Understanding and Encouraging Volunteerism and Community Involvement

Arthur A. Stukas   Mark Snyder   E. Gil Clary

La Trobe University   University of Minnesota   Kutztown University

Please address correspondence concerning this article to Art Stukas, Department of Psychology and Counselling, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria 3086, Australia. Tel. 61-3-9479-1515. Email: A.Stukas@latrobe.edu.au.

9 February 2016

Abstract

Volunteerism and community involvement have been demonstrated to offer benefits both to communities and to volunteers themselves. However, not every method to encourage these behaviors is equally effective in producing committed volunteers. Drawing on relevant theoretical and empirical literatures, we identify features of efforts that are likely to produce intrinsically motivated other-oriented volunteers and those that may produce extrinsically motivated self-oriented volunteers. In particular, we explore ways to socialize young people to help and ways to build a sense of community focused on particular issues. We also examine requirements for community service and other approaches that highlight self-oriented benefits that volunteers may obtain. Finally, we return to a focus on the importance of intrinsic motivation for promoting sustained involvement in volunteers, even as we acknowledge that volunteers who come with extrinsic or self-oriented reasons can still offer much to communities and can be satisfied when their activities match their motivations. (150 words)

Keywords: volunteerism; community involvement; motivation; intrinsic motivation; extrinsic motivation.

Understanding and Encouraging Volunteerism and Community Involvement

Every year, millions of people around the world contribute time and effort for organizations that provide help to people and groups in need, with contributions taking the form of social support, physical assistance, organizing and advising, ensuring that group activities can function, or acting on behalf of causes or movements designed to improve quality of life. In many domains, core activities of people's lives would be disrupted if volunteers were not present to provide much needed help; for example, schools, health clinics, animal shelters and countless other organizations rely heavily on the labor of volunteers.

There have now been several decades of research on volunteering and community involvement from a psychological perspective (see Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 2015, for a review). The general consensus is that the prosocial actions of volunteers offer numerous benefits not only to communities but also to volunteers themselves (Snyder, Omoto, & Dwyer, in press). While we are not saying that volunteering has no costs or downsides or that all such activities are worth promoting (e.g., Clary & Snyder, 2002), *on balance*, bringing people together in ways that enhance and improve the lives of community members has been shown to be a good thing. Thus, the next step is to find ways to promote community involvement and volunteering and to determine the factors that influence when and why volunteer engagement leads to positive rather than to nil or negative outcomes.

In our earlier writing on "social marketing" efforts to attract volunteers (e.g., Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 2008), we divided potential targets of recruitment efforts into three groups: those ready to volunteer, those open to good offers to volunteer, and those resistant to volunteering. Although it is not entirely clear why a person might fall into one or another of these categories (and it may depend on the particular type of activity on offer), research has identified numerous personal antecedents of volunteer activity, such as dispositional traits,

interpersonal skills, and demographic characteristics (e.g., Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; or Wilson, 2012, for a review). This research raises the question of whether *stable personal characteristics* lead people to volunteer, and whether non-volunteers without these stable characteristics might be encouraged to get involved. Our earlier focus on people "open to good offers" suggested that recruitment messages that target the important goals of particular potential volunteers can work. However, methods to encourage those resistant to volunteering seemed to have very mixed results. Moreover, not every "good offer" will result in sustained commitments to volunteering even if volunteers are attracted for the short term.

In this article, we provide a conceptual overview of the factors underlying efforts to promote volunteerism and community involvement, focused primarily on the ways in which these efforts influence sustained patterns of volunteering. As we do so, we integrate the seven articles that appear in this special issue of *The Journal of Social Psychology* on "Volunteerism and Community Involvement" with the existing research literature. Throughout the special issue, the authors investigate factors that make volunteering more likely, satisfying, or sustained, ranging from informal and formal efforts focused on young people to the broader motivating influences that lead adults to get involved. In the literature and in the special issue itself, there is a tension between approaches that rely principally on the intrinsically motivating aspects of volunteerism and community involvement and those that rely on extrinsic motivators to encourage service. We hope that our analytic considerations in this article, as well as the contributions of the articles in this special issue, will help move this debate toward a resolution.

Socialization

Efforts to develop an ongoing commitment to prosocial behavior might work best if they begin early, by encouraging young people to engage in such actions. Modelling of giving and volunteering by parents, including offering opportunities for children to get

involved, can set the stage for later prosocial behaviors by children (e.g., Eisenberg, Eggum-Wilkens, & Spinrad, 2015; Staub, 2005). For example, McGinley, Lipperman-Kreda, Byrnes, and Carlo (2010) demonstrated an indirect effect of parents' own volunteering (and encouragement of their children) on Israeli teens' volunteerism; this relationship was mediated by teens' feelings of sympathy and self-perceptions of helpfulness. A civic family orientation (operationalized as the extent to which the family discusses and gets involved with community and political events) may also contribute to the amount of volunteering that adolescents do (e.g., Van Goethem, van Hoof, van Aken, de Castro, & Raaijmakers, 2014). As Luengo Kanacri et al. (this issue) suggest, one pathway to wider civic and community engagement may be through donations to charities of choice; parents might encourage young people to use their spending money in this positive way to later good effect. Ensuring that such actions are attributed internally to prosocial concern and not externally to extrinsic rewards or pressures would seem to be important in this regard (e.g., Fabes, Fultz, Eisenberg, May-Plumlee, & Christopher, 1989).

