

Developing the Volunteer Motivation Inventory
to
Assess the Underlying Motivational Drives
of Volunteers in Western Australia

A Research Project funded by Lotterywest
Social Research Grant
and
Undertaken by CLAN WA Inc.

Conducted by

Judy Esmond, Ph.D.

Chief Investigator

and

Patrick Dunlop

Assistant Researcher

at

MTD-MAKING THE DIFFERENCE



A Research Project funded by the Lotterywest, Social Research Grant and undertaken by CLAN WA Inc.

© Copyright 2004 by CLAN WA Inc. This work is copyright. It may be reproduced as a whole or in part subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgment of the source and the authors and for no commercial usage or sale. Reproduction for purposes other than those indicated above does require the written permission of the source or authors.

Whilst all reasonable care has been taken in the preparation of this publication, no liability is assumed for any errors or omissions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	3
List of Tables	4
Acknowledgements	5
Executive Summary	6
Introduction and Literature Review	10
Research into Volunteer Motivation.....	10
The Two or Three Factor Model	11
Unidimensional Model	13
Multifactor Model	13
Other Studies of Volunteer Motivation.....	15
The Australian Experience	16
Context of the Current Research.....	18
Research Objectives	20
Research Methodology	20
Pilot Study One – Stage One	26
Method.....	26
Results and Discussion	26
Pilot Study Two – Stages Two and Three	27
Method.....	27
Results and Discussion	29
Main Study - Stage Four.....	30
Method.....	30
Results and Discussion	33
Main Study - Stage Five	42
Comparing the VMI and VFI.....	42
Creating an Improved Inventory of Volunteer Motivations	46
Overall Discussion and Conclusion	48
Understanding the Underlying Motivations of People who Volunteer	49
Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers through the VMI	51
Limitations of the Current Research.....	55
Appendix 1 – The Non-Volunteering Study.....	58
Introduction.....	58
Method.....	58
Results.....	60
Conclusion	63
Appendix 2 – Distribution of Responses to VMI Items At Stages Four and Five.....	64
Appendix 3 – Mean Responses and Rank Order of Importance for All VMI Items.....	67
Appendix 4 – Items to be Included in the Improved VMI	69
Appendix 5 – Final VMI Including Scoring Guide.....	71
Instructions.....	71
Scoring Guide.....	73
Scoring Instructions.....	73
Description of Results.....	74
References.....	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Organisations Participating in this Research Project.....	23
Table 2. Overall Number of Participants Broken Down by Age Levels.....	24
Table 3. Number of Responses Broken Down by Marital Status	24
Table 4. Number of Responses Broken Down by Income Level.....	25
Table 5. Total Number of Responses Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service.....	25
Table 6. Number of Responses to Pilot Study 1 Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service	27
Table 7. Number of Responses to Pilot Study 2 Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service	28
Table 8. Cronbach’s Alpha Internal Consistency Scores for the Eight VMI Scales.....	29
Table 9. Number of Responses to the Main Study Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service	33
Table 10. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the VMI Scales.....	35
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for the Revised VMI Scales and Unique Items Presented in Rank Order of Motivational Strength.....	36
Table 12. Intercorrelations amongst the VMI Motivational Factors.....	37
Table 13. Correlations between VMI Motivational Factors and Selected Demographic Variables	38
Table 14. Mean VMI Motivational Scores Broken Down by Demographic Variables.....	40
Table 15. Mean VMI Motivational Scores Broken Down by Income Levels.....	41
Table 16. Mean VMI Motivational Scores Broken Down by Volunteer Length of Service....	42
Table 17. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the VMI Scales and the VFI Scales	43
Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for the VMI Scales and VFI Scales.....	44
Table 19. Correlations between VMI and VFI Scales.....	45
Table 20. Descriptive Statistics for Improved VMI Scales Ranked in Order of Importance...	47
Table 21. Number of Non-Volunteer Responses Broken Down by Marital Status	59
Table 22. Number of Non-Volunteer Responses Broken Down by Income Levels.....	60
Table 23. Responses to Non-Volunteer Survey Items Listed in Rank Order of Mean Response Scores.....	61
Table 24. Frequency Distributions for all Non-Volunteer Survey Items	62

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank:

Lotterywest for funding this research.

CLAN WA Inc. for undertaking this research.

The members of the Reference Group for this research project.

Linda Jacobsen-D'Arcy and Maxine McEwin who conducted the initial research into the development of the Volunteer Motivation Inventory.

The managers of volunteers and the volunteers from the following organisations that contributed to this research:

Linda Jacobsen-D'Arcy & Maxine McEwin	CLAN WA Inc.
Helen Tucker	Wesley Do Care
Joan Syme	Churches of Christ Homes Inc.
Kelsie Prabawa-Sear	Southcare Inc.
Brad McKay	Rocky Bay Inc.
Margaret Hukin	Guides WA
Barbara Hollin	Australian Red Cross (WA)
Christine Gray	The School Volunteer Program Inc.
Lorraine Gillett	City of Stirling Community Service Department
Christine Currell	RSPCA (WA)
Jonine Collins	Anglicare WA
Vicki Brown	Starlight Children's Foundation
Robyn Shaw	CARAD Coalition for Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Detainees
Robyn Cooper	Volunteer First Aid Service, St John Ambulance Australia (WA) Inc.
Alan Melchert & Cathy Jordan	Volunteering WA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The motivation of people to volunteer has long fascinated those researching and working alongside volunteers. Understanding the underlying motivational drives of those who volunteer has been a recurring theme preoccupying much of the literature on volunteering.

What actually motivates a person to volunteer is a complex and vexing question, yet understanding these motivations can be of great assistance to organisations in attracting, placing and retaining volunteers.

First, organisations can use information on motivations to attract potential volunteers by tailoring recruitment messages to closely match their motivational needs. Second, in assessing the motivational needs of new volunteers, organisations can ensure effective placement of volunteers into activities that meet their needs. Third, by understanding their volunteers' motivations, organisations can seek to maintain volunteer satisfaction by ensuring these motivations are fulfilled.

This research project aimed to develop a self-report inventory of volunteer motivations, which is intended to be administered to individual volunteers, to determine the key factors that motivated the volunteer to engage in their volunteering activity.

An initial Volunteer Motivation Inventory (VMI) was developed in a previous study by McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy (2002). Then, in this current research, the VMI was administered to various samples of volunteers in many organisations in Western Australia. This research consisted of *three* studies and *five* stages. At each stage, the VMI was revised with the ultimate goal of maximising its capacity to robustly assess volunteer motivations. The VMI, in its various forms, was administered to a total of 2444 volunteers from 15 different organisations, making the present study the one of the largest studies of volunteer motivations to be conducted worldwide. A summary of the research stages is presented below:

Stage One - In Stage One of the research, the original VMI designed by McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy (2002) that consisted of 40 items was used. This original VMI was distributed to volunteers in three organisations and completed by a total of 101 volunteers.

Stage Two - In Stage Two, a revised VMI based on analysis of the responses from Stage One was used. This VMI still consisted of 40 items (but with some of the statements re-worked) and was distributed to volunteers in one organization and completed by a total of 152 volunteers.

Stage Three – During the distribution of the VMI and in discussions with the managers of volunteers, three further motivations not previously included in the VMI and suggested by the managers of volunteers were added to the VMI used in Stage Two. This VMI now consisted of 43 items and was distributed to volunteers in two organisations and completed by a total of 192 volunteers.

Stage Four – A revised VMI based on analysis of the responses from Stages Two and Three was developed. This VMI now consisted of 41 items and was distributed to volunteers in 12 organisations and completed by a total of 1221 volunteers.

