volunteers can be segmented by their demographics, generational information, life stage information, and social class (Morton, 2006). Through knowledge of their publics’ values, demographics, and social life, organizations will have a better chance at recruiting and retaining volunteers. “By identifying characteristics that are shared in multiple segments, we can build a more complete picture of volunteers and begin to understand how to target them for our organizations” (Morton, 2006, p. 43)

Volunteers play a key role in nonprofit organizations as a result of their giving of time free of charge, which allows the organization to carry-out its services and activities. In addition, volunteers also provide valuable skills or talents that an organization may lack. This is especially true for the volunteers for Phi Kappa Phi, who often are leaders in their respective fields as both scholars and practitioners. Their expertise brings a wealth of knowledge to the organization. Due to the numerous volunteer opportunities at Phi Kappa Phi, volunteers who serve on national committees and the board of directors, often present an open, participatory image of the organization, and spread the word about its mission.

People who volunteer are often individuals who are willing to sacrifice their personal leisure time for challenging tasks, but they also enjoy doing them. Some of these people are so committed that they champion their specific cause passionately throughout their lives, or eventually become the leader of the organization. That was the case for Phi Kappa Phi, who on
April 30, 2012 announced the hiring of a new executive director, Dr. Mary Todd, who was a charter member and chapter officer from one of Phi Kappa Phi’s newest member institutions at Marshall University.

Despite the many wonderful opportunities available for volunteering, there has been a declining interest in volunteering, which is particularly true at Phi Kappa Phi. When asked why is this happening? Many explanations have been suggested. Some say that people, especially young people, are more self-centered now, or that volunteer work is not valued in our modern, materialistic society. Others believe that voluntary organizations themselves do not make a serious effort to attract, motivate, and retain volunteers. Earlier, the case was made for the devaluing of service in the tenure and promotion process as a contributing factor in the decline in volunteers at institutions of higher learning. Regardless of the reasons, people are not as attracted to volunteering as they once were, and voluntary organizations do not inspire people to work for free.

**Predictors of volunteering.** There are many approaches to study predictors of volunteering, such as demographics. However, beyond studying demographics and lifestyles of the typical volunteer, it is also important to study their psychographic profile which suggests a way of life, a way of doing things, such as activities, interests, and opinions of consumers (Dutta-Bergman, 2004).

**Past volunteering.** One of the strongest predictors of future volunteering among the elderly is past volunteering (Mutchler, Burr, & Caro, 2003; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001). Existing research brings to surface key demographic variables such as age, sex, race, and ethnicity that are significant predictors of volunteering. The Independent Sector (2001) declared charitable donors are more likely than are non-donors to volunteer. Lee, Piliavin, and Call (1999) found that
through role identity, people repeatedly engage in a socially valued activity such as volunteering, they take on this role as a key aspect of their identity and seek out opportunities to fulfill this role in the future. This view is confirmed by Einolf (2009), who suggests people tend to consistently engage in charitable activity over time, so two of the best predictors of future volunteering among the elderly are past volunteering and charitable giving.

**Age.** The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010) states the age groups that are most likely to volunteer were those in the 35 to 44-year-old (31.5%) and the 45 to 54-year-old (30.8%) age ranges. The age groups with the lowest volunteer rates were persons in their early twenties (18.8%) and those age 65 and over (23.9%). However, the 65 and over age group volunteered more hours than any other age group at 90 hours per year, and 25 to 34-year-old age group spent the least amount of time volunteering with an average of 36 hours annually (BLS, 2010). A different study by the Department of Labor (2009) indicates a steady decline in volunteers between the years 2004 and 2008. That study found persons from the 35-44 age bracket, have shown to be the consistently higher volunteering age group closely followed by those 45-54 years of age.

**Race.** The Independent Sector (2001) reports Non-Hispanic Whites tend to volunteer more than do non-Whites and Hispanics, although much of this difference can be explained by racial and ethnic differences in socioeconomic status (T. W. Smith, 2003). The BLS (2010) reported that among the major race and ethnicity groups, Whites continued to volunteer at a higher rate (28.2 percent) than did Blacks (20.3 percent), Asians (20.0 percent), and Hispanics (14.9 percent).

**Gender.** Overall, women volunteer at a higher rate than men (BLS, 2010). The volunteer rate for women in 2009 was 30.1%, while the volunteer rate for men was 23.3%. 
Women tend to volunteer more than men, largely because of the fact that they work fewer hours, on average, in paid employment (Einolf, 2009). Surprisingly, despite the fact women volunteered more often, men spent more time volunteering. According to a report by the BLS (2010) in 2009, women volunteers spent a median of 50 hours volunteering compared to men spending 52 hours on volunteer activities.

**Education.** Among all the demographic variables, education is the most consistent predictor of volunteering (McPherson & Rotolo, 1996; Sundeen & Raskoff, 1995). Wilson (2000) pointed out that education boosts volunteerism by heightening awareness of problems, increasing empathy, and building self-confidence. Educated people are also more likely to be asked to volunteer because they belong to more organizations where they learn civic skills (Wilson, 2000). According to Dutta-Bergman (2004), a common characteristic of the average volunteer is education because it boosts volunteerism by heightening awareness of problems, increasing empathy, and building self-confidence.

The BLS (2010) reports that college graduates volunteered more hours than those with less than a high school diploma. The research shows that individuals with higher educational attainment were more likely to volunteer for multiple organizations compared to those with less education (BLS, 2010). Finally, college graduates were more likely than high school graduates to volunteer in more professional and management related activities, and more likely to provide tutoring, teaching, and mentoring to students than those with less education (BLS, 2010).

**Income.** When it comes to volunteers and income, the evidence is mixed (Wilson, 2000). Some research documented a negative relationship between the hours volunteered and wage income (Wilson, 2000). However, Menchik and Weisbord (1987) found that the hours of volunteering work are positively related to income from all sources. Raskoff and Sundeen (1995)
reported income was positively correlated only with health-related and education-related volunteering and had no impact on religious or informal volunteering.

**Retention of volunteers.** Though knowledge of the motives is effective for recruiting volunteers, the retention of this valuable resource is equally important (Karl, et al., 2008). Wymer and Starnes (2001) suggest effective retention reduces the need for recruitment but it also requires careful attention to all aspects of the volunteer experience. Volunteer turnover can be a "costly" problem for organizations, with rates of up to 30% in some sectors (Wymer, 1998). Mitchell and Taylor (2004) propose that it costs at least five times more to develop a new volunteer than to cultivate greater exchanges with existing ones. Researchers have also suggested that what attracts volunteers to an organization is not necessarily what sustains them once they are "on board" (Bussell & Forbes, 2002).

Dutta-Bergman (2004) suggests that volunteering outlets need to highlight the individual’s responsible commitment to the community as well as incorporate communicative strategies which are appealing to different aspects of a responsible lifestyle. The researcher also suggests that in order to recruit and retain volunteers, organizations must understand the individual and focus on communication strategies.

In summary, a U.S. Department of Labor (2008) study confirms previous research on adult volunteers that demonstrate significantly more females volunteer than males (Hsieh, 2000; Rosenbaum, 1997; Tsai, 2000). Some descriptive studies confirm adult volunteers are more likely to be college-educated (Boughton, 1995; Gentile, 2001; Meyer, 2008; Pauline, 2006; Soo & Gong-Song, 1998; Tsai, 2000) and married with high incomes (Soo & Gong-Song, 1998; Tsai, 2000). Other research shows the diversity and value of the benefits received by volunteers (J.L. Brudney, 2005; Toppe, Kirsch, & Michel, 2002). In addition, there are several studies that show
support for volunteers learning specific job skills as well as finding the opportunity to socialize (Brown & Zahrly, 1989; Menchik & Weisbrod, 1987; Schram & Dunsing, 1981; Vaillancourt & Payette, 1986).

**Volunteer Motivation.** Given that a volunteer is someone who provides unpaid services and receives non-monetary compensation in return; people often wonder what the motivation for individuals to engage in volunteerism is? Handy et al. (2007) state that “volunteering can increase their human and social capital; on-the-job training and social connections made while volunteering can be profitable, augmenting their personal and professional status” (p. 2). For example, a volunteer at Phi Kappa Phi could reap prestige and status from serving on the national board.

Motivation is a concept used to describe the forces acting on or within an individual to initiate or choose a behavior (Beck, 1978; Petri, 1981). Understanding the motivation of volunteers is critical to understanding volunteer recruitment (Dunlap, 2000). While honor society volunteer motivation is not known to have been studied, research has been conducted to understand volunteer motivation in other contexts.

Brudney (2005) characterizes volunteers into two groups: “service” volunteers are individuals who volunteer their time to help other people directly (e.g., chapter officers), and “policy” volunteers (e.g., board members) are citizens who assume the equally vital role of sitting as a board of director for a nonprofit organization. Both groups work together to carry-out the mission of the organization. Volunteering appears to spring from a mixture of altruistic and instrumental motivations. Brudney (2005) maintains that volunteers can pursue both types simultaneously: “One can certainly help others, derive strong interest and satisfaction in the
work, learn and grow from the experience, and enjoy the company of friends and colleagues in the process” (p. 330).

There are many benefits for people who engage in volunteer activities. In fact, many researchers classify benefits and motivation as the same, and they should not be underestimated. Smith (2001) states there was a time when volunteering was based on the idea of a gift relationship but now most people see it as an exchange, where volunteers are motivated because both giver and receiver benefit in equal measure. Nowadays volunteers can quickly cite a rich list of benefits, from meeting friends, to learning new skills, and gaining a different perspective on life (J.L. Brudney, 2005).

In the field of economics, researchers provide some explanations for giving behavior, both time-giving (volunteering) and money-giving (donation). Handy and Mook (2011) describes a consumption-focused or “private” benefits model as one that assumes that individuals receive private benefits, including the “warm glow” from the very act of giving. A more investment-focused model implies that volunteers obtain private benefits from the training and acquire skills through volunteering, which increases their human capital (Handy & Mook, 2011). In addition, volunteers build social networks that augment their social capital.

Handy et al. (2000) and Cnaan, Handy, and Wadsworth (1996) formalized the use of this positive net-costs model by assuming that rational volunteers who are impure altruists will calculate the private and public benefits of their act of volunteering; they will only volunteer if the sum of these benefits exceeds their private costs. Therefore, even though there are positive private net costs, individuals volunteer because they care for the public benefits of their actions.

Economists have also looked at volunteerism as an opportunity to expand human capital by offering skills training (Hackl, Halla, & Pruckner, 2007; Musick, Herzog, & House, 1999).
Other studies have focused on the private benefits of volunteering as a means for increasing social capital (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Glaeser, Laibson, & Sacerdote, 2002; Proutcu & Wolff, 2006; Wilson, 2000). Researchers have also considered volunteerism as a stepping stone for immigrants seeking employment skills (Handy & Greenspan, 2009). In addition, Schram and Dunsing (1981) found women who have been out of the labor force raising children used volunteering as method to gain experience as a re-entrance strategy.