Parents can also encourage prosocial attitudes and behavior through nurturant actions toward their own children, including displays of warmth, use of authoritative but not authoritarian parenting styles, and conversations about moral issues (see Eisenberg et al., 2015, for a review). Resulting feelings of empathy or sympathy for those in need and internalized prosocial values are likely to boost rates of volunteering and community involvement (see Stukas et al., 2015). In addition, children who develop secure attachment styles as a result of their bonds with parents are also more likely to volunteer later in life (Gillath, Shaver, Mikulincer, Nitzberg, Erez, & Van Ijzendoorn, 2005).

Through socialization, children may learn that helping can make them feel good or reduce negative feelings (e.g., Cialdini, Baumann, & Kenrick, 1981). These hedonistic goals for prosocial behavior may relate to the desires for self-enhancement and protection from

negative self-perceptions that have been identified as important motivations for volunteering (e.g., Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen & Miene, 1998). Socialization can also help children to make the transition from normative helping (responding to social sanctions) to autonomous helping (acting on internalized values), categories identified by Rosenhan (1970) that are a function of both relations with parents (warm vs. ambivalent) and parental modeling of helping behaviors (explicit or hypocritical). Yet, even those people who have not experienced an upbringing that lends itself to internalized and autonomous helping may be encouraged through specific situational factors and interventions to get involved in their communities and to persist in their social actions (e.g., Clary & Miller, 1986). So, there is hope that those who are not dispositionally inclined toward helping or who do not benefit from childhood environments that encourage such action can be subsequently influenced toward community involvement.

Sense of Community

The socialization of young people may also include introducing them to existing communities and helping them to feel a sense of belonging to these groups. Religious organizations are prominent examples and indeed religious participation has long been associated with volunteering and community engagement (e.g., Hustinx, van Essen, Haers, & Mels, 2015; Maton & Domingo, 2006). However, geographical communities such as neighborhoods, towns, and cities also engage residents, young and old, through events and opportunities to get involved. As Omoto and Packard (this issue) report, a strong sense of community is associated with increased volunteering. This sense of community may be location-based, as in their Study 1 of retirement community dwellers, or it may be a community focused on an important issue or avocation, as in their Study 2 of environmental volunteers. Omoto and Snyder (2002, 2010) have outlined how community can be both the

environment (physical or not) in which involvement takes place and also the continually changing collective process that people build through their efforts and identification.

Building a new community or instilling a sense of community may not be as easy as introducing new members to thriving existing communities. We already know that many volunteers are recruited by people from their social networks (Musick & Wilson, 2008; Omoto & Snyder, 2002); this suggests that levels of social capital are linked to getting involved, although social capital may be both cause and consequence (e.g., Flanagan, Kim, Collura, & Kopish, 2015). But how can a sense of community be created or promoted to get the ball rolling? Omoto and Snyder (2010) have used small-group workshops to foster a psychological sense of community in people who have an initial interest in, and a concern for, those affected by HIV and AIDS. Compared to a no-workshop control, their intervention boosted sense of community and more importantly, boosted intentions to engage in different forms of social action, such as giving money and volunteering for relevant community organizations. Similarly, Thomas, McGarty, and Mavor (2015) drew on Kurt Lewin's (1947) ground-breaking studies showing that group interactions increased women's willingness to serve offal to their families during wartime, and demonstrated how 30-minute discussions of a United Nations program designed to provide safe water to developing countries could boost action tendencies and social identification in students. Thus, bringing people together in small groups and working with them to create a feeling of shared sense of community may boost their willingness to get involved in prosocial action.

Collaborative tasks can even increase prosocial behavior across previously delineated group lines by invoking identification with a larger superordinate ingroup (e.g., Dovidio et al., 1997). Whether it is appropriate to call these new ingroups "communities" is an open question, but promoting new ways of construing group memberships may be the first step toward building a broader sense of community. As Stürmer, Rohmann, and van der Noll (this

issue) demonstrated, even efforts to encourage people to identify with as large a group as all humanity may help to promote volunteerism for global causes. McFarland, Webb, and Brown (2012) also revealed that an individual difference measure of Identification with All Humanity predicted willingness to donate money for international relief efforts. Such efforts may represent a form of "collectivism", or actions designed to improve the welfare of a group, one of the primary motivations for community involvement identified by Batson, Ahmad, and Tsang (2002).

Under ordinary circumstances, however, most people may tend first to their own more circumscribed ingroups or communities to the extent that they feel or are encouraged to feel that they identify with them. This preference for ingroup helping may be more common in longstanding and stable residential communities (e.g., Lun, Oishi, & Tenney, 2012). Thus, some helping can be a closed system, creating *bonding* social capital where the social ties are strong and inward-looking within groups (Putnam, 2000) but not *bridging* capital where ties are weaker but span between groups. However, despite its benefits for social inclusion, we must acknowledge that the promotion of "outgroup helping" can be complicated. When status relations between groups are unstable, high powered groups may prefer to provide help that keeps the other group in a position of dependency, whereas low powered groups may prefer to receive help that promotes autonomy and self-help and may even reject dependency-oriented help; see Nadler (2015) for a review. Indeed, diversity within communities is often negatively related to rates of volunteering, possibly because it relates to a lack of trust between people in different groups (e.g., Rotolo & Wilson, 2014). The implications are that communities may be easier to build when they are homogeneous and promote ingroup helping. However a moral imperative to create and sustain communities of people who are willing to offer autonomy-oriented help to outgroup members in need would yield a host of benefits both to recipients and to society (see Snyder et al., in press), not least because this

form of help promotes equality, self-sufficiency, and social inclusion, principles that are held in high regard in democratic societies (e.g., Jiranek, Kals, Humm, Strubel, & Wehner, 2013; Nadler, 2015).