Stage Five – The revised VMI from Stage Four was then combined with an adapted version of another measurement tool by Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) entitled the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). The VMI now consisted of a total of 70 items and was distributed to volunteers in three organisations and completed by a total of 778 volunteers.

The final VMI that was produced from this research consisted of 44 short statements, to which volunteers respond using a 5-point 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree' Likert scale. This final inventory identifies ten key motivational categories. Six of these categories were identified previously by Clary, Snyder, and Ridge (1992), and the remaining four categories were not previously investigated. These factors and explanations are listed below:

1. *Values* whereby the individual volunteers in order to express or act on firmly held beliefs of the importance for one to help others (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992).

2. *Reciprocity* whereby the individual volunteers in the belief that ‘what goes around comes around’. In the process of helping others and ‘doing good’ their volunteering work will also bring about good things for the volunteer themselves.
3. *Recognition* whereby the individual is motivated to volunteer by being recognised for their skills and contribution.
4. *Understanding* whereby the individual volunteers to learn more about the world through their volunteering experience or exercise skills that are often unused (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992).
5. *Self-Esteem* whereby the individual volunteers to increase their own feelings of self-worth and self-esteem.
6. *Reactivity* whereby the individual volunteers out of a need to ‘heal’ and address their own past or current issues.
7. *Social* whereby the individual volunteers and seeks to conform to normative influences of significant others (e.g. friends or family) (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992).
8. *Protective* whereby the individual volunteers as a means to reduce negative feelings about themselves, e.g. guilt or to address personal problems (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992).
9. *Social Interaction* whereby the individual volunteers to build social networks and enjoys the social aspects of interacting with others.
10. *Career Development* whereby the individual volunteers with the prospect of making connections with people and gaining experience and skills in the field that may eventually be beneficial in assisting them to find employment.

When each of these 10 scales are scored, they provide a rank order for the most salient motivations for the individual who completed the VMI and an overall profile of the motivations an individual has for volunteering.

This research, through the continued development of the VMI, provided valuable information about the actual motivations and their importance to volunteers. *Values*, based on deeply held beliefs of the importance of helping others, was found to be the most important motivation. This was followed by *Reciprocity* - the belief that ‘what goes around comes around’. By helping others and ‘doing good’ you too will be helped. The third most important motivation to volunteer identified in this research was that of *Recognition*. Receiving recognition and

being recognised for their skills and contribution was important to volunteers. Career Development, Social and Protective factors were generally regarded as being less important.

Also within this research, a small-scale study considered the reasons why people do *not* volunteer. This smaller study involved 213 non-volunteers. The results identified that in order to convert non-volunteers into potential volunteers there was a need to demonstrate the meaningfulness of the volunteering tasks they would be undertaking and address their feelings of being time-poor or being too busy.

The final product of this research project was an improved inventory of volunteer motivations. Although this inventory could potentially assist in attracting, placing and retaining volunteers within an organisation, it is important to acknowledge that future investigations regarding the predictive validity and universal application of the VMI need to be conducted before it is able to be widely used or ever offered as a commercially viable product. Its limitations notwithstanding, the VMI has provided a valuable contribution to an increased understanding of the complex motivational drives of volunteers.

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Each and every day millions of people around the world give of their time and energy to make a difference through volunteering. The types of volunteer activities engaged in by people are as varied as the volunteers themselves and their value to their communities and society as a whole remains immeasurable.

The motivation of people to volunteer has long fascinated those researching and working alongside volunteers. Understanding the underlying motivational drives of those who volunteer has been a recurring theme preoccupying much of the literature on volunteering. Although limited in comparison to the social research into other areas of human engagement (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen & Miene, 1998) such research as there is into volunteer motivation has been undertaken with great interest and enthusiasm.

What actually motivates a person to volunteer is a complex and vexing question (Esmond, 1997), yet understanding these motivations is suggested by many authors to be of great assistance to the managers of volunteers in their recruitment, selection, placement and ultimate retention of volunteers (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992; Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Esmond, 2001a; McCurley & Lynch, 1994, Vineyard, 2001).

So what is it that motivates and moves people into action, to get up, to go and to volunteer? An examination of the previous research investigating this complex issue follows.

Research into Volunteer Motivation

It was the 1970's that first saw the emergence of research with an increasing number of studies examining volunteerism and motivation. Pitterman (1973) provided some early insights into understanding older volunteers and their motivations. At the same time, Tapp and Spanier (1973) conducted a study comparing the attitudes and motivations of 36 hot-line volunteers to those of 34 college students. Howarth (1976) in a Canadian study of 374 female volunteers used a self-developed personality questionnaire containing questions relating to social conscience and concern for others, to provide further insight into volunteer motivation.

Interestingly, Howarth (1976: 857) surmised that the volunteer is "...impelled by conscience as a form of anxiety, and volunteer work as anxiety reducing".

In 1978, Gidron drew on the work of Herzberg (1966) and his Motivational-Hygiene Theory that identified both intrinsic motives and extrinsic hygiene factors in people's motivations in paid work. Adapting this theory to volunteering, Gidron (1978) surmised that the rewards for volunteering were either: personal (e.g. the opportunity for self-fulfilment); social (e.g. developing interpersonal relations); or indirectly economic (e.g. gaining work experience).

Although Gidron (1978) did not test the internal structure of the Motivational-Hygiene Theory, his study involving 317 volunteers across four mental and health institutions did also identify that motivations and rewards can differ with age. Older volunteers were found to place a higher value on social relationships and younger volunteers on gaining work experience.

In the 1980's an increasing number of studies appeared that were focused on or included understanding of volunteer motivations in their research (Chapman, 1985; Daniels, 1985; Francies, 1983; Grieshop, 1985; Henderson, 1984; Miller, 1985; Rubin & Thorelli, 1985; Schram, 1985; Smith, 1982).

Generally, these studies were centred around what can be considered as the *two or three factor model* for understanding the motivations of those who volunteer.

The Two or Three Factor Model

In 1981, Horton-Smith developed a two-factor model for understanding volunteer motivation distinguishing between altruistic motives (i.e., intangible rewards such as feeling good about helping others) and egoistic motives (i.e., tangible rewards).

In the same year, Frisch and Gerrard (1981) in their study involving 455 Red Cross volunteers throughout the United States reinforced the concept of a two-factor model. They also found that people were motivated to volunteer by either altruistic motives such as a concern for others or egoistic motives involving a concern for themselves. Gillespie and King (1985) in a mailed survey of 1,346 Red Cross volunteers found a similar classification of motivations.

Then in 1987, Fitch in a study aimed at understanding the motivations of college students who volunteered, developed a 20-item scale that involved a three rather than two factor model. This scale contained three motivational constructs: altruistic, egoistic and social-obligation motives for volunteering.

Morrow-Howell and Mui (1989) in their research involving seniors who were volunteers in self-help groups found a similar three factor model. They suggested that there were three main motivational classifications for older person's decisions to volunteer: altruistic, social or material.

The 1980's also saw the emergence of writings by other authors (McCurley & Vineyard, 1988; Wilson, 1983) that began to discuss volunteer motivation adapting the well-known theories of others into motivation and human behaviour. Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs and again Herzberg's (1966) Motivational-Hygiene Theory were considered in discussing volunteer motivations. The work of McClelland, Atkinson and Lowell (1953) and their three-factor model on motivation and organisation received the most attention in adapting to volunteering experience.

McClelland, Atkinson and Lowell (1953) had identified three main motives that they considered affected the work-related behaviour of employees, of which one motive is more dominant than the others. These three main motives or needs were the need for: achievement, power and affiliation.