Research indicates that volunteers may also receive numerous private benefits that go way beyond the warm glow of giving. There are numerous studies that document the benefits of volunteering for an aging population. For example, the relationship of volunteering with reduced mortality (Musick, et al., 1999), increased physical function (Lum & Lightfoot, 2005), increased levels of self-rated health (Morrow-Howell, Kinnevy, & Mann, 1999), muscular strength (Fried et al., 2004), reduced depressive symptomatology (Musick & Wilson, 2003), reduced pain (Arnstein, Vidal, Wells-Federman, Morgan, & Caudill, 2002), mental and physical health benefits (Greenfield & Marks, 2004; Li & Ferraro, 2006; Musick & Wilson, 2008; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001), and life satisfaction (Van Willigen, 2000). One of the oldest studies on the effects of volunteering for older adults by Moen, Dempster-McClain, and Williams (1992), women were followed for a period of 30 years and the researchers found that those who volunteered, even on an intermittent basis across these years, had higher levels of functional ability at the end of the observation period. The researchers suggested that social integration and meaningful engagement, especially in light of the discretionary nature of volunteer activity, explained the positive health effect (Moen, et al., 1992).

A neuroscientific study of happiness gives credibility to the consumption model. Using magnetic resonance imaging, neuroscientists have found that the part of the brain active when a
person donates is the same part of the brain responsible for producing dopamine, which is one of the brain chemicals associated with happiness (Moll et al., 2006). They also consider the warm glow that accompanies giving to have a physiological basis. Although this research looked at the donation of money, it is likely that those individuals who donate time also experience heightened levels of happiness through their volunteering (Moll, et al., 2006).

To summarize, the literature presents a better understanding of both volunteerism and volunteer motivation. The motivations that emerged in this review were based on social and personal growth. In order to better understand what theory would be best to test the research questions of this study, the next section of this literature review is a synopsis of the motivation theories that relate to volunteer motivation.

**Motivation Theory**

As stated earlier, volunteerism is any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group, or organization (Wilson, 2000), and motivation is considered to be an idea used to describe the forces acting on or within an individual to initiate or choose a behavior (Beck, 1978; Petri, 1981). Even though people are willing to engage in volunteer work, they still need to be motivated. As a result, numerous motivation theories have been constructed in an effort to describe the “why” of volunteering. Understanding why people volunteer, or their motivations, can help nonprofit leaders understand what volunteers are looking for from the volunteering experience. In addition, through understanding the motivation, nonprofit leaders can also tailor the volunteer offering to better meet the needs of the volunteers.

The act of volunteering has been described as people wanting to help others, and people’s motivations are at the core, altruistic (Bussell & Forbes, 2002). However, other research suggests while altruism may be present in many types of volunteering, people are ultimately
motivated by a second broad group of egotistic factors, such as the benefits they receive from getting involved (Hibbert, Piacentini, & Dajani, 2003). “Altruism is a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare. Egoism is a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing one’s own welfare” (Barton, 2002, p. 90). Some researchers went as far as to suggest that volunteers are motivated solely by their own interests rather than any form of altruism (D. H. Smith, Macauley, & Associates, 1980). Individuals may engage in voluntary activities to maximize one’s own situation by building skills that may prove to be valuable to one’s self, such as developing business connections or forming the basis for future political endeavors (Burns, Reid, Toncar, Fawcett, & Anderson, 2006). Nonetheless, most research supports the notion that volunteer motivation is multifaceted and occurs in combination with each other rather than in isolation (Rehberg, 2005). This section will review some of the different motivation theories related to this study.

**Adragogy.** Andragogy is considered to be a set of assumptions about how adults learn. Its roots have been traced back to Alexander Kapp, a German grammar teacher who used it to describe Plato’s educational theory (Knowles, Holton III, & Swanson, 1998). Research indicates the discussion of andragogy continued in Europe until Dusan Savicevic, a Yugoslavian adult educator, first discussed the concept in the United States. Malcolm Knowles heard about the term and in 1968 used it in an article in *Adult Leadership*, and from that point on, Knowles has become known as the principle expert on andragogy in adult education (Knowles, et al., 1998). Knowles et al. (1998) states the five elements or assumptions of andragogy are: the need to know; changes in self-concept; role of experience; readiness to learn; and orientation to learning. Knowles (1975) acknowledged that adult learners responded to motivators like career advancement or salary increases, but associated the theory of andragogy with the internal
motivation known as “motivation to learn.” Self-esteem, better quality of life, and recognition were identified as strong motives to learn (Knowles, 1985).

There are some studies on the motivation to learn for college faculty and staff who volunteer as organization advisors. The research indicates an individual’s motives to serve may be more complex than just personal growth. Other research demonstrates that affiliation, egotism, and altruism motives affect a person’s desire to volunteer (Fraser, 2005; Powell, 2005; Rumsey, 1996; Stergios, 2001; Tsai, 2000).

**Humanistic Theory of Motivation.** Humanistic theories of motivation are based on the idea that people also have strong cognitive reasons to perform various actions. It is famously illustrated by Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Basic Needs (Maslow, 1943). This theory was built upon the work by Aristotle and it presents different motivations at different levels. The Hierarchy of Needs (often represented as a pyramid with five levels of needs) is a motivational theory in psychology that argues that while people aim to meet basic needs, they seek to meet successively higher needs in the form of a hierarchy. The theory is supported on a non-rigid order of individual needs: physiological or basic needs (food, water and shelter); safety needs (security, employment and health); belonging needs (love, friendship, intimacy and family); esteem needs (confidence, self-esteem, achievement and respect); and self-actualization needs (morality, creativity and problem solving) (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow (1943) concluded that when one set of needs is satisfied, it ceases to be a motivating factor. Therefore, the next set of needs in the hierarchy order takes place. That is why the Hierarchy of Basic Needs is commonly viewed as a pyramid. At the lowest level, there will be the first set of needs which can be described as basic needs. The other sets of needs follow once the first set is satisfied (Maslow, 1943).
Despite the vast amount of research using Maslow’s Hierarchy of Basic Needs, there have also been some critics of this model. Jung (1933, 1971) argued that middle-aged adults realize that society rewards achievement based on the cost of making personal compromises and these compromises were not interpreted as self-actualization because it went against the personality of the individual. Therefore, reaching self-actualization is considered to be vaguely defined. Other criticisms were based on the need for a clear method for measuring each stage in the theory (Nairne, 2006) and the lack of understandable measurement methods for distinguishing between basic needs and self-actualization needs (Wahba & Bridwell, 1976).

Meyer (2008) suggested that Maslow’s theory may provide an explanation for how people serve themselves rather than clarifying the motivation behind serving others. As stated earlier, it has been determined that volunteer motivation can be altruistic (Barz, 2001; Ference, 2000; Stegall, 1998). Also, other research supports that volunteer motives include social obligations (Robinson, 1999; Shutt, 2004) and commitment (Fraser, 2005); however, those two elements are not addressed by the basic needs theory.

**Functional Theory.** There are two different perspectives on motivation: psychologist who embrace a functional approach and sociologist who embrace a symbolic approach (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Scott & Lyman, 1968). According to the functional approach, motives represent the function served by actions, and the same action (e.g., volunteering) can serve different functions (Allison, Okun, & Dutridge, 2002). These functions require the conscious desires of individuals. Although, the symbolic approach focuses on the connotative meanings that individuals attach to their behavior. It is based on the idea that motives involve interpretations and explanations of one’s actions (Allison, et al., 2002). As stated in the theoretical framework, this study will focus on understanding volunteer motivation rooted in the functional approach.
The study by Phillips (2005) summarized a review of the literature that identified the functional theory as the most applicable for studies determining the motivation to volunteer because other theories approached volunteerism from very different, specific areas of focus, but that they were all included in some way by the six functions identified by Clary et al. (1998). Phillips (2005) stated: “This broad scope, accompanied by its robust psychometric properties, suggests that functional theory surpasses other motivation theories in its ability to deal with the multifaceted nature of volunteer motivations” (p. 31).

**Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI).** The VFI has been used extensively in research to measure volunteer motivations. Based on an analysis of the empirical research, Clary et al. (1998) identified six motives for volunteering. These motives are discussed in detail in this section, as well as some of the research that employs the VFI instrument.

**Values.** The first function is when organizations provide volunteers with expressed values that are related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others (Clary, et al., 1998). “At the heart of the values function is the suggestion that volunteerism is influenced by values about other people’s welfare” (Snyder, Clary, & Stukas, 2000, p. 370). It is based off of Katz’s (1960) “value expressive” function and Smith et al.’s (1956) “quality of expressiveness” functions. The premise of this function is based on the idea that concern for others is often characterized by those who volunteer (Allen & Rushton, 1983), and predicts whether volunteers complete their expected period of service (Clary & Miller, 1986; Clary & Orenstein, 1991).

**Understanding.** The second function was established to provide volunteers with an opportunity to engage in new learning experiences as well as exercise knowledge, skills, and abilities that may otherwise go unpracticed (Clary, et al., 1998). This function was exemplified by a large number of Gidron’s (1978) volunteers in health and mental health institutions who
expected to receive benefits that related to self-development, learning, and variety in life through volunteer work.

**Social.** The third function that is potentially served by volunteers is the motivation concerning relationships with others. Clary et al. (1998) stated: “volunteering may offer opportunities to be with one’s friends or to engage in an activity viewed favorably by important others” (p.1518). Clary et al. (1998) also described the application of this function in a study by Rosenhan (1970) in which civil rights activists were motivated to help because of social rewards as well as punishments.

**Career.** The fourth function is based on the principle people want to volunteer to further their career. It is focused on building and developing career-related skills, relationships, and contacts. This function relates to the utilitarian function described by Katz (1960) and exemplified in a study by Jenner (1982) where individuals providing volunteer services for the Junior League perceived their volunteer experiences as a method for improving or maintaining their career-related skills (Clary, et al., 1998).

**Protective.** The fifth function relates to a person’s ego, similar to Katz’s (1960) “ego defensive” function and Smith et al.’s (1956) “externalization” concerns. Clary et al. (1998) describe this motivation as one that centers around the need to reduce guilt, address one’s personal problems, or deal with individual inner struggles. Clary et al. (1998) depict the protective function in a study by Frisch and Gerrard (1981) that reported some Red Cross volunteers often volunteered because of a feeling of guilt due to their own good fortune.