Service-Learning and Other Requirements to Serve

Some communities may rely on explicit social norms, and even actual social pressure, to encourage their members to engage; for example, religious communities invoke moral prescriptions to act benevolently (e.g., Johnson, Memon, Alladin, Cohen, & Okun, 2015). However, other communities may also decide to use requirements to encourage and even force involvement and prosocial action. For example, in the United States, residents of public housing are subject to a Community Service and Self-Sufficiency Requirement (e.g., Seattle Housing Authority, 2016) that involves eight hours of service (for those not engaged in paid employment for at least that amount of time) with the objective of improving resident well-being and self-sufficiency.

The most common use of requirements to engage in community service is in the educational arena, where service-learning programs can be promoted as offering both benefits to knowledge and benefits to communities. Indeed, the outcomes of service-learning programs are varied and there can be no doubt that participants benefit in many ways (see Stukas, Clary, & Snyder, 1999, and Yorio & Ye, 2012, for reviews). For example, Flanagan et al. (2015) found that participating in community service activities increased adolescents' reports of both bonding and bridging social capital and more so than participating in other extracurricular activities; this benefit did not change depending on whether the service was mandated or freely chosen. Thus, one benefit of even required activities is to expose students to new people and to allow them to develop trusting bonds, both within groups and across groups – this could bolster the development of a new broader psychological sense of community, a further spur to involvement (as discussed above).

At the same time, other studies suggest that prosocial motivations or intentions to engage in future community service or volunteering may be undermined by requirements, at least for a subset of participants. Our own research on "mandatory volunteerism" (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999) found that university students who felt that requirements were controlling or who claimed to be "not ready" to volunteer had lowered future intentions compared to students who did not find the requirements as intrusive. More recently, in a longitudinal study of more than 16,000 secondary school students, Horn (2012) found that students showed increases in prosocial value orientation after engaging in community service for humanitarian organizations -- but not when they felt explicitly pressured (or even strongly encouraged) to do so. Institutional requirements to engage in community service were not effective in boosting the prosocial values of students who were initially egoistic in their value orientation, but requirements did not undermine the values of those who were originally more prosocial. However, freely chosen community service had much stronger effects on the internalization of prosocial values than required service for all students, including those originally more egoistic. These findings corroborate longitudinal studies showing that students who were originally positive toward volunteering when required sustained their service activities further into the future than students who were less positive from the start, particularly if they had engaged in a lot of service, required or not, during high school (e.g., Hart, Donnelly, Youniss & Atkins, 2007; Planty, Bozick, & Regnier, 2006).

To prevent some students from experiencing reactance against efforts to encourage their involvement, programs promoting community service by educational institutions need to be implemented with care, as suggested by Dienhart et al. (this issue). Dienhart et al. found that required programs that were not properly introduced in terms of their rationale and benefits could be interpreted by students as an extra burden which consequently undermined their motivation to serve in the future. Thus, more clearly explaining why required

community service programs fit with students' own goals may be one possible solution. The functional approach to understanding volunteerism argues that volunteer experiences that allow participants to satisfy their most important motivations will be the ones that lead to greater satisfaction and potentially other benefits and those that do not fulfill motives will be less likely to do so (see Stukas, Worth, Clary, & Snyder, 2009). Therefore the undermining effects of requirements may be ameliorated if participants can choose their own opportunities or, better yet, be placed in service activities that are expected to offer benefits that are matched to students' primary motivations (but see Houle, Sagarin, & Kaplan, 2005, for a caveat). Indeed, in a recent study of university business students in a required service-learning program, Nicholls and Schimmel (2012) demonstrated that the extent to which students saw their motivations fulfilled in their activities (as assessed by the Total Match Index; Stukas et al., 2009) was a strong predictor of their future intentions to volunteer, mediated by both positive attitude change toward service and satisfaction.

Another possibility for avoiding reactance is to increase the amount of "autonomy support" that is offered by the volunteer placement organization, where efforts are made to encourage people's sense that the behaviors to be undertaken are personally desirable and freely chosen (Gagne, 2003). Perceptions of autonomy support were negatively associated with volunteer turnover (but only marginally predictive of hours volunteered) in Gagne's study of animal welfare volunteers. A further study by Millette and Gagné (2008) examining volunteer position characteristics demonstrated that a position's perceived motivating potential (including perceptions of the variety of activities included, the impact on the lives of other people, the level of autonomy, and the amount of performance feedback available) was positively correlated with both volunteers' satisfaction and supervisors' ratings of volunteer performance. Given that perceptions of controllingness and a lack of autonomy by helpers have been related to reduced intentions to volunteer in the future (e.g., Stukas et al., 1999),

reduced quality of help and reduced well-being for volunteers (e.g., Weinstein & Ryan, 2010), it seems important to ensure that any requirements or even strong encouragements to engage in community service are tempered by efforts to retain volunteers' perceptions of freedom and intrinsic motivation.