Although not based on extensive research, the focus of later authors (McCurley & Lynch, 1994; Vineyard, 1991) on practical ways to meet the needs of achievement-motivated, power-motivated and affiliation-motivated volunteers has been of great interest and assistance to those involved in the recruitment and retention of volunteers.

As an increasing number of studies in the 1980's focused on the two or three factor model, this provided a much greater insight into understanding the complex motives of those who volunteer. However, this research was not without limitations. Many of these studies were not based on empirical evidence. They often involved small sample sizes and were confined to one group of volunteers in one organisation.

Consequently, the 1990's saw the emergence of two further models for understanding volunteer motivation – the *unidimensional* model and the *multifactor* model.

Unidimensional Model

In 1991, Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen in undertaking an extensive review of all the literature relating to volunteer motivation, confirmed the limitations of many previous studies. They found that much of the previous research had been predominantly descriptive and was neither consistent nor systematic in nature. Further weaknesses were found in the two or three-factor model as few studies had tested this type of classification beyond some content analysis and had not considered the interrelationships between different motives.

Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) then set about identifying and categorizing the main motivations to be found in their comprehensive literature review. From this they identified 28 motives to volunteer and using a 5-point Likert scale, they developed the Motivation to Volunteer (MTV) scale. The scale was then used in their subsequent study and was completed by 258 volunteers from human service agencies and 104 non-volunteers.

From this study, Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) concluded that volunteers have both altruistic and egoistic motivations for volunteering. However, their research added a different perspective as they found that volunteers did not distinguish between these different types of motives and do not act on just one motive or a single category of motives. These researchers concluded that it is a combination of these motives that are part of the whole volunteering experience and therefore it is a unidimensional model that explains the motivations of those who volunteer.

Although the items for the MTV scale were not derived within the context of a theoretical framework and another model was soon to question the unidimensional framework, this research did generate an alternative perspective on motivations.

Multifactor Model

The early 1990's also saw the emergence of another model in understanding volunteer motivation – the *multifactor model*.

This model was developed by Clary, Snyder and their colleagues. The initial understanding for this model was based on functional analyses and theorising on motivation, specially derived from the theories on attitudes by social researchers Katz (1960) and Smith, Brunei and White (1956).

This functional analysis of motivation was then applied to volunteering and was concerned with "...the reasons and the purposes, the plan and the goals, that underlie and generate psychological phenomena – that is, the personal and social functions being served by an individual's thoughts, feelings, and actions..." (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen & Miene, 1998:1517).

Snyder and Omoto (1990) began by considering the social psychology and personalities of people involved as HIV/AIDS volunteers. Clary and Snyder (1990 & 1991) and Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) then analysed the empirical research on volunteering and in so doing identified a set of six primary functions or motivations that were served through volunteering.

These functions were:

- (i) Values (i.e. acting on deeply held beliefs about the importance of helping others)
- (ii) Understanding (i.e. involvement in activities that satisfy the desire to learn)
- (iii) Career (i.e. seeking ways to explore job opportunities or advance in the work environment)
- (iv) Social (i.e. conforming to the normative influence of significant others)
- (v) Esteem (i.e. enhancing the person's sense of esteem)
- (vi) Protective (i.e. escaping from negative qualities or feelings).

These six functions were then combined with a series of five statements for each function and a 7-point Likert scale. This resulted in the development of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). This VFI was based on a large amount of empirical evidence and in the course of developing and testing the VFI "...almost 1,000 volunteers from a wide range of organisations as well as 500 university students" (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992: 339) were involved.

Although solely based on self-reporting by volunteers themselves, the VFI is one of the few measures of volunteer motivation to undergo extensive testing. For as Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992: 339) points out: "... the VFI is reliable and valid and has a solid conceptual base".

And for more than a decade Clary, Snyder and their colleagues have provided an array of studies and papers based on the VFI and discussing a multi-factor model relating to people's motivations for volunteering (Clary & Snyder, 2000; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene & Haugen, 1994; Clary, Snyder & Stukas, 1996; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Snyder, Clary & Stukas, 2000; Stukas, Clary & Snyder 1999, Stukas, Snyder & Clary, 1999).

To summarise, past researchers have classified volunteer motivation under one of the three main models: (i) a two or three factor model; (ii) a unidimensional model; or (iii) a multifactor model.

Other Studies of Volunteer Motivation

Subsequent researchers into volunteer motivation have either incorporated or adapted at least one of these three models and their measurement scales in their own studies.

Trudeau and Devlin (1996) incorporated the unidimensional model and the Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen's (1999) Motivation to Volunteer (MTV) scale in their study involving 124 under-graduates, focussing on the aspects of motivation, gender, extra-introversion and social anxiety.

Zweigenhart, Armstrong and Quintis (1996) used Fitch's (1987) 20-item Community Service Involvement Survey based on a three-factor model in considering the motivations and the effectiveness of 98 hospital volunteers.

Penner and Finkelstein (1998) utilising a series of three questionnaires studied HIV/AIDS volunteers and incorporated the multifactor model in their research with a section on motives developed by Omoto and Snyder (1995).

Chapman and Morley (1999) combined the VFI and the Crowne and Marlowe (1960) social desirability scale to assess the volunteer motives of 85 college students and changes to their level of motives after participating in volunteer service.

Switzer, Switzer, Stukas and Baker (1999) in studying the motivations of medical students to volunteer across gender and in comparison to other volunteers also utilised the VFI and found high reliability and validity in the VFI.

Finally, Okun and Barr (1998) in studying the motivations of older volunteers actually considered all three models of motivation in their research. Interestingly, they found no support in their study for the two or three factor model or the unidimensional model. It was the multifactor model of motivation that received qualified support from these researchers and provided "...the best fit of the data obtained" (Okun & Barr, 1998: 608).

Much of the research into understanding the motivations of those who volunteer has been based overseas, particularly in the United States with the sustained writings of Clary, Snyder and their colleagues. Research in Australia exploring the motivations of volunteers remains limited in comparison to our overseas counterparts but is slowly beginning to appear.

The Australian Experience

It was not until the 1990's that studies into the motivations of volunteers in the Australian setting began to incorporate a degree of greater empirical evidence.

In 1990, Vellekoop-Baldock in her study of volunteers in the welfare sector did identify altruism as the most frequently mentioned motive, followed by social interaction, personal growth and work skills. Although this study did identify a multiplicity of motives, these were not explored further.

Blanchard, Rostant and Finn (1995) in their study involving 700 university students and later Esmond (2000) in her study of 162 university students provided a further insight into volunteer motivations. Some of the main motives of students were identified as being altruistic in nature (e.g. helping others, making a difference and being part of a worthy cause) and egoistic (e.g. assisting in future employment).

Warburton (1997), in considering an assessment of the costs and benefits of volunteering involving volunteers over 65 years of age, also found both altruistic and egoistic reasons for volunteering.

Baum, Modra, Bush, Cox, Cooke & Potter (1999) in their Adelaide-based study also examined motivations for volunteering and identified a range of motives from helping others through to meeting people.

Esmond (2001b, 2002, 2004) in her series of research reports into the baby boomer generation and volunteering identified the needs and associated motivations of what baby boomers are looking for from volunteering.

Other publications have also provided further discussion on the motivations of those who volunteer in the Australian context especially in light of volunteer recruitment and retention issues (Noble & Rogers, 1998; Cowling, 2001; Zappala, 2000). Esmond (2001a: 51) highlights that "...it's very important in recruitment to understand what actually motivates people to volunteer. Each individual's personal motivations are unique, but there are some common types of motivations".