**Enhancement.** The sixth function proposed is based on the concept of volunteering being a protective function that is done to fulfill a need of the ego. Clary et al. (1998) stated this “function of volunteering derives from indications that there may be more to the ego, and
especially the ego’s relation to affect, than protective processes” (p. 1518). It is primarily centered on the need of personal growth and improving the self esteem of the volunteer. Katz (1960) and Smith (1956) did not address this function but it is considered an extension of the protective function, however enhancement focuses on positive motives. Clary et al. (1998) pointed to research on volunteerism that showed evidence of positive strivings, such as Anderson and Moore’s (1978) report that some people volunteer for reasons of personal development or Jenner’s (1982) findings that volunteers obtain satisfactions related to personal growth and self esteem. Clary et al. (1998) considered the protective function to be concerned with eliminating negative aspects surrounding the ego, while the enhancement function is related to the development of the positive features of a volunteer’s ego.

The authors of the VFI (Clary, et al., 1998), noted they were well aware of the questions that would arise regarding the optimal number of functions. They built their instrument based on the work of Katz (1960) and Smith (1956), which both used four functions. In addition, the authors also noted that they were mindful of some of their own research regarding volunteerism that began with examinations of only four functions (Clary & Snyder, 1991). Clary et al.’s (1998) instrument was built on previous theorizing and the incorporation of important distinctions in self- and ego-related functioning, which led them to conceptualize the six motivational functions of the VFI that are potentially served by volunteers.

Researchers are using the VFI in an effort to better understand the motivations of volunteers. It is helping to make research on volunteerism become more systematic in its approach to the study of volunteer motives. This is evident in some of the recent research on volunteer motives that employ the VFI. For example, to determine if gender had any effect on the motivations of young adults to volunteer (Burns, Reid, Toncar, Anderson, & Wells, 2008);
to see if there are gender differences in college students’ motivation to volunteer (Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2005); and to study the difference of senior adults who had and had not volunteered (Yoshioka, Brown, & Ashcraft, 2007).

Allison et al. (2002) found the VFI to be a valid instrument when determining if there was a relationship between a person’s motivation to volunteer and the future tendency for that person to perform additional volunteer activities within an organization. Burns et al. (2006) described the VFI as “the most comprehensive and commonly used scale to measure individual’s motivations for volunteering” (p. 86). A dissertation study by Gossen (2011) looked at the membership of the National FFA Alumni Association to determine whether differences exist regarding members’ motivation to join and engage themselves in the local FFA Alumni affiliate. Gossen (2011) determined the VFI to be the most appropriate instrument for measuring the differences in motivations to volunteer between the various demographic variables.

For this exploratory study of the motivation of the volunteers the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, the VFI appears to be the appropriate tool to achieve its purpose. The findings of previous research by Clary et al. (1998) defined the purpose of this study through the following: Our findings have direct implications for organizations dependent on the services of volunteers; such organizations could use (and applied research potentially could demonstrate the utility of using) the VFI to assess the motivations of potential volunteers, or groups of potential volunteers, and then use this information to strategically promote their organizations in ways that speak to the abiding concerns of the volunteers they seek to recruit (p. 1528).

The merit of employing the VFI as the primary instrument is it is generic enough to allow for researchers to pinpoint the various motives of people who engage in volunteer work at a specific organization.
Summary

Volunteerism forms the core of nonprofit organizations in the United States (Snyder & Omoto, 1992; Wilcox, Cameron, Ault, & Agee, 2003; Wilson, 2000). Most nonprofit organizations such as the United Way and the Red Cross depend heavily on a constant supply of volunteers to function smoothly (Wilcox, et al., 2003). The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi is very similar to those organizations, for the reason that it too is reliant on volunteers to carry-out the mission of the Society on the campuses of colleges and universities where it has chapters.

Putnam (1995) advocates in the face of a society that is declining in the social cement that ties communities together, it is especially important to find ways to attract individuals to volunteer their time and energy to nonprofit organizations. Through this review of literature, we have learned one way to attract and retain volunteers to an organization is to match the organizations volunteer offerings to the needs of the volunteers. Since each individual has their own unique mix of interests, feelings, and circumstances that can drive a person to engage in a volunteer activity, it is important to be able to pinpoint these motivations. Research on volunteers and volunteerism in America does point to a cluster of motivations commonly found among volunteers and they are best captured in the VFI developed by Clary et al. (1998). As a result, this study proposed to employ the VFI instrument as the tool to discover the motivating factors behind the volunteers of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Through learning these motives, the leaders of Phi Kappa Phi and other nonprofit organizations may be better prepared to develop programs that will enhance the recruitment and retention of its volunteers.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter explains the methodology and methods that were used in the study of volunteer motives. The review of literature illustrated some important aspects of the situation facing the leadership of nonprofit organizations, specifically honor societies. Given that honor societies understand the valuable contributions made by their volunteers, more attention must be given to the motivational issues underlying this type of volunteering. The increased attention is needed to better understand the various motivations for serving as a local and national volunteer. In addition, if honor societies are going to maintain their position within higher education, the leadership of these organizations must come to understand if the motives for volunteering differ for those who plan to continue to volunteer compared to those who do not.

Therefore, the objective of this study was to examine the motivations for volunteering in honor societies—specifically at the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. With this purpose in mind, the research questions for this study are:

1. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer?
2. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level?
3. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group?
4. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank?
This chapter describes the procedures that will be used to conduct this study. It will be divided into the following sections: (1) Site and participants; (2) data collection; and (3) data analysis.

**Site and Research Subjects**

*Population and sampling.* The study site and subjects for this study will be the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi’s volunteer chapter officers, committee members, and board of directors for 2011-2012. The individuals who meet this criterion are listed below:

1. Chapter Officers
   
   A. President
   B. Vice-President/President Elect
   C. Secretary
   D. Treasurer
   E. Student Vice Presidents
   F. Past President
   G. Scholarship and Awards Officer
   H. Public Relations Officer
   I. Chapter Administration

2. Committee Members
   
   A. Executive
   B. Chapter Relations
   C. Investment
   D. Marketing and Member Benefits
   E. Fellowship and Awards Council
F. Bylaws

G. Council of Students

H. Service

3. Board of Directors

A. President

B. President Elect

C. Past President

D. Executive Director (non-voting member)

E. Vice President for Member and Marketing Benefits

F. Vice President for Chapters Relations

G. Vice President for Fellowships and Awards

H. Vice Presidents for Finance

I. Vice Presidents for Students (2)

J. Vice Presidents at Large (2)

Data containing the contact information (electronic email addresses) for all participating volunteers was obtained from records provided by the Society’s database, IMIS. In 2011-2012 (from July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012), there were 295 active chapters in the Society and 1540 members and non-members who volunteered as chapter officers. During that same period of time, there were also 133 individuals who served as committee members as well as 11 volunteer members who sat on the Society’s board of directors. After removing duplicates (individuals who volunteered for more than one position), members of the paid nation staff, and individuals
with incorrect contact information, there was a total of 1395 members and non-members who made up the roster of Phi Kappa Phi volunteers in 2011-2012 (July 1 – June 30).

Given that Phi Kappa Phi has a professional staff to make use of the results of this research study, it was determined to invite all 1395 individuals who volunteered as chapter officers, committee members and board of directors for 2011-2012 to participate in this study.

**Research design.** This study proposed to use a survey research design that investigates characteristics and perceived motivational functions of volunteers for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. The purpose of survey research was to produce statistics, such as quantitative or numerical descriptions about some aspects of the study population (Fowler, 2009). Kraemer (1991) identified three unique characteristics of survey research: First, survey research is used to quantitatively describe specific aspects of a given population (such as examining the relationships among variables); second, the data required for survey research are collected from people and are, therefore, subjective; and finally, survey research uses a selected portion of the population from which the findings can later be generalized back to the population.

The survey methodology was selected for this study since they are capable of obtaining information from large samples of the population. This method is useful since Phi Kappa Phi has volunteers from chapters that are located in 49 states, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. Surveys are well suited to gathering demographic data that describe the composition of the sample (McIntyre, 1999). They are inclusive in the types and number of variables that can be studied, require minimal investment to develop and administer, and are relatively easy for making generalizations (Bell, 1996). In addition, surveys can also elicit information about attitudes that are otherwise difficult to measure using observational techniques (McIntyre, 1999).
In this study, volunteer chapter officers, committee members, and the Society’s board of directors, were asked to voluntarily complete an electronic questionnaire using SurveyMonkey®. After collection, the data was analyzed for frequency of response and differences between volunteers who plan to continue volunteering and those volunteers who do not plan to continue volunteering.

**Statistical power analysis.** A statistical power analysis was performed to determine the sample size required for this study. As discussed in a subsequent section, the inferential statistical tests to be performed in this study consist of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The G*Power computer program (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996) was used to perform the power analysis. The power analyses were performed specifying medium effect sizes, two-tailed tests, an alpha level of .05, and desired power of .80. For the MANOVA analyses, a medium effect size of $f^2 = .25$ was specified, along with the number of response variables equal to six (represented by the six motivational factor scores from the VFI). With two groups (for the first research question), 62 participants will be required to achieve power of .80. With three groups (for the second research question), 42 participants will be required to achieve power of .80. With seven groups (for the third research question), 28 participants will be required to achieve power of .80. With four groups (for the fourth research question), 36 participants will be required to achieve power of .80. Based on the results from the power analyses, the minimum required sample size for this study will be set at 62 to ensure statistical power of .80.

**Instrumentation.** A survey instrument (see Appendix C) consisting of three sections: First, is an opt-out question that will determine volunteer status; second, is the Volunteer
Functions Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al. (1998); and third, is a selection of descriptive questions that was used to better categorize volunteer motives.

**Opt-out question.** The purpose of the opt-out question is to allow for members and non-members to self-identify their volunteer status. Some of the chapter officers are paid by their chapter’s institution because their role within the chapter is part of their professional job responsibilities. In addition, there are also a few chapter officers who receive compensation for their work with the local chapter that comes from the chapter’s finances. The compensation usually is an hourly rate for an officer to conduct the general business of the chapter. Collecting this information is important for the integrity of this study (which is to understand the motivational factors of volunteers). The opt-out question was:

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), volunteering is defined as persons who perform unpaid volunteer activities. Based on this definition, do you qualify as a volunteer for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi?

____ yes  ____ no

**Volunteer Functions Inventory.** The second section utilizes the VFI developed by Clary et al. (1998). On April 24, 2012, permission to use the VFI was provided by Dr. Mark Snyder at the University of Minnesota, who is one of the original authors of the VFI. The VFI is a thirty question survey that uses a seven-point Likert scale to identify values for six motivational functions: values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement functions. First, the values function signals the opportunities volunteerism provides for individuals to convey values related to altruistic concerns for others. Second, the understanding function reflects the potential of having new learning experiences as well as developing and practicing new skills. Third, the social function conveys the motivational appeal of being with friends, developing a new
relationship, and engaging in an activity that is viewed favorably by others. Fourth, the career function reflects the motivation to volunteer for potential career related interests. Fifth, the protection function indicates that some volunteerism stems from feelings of guilt from being more fortunate than others or to escape negative feelings. Lastly, the enhancement function suggests there is a motivational appeal for volunteering that relates to personal development or personal growth (Clary, et al., 1998).