External or Extrinsic Motivations to Volunteer

Requirements to engage in community service are but one external factor governing the initiation of involvement, and in fact, there are many incentives for volunteering (e.g., Snyder et al., in press). Benefits for career advancement are a key tangible outcome for many younger volunteers (see Clary et al., 1998; Snyder et al., 2000). These and other self-oriented motivations (e.g., esteem enhancement, self-protection) may offer real benefits to volunteers, particularly if service activities allow volunteers to fulfil these motivations when important (e.g., Stukas et al., 2009). However, more self-oriented motivations may be associated with reduced intentions to continue volunteering in the future and with lower psychological and physical well-being (Gebauer, Riketta, Broemer, & Maio, 2008; Konrath Fuhrel-Forbis, Lou, & Brown, 2012; Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown & Aisbett, 2016).

As Güntert, Kals, Strubel, and Wehner (this issue) point out, in line with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), the extent to which motivations are associated with feelings of autonomy and self-determination or feelings of control may be one of the keys for discovering when and why certain motivations produce positive effects and others do not. Theoretically, any goal can be pursued because it is self-determined and driven by intrinsic processes, or because of some degree of control exerted through rewards or punishments, including experiences of guilt or shame. However, extrinsically motivated activities are typically associated with reduced persistence, as compared to intrinsically motivated activities (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2000). Therefore, volunteerism to gain instrumental

self-benefits or to avoid negative emotions might not be sustainable and might not improve well-being.

One reason why helping that is required, pressured, or controlled does not increase well-being may be because it has been associated with lower needs-satisfaction (for autonomy, relatedness, and competence) than helping that is freely chosen and self-determined (e.g., Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Yet, as Okun and Kim (this issue) conclude, there may yet be a positive effect of being pressured into volunteering if this results in high rates of behavior, at least with regard to purpose in life. Similarly, other concrete benefits may accrue regardless of volunteers' motivations, as long as they are afforded by the service activities involved (e.g., Flanagan et al., 2015). Moreover, external influences to get involved might only undermine the experiences and benefits of those who perceive the activities and the pressures used to encourage them negatively (e.g., Horn, 2012; Planty et al., 2006; Stukas et al., 1999).

In our own studies (e.g., Clary et al., 1998; Stukas et al., 2009), we have focused on the ways in which the volunteer environment can be tailored to provide motivation-matching benefits to volunteers and on demonstrating how this can predict greater satisfaction with volunteering and higher intentions to continue. Following from the functional theories of attitudes (Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1959), we have identified six primary functional motivations to volunteer that we assess with the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary et al., 1998): to express important *values*; to increase *understanding* of the world, an issue, other people, or one's own abilities; to experience self-*enhancement* and positive feelings toward the self; to fulfil the *social* expectations of one's friends, family, and reference group; to gain a *protective* benefit against negative feelings and self-beliefs; and to secure *career* opportunities and advancement. Moreover, we have demonstrated how an understanding of the motivations of potential volunteers can assist with the design of

recruitment messages to attract them (e.g., Clary et al., 1998; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994). However, we have never explicitly discriminated between self-determined and controlled motivations, seeing this as an orthogonal and qualitative dimension that might characterize the same goal differently for different volunteers under different conditions. In contrast, Güntert et al. (this issue) argue that some of the motivations that we have studied, particularly the values and understanding motives, are relatively more self-determined than others.

Other researchers have contrasted self-oriented egoistic and other-oriented altruistic motivations without invoking self-determination theory. Typically, values motivation is declared to be the only purely altruistic motivation (e.g., Cornelis, Van Hiel, & De Cremer, 2013; but see Omoto et al., 2010, who include community concern, a seventh prominent motivation, as altruistic) with all of the other motivations involving some egoistic self-oriented benefits. However, looser operationalizations that classify social or even understanding motivation as other-oriented also exist (e.g., Konrath et al., 2012; Stukas et al., 2016). In contrast, Finkelstein (2009) categorized only career as an external motivation, judging the other five motivations to be internal, in that they could be satisfied within the context of the volunteer activity itself. Generally, researchers have found that egoistic, self-oriented motivations are associated with smaller effects or poorer outcomes but some exceptions exist. For example, Omoto and Snyder (1995) found that egoistic motivations were a significant predictor of volunteer longevity whereas more altruistic motivations were not, suggesting that people with purely altruistic motivations may burn out. Cornelis et al. (2013) found that self-oriented motivations were important predictors of "in-role" volunteer behaviors, those that involve living up to the expectations of the role, whereas other-oriented motivations predicted "extra-role" behaviors that go beyond what is expected. Nevertheless,

promoting volunteering and community involvement by advertising extrinsic rewards and benefits may result in a mixed bag of effects.