Two recent studies have added another perspective to the Australian research. These studies involved either the adaptation of the American VFI or the development of another motivational scale.

Lucas and Williams (2000) in their study investigated 51 volunteers in the Volunteers in Policing (VIP) program in New South Wales. This research aimed to understand the motivations of those volunteers involved in the program and their level of satisfaction. A modified version of the VFI was used to investigate motivations and was found to be very reliable.

Wang (2001) did consider the literature but then he developed a 20-item scale from the literature to measure motivations for sports volunteerism of 935 prospective volunteers for the Sydney 2000 Olympics. Five motivations were identified as most salient to sports volunteers: altruistic value; personal development; community concern; ego enhancement and social adjustment. Wang (2001:13-14) found that "overall, the findings reported so far have

provided reasonably strong evidence in support of unidimensionality, reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity associated with the 20-item motivation scale for sports volunteerism". However, further refinement to the measurement was certainly desirable.

Overall, Australian studies specifically examining the motivations of those who volunteer have remained limited. Although undertaken with great enthusiasm many have been more descriptive in nature, with small sample sizes and few have been methodologically sound.

However, in 2002 McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy undertook a study to begin to develop a scale to understand and assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers particularly in the uniquely Western Australian setting.

Context of the Current Research

It is this initial study undertaken by McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy (2002) that provides the underlying foundations for the current research and will be discussed in some further detail here.

In 2002 McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy through CLAN WA Inc., received a research grant from Lotterywest to undertake research into the motivations of individuals to volunteer. Their study consisted of three stages and involved a total of 280 volunteers from a range of organisations.

Stage *One* consisted of two public forums involving 43 volunteers. Assisted by trained facilitators, these volunteers in small groups answered a series of open-ended questions and completed a checklist to describe, in their own words, the reasons why they volunteered. The responses of participants were then analysed and a subsequent literature search resulted in a further 18 statements being included, and a survey that contained 105 statements was developed. These statements were compared for common themes and ultimately reduced to 15 categories.

Stage *Two* then involved the distribution of this survey to volunteers through a number of organisations via the manager of volunteers. A total of 215 volunteers completed and returned these surveys. From the analysis of these longer surveys, a pilot Volunteer

Motivation Inventory (VMI) was developed. This VMI contained 40 statements with five statements associated with each of the eight motivational factors, scored with a 5-point Likert scale. The eight motivational factors identified were:

- (i) Values (i.e. Strong family and personal values underpin volunteering. Volunteering is part of the individual's value system).
- (ii) Career (i.e. The individual is volunteering to gain experience and skills in the field that may eventually be beneficial in assisting them to find employment).
- (iii) Personal Growth (i.e. Volunteering has become part of the individual's personal growth. Volunteering might even have been sought out, initially, to address personal growth needs).
- (iv) Recognition (i.e. The individual enjoys the recognition that volunteering gives them. They enjoy their skills and contributions being recognised).
- (v) Hedonistic (i.e. The individual enjoys the heady feeling of being able to be of assistance. Often these feelings are quite surface. This may be the prelude to greater personal growth).
- (vi) Social (i.e. They enjoy the social atmosphere of volunteering. They enjoy the opportunity to build social networks and interact with other people).
- (vii) Reactive (i.e. Here the person is volunteering out of a need to heal or address their own past issues).
- (viii) Reciprocity (i.e. The volunteer enjoys volunteering and views it as a very equal exchange. The volunteer has a strong understanding of the 'higher good').

Stage *Three* and the final stage of this study involved the initial testing of the VMI on a sample 22 volunteers. This small sample size prompted McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy (2002:15) to note in their final report that "...future research needs to administer the final

tool to a great number of participants, thus enlarging the sample”.

In late 2003, a further research grant from Lotterywest was provided to CLAN WA Inc. to build upon this initial study and continue the development of the VMI, as an instrument to ‘tap into’ the motivation of volunteers.

Over a 12-month period in 2003-2004, Dr Judy Esmond, chief investigator and Patrick Dunlop, assistant researcher, were appointed and undertook this current research project.

Research Objectives

As part of the grant application to Lotterywest to obtain funding for this current research, two research objectives were identified:

Objective One

The main and central objective of this research was to undertake a large-scale study to:

- Develop a scale to understand and assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers in Western Australia.

Objective Two

A further objective was to undertake a small-scale study to:

- Understand the reasons why people do *not* volunteer.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objective One

A research methodology involving *three* studies and *five* stages was utilised in this research in relation to the main research objective and consisted of the following:

Stage One - Pilot Study One. In Stage One of Pilot Study One, the original VMI designed by McEwin and Jacobsen-D’Arcy (2002) that consisted of 40 items was used. This original VMI was distributed to volunteers in three organisations and completed by a total of 101 volunteers.

Stage Two – Pilot Study Two. In Stage Two, a revised VMI based on analysis of the responses from Stage One of Pilot Study One was used. This VMI still consisted of 40 items (but with some of the statements re-worked) and was distributed to volunteers in one organisation and completed by a total of 152 volunteers.

Stage Three – Pilot Study Two. During the distribution of the VMI and in discussions with the managers of volunteers, three further motivations not previously included in the VMI and suggested by the managers of volunteers were added to the VMI used in Stage Two. This VMI now consisted of 43 items and was distributed to volunteers in two organisations and completed by a total of 192 volunteers.

Stage Four – Main Study. A final VMI based on analysis of the responses from Stage Three was developed. This VMI now consisted of 41 items and was distributed to volunteers in 12 organisations and completed by a total of 1221 volunteers.

Stage Five – Main Study. The final VMI from Stage Four was then combined with an adapted version of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992). The VMI now consisted of a total of 70 items and was distributed to volunteers in three organisations and completed by a total of 778 volunteers.

In total, 2444 volunteers and 15 organisations participated in this VMI research. This makes this current research one of the *largest studies undertaken* into the motivations of volunteers and the development of a Volunteer Motivation Inventory (VMI).

Objective Two

A research methodology involving a survey containing 21 reasons identified in the research as to why people do *not* volunteer was utilised in this small-scale study. A *total of 213 participants who were not volunteers* completed the non-volunteering survey and although a much smaller study and sample size, this research provides further insights into the reasons why people do *not* volunteer.

However, as Objective Two was not the main objective of this research and was undertaken as a small-scale study, further discussion of this study of non-volunteers is considered in Appendix One.

Procedure

In early 2004, a range of organisations that utilise volunteers were visited to discuss their interest and involvement in the research project. All organisations were approached through their manager of volunteers who remained the contact person throughout the research and all agreed to be involved. An overall total of 15 organisations participated in this research at various stages during 2004.

The distribution of the VMI to volunteers in both the pilot studies and the main study varied amongst organisations, with the most effective distribution method being decided upon by the manager of volunteers in each organisation. Two methods were used for distribution:

- (i) VMI was mailed out to volunteers on the database of the organisation with a letter of explanation and a reply paid envelope; or
- (ii) VMI was distributed to volunteers internally by the manager of volunteers when these volunteers came into the organisation for orientation/training sessions and/or to undertake their volunteer duties.

The distribution of the VMI occurred over a six-month period and only one organisation, Australian Red Cross (WA), distributed each prototype of the VMI. A total of 8,715 surveys were distributed and 2444 were returned with a response rate of 28 percent overall. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the organisations involved, the distribution rate, response rate and method of distribution.

Participants

As previously mentioned, a total of 2444 participants were involved in formal volunteering through one of the 15 organisations that contributed to the overall research. Demographic details of the participants were also collected within the VFI for this research including age, gender, retirement from occupation and time spent volunteering each week.