According to Clary et al. (1998), the scores for the six motivational functions of the inventory are calculated from the thirty items of the inventory as follows: The values function is calculated from inventory items 3, 8, 16, 19 and 22. The understanding function is calculated from inventory items 12, 14, 18, 25, and 30. The social function is calculated from inventory items 2, 4, 6, 17, and 23. The career function is calculated from inventory items 1, 10, 15, 21, and 28. The protective function is calculated from inventory items 7, 9, 11, 20, and 24. Lastly, the enhancement function is calculated from inventory items 5, 13, 26, 27, and 29. The questions utilized in the Volunteer Functions Inventory are identified in Table I and the Scoring Sheet is listed in Table II.

Descriptive questions. The final section of the survey was a selection of descriptive questions. The following volunteer descriptive questions were chosen by the members of the executive staff for Phi Kappa Phi: age (year of birth), gender (male, female), education level (highest earned degree), membership status (active chapter, national, life), engagement level (chapter officer, committee member, board), engagement level, years of volunteering, hours of annual volunteering, recruitment activity, volunteer recruitment status (who recruited them to volunteer), volunteer plans (for 2012-2013), joining status (undergraduate, graduate/professional student, alumni, faculty/staff/administration, honorary member), volunteer activity, ethnic
background, occupation (student, staff, faculty, administration, outside academia, retired, other), and chapter affiliation (northeast, north central, southeast, south central, western).

**Validity and Reliability**

The Volunteer Functions Inventory as developed by Clary et al. (1998) was selected because of its widespread use (Burns, et al., 2006), its acceptance as the most applicable instrument for studies determining motives for volunteering (Phillips, 2005), and its validity for studies on volunteer motivation (Burns, et al., 2008; Papadakis, et al., 2005). There have been six studies conducted on the VFI to assess validity and reliability.

The first study used volunteers from five (health, human and social) service organizations in the Minneapolis and St. Paul metropolitan areas to determine psychometric properties of the inventory. The researchers used factor analysis as the method for determining if indeed there were six distinct motivational functions for volunteerism assessed by the VFI. Results indicate each of the six functions were actual motivations served by volunteerism. In addition, items from each scale loaded on their intended factor and did not load with items from another scale. Internal consistency was assessed by computing Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for each of the VFI scales: Career, .89; enhancement, .84; social, .83; understanding, .81; protective, .81; and values, .80 (Clary, et al., 1998). In summary, these findings provided support for the functional approach to studying volunteer motivation and to the appropriateness of using the VFI as an instrument for measuring those motivations (Clary, et al., 1998).

The second study aimed to examine the motivations to volunteer under conditions in which these motivations are less salient and with a sample of respondents that add diversity (such as age and experience with volunteering). This study sought to cross validate the VFI using a younger population of college students, with and without volunteer experience. Results
of confirmatory factor analysis identified the presence of six factors as well as proposed the six-factor model as optimal (Clary, et al., 1998). The internal consistencies of this study ranged from .82 to .85 motivations (Clary, et al., 1998).

The purpose of study three was to examine the temporal stability of the instrument by having respondents complete the inventory at two points in time. By doing so, this study permitted an assessment of the test-retest reliability of the VFI scales. A sample of 65 students completed the VFI early in a semester, then again four weeks later. The test-retest correlation for the values scale was .78; for understanding and enhancement, .77; for social and career scales, .68; and for the protective scale, .64 (all p<.001), indicating the individual scales are stable over a one-month interval motivations (Clary, et al., 1998).

The next three studies were intended to use the VFI as a method for investigating critical aspects of volunteerism: recruiting volunteers, promoting volunteer satisfaction, and fostering long term volunteer commitment. In the fourth study, brochures were developed as a way to recruit volunteers. Specific brochures were developed to appeal to persons with high scores on each of the six motivational functions. The intentions were to match the motivations of the individuals and the opportunities afforded by the environment. Participants were asked to select the brochure that they felt would best recruit volunteers. Clary et al. (1998) assumed that people would select the brochures that most closely linked to their individual motivational function. Using regression analysis, the findings indicated that four of the six scales were predictive of the career appeals brochure. There was no scale from the VFI that was significantly predictive of the social brochure (Clary, et al., 1998). As a result, this study indicated the practical usability of the VFI instrument as a means for customizing recruitment efforts to meet the needs of an individual’s personal motivations.
The fifth study was similar to the fourth study, because it examined the VFI to determine its suitability as a predictor of volunteer satisfaction. In this study, participants were asked to complete the VFI along with demographic information. Then, sixteen weeks later, participants completed a satisfaction questionnaire. For six between-subject-factorial designs (one for each scale) contrast analysis was performed comparing satisfaction scores. Results were statistically significant, with volunteers for whom a participant scale was important and who perceived relatively greater benefits related to that function were more satisfied than those who did not receive as much relevant benefits or for whom that motivational function was not as important (Clary, et al., 1998).

The final validation study by Clary et al. (1998) studied, from a functional perspective, the role of individuals’ motivations for volunteering and the benefits they receive for volunteering in influencing their intentions to continue to volunteer. In that study, students were given the opportunity to volunteer in a variety of services for various organizations. Results show that for students who received benefits relative to their primary functional motivation, they were not only more satisfied, but they also intended to continue to volunteer at higher levels than those with lower levels of perceived benefits. Once again, Clary et al. (1998) used between-subjects-factorial designs to determine the content, construct and criterion-related validity of the VFI. Employing test-retest methodology and measures of internal consistency (Chronbach’s alpha), the VFI has been determined to be a reliable survey instrument for measuring motivational functions of volunteerism (Clary, et al., 1998).

In summary, the Volunteer Functions Inventory was designed using a seven-point Likert scale with a range of 1 representing “not at all important” and 7 representing “extremely
important.” With the purpose of following the design and intent of the original authors, the same scale will be used in this study.
# TABLE 1
**VOLUNTEER FUNCTIONS INVENTORY ITEMS BY MOTIVATIONAL FUNCTION**

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

*Note: Clary et al., 1998*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Career</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>____+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>____ (SUM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Social</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>____ (SUM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Values</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>____ (SUM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Understanding</th>
<th>Item 12</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>____+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>____ (SUM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Enhancement</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>____+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>____ (SUM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFI Protective</th>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>____+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>___+</td>
<td>____ (SUM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Clary et al., 1998
Data Collection

Permission for surveying the volunteers of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi was obtained from Lourdes Barro, Acting Executive Director, on April 16, 2012. There was a pre-survey email (see Appendix A) that was distributed to all 2011-2012 Phi Kappa Phi volunteers (n=1395) on October 3, 2012, to inform the participants of this study and asking them to participate in this voluntary survey. On October 10, 2012, the link to the electronic questionnaire using SurveyMonkey® was distributed to all volunteer chapter officers, committee members, and the Society’s board of directors. In addition to the link to the survey, complete instructions were provided (see Appendix B). The instrument contains the required disclosures concerning informed consent. Participants received a reminder email on October 17, 2012 to complete the online survey. The survey ended and was closed on October 24, 2012.

Data Analysis

The responses to the survey were recorded into an Excel spreadsheet program. Data analysis was performed by a computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, Version 19.0. Initially, descriptive statistics were computed for the items in the demographic and background portion of the survey including Items 31 through 50 in Section 3. Descriptive statistics consisted of means and standard deviations for the continuous variables (such as age, computed from year of birth, years volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi, and hours per year volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi), and frequencies and percentages for the categorical variables (such as gender, highest level of education, and whether or not they plan to volunteer for Phi Kappa Phi in 2012-2013). Then, descriptive statistics were computed for the six subscales of the VFI including ranges, means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha).
The first research question of this study is: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer? The dependent variables for this research question are the six motivation scores from the VFI. The independent variable is whether or not the participant plans to continue to volunteer during the 2012-2013 academic year. The null hypothesis to be tested is:

**Ho1:** There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer.

Due to the fact that the independent variable is categorical and there are six continuous dependent variables, a MANOVA will be performed followed by individual ANOVAs (one for each motivational factor) if the initial MANOVA is statistically significant.

The second research question is: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level? The dependent variables for this research question are the six motivational factor scores from the VFI and the independent variable is whether the individual volunteers at the national or chapter level. Three groups will be formed based on responses to Item 40 in the survey: those who volunteer only at the chapter level, those who volunteer only at the national level, and those who volunteer at both the national and chapter level. The null hypothesis is:

**Ho2:** There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level.

Due to the fact that the independent variable is categorical and there are six continuous dependent variables, a MANOVA will be performed followed by individual ANOVAs (one for each motivational factor) if the initial MANOVA is statistically significant.
The third research question is: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group? The independent variable is the participants’ occupational group as defined by responses to Item 49 in the survey. The dependent variables are the motivational factor scores from the VFI. The null hypothesis to be tested is:

**Ho3:** There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group.

Initially, a MANOVA will be performed. If the initial MANOVA is statistically significant, individual ANOVAs will be performed for each motivational factor score.

The fourth research question of this study is: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank? The independent variable is faculty rank and the dependent variables are the motivational factor scores from the VFI. The null hypothesis to be tested is:

**Ho4:** There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank.

Initially, a MANOVA will be performed followed by individual ANOVAs for each motivational factor score if the initial MANOVA is statistically significant.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

Protection of participants was not expected to be a major concern and was handled as intended. Only adults participated, participation was fully voluntary, individual names were not collected, and only aggregate data was being provided back to the leadership of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi and the participants. Participants were informed ahead of time about
the survey (see Appendix A), each received a detailed consent statement (see Appendix B) and a survey reminder email (see Appendix C).

To further ensure anonymity, only the author of this study reviewed the results of the questionnaire and transposed the data into SPSS. No access to the questionnaires was provided to anyone other than the researcher and the file will be kept on the personal jump drive of the researcher.

Summary

This doctoral thesis proposal sought to expand the work on functionalist theory and how it relates to the motivation of nonprofit volunteers. In doing so, the proposed research methodology used in this study was a quantitative model. The decision to use a quantitative model was made because the problem being examined was more suited to a deductive process. As a result, the Volunteer Functions Inventory was selected as the primary foundation for the collection of data in this study.
Chapter 4: Results

The problem addressed in this study was that while increased and sustained volunteer work is needed (such as within The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi), there is insufficient knowledge of what motivates people to do this type of volunteer work. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine the motivation of faculty, staff, administration, and students who volunteer as chapter officers, committee members, and board of directors for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Four research questions were posed in Chapter 1:

1. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer?
2. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level?
3. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group?
4. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank?

In this chapter, the results from the statistical analyses of the survey data are presented. Initially, a summary of the response rate is presented. Next, the results from descriptive statistical analyses are discussed including analyses performed on the demographic and background variables and analyses performed on the volunteering scale dependent variables. Then, results related to each of the four research questions are discussed, and the chapter ends with a summary.
Response Rates

Prior to data collection, The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi provided contact information including electronic email addresses for the individuals who volunteered as chapter officers, committee members, and the Society’s board of directors for 2011-2012. After removing duplicates (individuals who served in more than one volunteer position), there were a total 1,433 volunteer contacts; however, 38 electronic email addresses were deemed unusable by electronic mail servers. As a result, 1,395 volunteers with electronic email addresses were considered viable and successfully reached email servers.