Although we argue that any important motivation that is fulfilled in a volunteer's experience should be satisfying and should lead to sustained behavior (e.g., Snyder et al., 2000), we recognize that there may be constraints on this principle. For example, some motivations, such as those focused on career or understanding goals, could be satiated by sustained activities, as when volunteers meet the contacts and develop the skills that enable them to secure paid employment or when they learn all there is to learn about a particular issue or experience. Even activities that are matched to and fulfil primary motivations may not promote ongoing commitments if terminal goals are the sole focus of volunteers. Indeed, in our studies, volunteers' satisfaction is generally more strongly influenced than future intentions to volunteer by the matching of motivations to service activities (e.g., Clary et al., 1998; Stukas, Daly, & Cowling, 2005; Stukas et al., 2009). Moreover, effect sizes for both outcomes are typically smaller for matching of self-oriented motivations, particularly career and protective motivations. Fortunately, in our administrations of the VFI, we have often found values motivation to be rated most important, and, because volunteer activities are generally framed in terms of their humanitarian or prosocial goals, this motivation may also be relatively easy for volunteers to feel that they have fulfilled. As such, volunteers who have strong needs to express and to act on their personal values may be easiest to attract and to sustain.

Intrinsically Motivated or Values-based Community Involvement

Thus, we return full-circle to our emphasis on socialization and sense of community, suggesting to those seeking to promote volunteering and community involvement that interest in particular issues and specific groups needing help is the main driver of sustained community service. To the extent that young people can be encouraged to internalize

prosocial values and attitudes and to become involved (or to create) and to identify with communities focused on social issues and people in need, then we expect volunteerism and service to be more likely to become a mainstay of their lives. We are mindful that the assessment of values-related motivation in the VFI focuses specifically on humanitarian and altruistic values, but the expression of other personal values and beliefs should also lead people to volunteer (see Shye, 2010), perhaps particularly for organizations that are not specifically humanitarian in focus. Research that has investigated this issue has generally found that the self-transcendence values, universalism and benevolence in Schwartz's typology (see Schwartz, 2010, for a review), are most associated with volunteer behavior (e.g., Plagnol & Huppert, 2009). These values focus on enhancing the welfare of a personal network (benevolence) or the welfare of all people and of nature (universalism); similar associations have been found with a different measure of values that contrasts non-materialistic with materialistic values (Kang et al., 2011).

Such broadly applicable values could be expressed by a variety of prosocial behaviors. So, making it clear to this subset of people (those who are ready to volunteer; Stukas et al., 2008) that there are ways to get involved may be sufficient to attract them. As Bekkers and de Witt (2014) have pointed out, awareness of the need for volunteers is often a sufficient factor in motivating people to get involved, particularly in the case of disaster relief and other high profile emergencies. However, building a sense of community around important issues that are intrinsically motivating to people with prosocial values and relevant attitudes and providing them with behavioral pathways for expressing them may be a more viable way to promote community involvement. This is the focus of Omoto and Snyder's work on the community of people affected by HIV and AIDS (e.g., 1995, 2002, 2010).

A desire to uphold important moral and philosophical principles may also underlie some decisions to volunteer. For example, Batson et al. (2002) identified "principlism" as a

significant motivation for community involvement; that is, acting on a moral principle, such as social justice or social responsibility. Jiranek et al.'s (2013) recent inclusion of a social justice function into the VFI reflects this focus. Creating a community around a moral principle or on behalf of a group that deserves assistance on moral grounds may be one route toward attracting and reinforcing those with similar beliefs. Indeed, focusing on the most disadvantaged within a community and on improving their future outcomes through the delivery of autonomy-oriented help (e.g., Luengo Kanacri, et al., this issue; Nadler, 2015) may be an appealing avenue for action for those with prosocial and social justice related attitudes.

Ensuring the future stability and health of our communities and all members within them may actually be a crucial motivating aspect of their work for volunteers. Omoto and Snyder (2010) proposed that people with a strong sense of community act on the belief that "the community itself is an entity and resource worth sustaining, nurturing, and growing" (p. 237). As such, Maki, Dwyer, and Snyder's research (this issue) highlighting how taking future time perspectives can promote continued service may be consistent with such a motivation. Maki et al. demonstrated that future time orientations may be dispositional but also that they may be experimentally induced, yielding hope that people may be led to orient toward prosocial actions that will benefit future members of their community through simple means. Similarly, recent work by Bain and colleagues (e.g., Bain, Hornsey, Bongiorno, Kashima, & Crimston, 2013; Milfont, Bain, Souza, Gouveia, & Kashima, 2014) suggests that people may be most motivated to hold attitudes and to perform actions in the present to the extent that they believe these actions will promote benevolence traits (morality and warmth) within their society in the future. Promoting volunteering and community involvement as pathways to this collective future of greater trust and cooperation, or to other beneficial futures, may increase willingness to engage in such activities.

Although one might be tempted to think that a focus on the future would be a primary motivator only for the young, research on the construct of "generativity", a life task focused on offering mentoring and guidance to the next generation (e.g., Erikson, 1963), suggests that volunteering can be motivated by this purposefor adults of all ages (e.g., Snyder & Clary, 2004). As Snyder and Clary (2004) point out, generativity could be considered an other-oriented motivation, similar to value expression, with less of a focus on obtaining immediate benefits; in fact, some generative actions might be focused proactively on preventing future problems rather than on addressing those problems already manifested. Snyder and Clary (2004) and de Espanés, Villar, Urrutia, and Serrat (2015) have found modest correlations between the motivations to volunteer assessed by the VFI (Clary et al., 1998) and the Loyola Generativity Scale (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992). However, generativity was not strongly related to values motivation, suggesting instead that it might reflect separate concerns not encompassed by the VFI. Generativity did not differ across age groups and was a strong predictor of volunteer commitment in Argentinian volunteers (de Espanés et al., 2015). Thus, highlighting how volunteers' contributions may make a difference for future generations may be another route to recruiting those who may already be inclined to volunteer.