Table 1. Organisations Participating in this Research Project

Organisation	No. of Surveys Distributed	Distribution Method	Stage of Distribution	Surveys Returned	Response Rate (%)
Anglicare WA	60	Internal	4	20	33.3
Australian Red Cross * (WA)	27	Internal	1	27	100.0
	583	Mail	2	152	26.1
	145	Internal	3	145	100.0
	276	Internal	4	276	100.0
	2800	Mail	5	440	15.7
Coalition for Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Detainees (CARAD)	18	Internal	1	14	77.8
	320	Mail	4	93	29.1
Churches of Christ Homes & Community Services	250	Internal	4	42	16.8
City of Stirling, Community Services Department *	465	Mail	4	171	36.8
CLAN WA Inc. *	80	Mail	3	47	58.8
	4	Internal	4	4	100.0
Guides WA	510	Mail	5	200	39.2
Rocky Bay Inc.	80	Mail	4	14	17.5
RSPCA WA	454	Mail	5	138	30.4
Southcare Inc.	140	Mail	4	42	30.0
Volunteer First Aid Service St Johns Ambulance (WA) Inc.*	280	Internal	4	125	44.6
Starlight Children's Foundation	161	Mail	1	60	37.3
The School Volunteer Program (WA) *	1800	Mail	4	339	18.8
Volunteering WA*	40	Internal	4	21	52.5
Wesley Do Care	222	Mail	4	74	33.3
TOTAL	8,715			2444	

Note: * Organisation was also involved in distribution of Non-Volunteer questionnaires.

Of the participants, 80 percent were female and 47 percent were retired from their occupation and on average, these participants volunteered 5.5 (sd = 5.8) hours per week. Other demographic details including age, marital status, length of volunteer service and annual household income were also collected and the frequency distributions showing the number for each demographic category are shown in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Table 2. Overall Number of Participants Broken Down by Age Levels

Age Levels	No. of Participants
20 years or younger	243
21- 30 years	288
31- 40 years	242
41- 50 years	341
51- 60 years	462
61- 70 years	521
70 years or older	328
Did not Provide	19
Total	2444

As can be seen from Table 2, a significant proportion of participants were from the older age levels, particularly 51-70 years old. Approximately, 22 percent of participants were less than 30 years of age.

Table 3. Number of Responses Broken Down by Marital Status

Marital Status	No. of Responses
De Facto	55
Divorced	151
Married	1167
Partnered	5
Separated	41
Single	674
Widow	245
Engaged	4
Did not provide	102
Total	2444

As can be seen from Table 3, the majority of participants were married, although approximately 28 percent of participants were single.

Table 4. Number of Responses Broken Down by Income Level

Income Level	No. of Responses
Less than \$10 000	464
\$10 000 - \$19 999	457
\$20 000 - \$29 999	277
\$30 000 - \$39 999	225
\$40 000 - \$49 999	173
\$50 000 - \$59 999	107
\$60 000 - \$69 999	75
Greater than \$70 000	187
Did not provide	479
Total	2444

As can be seen from Table 4, the majority of participants were from households with lower incomes. The number of participants tended to decrease as income levels increased. Approximately, 20% of participants did not respond to this question.

Table 5. Total Number of Responses Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service

Volunteer Service	No. of Responses
A new volunteer – just starting	96
Less than 3 months	226
3-6 months	191
6-12 months	271
1-2 years	324
2-4 years	446
4-6 years	217
6-8 years	130
8-10 years	61
10-15 years	110
15-20 years	65
over 20 years	135
Did not provide	172
Total	2444

Just under half of the participants had been volunteering at their organisation for less than two years. As the length of volunteer service increased, the number of participants decreased somewhat.

Each of the stages of this research and the associated studies will now be discussed in greater detail.

PILOT STUDY ONE – STAGE ONE

Method

Procedure

The original VMI developed by McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy (2002) was used in this study. This original VMI consisted of 40 statements on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 being 'strongly disagree' through to 5 being 'strongly agree'. Five statements each represented the *eight* motivational factors determined by McEwin and Jacobsen-D'Arcy (2002): Values, Career, Personal Growth, Recognition, Hedonistic, Social, Reactive and Reciprocity.

This VMI was distributed to volunteers from three organisations through the manager of volunteers. Distribution was either through a mail out or via internal distribution by the manager of volunteers. A total of 206 VMI were distributed.

Participants

A total of 101 responses were obtained for this pilot study from the three organisations that were involved. This brought about a response rate of 49.0 percent. The average age of the participants was 42.0 years (sd = 17.0 years), 86.7 percent were female and participants volunteered for an average of 5.5 hours per week (sd = 4.8). Data on the length of volunteer service was also collected, and can be viewed in Table 6. As can be seen from Table 6 on the next page, over half of the participants had been volunteers for less than one year. Most participants had only volunteered for a short period of time.

Results and Discussion

The first stage of the analysis involved an examination of the frequency distributions and descriptive statistics of the individual survey items. These analyses brought to light several issues. The first issue was with regards to skewness. Many of the survey items were either very strongly positively skewed or strongly negatively skewed and for these items, there was very little variation amongst the responses (i.e. low standard deviations). Given that the VMI was intended to be an instrument used for making distinctions between the motivations of volunteers and that many of the survey items were not exposing these differences (through the lack of variance in responses), it was felt that some of the items needed to be revised to an extent.

Table 6. Number of Responses to Pilot Study 1 Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service

Length of Volunteer Service	No. of Responses
A new volunteer – just starting	20
Less than 3 months	11
3-6 months	16
6-12 months	14
1-2 years	15
2-4 years	13
4-6 years	5
6-8 years	2
8-10 years	0
10-15 years	0
15-20 years	0
over 20 years	1
Did not provide	4
Total	101

The first step to the revision of the survey items was a visual inspection of the wording of the items. It was noticed at this stage that many of the items appeared to be measuring attitudes about volunteering as opposed to motivations to volunteer. One example of such an item was “It is important to help others”. This item had a mean response score of 4.74 (maximum possible was 5.00), and a standard deviation of .44. It seemed that this item was assessing volunteers’ attitudes about the need to help others, but not whether or not this was a motivator for them to become volunteers. Not surprisingly, almost all volunteers indicated that they agreed it was important to help others. Many of the items showed a similar pattern, so in the second pilot study these items were modified slightly such that they were assessing motivations rather than attitudes. For the most part, this was accomplished by adding a prefix “I volunteer because...”, but in some cases the items had to be reworded in other ways.

PILOT STUDY TWO – STAGES TWO AND THREE

Method

Procedure

Data for this Pilot Study Two was collected in two stages. The revised VMI based on analysis of the responses from Pilot Study One and consisting of 40 items, was distributed via the manager of volunteers who arranged a mail out of the VMI to volunteers in that one organisation. A total of 583 VMIs were distributed.

During the discussions about the revised VMI with managers of volunteers of some organisations, three motivational items not included in the VMI and suggested by the managers of volunteers, were then added to the VMI before further distribution. The VMI now consisted of 43 items.

This further amended VMI was distributed via the managers of volunteers to volunteers in two organisations. One organisation mailed out the VMI and the other organisation distributed the VMI internally to volunteers. A total of 225 VMI were distributed. Therefore, from Stages One and Two of Pilot Study Two a total of 808 VMI were distributed.

Participants

A total of 344 responses were obtained for this second pilot study from the organisations that were involved. This brought about a response rate of 42.5 percent. The average age of the participants was 34.5 years (sd = 17.8 years), and 81.2 percent were female. Participants volunteered for an average of 4.5 hours per week (sd = 5.0). Data on length of volunteer service were also collected, and can be viewed in Table 7. Similar to the sample from Pilot Study One, the majority of participants had been volunteering for less than one year.