On October 3, 2012, a pre-survey email was sent to all research subjects from the Executive Director of Phi Kappa Phi, Dr. Mary Todd. The survey and informed consent were circulated on October 10, 2012. A reminder email was distributed by the researcher one week later on October 17, 2012. On October 24, 2012, after two weeks of data collection, the survey was closed and 390 total responses were received, for a 27.9% overall response rate. For the purposes of this study, 35 questionnaires ended after question one, for the reason that they did not qualify as volunteers (according to the definition provided in the survey). In addition, another 51 incomplete questionnaires were removed, leaving 304 completed and usable questionnaires for data analysis.

The volunteer subjects from The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi were able to provide a 21.8% response rate for fully completed questionnaires. Deutskens, De Ruyter, Wetzels and Oosterveld (2004) found response rates for online questionnaires to be consistently between 9% and 30% for most electronic studies. For that reason, the response rates for this study were found to be within a previously established and acceptable parameter.
Descriptive Statistics

A total of 304 subjects participated in this study. Table 3 shows descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) for the categorical demographic and background characteristics of the sample and Table 4 contains descriptive statistics (ranges, means, and standard deviations) for the continuous demographic and background characteristics. Most of the participants were female (66.1%) and the most common level of education was a doctoral degree (54.6%). The participants ranged in age from 19 to 77 years old with a mean of 50.08 years old ($SD = 13.89\text{ years}$). The most common ethnic group was White (86.5%). Nearly half of the participants (46.7%) stated that their occupation was faculty member while 18.4% were administrators, 12.8% were staff, and 11.5% were students. Among faculty members, the most common level was tenured full professor (38.1%) followed by tenured associate professor (31.3%), and non-tenured full-time faculty (16.3%).

Most of the participants were official members of Phi Kappa Phi (98.7%); most were dues-paying chapter members (84.5%) and dues-paying members of the national organization (87.5%). A minority of the participants were active-for-life members (30.3%). Most of the participants reported being engaged at the chapter officer level (90.8%) while 24.7% were engaged as committee members and 8.2% were engaged as members of the board of directors. Most of the participants were engaged with a local chapter (85.2%).

Over two-thirds of the participants stated that they had actively recruited individuals to become Phi Kappa Phi volunteers (71.1%). The most common persons to encourage the participants to volunteer with Phi Kappa Phi were local Phi Kappa Phi chapter officers (40.5%) and colleagues who were Phi Kappa Phi members (30.3%), while 23.7% had decided to volunteer on their own. The majority of individuals indicated that they planned to continue to
volunteer (82.8%) in the 2012-2013 academic year. The most common periods for joining Phi Kappa Phi were as a faculty member, staff member, or administrator (39.5%), as an undergraduate student (33.6%), or as a graduate or professional student (23.7%). The most common regional affiliation was South Central (25.7%) with fewer participants from the Southeast (19.7%), West (18.4%), North Central (17.8%), and Northeast (16.8%) regions. The participants had been volunteers with Phi Kappa Phi local chapters for between 0 and 40 years with a mean of 6.38 years ($SD = 6.50$ years). At the national level, the participants had volunteered for between 0 and 40 years with a mean of 1.29 years ($SD = 3.85$ years). The participants reported volunteering with Phi Kappa Phi for between 0 and 500 hours per year with a mean of 48.01 hours ($SD = 56.95$ hours). Most of the participants stated that they volunteered for one or two other organizations (52.6%).

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Categorical Demographic and Background Variables (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School or Associate Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree (BA, BS, etc.)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree (MA, MS, MBA, etc.)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree (MD, DDS, DVM, JD, etc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree (EdD, PhD, etc.)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Phi Kappa Phi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active dues-paying member of a chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active dues-paying member of the national organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active for life member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of engagement with Phi Kappa Phi (multiple response)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter officer</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged with a local chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively recruited individuals to become Phi Kappa Phi volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged by whom to volunteer with Phi Kappa Phi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague, non-member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague, Phi Kappa Phi member</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Phi Kappa Phi chapter officer</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided to volunteer myself</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to volunteer for Phi Kappa Phi in 2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When joined Phi Kappa Phi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an undergraduate</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an graduate/professional student</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an alumni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a faculty, staff, or administrator</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an Honorary member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside academia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty level (for faculty members only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured full-time faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. professor tenured</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. professor tenured</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor tenured</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter’s regional affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of other organizations actively volunteering for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Demographic and Background Variables (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50.08</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years volunteered with Phi Kappa Phi local chapter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years volunteered with Phi Kappa Phi national</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual hours of active volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi activities at any level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>48.01</td>
<td>56.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volunteerism Scales**

Table 5 shows descriptive statistics for the six subscales of the VFI including ranges, means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha). The reliability coefficients for the six VFI scales were all acceptable and ranged from .86 for the Values and Protective scales to .88 for the Understanding, Career, and Enhancement scales. For most of the scales the range of scores covered the entire possible range from 5 to 35 while for the Protective scale the scores ranged from 5 to 31 and for the Enhancement scale the scores ranged from 4 to 34. The highest means were for the Values ($M = 27.78$, $SD = 6.02$) and Understanding ($M = 24.46$, $SD = 6.96$) scales while the lowest were for the Protective ($M = 13.30$, $SD = 6.77$) and Career ($M = 17.33$, $SD = 8.24$) scales.
Table 5

**Descriptive Statistics for Composite Volunteering Scales (N = 304)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Questions**

**Research Question 1.**

The first research question of this study was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer? The dependent variables for this research question were the six motivation scores from the VFI. The independent variable was whether or not the participant plans to continue to volunteer during the 2012-2013 academic year. The null hypothesis was:

**Ho1:** There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer.

Table 6 shows the mean scores on the six VFI scales as a function of whether or not the participant planned to volunteer in the 2012-2013 academic year. A MANOVA was performed, followed by an ANOVA to determine if the differences between these two groups on the VFI
scales were statistically significant. The result was statistically significant, $F(6, 297) = 4.16, p < .001$. This indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer.

Follow up ANOVAs indicated that there were statistically significant differences on three of the six VFI scales. For the Values scale, $F(1, 302) = 6.07, p = .014$. The means in Table 6 show that those who did plan to volunteer in the future had higher Values scores ($M = 28.17, SD = 5.57$) than those who did not plan to volunteer in the future ($M = 25.96, SD = 7.55$). There was also a statistically significant difference for the Social scale, $F(1, 302) = 4.40, p = .037$, with those who planned to volunteer in the future having higher scores ($M = 19.27, SD = 7.50$) than those who did not ($M = 16.93, SD = 7.14$). Finally, there was a statistically significant difference for the Career scale, $F(1, 302) = 5.81, p = .017$, with those who planned to volunteer in the future having lower scores ($M = 16.80, SD = 7.95$) than those who did not ($M = 19.76, SD = 9.15$). There were no statistically significant differences for the Understanding scale, $F(1, 302) = .14, p = .714$, the Protective scale, $F(1, 302) = 1.13, p = .289$, or the Enhancement scale, $F(1, 302) = 1.18, p = .278$.

Based on these results, it was concluded that subjects who planned to continue volunteering with Phi Kappa Phi in the future tended to be motivated more by their values (e.g., feeling compassion toward people in need) and the social (e.g., having friends who volunteer or place importance on volunteering) aspects of volunteering and less by the career-advantage aspects of volunteering (e.g., making new contacts that might help in their career) than those who did not plan to volunteer in the future.
Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Composite Volunteering Scales as a Function of Future Volunteering Plans (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Plan to volunteer in 2012-2013 (n = 250)</th>
<th>Do not plan to volunteer in 2012-2013 (n = 54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

The second research question was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level? The dependent variables for this research question were the six motivational factor scores from the VFI and the independent variable was whether the individual volunteers at the national level, the chapter level, or both. The null hypothesis was:

\( \text{Ho2: There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level.} \)

Table 7 shows the mean score on the six VFI scales as a function of volunteer level group. A MANOVA was performed to determine if these differences were statistically significant. The
MANOVA was not statistically significant, $F(12, 594) = 1.64, p = .078$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected and it was concluded that there were no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level. Due to the fact that the MANOVA was not statistically significant, differences between the three volunteer-level groups for each of the six VFI scales were not examined.

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics for Composite Volunteering Scales as a Function of Volunteering Level*  
*Group (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chapter-level only volunteer ($n = 205$)</th>
<th>National-level only volunteer ($n = 12$)</th>
<th>National- and chapter-level volunteer ($n = 87$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>27.05</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>25.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>20.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3

The third research question was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group? The null hypothesis was:

**Ho3**: There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group.

The independent variable was the participants’ occupational group and the dependent variables were the motivational factor scores from the VFI. Table 8 shows the mean scores for the six VFI scales as a function of occupational group. A MANOVA was performed to compare the three occupational groups on the six VFI scales. The MANOVA was statistically significant, $F(36, 1782) = 3.55$, $p < .001$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group.

Because the MANOVA was statistically significant, follow up ANOVAs for each of the VFI scales were conducted, and five of the six were statistically significant. First, the ANOVA for the Values scale was statistically significant, $F(6, 297) = 2.97$, $p = .008$. Follow up tests were performed using the Tukey HSD procedure to compare each pair of groups. The results from these tests showed that participants in the faculty group had lower scores on the Values scale ($M = 26.45, SD = 6.47$) than those in the other group ($M = 30.45, SD = 4.03$), $p = .044$. No other pairs of groups differed significantly on the Values scale.

The ANOVA for the Understanding scale was statistically significant, $F(6, 297) = 5.36$, $p < .001$. Follow up Tukey HSD tests indicated that participants in the faculty occupational group had lower scores ($M = 22.58, SD = 7.43$) than participants in the student group ($M = 27.66, SD$
= 4.43), \( p = .001 \), and lower scores than participants in the staff group (\( M = 27.36, SD = 4.37 \)), \( p = .002 \). No other pairs of groups differed significantly.

The ANOVA for the Career scale was also statistically significant, \( F(6, 297) = 13.37, p < .001 \). Follow up Tukey HSD tests indicated that students had higher scores (\( M = 26.51, SD = 4.33 \)) than staff members (\( M = 18.79, SD = 7.72 \)), \( p < .001 \), faculty members (\( M = 15.40, SD = 7.22 \)), \( p < .001 \), administrators (\( M = 14.93, SD = 8.06 \)), \( p < .001 \), or retired persons (\( M = 12.70, SD = 6.52 \)), \( p < .001 \). No other pairs of groups differed significantly.