Having the chance to act on one's important values and principles or to make contributions to the future of communities may be intrinsically motivating. However, most definitions of intrinsic motivation focus on the sheer enjoyment of activities themselves; therefore, simply put, people may choose to volunteer because they find it fun. For example, Omoto and Snyder's (1995) research demonstrated that satisfaction was a significant predictor of volunteer longevity. Vecina et al. (2012) found that volunteer engagement, assessed as a multifactorial construct comprised of vigor, absorption, and dedication, predicted satisfaction in new volunteers but ongoing commitment in more established volunteers. Moreover, people may treat volunteering as a form of "serious leisure" (see

Stebbins, 2015), committing to their activities with the same enthusiasm that they might give to a career.

Another approach has been to examine volunteers' varying interests in different types of activities. Maki and Snyder (in press) have developed a Volunteer Interest Typology (VIT) that assesses preferences for different activities, including those that focus on animals or the environment as well as preferences for delivering dependency-oriented or autonomy-oriented help. Their research suggests that volunteers with different motivations may be attracted to different ways of volunteering; similarly, Clary, Snyder, and Stukas (1996) and Stukas et al. (2016) reported motivational differences for volunteers who served different types of organizations (focused on health, education, sport, young people, etc.) doing different types of tasks (administrative, mentoring/befriending, fundraising, etc.). Of course, identifying preferences for certain activities is not equivalent to determining that volunteers find these activities intrinsically motivating because other extrinsic benefits may be available and driving such preferences, but the absence of strong interest or engagement in the activities at hand may suggest a lack of intrinsic motivation. Making certain that activities match the interests of volunteers seems an important way to keep them motivated (e.g., Maki & Snyder, in press).

Concluding Comments

Based on our considerations of the relevant theoretical and empirical literatures on volunteerism and community involvement, we are optimistic that it is possible to build an engaged society and even to recruit and involve those who are currently resistant to volunteering. However, we are sensitive to the possibility that methods to encourage community involvement may potentially result in two different classes of volunteers: those who are primarily other-oriented and intrinsically motivated and those who are primarily self-oriented and extrinsically motivated. Although no real harm (and potentially a lot of good)

may be achieved by volunteers who are self-oriented and extrinsically motivated, their commitment to *sustained* service may be lower than that of volunteers who are more other-oriented and intrinsically motivated. However, volunteers with more intrinsic motivation and other-oriented goals may receive more personal health and well-being benefits as a result of their service. Therefore, methods that encourage people to develop and to internalize a compassionate motivation to help others in need of their help may result in the most benefits for all.

As we have seen, certain types of socialization experiences and encouragements to build and to identify with communities focused on shared prosocial values and beliefs may make other-oriented volunteerism more likely. Conversely, terminal extrinsic goals and explicit requirements may result in self-oriented volunteerism that is not sustained for the long-term. A fortunate caveat is that some heavy-handed efforts to encourage community service do not seem to negatively impact those who have internalized altruistic and humanitarian values. Moreover, the extent to which volunteers see that their motivations and interests can be (and actually are) satisfied in the activities available to them is likely to be an important influence on their decision to get involved and to remain involved.

We close, then, on a positive note, after considering relevant exemplars from the literature that point to productive ways in which volunteering and community involvement can be promoted to increase benefits for all. We are mindful, however, that a number of the issues covered here have not been definitively resolved. Therefore, we look forward to a future of more research on these topics and to its systematic application to promote community involvement and an engaged society.

References

Bain, P. G., Hornsey, M. J., Bongiorno, R., Kashima, Y., & Crimston, D. (2013). Collective futures: How projections about the future of society are related to actions and attitudes supporting social change. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*, 523-539.

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

Bekkers, R. & de Witt, Arjen. (2014). Participation in volunteering: What helps and hinders. A deliverable of the project: "Impact of the third sector as Social Innovation" (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Cialdini, R. B., Baumann, D. J., & Kenrick, D. T. (1981). Insights from sadness: A three-step model of the development of altruism as hedonism. *Developmental Review, 1,* 207-223.

Clary, E. G., & Miller, J. (1986). Socialization and situational influences on sustained altruism. *Child Development, 57,* 1358-1369.

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2002). Community involvement: Opportunities and challenges in socializing adults to participate in society. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 581-591.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1516-1530.

Cornelis, I., Van Hiel, A., & De Cremer, D. (2013). Volunteer work in youth organizations: Predicting distinct aspects of volunteering behavior from self- and other-oriented motives. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*, 456-466.

de Espanés, G. M., Villar, F., Urrutia, A., & Serrat, R. (2015). Motivation and commitment to volunteering in a sample of Argentinian adults: What is the role of generativity? *Educational Gerontology, 41*, 149-161.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and the "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs

and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11,* 227–268.

Dienhart, C. R., Maruyama, G., Snyder, M., Furco, A., Hirt, L., McKay, M. S., & Huesman,

R. (this issue). *The impacts of mandatory service on students in service-learning classes.*

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Validzic, A., Matoka, K., Johnson, B., & Frazier, S. (1997).