Table 7. Number of Responses to Pilot Study 2 Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service

Length of Volunteer Service	No. of Responses
A new volunteer – just starting	34
Less than 3 months	48
3-6 months	33
6-12 months	58
1-2 years	49
2-4 years	42
4-6 years	14
6-8 years	4
8-10 years	2
10-15 years	4
15-20 years	4
over 20 years	6
Did not provide	46
Total	344

Results and Discussion

The first step to the data analysis was to examine frequency distributions and descriptive statistics for all survey items. The frequency distributions of the survey items showed that there was a substantial increase in the amount of variation in the responses to the items when compared to Pilot Study One. This was evidenced by the general increase in the standard deviations of the responses to the items.

The second step of the analysis was to examine the structures of the eight hypothesised scales of the VMI. This involved computing Cronbach's alpha internal consistency scores for each of the scales. These results are displayed in Table 8. As can be seen from Table 8, the alpha coefficients for the various scales were fairly low, which suggests that the items for these scales do not share a common theme. The implications of these findings were that the scales and items needed further revision, both in terms of definition and in terms of content.

Table 8. Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Scores for the Eight VMI Scales

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
Values	.5800
Career Development	.7482
Personal Growth	.6259
Recognition	.5592
Social	.6743
Reciprocity	.3653
Reactivity	.0663
Hedonism	-.1176

Scale Revision

The revisions of the scale involved both the examination of the content of the items on each scale and the correlations amongst the scale items. For the majority of the scales, there were items that in terms of content, did not appear to be relevant for the construct being measured by the scale. While some scales (e.g. Career Development) were better formed than others (e.g. Hedonism), it was evident that many items did not belong on their respective scales and thus had to be dropped or reworded. The correlations amongst scale items were also considered and where inter-item correlations were relatively high for a given scale, the items were retained.

To provide a pool of potential replacement items, the authors consulted a list of survey items that were considered but not chosen at the final stage of the previous research project on the VMI (McEwin & Jacobsen-D'Arcy, 2002). The authors of this current study both examined each of these potential replacement items, and made independent judgements regarding which scale they could potentially belong to, given the definitions of the VMI factors. Wherever the two authors agreed that a particular item belonged to the same scale, this item was considered as a suitable replacement item. After following these two procedures, the revised VMI was produced and used in the next study.

MAIN STUDY - STAGE FOUR

Method

Procedure

A revised VMI was developed based on the responses from Pilot Study Two. This revised VMI consisted of eight subscales, which assessed the eight factors of volunteer motivation previously described in the original VMI (McEwin & Jacobsen-D'arcy, 2002). These factors were:

- (i) Values (e.g. 'I volunteer because I believe I am meeting a need in the community in my volunteering role').
- (ii) Career Development (e.g. 'I volunteer because I feel that volunteering will help me to find out about employment opportunities').
- (iii) Personal Growth (e.g. 'I volunteer because I feel that volunteering gives me a better understanding of what life is about').
- (iv) Recognition (e.g. 'I feel that it is important to receive recognition for my volunteering work').
- (v) Self-Esteem (e.g. 'I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel like a good person'; *Name changed from 'Hedonism' for clarity*).
- (vi) Social Interaction (e.g. 'I volunteer because volunteering provides a way for me to make new friends'; *Name changed from 'Social' to emphasise the desire to interact with new people as a motivation to volunteer*).
- (vii) Reactivity (e.g. 'Volunteering gives me a chance to try to ensure people do not have to go through what I went through').
- (viii) Reciprocity (e.g. 'I volunteer because I believe that you receive what you put out in the world').

Three other items from the Pilot Study Two VMI were also included in this inventory and were:

- Religious (e.g. ‘I volunteer because volunteering fits in with my religious beliefs’).
- Government (e.g. ‘I volunteer because I do not believe the government is doing enough to help those I assist as a volunteer’).
- Community (e.g. ‘I volunteer because I do not believe the community is doing enough to help those I assist as a volunteer’).

Participants were asked to indicate their agreement to each of the 41 items in the survey using a 5-point Likert response scale with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strong agree’.

This revised VMI was distributed and collected in stages – *Stage Four* and *Stage Five* of this research project.

In *Stage Four* the 41-item VMI was distributed to volunteers in 12 organisations. As with the previous studies, distribution was arranged via the manager of volunteers either through a mail out or through internal distribution of the VMI. A total of 3937 VMI were distributed.

In *Stage Five* of this main study, the VMI was then combined with an adapted version of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992). The VFI consists of six functions with each containing five statements on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The VFI items were modified to provide greater consistency with the VMI items and in most cases this modification simply involved adding the prefix phrase ‘I volunteer because...’ to each of the items:

- (i) Values (e.g. ‘I volunteer because I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself’).
- (ii) Understanding (e.g. ‘I volunteer because I can learn more about the cause for which I am working’).
- (iii) Career (e.g. ‘I volunteer because I can make new contacts that might help my business or career’).
- (iv) Social (e.g. ‘I volunteer because my friends volunteer’).

- (v) Esteem (e.g. 'I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel better about myself').
- (vi) Protective (e.g. 'I volunteer because volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles').

One of the Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) items (from their Esteem scale) was dropped because, coincidentally, it was identical to one of the VMI Self-Esteem items.

Thus, the inventory used in this final stage contained the 41-item VMI, plus 29 of the 30 items adapted from the Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) VFI. In total the inventory contained 70 items.

This final VMI was distributed to volunteers in three organisations all through a mail out of the VMI. A total of 3764 VMI were distributed in Stage Five.

Therefore, from Stages Four and Five of the Main Study a total of 7701 VMI were distributed.

Participants

A total of 1999 responses were obtained for the Main Study from the 14 organisations that were involved. This brought about a response rate of 25.9 percent. The mean age of participants was 52.7 (sd = 18.0) years and 80.0 percent of participants were female. 52.1 percent of participants indicated they had retired from their occupation and on average, participants volunteered 5.6 (sd = 5.9) hours per week for their volunteer organisation. Data on volunteer tenure were also collected, and can be viewed in Table 9. Of those participants who provided information on their length of volunteer service, just under one third indicated that they had been volunteering for less than one year. However, just over 15 percent indicated they had been volunteering for 10 years or more.

Table 9. Number of Responses to the Main Study Broken Down by Length of Volunteer Service

Length of Volunteer Service	No. of Responses
A new volunteer – just starting	42
Less than 3 months	167
3-6 months	142
6-12 months	199
1-2 years	260
2-4 years	391
4-6 years	198
6-8 years	124
8-10 years	59
10-15 years	106
15-20 years	61
over 20 years	128
Did not provide	122
Total	1999

Results and Discussion

Analysis of VMI

Preliminary Analyses

The *first* step in the data analysis involved examining the frequency distributions of the responses to each survey item. The results of these analyses are displayed in Appendix 2. Following this analysis, mean response scores were calculated for all survey items to determine the extent to which each motivation identified in the items was a motivation for people to become volunteers. The ranking order of the survey items in terms of response is presented in Appendix 3. Note that all negatively-worded items were reverse-scored prior to this rank ordering. Clearly the most important motivation identified by participants was that they volunteered because they believed they were *meeting a need in the community*. In second place was the belief that they were *making the world a better place* through volunteering. The third most important motivation was the belief that *one receives what one puts out into the world*. From this point on, the motivations tended to be more difficult to separate in order of importance. At the other end of the spectrum, the least important motivation was that volunteering would help one find out about employment opportunities. Other less important motivations included volunteering in order to make important work connections, and volunteering because one's family is also involved in volunteering.