The ANOVA for the Protective scale was statistically significant, \( F(6, 297) = 3.04, p = .007 \). Despite the fact that the ANOVA was statistically significant for the Protective scale, the follow up Tukey HSD tests did not show that any pairs of groups differed significantly. The ANOVA for the Enhancement scale was also statistically significant, \( F(6, 297) = 4.91, p < .001 \). Follow up Tukey HSD tests indicated that students had higher scores on the Enhancement scale (\( M = 23.23, SD = 5.75 \)) than faculty members (\( M = 18.08, SD = 7.63 \)), \( p = .004 \), and higher scores than administrators (\( M = 18.25, SD = 7.51 \)), \( p = .029 \). Staff members also had higher scores on this scale (\( M = 22.82, SD = 6.51 \)) than faculty members, \( p = .007 \), or administrators, \( p = .046 \). No other pairs of groups differed. There were no differences between the occupational groups on the Social scale from the VFI, \( F(6, 297) = .79, p = .575 \).
Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics for Composite Volunteering Scales as a Function of Occupational Group*

(N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Other (n = 11)</th>
<th>Student (n = 35)</th>
<th>Staff (n = 39)</th>
<th>Faculty (n = 142)</th>
<th>Admin. (n = 56)</th>
<th>Outside academia (n = 11)</th>
<th>Retired (n = 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4

The fourth research question of this study was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank? The null hypothesis was:

**Ho4:** There are no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank.

Only faculty members were included in the analyses for this research question and the independent variable was faculty rank. The dependent variables were the motivational factor scores from the VFI. A MANOVA was performed to compare the faculty rank groups and Table 9 shows the mean VFI scores as a function of faculty rank. Due to the fact that some faculty rank levels had very few participants (e.g., there were only three individuals who stated that they were full time instructors, there were only four individuals who stated that they were adjunct instructors), as shown in Table 3, the faculty rank variable was recoded prior to conducting the MANOVA. Specifically, the following grouping was used: tenured full professors \((n = 56, 38.1\%)\), tenured associate professors \((n = 46, 31.3\%)\), and all others \((n = 45)\). This coding scheme had the advantages of (a) approximately equal group sizes, and (b) all individuals in the “other” category were of lower rank than associate professors and the full professors, so that the other category did not consist of individuals with both higher and lower ranks than the other groups.

This MANOVA was statistically significant, \(F(12, 280) = 2.79, p = .001\). Therefore, follow up ANOVAs were performed, one for each of the six VFI scales. Three of the ANOVAs were statistically significant. First, the ANOVA performed on Understanding scores was statistically significant, \(F(2, 144) = 6.03, p = .003\). Follow up Tukey HSD tests indicated that the lowest rank group had higher scores \((M = 25.16, SD = 5.55)\) than tenured full professors \((M
= 20.25, SD = 8.22), p = .003. Tenured full professors did not differ from tenured associate professors.

The ANOVA was also statistically significant for the Career scores, $F(2, 144) = 8.55, p < .001$. Follow up tests indicated that tenured full professors had lower scores ($M = 12.63, SD = 6.72$) than the lowest rank group ($M = 18.33, SD = 7.56$), $p < .001$, and lower scores than the tenured associate professor group ($M = 16.39, SD = 7.06$), $p = .023$. The lowest rank group did not differ from tenured associate professors. Finally, the ANOVA was statistically significant for the Enhancement scores, $F(2, 144) = 3.82, p = .024$. Follow up tests indicated that the lowest rank group had higher scores ($M = 20.38, SD = 7.12$) than tenured full professors ($M = 16.25, SD = 7.66$), $p = .021$. The tenured associate professors did not differ from the tenured full professors. The ANOVAs were not statistically significant for the Values scores, $F(2, 144) = 1.00, p = .371$, the Social scores, $F(2, 144) = .10, p = .906$, or the Protective scores, $F(2, 144) = 1.52, p = .222$. 
Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics for Composite Volunteering Scales as a Function of Faculty Rank (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Lower rank (n = 45)</th>
<th>Tenured associate professor (n = 46)</th>
<th>Tenured full Professor (n = 56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>25.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>23.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This chapter contained the results from the data analyses performed to answer the four research questions of this study. The first research question of this study was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer? The MANOVA performed for this research question was statistically significant indicating that there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer. Specifically, participants who planned to continue volunteering with Phi Kappa Phi in the future tended to be motivated more by their feeling compassion toward people in need (demonstrated by statistically significant differences on the Values scale) and from having friends who volunteer or place importance on volunteering (demonstrated by statistically significant differences on the Social scale) than those who did not plan to volunteer in the future. Those who did not plan to volunteer in the future, on the other hand, tended to be more motivated to volunteer due to the potential advantages to their careers (demonstrated by statistically significant differences on the Career scale) than those who did plan to volunteer in the future.

The second research question was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level? The MANOVA performed for this research question was not statistically significant. This indicated that there were no differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level.

The third research question was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group? The MANOVA for this research
question was statistically significant: there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group. Due to the facts that there were statistically significant differences on five of the six motivation scales and that there were six occupational groups, the specific results for this research question were complex:

1. Participants in the faculty group had lower scores on the Values scale than those in the other occupational group.

2. Participants in the faculty occupational group had lower scores on the Understanding scale than participants in the student group or the staff group.

3. Students had higher scores on the Career scale than staff members, faculty members, administrators, or retired persons.

4. Students and staff members had higher scores on the Enhancement scale than faculty members or administrators.

The fourth and final research question for this study was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank? The MANOVA was statistically significant indicating that there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank. Specifically, the results indicated that:

1. The lowest faculty rank group had higher scores on the Understanding scale than tenured full professors.

2. Tenured full professors had lower scores than both the tenured associate professor group and the lowest faculty rank group on the Career scale.

3. The lowest faculty rank group had higher scores than tenured full professors on the Enhancement scale.
In the next chapter, these results are discussed in the context of past research and recommendations are offered for educational practice and future research.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The benefit of conducting quantitative research is its generalizability in practice. This doctoral thesis expands on earlier research regarding volunteer motives by investigating the motivations of volunteers with a leading higher education honor society. It is preceded by the work of Clary et al. (1998), who have been the leaders in investigating motivation in a wide variety of volunteer populations. The results of this study provide nonprofit leaders a summary of what factors motivated those providing unpaid work for The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. It was expected, as a result, that understanding motivating factors would assist in improving recruitment and retention efforts. Given the value of volunteers and their importance to every nonprofit organization, this topic was worthy of further investigation especially for an organization dedicated to promoting academic excellence.

This chapter discusses the results of the study in the context of past research and recommendations are offered for educational practice and future research. The first section will discuss an overview of the purpose of the study and research questions. The second section reviews the findings from chapter 4 and provides an interpretation of these findings, how they relate to past research, and their practical implications. The third section offers suggestions for future research. The final section is concluding statements.

Overview

The purpose of this doctoral thesis was to expand the work on functionalist theory and how it relates to the motivation of nonprofit volunteers. This study attempts to understand what motivates people to do volunteer work at The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, determine if there were differences in volunteers’ motivation based on their intentions to continue volunteering, level of volunteering, occupation, and faculty rank. Knowledge of this information may provide
a better understanding of current volunteers and allow for improved volunteer experiences within The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi and other similar nonprofit organizations.

Research Questions

The research questions used to guide this study were:

1. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer?

2. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level?

3. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group?

4. To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank?

To investigate the research questions, 304 Phi Kappa Phi volunteers from 2011-2012 participated in the study and completed the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) along with 18 supplementary descriptive questions. The VFI was based on the functionalist theory of behavior (Clary & Snyder, 1991). This theory is rooted in the belief that individuals may have similar behaviors but their actions satisfy different motivation factors. The VFI measures motivation in six categories: value, understanding, career, social, protective, and enhancement. The merit of employing the VFI as the primary instrument in this study is it is generic enough to allow for researchers to pinpoint the various motives of people who engage in volunteer work at a specific organization.
Participation in this study was strictly voluntary. An electronic questionnaire using SurveyMonkey® was distributed to all volunteer chapter officers, committee members, and the Society’s board of directors. Findings are presented next.

Review and Interpretation of Findings

Chapter 4 contained the results from the data analyses performed to answer the four research questions of this study. The findings in this dissertation are consistent with the functionalist theory in that various motives were identified and some were more important than others. Findings and conclusions related to each of the research questions asked in this study will be discussed separately based on the data obtained in this study. Relevant literature which aids in understanding the findings will be identified. These findings and conclusions will then be considered in the context of the theoretical foundations of this doctoral thesis and practical implications.

Summary of Research Question One. The first research question addressed in the study was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual plans to continue to volunteer or does not plan to continue to volunteer?

In order to better understand this question, an item on the questionnaire asked whether participants plan to volunteer during the following year. The results from 304 Phi Kappa Phi participants were highly affirmative. Responses were analyzed and it was determined that volunteers who planned to continue volunteering (n=250) in the future have a tendency to be motivated more by their feeling compassion toward people in need (demonstrated by the statistically significant differences on the Values scale) and from having friends who volunteer or place importance on volunteering (demonstrated by statistically significant differences on the Social scale) than those who did not plan to continue to volunteer (n=54) in the future. These
key findings are aligned with Bussell and Forbes (2002) research that describes the act of volunteering as people wanting to help others. In addition, Brudney (2005) found it provides the opportunity to enjoy the company of colleagues in the process. The results also support other past studies that have focused on the private benefits of volunteering as a means for increasing social capital (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Glaeser, et al., 2002; Prouteau & Wolff, 2006; Wilson, 2000). Another key finding came from participants who indicated they did not plan to volunteer in the future were inclined to be more motivated to volunteer for potential advantages for their careers (demonstrated by the statistically significant differences on the Career scale) than those who did plan to volunteer in the future. This outcome was in line with previous research on using volunteerism as an opportunity to expand human capital by offering skills training (Hackl, et al., 2007; Musick, et al., 1999).

One of the motives for conducting the research associated with this thesis was to begin to study how the Volunteer Functions Inventory might be used to help volunteer organizations, (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi) with recruitment and retention. The literature review in chapter 2 exhibited there is not an existing body of research related to predicting continued volunteering through use of a VFI motive profile. However, in the six studies which comprise Clary et al. (1998), the last study looked at predicting a commitment to volunteering and found those volunteers who indicated satisfaction in relation to their motive profiles indicated the strongest intent to continue. This might be considered consistent with this thesis since the Values motive was more dominant in this study and the intent to continue volunteering was extremely high (82.2%). A study by Favreau (2005) found similar results and suggested that if a dominant motive is satisfied, a continued commitment to volunteer might also be expected.
**Practical Implications.** As a result of research question 1, nonprofit organizations (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi) might consider using both values and social type messaging in future marketing campaigns aimed at attracting volunteers. In addition, practitioners might also consider focusing on more career type communications in an effort to retain current volunteers.