Extending the benefits of recategorization: Evaluations, self-disclosure, and helping.

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33, 401-420.

Eisenberg, N., Eggum-Wilkens, N. D., & Spinrad, T. L. (2015). The development of

prosocial behavior. In In D. A. Schroeder & W. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of*

prosocial behavior (pp. 114-136). New York: Oxford University Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society.* New York, NY: Norton.

Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J., Eisenberg, N., May-Plumlee, T., & Christopher, F. S. (1989). Effects

of rewards on children's prosocial motivation: A socialization study. *Developmental*

Psychology, 25, 509-515.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2009). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer

process. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 653-658.

Flanagan, C. A., Kim, T., Collura, J., & Kopish, M. A. (2015). Community service and

adolescents' social capital. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 25,* 295-309.

Gagné, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial

behavior engagement. *Motivation and Emotion, 27*, 199-223.

Gebauer, J. E., Riketta, M., Broemer, P., & Maio, G. R. (2008). Pleasure and pressure based

prosocial motivation: Divergent relations to subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in*

Personality, 42, 399-420.

Gillath, O., Shaver, P. R., Mikulincer, M., Nitzberg, R. E., Erez, A., & Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2005). Attachment, caregiving, and volunteering: Placing volunteerism in an attachment-theoretical framework. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 425-446.

Güntert, S. T., Kals, E., Strubel, I. T., & Wehner, T. (this issue). *The quality of volunteers' motives: Integrating the functional approach and self-determination theory.*

Hart, D., Donnelly, T. M., Youniss, J., & Atkins, R. (2007). High school community service as a predictor of adult voting and volunteering. *American Educational Research Journal, 44,* 197-219.

Hastings, P. D., Utendale, W. T., & Sullivan, C. (2007). The socialization of prosocial development. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization* (pp. 638-664). New York: Guilford.

Horn, A. S. (2012). The cultivation of a prosocial value orientation through community service: An examination of organizational context, social facilitation, and duration. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41,* 948–968. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9714-y

Houle, B. J., Sagarin, B. J., & Kaplan, M. F. (2005). A functional approach to volunteerism: Do volunteer motives predict task preference? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 337-344.

Hustinx, L., von Essen, J., Haers, J., & Mels, S. (Eds.) (2015). *Religion and volunteering: Complex, contested, and ambiguous relationships.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.

Jiranek, P., Kals, E., Humm, J. S., Strubel, I. T., & Wehner, T. (2013). Volunteering as a means to an equal end? The impact of a social justice function on intention to volunteer. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 153*, 520-541.

Johnson, K. A., Memon, R., Alladin, A., Cohen, A. B., & Okun, M. A. (2015). Who helps the Samaritan? The influence of religious vs. secular primes on spontaneous helping of members of religious outgroups. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 15,* 217-231.

Kang, C., Handy, F., Hustinx, L., Cnaan, R., Brudney, J. L., Haski-Leventhal, D., Holmes, K., Meijs, L., Pessi, A. B., Ranade, B., Smith, K., Yamauchi, N., & Zrinsczk, S. (2011). What gives? Cross-national differences in students' giving behavior. *The Social Science Journal, 48,* 283-294.

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

Konrath, S., Fuhrel-Forbis, A., Lou, A., & Brown, S. (2012). Motives for volunteering are associated with mortality risk in older adults. *Health Psychology, 31*, 87-96.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics II. Channels of group life; social planning and action research. *Human Relations, 1,* 143–153. doi:10.1177/001872674700100201

Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Gonzalez, R., Valdenegro, D., Jiménez-Moya, G., Saavedra, P., Mora, E., Miranda, D., Didier, L., & Pastorelli, C. (this issue). *Civic engagement and giving behaviors: The role of empathy and beliefs towards poverty.*

Lun, J., Oishi, S., & Tenney, E. R. (2012). Residential mobility moderates preferences for loyal versus egalitarian helpers. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 291–297.

Maki, A., Dwyer, P. C., & Snyder, M. (this issue). *Time perspective and volunteerism: The importance of focusing on the future.*

Maki, A., & Snyder, M. (in press). Investigating similarities and differences between volunteer behaviors: Development of a Volunteer Interest Typology. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarerly*. doi: 10.1177/0899764015619703

Maton, K. I., & Domingo, M. R. S. (2006). Mobilizing adults for positive youth development: Lessons from religious congregations. In E. G. Clary & J. E. Rhodes (Eds.), *Mobilizing adults for positive youth development* (pp. 159-175). Springer US.

McAdams, D. P., & de St Aubin, E. D. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 1003-1015.

McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my ingroup: A measure and studies of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103,* 830-853.

McGinley, M., Lipperman-Kreda, S., Byrnes, H. F., & Carlo, G. (2010). Parental, social and dispositional pathways to Israeli adolescents' volunteering. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 31*, 386-394.

Milfont, T. L., Bain, P. G., Souza, R. V., Gouveia, V. V., & Kashima, Y. (2014). Examining how projections about the future of society are related to present-day climate change action. *Psico, 45*, 359-368.

Millette, V., & Gagné, M. (2008). Designing volunteers' tasks to maximize motivation, satisfaction and performance: The impact of job characteristics on volunteer engagement. *Motivation and Emotion, 32*, 11-22.

Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Nadler, A. (2015). The other side of helping: Seeking and receiving help. In D. A. Schroeder & W. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior* (pp. 307-328). New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, J., & Schimmel, K. (2012). Match/mismatch of the college business student service-learning experiences: Drivers of perceived attitude change, satisfaction, and future volunteering intentions. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 12*, 91-99.

Okun, M. A., & Kim, G. Y. (this issue). *The interplay of frequency of volunteering and prosocial motivation on purpose in life in emerging adults.*

Omoto, A. M. & Packard, C. (this issue). *The power of connections: Psychological sense of community as a predictor of volunteerism.*

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 671-686.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (2002). Considerations of community: The context and process of volunteerism. *American Behavioral Scientist, 45*, 846-867.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (2010). Influences of psychological sense of community on voluntary helping and prosocial action. In S. Stuermer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping* (pp. 223-243). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Omoto, A. M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J. D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality, 78*, 1703-1734.

Plagnol, A. C., & Huppert, F. A. (2009). Happy to help? Exploring the factors associated with variations in rates of volunteering across Europe. *Social Indicators Research, 97*, 157-176.

Planty, M., Bozick, R., & Regnier, M. (2006). Helping because you have to or helping because you want to? Sustaining participation in service work from adolescence to young adulthood. *Youth & Society, 38,* 177-202.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New

York: Simon & Schuster.

Rosenhan, D. (1970). The natural socialization of altruistic autonomy. In J. Macauley & L.

Berkowitz (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior* (pp. 251-268). New York: Academic

Press.

Rotolo, T., & Wilson, J. (2014). Social heterogeneity and volunteering in US cities.

Sociological Forum, 29, 429-452.

Schwartz, S. H. (2010). Basic values: How they motivate and inhibit prosocial behavior. In

M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions, and behavior: The*

better angels of our nature (pp. 221-241). Washington, DC: American Psychological

Association.

Seattle Housing Authority (2016). Community service requirement. Retrieved from

https://www.seattlehousing.org/residents/information/public/service/

Shye, S. (2010). The motivation to volunteer: A systemic quality of life theory. *Social*

Indicators Research, 98, 183-200.

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

Wiley.

Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2004). Volunteerism and the generative society. In E. St. Aubin,

D. P. McAdams, & Kim, T. (Eds.), *The generative society: Caring for future generations*

(pp. 221-237). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Snyder, M., Clary, E. G., & Stukas, A. A. (2000). The functional approach to volunteerism.

In G. R. Maio & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes* (pp. 365-

393). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Snyder, M., Omoto, A. M., & Dwyer, P. C. (in press). Volunteerism: Multiple perspectives

on benefits and costs. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), *The social psychology of good and evil* (2nd

edition, pp. xxx-xxx). New York: Guilford Publications.

Staub, E. (2005). The roots of goodness: The fulfillment of basic human needs and the

development of caring, helping and nonaggression, inclusive caring, moral courage,

active bystandership, and altruism born of suffering. In G. Carlo & C. P. Edwards (Eds.),

Moral motivation through the life span (pp. 33-72). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska

Press.

Stebbins, R. A. (2015). *Leisure and the motive to volunteer: Theories of serious, casual, and

project-based leisure.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stürmer, S., Rohmann, A., & van der Noll, J. (this issue). *Mobilizing the global community to

combat Ebola: Psychological effects of the Band Aid 30 campaign.*

Stukas, A. A., Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). Service learning: Who benefits and why.

Social Policy Report: Society for Research on Child Development, 13, 1-19.

Stukas, A. A., Daly, M., & Cowling, M. J. (2005). Volunteerism and social capital: A

functional approach. *Australian Journal on Volunteering, 10*(2), 35-44.

Stukas, A. A., Hoye, R., Nicholson, M., Brown, K., & Aisbett, L. (2016). Motivations to

volunteer and their associations with volunteers' well-being. *Nonprofit and Voluntary

Sector Quarterly, 45,* 112-132.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism"

on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10*, 59–64.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2008). The social marketing of volunteerism: A

functional approach. In C. P. Haugtvedt, P. Herr, & F. Kardes (Eds.), *Handbook of

consumer psychology* (pp. 959-979). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stukas, A A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2015). Volunteerism and community involvement: Antecedents, experiences, and consequences for the person and the situation. In D. A. Schroeder & W. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior* (pp. 459-493). New York: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399813.013.012

Stukas, A. A., Worth, K. A., Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2009). The matching of motivations to affordances in the volunteer environment: An index for assessing the impact of multiple matches on volunteer outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 38, 5-28.

Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. (in press). Group interaction as the crucible of social identity formation: A glimpse at the foundations of social identification for collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations.* doi:10.1177/1368430215612217

Van Goethem, A. A., van Hoof, A., van Aken, M. A., de Castro, B. O., & Raaijmakers, Q. A. (2014). Socialising adolescent volunteering: How important are parents and friends? Age dependent effects of parents and friends on adolescents' volunteering behaviours. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 35*(2), 94-101.

Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 222-244.

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41,* 176-212.

Yorio, P. L., & Ye, F. (2012). A meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on the social, personal, and cognitive outcomes of learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*, 9-27.