Scale Refinement

The *second* step of the data analysis was to examine each hypothesised scale separately. These scale-by-scale analyses were conducted as a means of examining the relationships between each scale item and their corresponding hypothesised scales. Ultimately, these analyses served the purposes of identifying scales that were poorly defined by the items, and identifying scale items that were either failing to contribute to the scale, or were doing damage to the scale.

This analysis involved determining the internal consistency of the items within the eight VMI scales. This was accomplished through the calculation of Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each of the scales. As part of these scale reliability analyses, 'problem' scale items were able to be identified by calculating the alpha coefficients of a scale after a selected item was removed. 'Problem' items were defined as any items that, if included in a scale, were causing a reduction in the alpha coefficient of that scale. Table 10 displays the internal consistency Cronbach's alpha coefficients, the extent to which these coefficients can be increased if one problem item was dropped, and the problem item, if any, that is causing a reduction in the alpha coefficients.

The results of the reliability analyses revealed four of the scales (Career Development, Social Interaction, Reciprocity, and Self-Esteem) yielded alpha coefficients of greater than .70. The Reactivity, Personal Growth, and Recognition scales yielded lower alpha coefficients between .60 and .70. Lastly, the Values scale yielded a particularly low alpha coefficient.

The analysis also identified several problem items that were reducing the internal consistencies of some of the scales. Although the Values scale could have been improved to an alpha of .60 with the removal of one item, it was felt that even after this correction was made, the reliability was still too low. Thus it was decided that the Values scale from the VMI should not remain in the VMI as it was not reliable enough to robustly assess Values as a motivation to volunteer.

Table 10. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the VMI Scales

Scale	Alpha	Alpha if Problem Item Removed	Problem Item
Values	.5405	.5991	'I do not see volunteering as part of my values system'
Career Development	.7913	.8130	'I do not think it is important that the skills I acquire through volunteering will help me in my employment'
Personal Growth	.6466	Cannot Improve	none
Recognition	.6264	Cannot Improve	none
Social Interaction	.7684	.8247	'I have not made many friends through volunteering'
Reciprocity	.7255	Cannot Improve	none
Reactivity	.6539	.7077	'My past experiences have nothing to do with my reasons for volunteering'
Self-Esteem	.7297	.7298	'I volunteer because volunteering keeps me busy'

The Career Development scale included one item that was causing some problems to the scale. From visual inspection of the problem item, it was decided that the item should be removed from the VMI as it was poorly worded. This sentiment was reinforced by several open-ended comments written by the participants.

The Social Interaction scale included one problem item. It was felt that this item should be removed from the Social Interaction scale, as it was not assessing Interaction as a motivation; rather it was simply determining whether or not the participant had made friends through volunteering. In other words the motivation to make friends through volunteering and the act of making friends may be considered as somewhat different concepts.

The Reactivity scale also included one problem item. This item, which asks whether past experiences were a motivation to be a volunteer, was felt to be closely *related* to the concept of Reactivity, but could also be 'contaminated' with unrelated concepts. For example, a volunteer who has had experiences as a parent might be motivated to assist an organisation involved with parental aid because of their past experiences as a parent. This type of

motivation, however, is not included in the domain of Reactive motivation. Thus it was felt that this problem item should be removed from the Reactivity scale.

The Self-Esteem scale also contained one problem item. There was no obvious reason, however, as to why this item might be reducing the consistency of the Self-Esteem scale. Additionally, removing this item would result in only a very slight improvement to the alpha coefficient of this scale. Thus this item was retained on the Self-Esteem scale.

At the end of the scale refinement procedure, the VMI consisted of seven motivational scales, and three individual items assessing unique motivations (religious, government, and community). All scale-level analyses from this point onwards were conducted on this reduced version of the VMI.

Descriptive Scale Statistics

Having refined the motivational scales of the VMI, the *third* step of the analysis involved an investigation into the properties of each scale. To this end, descriptive statistics were calculated for each scale, and are presented in Table 11. The motivational scales and unique items are presented in rank order of their motivational strength.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for the Revised VMI Scales and Unique Items Presented in Rank Order of Motivational Strength

Rank	Scale / Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error of Mean
1	Reciprocity	3.81	0.96	0.02
2	Recognition	3.58	0.68	0.02
3	Personal Growth	3.53	0.71	0.02
4	Community	3.36	1.14	0.03
5	Government	3.32	1.17	0.03
6	Self-Esteem	3.31	0.76	0.02
7	Social Interaction	2.88	0.84	0.02
8	Reactivity	2.79	0.78	0.02
9	Religion	2.52	1.31	0.03
10	Career Development	2.39	0.88	0.02

Of the 10 motivational scales identified in the revised VMI, Reciprocity was the strongest motivator with a mean score well above those of the other motivational factors. Next in line was Recognition, followed by Personal Growth. The perceptions that the community and/or the government weren't doing enough were the next strongest motivators. Self-Esteem as a

motivation was the next most important motivator. The remaining motivating factors, Social Interaction, Reactivity, Religion, and Career Development were seen as relatively weak motivators, all with mean scores lower than 3.00, which is the midpoint of the response scale.

Relationships between VMI Scales

The *fourth* step of the analysis involved an investigation into the interrelationships amongst the VMI motivational factors. These relationships were examined through correlational analyses and are displayed in Table 12.

Several strong and positive correlations were observed amongst the VMI scales. Personal Growth correlated strongly with Career Development, Recognition, Social Interaction, Reactivity, and Self-Esteem. Career Development, Social Interaction, and Self Esteem were all strongly correlated with one another.

Moderate and positive correlations were also found. Personal Growth correlated moderately with Reciprocity. Career Development correlated moderately with Recognition and Reactivity. Social Interaction correlated moderately with Reactivity.

Table 12. Intercorrelations amongst the VMI Motivational Factors

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Career Development									
2. Personal Growth	0.40								
3. Recognition	0.34	0.44							
4. Social Interaction	0.51	0.46	0.41						
5. Reciprocity	0.15	0.32	0.18	0.27					
6. Reactivity	0.37	0.40	0.26	0.38	0.21				
7. Self-Esteem	0.41	0.48	0.39	0.53	0.38	0.37			
8. Religion	0.07	0.17	0.06	0.16	0.11	0.27	0.08		
9. Government	0.06	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.18	0.09	0.03	
10. Community	-0.03	0.05	0.03	-0.01	0.08	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.62

Notes. Sample Size ranges from 1893 to 1979. All correlations $>.05$ are significant at the $p<.05$ level.

The three remaining factors, Religion, Government, and Community, did not correlate strongly with any of the VMI scales. Community and Government motivations were very strongly correlated. All correlations described here were positive and statistically significant.

These correlational analyses suggest that the motivations to volunteer identified by the VMI are not independent to one another. It is possible (although impossible to determine from these analyses alone) that there is an overarching motivational factor at work which could explain these strong relationships. It is interesting to note the three additional factors (i.e. Religion, Government, and Community) did not correlate with any of the motivational scales. These findings indicate that the aforementioned factors explain unique motivations to volunteer which are not sufficiently explained by the VMI scales alone.