**Summary of Research Question 2.** The second research question was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of whether an individual volunteers at the chapter level or the national level?

To understand this research question, an item on the questionnaire asked participants to classify their engagement with Phi Kappa Phi by selecting all positions (chapter officer, committee member, board member) that apply. The overwhelming majority indicated they were chapter officers (90.8%), followed by committee members (24.7%) and board members (8.2%). Prior to analysis, the positions were coded into three groups: chapter (chapter officers), national (committee members and board members), or both (chapter and national).

To investigate research question 2, the six volunteer motivational factors of the VFI (values, understanding, social, career, protective, enhancement) were the dependent variables and volunteer levels (chapter, national, or both) were the independent variables. A MANOVA was performed to determine if the volunteer levels were statistically significant, but the test was not statistically significant, $F(12, 594) = 1.64, p = .078$. This outcome indicates that descriptive statistics for composite volunteering scales as a function of volunteering level remained consistent across the three volunteer levels (chapter, national, and both). Therefore, it was concluded that there were no differences in volunteering motivation factors as determined by volunteering at the chapter level or national level. Given that the MANOVA test was not
statistically significant, the differences between the three volunteer levels for each of the six motivational factors, was not examined further.

**Research Question 3.** The third research question was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group?

To better understand research question 3, an item on the questionnaire asked participants to designate their occupation. Descriptive results show the majority of the participants were faculty (46.7%), followed by administration (18.4%), staff (12.8%), students (11.5%), outside academia (3.6%), and retired (3.3%). A MANOVA test showed there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of occupational group. As revealed in chapter 4, the ANOVA results indicate there were statistically significant differences on five (value, understanding, career, protective, and enhancement) of the six motivation scales.

There were several key findings from research question 3. The overall results indicated that all of the occupational groups scored the Values and Understanding scales as their highest two functions of the six motivation scales. However, the first key finding was the participants from the faculty group had lower scores on both the Values and Understanding scales compared to those in the other occupational groups.

**Practical Implications.** This implies that when nonprofit organizations (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi) are targeting recruitment efforts, it is important to remember every occupational group is motivated by helping those in need (Values) as well as seeking to learn more about the world (Understanding), but faculty members are motivated at a lesser extent when compared to those in other occupational groups (e.g., staff, student, outside academia, and retired). For practical implications, these nonprofit organizations might consider specifically addressing those needs through their marketing and recruiting efforts for all higher education occupational groups.
A second key finding from this research question was students had higher scores on the Career scale than staff members, faculty members, administration, or retired people. With a mean score of 26.51, the students had scored career interests significantly higher than all other occupation groups (outside academia was next highest for career with a mean of 21.36). These results were aligned with previous research by Handy and Mook (2011) that describes an investment-focused model that implies volunteers can obtain private benefits from training and acquire skills through volunteering, which increases their human capital. The principle that people want to volunteer to further their career also supports past research that relates to the utilitarian function described by Katz (1960) and exemplified in a study by Jenner (1982) where individuals providing volunteer services for the Junior League perceived their volunteer experiences as a method for improving or maintaining their career-related skills (Clary, et al., 1998).

**Practical Implications.** As a result of these findings, nonprofit organizations (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi) might consider directing more of their future recruiting efforts towards students with messages that convey the significance of volunteering in developing career skills.

The third and final key outcome from research question 3 was the students (n=23.23) and staff members (n=22.82) had higher mean scores on the Enhancement scale than faculty members (n=18.08) or administrators (n=18.25). The Enhancement function seeks to measure how much an individual is seeking to grow and develop psychologically through involvement in volunteering. Clary et al. (1998) identified research on volunteerism that showed evidence of positive strivings, such as Anderson and Moore’s (1978) report that some people volunteer for reasons of personal development or Jenner’s (1982) findings that volunteers obtain satisfactions related to personal growth and self-esteem. Clary et al. (1998) considered the protective function
to be concerned with eliminating negative aspects surrounding the ego, while the enhancement function is related to the development of the positive features of volunteers ego. It is reasonable to conclude that these results indicate that students and staff members are more likely than faculty members and administrators to be receptive to volunteer recruiting messages that augment personal growth.

**Practical Implications.** As a result of these findings, nonprofit practitioners may consider developing recruitment messages that augment personal growth by identifying direct benefits to positive feelings (Enhancement function), due to the fact that this function was more important to students and staff participants.

**Research Question 4.** The fourth research question of this study was: To what extent are there differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank?

To better understand the final research question, a follow-up item on the questionnaire asked participants that indicated “faculty” on the previous item to designate their “faculty rank.” Descriptive results show the majority of the faculty members were ranked as tenured full professor (38.1%), followed by tenured associate professor (31.1%) and all others (30.5%). The outcome of the final research question revealed that there were differences in volunteering motivation factors as a function of faculty rank. The follow-up ANOVA test was statistically significant for the understanding, career, and enhancement scores, but not statistically significant for the values, social, or protective scores.

There are three key findings from research question 4. First, was the lowest faculty rank group had higher scores on the Understanding scale than tenured full professors. Since the researcher did not find any previous research associated with volunteer motivation and faculty rank, this outcome may imply that the lowest faculty rank group (tenured assistant professors,
non-tenured full-time faculty, full-time instructors, and adjunct instructors) may be more likely motivated by volunteer opportunities that will allow them to engage in new learning experiences as well as exercise knowledge, skills, and abilities that may otherwise go unpracticed (Clary, et al., 1998) than tenured full professors. Similar to Meyer’s (2008) study, it is reasonable to conclude that members of the lowest faculty rank group who serve as campus organization advisors (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi chapter officers) are motivated to serve based on the Understanding function, which is to develop and practice new skills (Clary, et al., 1998).

**Practical Implications.** As a result of these findings, nonprofit organizations (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi) may consider developing messages aimed towards recruiting the lowest faculty rank group (tenured assistant professors, non-tenured full-time faculty, full-time instructors, and adjunct instructors) by highlighting the significance of volunteering in developing new skills.

The second key finding was tenured full professors had lower scores than both the tenured associate professor group and the lowest faculty rank group on the Career scale. These results identify a high importance for the Career scale for both the tenured associate professor group and the lowest faculty rank group, while detecting a low importance for the tenured associate professor faculty members. This effect may be a result of tenured full professors being at the highest rank for a faculty member compared to associate tenured professors and the lowest rank faculty groups are still seeking to advance within the faculty ranks. Similar to results found by Meyer (2008), it may be reasonable to conclude that campus organization advisors (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi chapter officers) who responded to career statements as low importance are secure with their employment and believe the volunteer service will not influence future jobs.

**Practical Implications.** As a result of these findings, practitioners looking to recruit volunteers for campus organizations (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi) may consider developing career
oriented messages geared toward tenured associate professor group and the lowest faculty rank group.

The final key finding from research question 4 is the indication that the lowest faculty rank group had higher scores than tenured full professors on the Enhancement scale. As stated earlier, the Enhancement function seeks to measure how much an individual is seeking to grow and develop psychologically through involvement in volunteering. These findings are consistent with Jenner (1982), Anderson and Moore (1978), and Clary et al.’s (1998) research that some people volunteer for reasons of personal development or satisfactions related to personal growth and self-esteem. It is reasonable to conclude that these results indicate that the lowest faculty rank group is more likely than tenured full professors to be receptive to volunteer recruiting messages that augment personal growth.

**Practical Implications.** As a result of these findings, nonprofit organizations (e.g. Phi Kappa Phi) may consider developing recruitment messages aimed toward the lowest faculty rank group that enhance personal growth by identifying direct benefits to positive feelings (Enhancement function).

**Summary of Practical Implications.** Based on an analysis of the data, it is reasonable to assume some methods that might be effective in recruiting and retaining campus organization advisors. Nonprofit organizations that are recruiting and retaining volunteer campus organization advisors (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi chapter officers) at higher education institutions may, in general, want to examine recruitment strategies that include the Values and Understanding motivations. The Social and Enhancement motivations might be added if these organizations are specifically trying to recruit and retain faculty members, staff members, and administrators to serve as campus organization volunteers. For recruiting strategies that center on attracting
student volunteers, organizations may want to focus efforts that add the Career and Enhancement motivations. In contrast, in an effort to retain current volunteers, practitioners might consider focusing on more career type communications.

**Future Research**

The results of this study offer several possibilities for additional research in order to more fully understand what motivates people to do volunteer work at higher education nonprofit organizations (e.g., The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi) and determine if differences exist in volunteer motivation. The assumptions for this study were the intentions to continue volunteering, level of volunteering, occupation, and faculty rank would be indicative of actual continued volunteering. However, at present it is not known if that will prove to be true for The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Perhaps a longitudinal study would afford the opportunity to include an appraisal of whether intent to continue volunteering is truly predictive of future volunteer behavior.

Based on the descriptive findings of this study, further research should be conducted to determine how The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi can appeal to a more diverse volunteer population. The majority of the participants were female (66.1%), education was a doctoral degree (54.6%), average age of 50.08 years old, ethnic group was White (86.5%), occupation was faculty (46.7%) member, and among faculty members, the most common level was tenured full professor (38.1%). The national Phi Kappa Phi organization currently has chapters at over 300 colleges and universities at both public and private institutions located in both urban and rural areas. This diversity of these chapters should provide a more diverse volunteer base; however, further research should focus on finding new members by determining if non-members
possess similar volunteer motivations and what barriers are keeping them from joining and volunteering.

Finally, while this thesis identified the overall importance of Values and Understanding functions in motivating individuals to volunteer for Phi Kappa Phi, future research may benefit from adding a qualitative dimension to the collection of the quantitative VFI data. This may provide more insight into how Phi Kappa Phi volunteers describe their motivations for volunteering. In addition, for faculty members, a better understanding of why certain faculty ranks are motivated by certain VFI functions may provide more depth to any conclusions drawn compared to the collection of quantitative data from the VFI scale.

Conclusions

The purpose of this doctoral thesis was to expand the work on functionalist theory and how it relates to the motivation of nonprofit volunteers by attempting to understand what motivates people to do volunteer work at The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Contributions to the current knowledge-base in the area of volunteer motivation include: extending the data gathered using the VFI which may contribute to further understanding and use of that instrument, and providing a better understanding of what motivates people to volunteer for The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

The practical usefulness of this research is clear since The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi accomplishes a wide variety of important work through its mission “to recognize and promote academic excellence in all fields of higher education and to engage the community of scholars in service to others” (Phi Kappa Phi, 2012b, p. 1). Phi Kappa Phi and other prominent honor societies, focus their efforts on honoring excellence in academics and the integrity of character. These honor societies exist because those who founded them believed that these are achievements worthy of celebration. Based on the results of this study, it is reasonable to assume
some of the methods discussed in this chapter might be useful in recruiting and retaining campus organization advisors. Practitioners that are recruiting and retaining volunteer campus organization advisors (e.g., Phi Kappa Phi chapter officers) at higher education institutions may want to revise their recruitment strategies to develop messaging that is directed more towards specific types of volunteers. A better understanding of what motivates individuals to become volunteers at institutions of higher learning will assist in both recruiting new volunteers and retaining current volunteers. This will allow nonprofit organizations (e.g., The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi) to provide more programs and services to more worthy scholars.
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Appendix A: Survey Pre-Letter

October 3, 2012

Dear Phi Kappa Phi Volunteer,

Within the next few weeks you will receive an email request to participate in a brief online survey about The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. This survey is being conducted for the doctoral research of Jim Carlson, at the College of Professional Studies, Northeastern University. Jim is a Chapter Relations Director at Phi Kappa Phi.

You were chosen to participate in this study because you were a volunteer of Phi Kappa Phi. This survey study is limited to the volunteers in 2011-2012; therefore, your response will be important to the success of this research.

The purpose of this survey is to understand what motivates members and non-members of Phi Kappa Phi to volunteer with the local and national organization. We also hope to determine the motives for volunteers who plan to continue volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi compared to those who do not, as well as to determine the demographic characteristics of the average Phi Kappa Phi volunteer.

I am writing to you in advance of the actual survey because many people like to know ahead of time that they have been selected to be part of a research study. This is an important study for the national office as we work to grow the organization and to meet the needs of the members.

I hope you will consider taking time out of your busy schedule to provide your feedback in the next few weeks to help move the Society forward. The survey will be distributed by email on Wednesday, October 10, 2012, and remain open until the close date of Wednesday, October 24, 2012. It is because of committed volunteers like you that we will have the information we need to move Phi Kappa Phi to the next level.

Sincerely,

Mary Todd, Ph.D.
Executive Director
The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies  
Principal Investigator: Carol Ann Sharicz, Student Researcher: Jim Carlson  
Protocol Title: The Call to Serve: A Survey Study Exploring the Motives of Volunteering  

Online Survey Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a research study that seeks to explore the motives of volunteering, especially as it relates to The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. In the 115 years of its existence, Phi Kappa Phi has been the subject of very little empirical research. Therefore, a scarce amount of information exists about the demographic characteristics of the volunteers of Phi Kappa Phi and what motivates them to engage in volunteer work.

You were chosen to participate in this study because you volunteered as a chapter officer, committee member, or Society board member. This survey study is limited to the volunteers of Phi Kappa Phi in 2011-2012; so your response is very important to the success of this research. Our study centers on the motivation of member and non-member volunteers. We also hope to determine the motives for volunteers who plan to continue volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi compared to those who do not.

Every effort will be made to keep your answers confidential, and your answers will be consolidated with others and reported only as group information. Your participation is totally voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue in this study at any time. It should take you approximately 5-10 minutes to complete this survey.

There should be no risks to participating in this survey, and there also will be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that your participation will be of assistance in the growth of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

If you have any questions, concerns or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. You may contact Jim Carlson at 800-804-9880, ext. 12. If you would rather contact us in writing, please email jcarlson@phikappaphi.org.

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.7570, Email: irb@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

Thank you again for your help in this study.
By clicking on the survey link below you are indicating that you consent to participate in this study. Please print out a copy of this consent form for your records.

https://s.zoomerang.com/s/carlson_pkp_survey

Sincerely,

Jim Carlson
Chapter Relations Director
The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
Appendix C: Survey Email Reminder

Dear Phi Kappa Phi Volunteers:

I would like to remind everyone about the Volunteer Motivation Survey. This survey is an excellent opportunity for you to share your reasons for serving at Phi Kappa Phi. The study is limited to the volunteers of Phi Kappa Phi in 2011-2012, and so far, 20% have participated – thank you to all who have taken the survey.

If you have not taken the survey, please consider visiting: https://s.zoomerang.com/s/carlson_pkp_survey—it should only take about 5-10 minutes to complete. The survey will close on Wednesday, October 24, 2012.

Online Survey Informed Consent

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies
Principal Investigator: Carol Ann Sharicz, Student Researcher: Jim Carlson
Protocol Title: The Call to Serve: A Survey Study Exploring the Motives of Volunteering

You are being asked to participate in a research study that seeks to explore the motives of volunteering, especially as it related to The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. In the 115 years of its existence, Phi Kappa Phi has been the subject of very little empirical research. Therefore, a scarce amount of information exists about the demographic characteristics of the volunteers of Phi Kappa Phi and what motivates them to engage in volunteer work.

You were chosen to participate in this study because you volunteered as a chapter officer, committee member, or Society board member. This survey study is limited to the volunteers of Phi Kappa Phi in 2011-2012; so your response is very important to the success of this research. Our study centers on the motivation of member and non-member volunteers. We also hope to determine the motives for volunteers who plan to continue volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi compared to those who do not.

Every effort will be made to keep your answers confidential, and your answers will be consolidated with others and reported only as group information. Your participation is totally voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue in this study at any time. It should take you approximately 5-10 minutes to complete this survey.
There should be no risks to participating in this survey, and there also will be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that your participation will be of assistance in the growth of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

If you have any questions, concerns or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. You may contact Jim Carlson at 800-804-9880, ext. 12. If you would rather contact us in writing, please email jcarlson@phikappaphi.org.

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.7570, Email: irb@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

Thank you again for your help in this study.

**By clicking on the survey link below you are indicating that you consent to participate in this study. Please print out a copy of this consent form for your records.**

https://s.zoomerang.com/s/carlson_pkp_survey

Sincerely,

Jim Carlson
Chapter Relations Director
The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
Appendix D: Survey Instrument

The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
Volunteerism Survey 2012

Thank you for taking time to participate in this important study of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. As a Phi Kappa Phi volunteer in 2011-2012, your responses are important for the future of the Society. Very little research has been done in the past, so this study will provide information that will be used to help the national association continue to grow.

Section 1: Opt-out question

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), volunteering is defined as persons who perform unpaid volunteer activities.

Based on this definition, do you qualify as a volunteer for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi?

_____ yes
_____ no

- If they answer “no”: Thank you for volunteering for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi and taking this brief survey (survey ends).

Section 2: Circle the numbers below that best describe your answers to the following questions.

Volunteering is an important part of carrying-out the mission of Phi Kappa Phi. Please indicate how important each item is as it relates to your motivation to volunteer for the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. In selecting an answer, be realistic about your motivation. Use the following scale with 1 being “not at all important” and 7 being “extremely important.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = not at all important</th>
<th>4 = neutral</th>
<th>7 = extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends volunteer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I’m close to want me to volunteer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I know share an interest in community service.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>By volunteering I feel less lonely.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Volunteering increases my self-esteem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel compassion toward people in need.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands-on experience.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel it is important to help others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I can do something for a cause that is important to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel needed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3:

Please answer each question below with the answer that most closely fits you in each category.

31. In what year were you born? ______

32. What is your gender?
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

33. What is your highest level of education completed?
   _____ Less than High School
   _____ High School Graduate
   _____ Technical School or Associate Degree (AS, AA, etc.)
   _____ Bachelor’s Degree (BA, BS, etc.)
   _____ Master’s Degree (MA, MS, MBA, etc.)
   _____ Professional Degree (MD, DDS, DVM, JD, etc.)
   _____ Doctorate Degree (EdD, PhD, etc.)

34. Are you a member of Phi Kappa Phi?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   ➢ If so, then:  Are you an active (dues paying) member of a chapter?
     _____ Yes
     _____ No
   ➢ Are you an active (dues paying) member of the national organization?
     _____ Yes
     _____ No
   ➢ Are you an active for life member?
     _____ Yes
     _____ No

35. To what degree would you classify your engagement with Phi Kappa Phi?

Please select all that apply:

   _____ Chapter Officers – members and non-members, who serve as local officers (such as President, Vice-President/President Elect, Secretary, Treasurer, Student Vice Presidents, Past President, Scholarship and Awards Officer, Public Relations Officer, or Chapter Administration), for a chapter of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
Committee Members – Standing committees and councils are those that have continuous existence. All standing committees and councils are advisory to the Board. There shall be the following standing committees and councils: Executive, Chapter Relations, Investment, Marketing and Member Benefits, Fellowship and Awards Council, Bylaws, Council of Students, and others.

Board of Directors – the 2010-2012 Board of Directors was made up of President, President Elect, Past President, Executive Director, VP for Member and Marketing Benefits, VP for Chapters Relations, VP for Fellowships and Awards, VP for Finance, two VP’s for Students, and two VP’s at Large.

36. Do you consider yourself as being active or engaged with a local chapter?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No
   ______ N/A (I am not affiliated with a local program)

37. How many years have you volunteered with Phi Kappa Phi?
   ________ years (local chapter)
   ________ years (national)

38. How many hours annually do you volunteer for Phi Kappa Phi activities at any level?
   ________ hours

39. Have you actively recruited individuals to become Phi Kappa Phi volunteers?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

40. Who encouraged you to volunteer with Phi Kappa Phi?
   ______ Colleague, non-member
   ______ Colleague, Phi Kappa Phi member
   ______ Local Phi Kappa Phi chapter officer
   ______ Decided to volunteer myself
   ______ Other (please specify) ______________________________

41. Do you plan to volunteer for Phi Kappa Phi in 2012-2013?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

42. A. If they answer “yes” (on question 44): What is your motivation for choosing to continue volunteering for Phi Kappa Phi? _______________________

   B. If they answer “no” (on question 44): What are reasons for choosing not to continue volunteering at Phi Kappa Phi? _______________________

   C. All, what can Phi Kappa Phi do to enhance your volunteer experience? __________
43. When did join Phi Kappa Phi?
____ As an undergraduate
____ As an graduate/professional student
____ As an alumni
____ As a faculty, staff, or administrator
____ As an Honorary member

44. For how many other organizations do you actively volunteer?
_____ (please specify how many)

45. What is your ethnic background?
_____ American Indian or Alaska Native
_____ Asian
_____ Black or African American
_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
_____ Hispanic
_____ White
_____ Other (please specify) ____________________

46. What is your occupation?
_____ Student
_____ Staff
_____ Faculty
- If faculty, what is your faculty level?
  _____ adjunct instructor
  _____ full-time instructor
  _____ non-tenured full-time faculty
  _____ full professor tenured
  _____ assoc. professor tenured
  _____ asst. professor tenured
_____ Administration
_____ Outside academia
_____ Retired
_____ Other

47. What is your chapter’s regional affiliation?
_____ Northeast
_____ North Central
_____ Southeast
_____ South Central
_____ West
Thank you for your time in completing this important survey. Your answers will be kept confidential and combined with all other responses for reporting. For a copy of the results of this study, contact the researcher at the address below:

Mr. Jim Carlson  
Chapter Relations Director  
The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi  
7576 Goodwood Blvd.  
Baton Rouge, LA 70806  
jcarlson@phikappaphi.org  
800-804-9880 ext. 12