Relationships between VMI Scales and Demographic Variables

The *fifth* step of the analysis was to investigate the relationships between demographic variables and the VMI motivational factors. First, correlational analyses were used to investigate the relationships of the scales with age, gender, whether the volunteer had dependent children, whether the volunteer was retired, whether the volunteer had friends or family who volunteered, and the number of hours per week they spent volunteering. The results of these analyses are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13. Correlations between VMI Motivational Factors and Selected Demographic Variables

	Age	Gender	Retired?	Hours Per Week	Family who Volunteer?	Friends who Volunteer?
Career Development	-0.47	0.06	-0.32	0.10	-0.07	-0.09
Personal Growth	-0.22	0.09	-0.15	0.08	0.07	0.07
Recognition	-0.19	0.02	-0.12	0.11	0.00	-0.02
Social Interaction	-0.20	0.04	-0.15	0.16	0.02	0.10
Reciprocity	-0.02	0.03	-0.04	0.02	0.02	0.06
Reactivity	-0.12	-0.02	-0.05	0.07	0.02	0.01
Self-Esteem	-0.15	0.02	-0.07	0.07	-0.05	-0.04
Religion	0.09	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.12	0.12
Government	0.01	-0.04	0.04	0.05	-0.01	-0.01
Community	0.04	-0.03	0.05	-0.01	0.00	-0.01

Notes. Higher scores on Yes/No Questions represent a Yes response. Males were coded as 1, females were coded as 2. All correlations greater than .05 are statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. n ranges from 1629 to 1929.

The different VMI scales only correlated strongly with two of the demographic variables, namely Age, and Retirement. As can be expected, the Career Development motivation was negatively correlated with both of these demographic variables. Hence, younger volunteers and non-retirees were more motivated to volunteer by opportunities to develop their careers

than were older volunteers and retirees. Scales that correlated modestly with Age included Social, Personal Growth and Recognition, again with older participants indicating they were less motivated by these factors than younger participants. The remaining demographic variables did not appear to correlate strongly with any of the VMI scales. Table 14 provides mean VMI scale scores for some of the demographic variables.

There were very few substantial differences between the demographic groups depicted in Table 14. While male participants were slightly less motivated by Career Development than female participants, there were no gender differences on the remaining VMI motivations. Retirees were much less motivated by Career Development than non retirees and interestingly they were less motivated by Social Interaction than non retirees.

Those with family members who also volunteered tended to be more motivated by Social Interaction or Religion than those without. Apart from the above findings, differences between these demographic groups in terms of motivations to volunteer were minimal.

An examination of volunteer motivations broken down by income levels of volunteers was also undertaken. Means on each volunteer scale were calculated for each income level and are presented in Table 15.

Relative to the other income levels, Career Development was a strong motivator for those within the lower income levels, although it should be noted that the average Career Development score was below the scale midpoint of 3.00, suggesting that generally Career Development is still not a strong motivator even in this income level. Personal Growth was a strong motivator for those in the lowest income levels relative to the other income levels. Although Recognition and Social Interaction motivations were strongest for the lowest income levels, the differences across income levels were not large, and there were no discernable relationships between Recognition or Social Interaction and income levels. Reactivity and Self-Esteem were strongest for the lowest income levels, and generally speaking these motivations became weaker as the income levels became higher. There were no obvious relationships between the remaining motivational factors and income levels.

Table 14. Mean VMI Motivational Scores Broken Down by Demographic Variables

	Gender		Are you retired?	
	Male	Female	Yes	No
Career Development	2.28	2.41	2.10	2.66
Personal Growth	3.41	3.56	3.43	3.63
Recognition	3.55	3.58	3.50	3.66
Social Interaction	2.82	2.89	2.75	3.00
Reciprocity	3.76	3.83	3.76	3.84
Reactivity	2.82	2.79	2.75	2.83
Self-Esteem	3.27	3.32	3.25	3.35
Religion	2.51	2.51	2.59	2.44
Government	3.42	3.30	3.37	3.27
Community	3.43	3.35	3.42	3.31

	Do you have friends who volunteer?		Do you have family members who volunteer?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Career Development	2.30	2.43	2.32	2.47
Personal Growth	3.60	3.50	3.58	3.48
Recognition	3.58	3.58	3.57	3.60
Social Interaction	2.89	2.86	2.95	2.78
Reciprocity	3.85	3.81	3.86	3.75
Reactivity	2.81	2.78	2.80	2.78
Self-Esteem	3.26	3.34	3.28	3.35
Religion	2.72	2.40	2.64	2.33
Government	3.31	3.33	3.32	3.34
Community	3.36	3.36	3.35	3.37

Table 15. Mean VMI Motivational Scores Broken Down by Income Levels

	<\$10000	\$10000 to 19999	\$20000 to \$29999	\$30000 to \$39999	\$40000 to \$49999	\$50000 to \$59999	\$60000 to \$69999	>\$70000
Career Development	2.74	2.28	2.30	2.54	2.18	2.26	2.27	2.19
Personal Growth	3.70	3.50	3.54	3.51	3.51	3.41	3.53	3.55
Recognition	3.67	3.53	3.55	3.60	3.58	3.54	3.61	3.59
Social Interaction	2.98	2.83	2.87	2.91	2.86	2.73	2.91	2.85
Reciprocity	3.78	3.81	3.89	3.84	3.73	3.77	4.06	3.82
Reactivity	2.95	2.84	2.85	2.80	2.71	2.66	2.69	2.64
Self-Esteem	3.44	3.32	3.28	3.24	3.25	3.25	3.22	3.22
Religion	2.55	2.52	2.69	2.39	2.37	2.51	2.33	2.34
Government	3.39	3.30	3.46	3.28	3.32	3.49	3.15	3.16
Community	3.32	3.42	3.41	3.35	3.39	3.76	3.09	3.24

Note. n ranged from 1529 to 1573

An examination of motivations broken down by length of volunteer service was also conducted. This process involved calculating mean scores on all VMI scales for each of the volunteer tenure levels. These results are shown in Table 16 on the following page.

Relative to the other volunteer length of service levels, Career Development was a strong motivator for those volunteers who had not been with their organisation for a long time. As tenure increased, Career Development as a motivator tended to level off. While Social Interaction was a fairly strong motivator for those who were new to the organisation, it was also a fairly strong motivator for those who had been part of the organisation for a lengthy period of time. This latter finding is possibly reflective of volunteers making long-term friends through their organisation. For the remaining motivational factors, however, there were no clear relationships between volunteering motivation and volunteer length of service.

Summary

The objective of Stage Four of the Main Study was to collect a large volume of data for the VMI from a diverse sample of volunteers. While the findings from these data provided insights into what motivates people of different ages, incomes, length of service, and many other demographic factors, the findings also provided an opportunity to identify several aspects of the VMI that needed adjusting. After making these adjustments, the VMI became a

more robust instrument assessing 10 different motivational factors, although it should be noted that three of these factors were assessed only with single-item measures.

Table 16. Mean VMI Motivational Scores Broken Down by Volunteer Length of Service

	A new volunteer	Less than 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	1 to 2 years	2 to 4 years
Career Development	2.83	2.72	2.45	2.42	2.31	2.20
Personal Growth	3.65	3.54	3.49	3.47	3.51	3.49
Recognition	3.64	3.71	3.58	3.58	3.54	3.57
Social Interaction	2.98	2.84	2.83	2.80	2.77	2.78
Reciprocity	3.77	3.82	3.83	3.89	3.78	3.75
Reactivity	2.90	2.94	2.82	2.86	2.74	2.73
Self-Esteem	3.47	3.36	3.29	3.24	3.30	3.26
Religion	2.73	2.45	2.16	2.50	2.25	2.54
Government	3.45	3.24	3.39	3.32	3.43	3.43
Community	3.29	3.34	3.41	3.34	3.45	3.43

	4 to 6 years	6 to 8 years	8 to 10 years	10 to 15 years	15 to 20 years	Over 20 years
Career Development	2.35	2.33	2.34	2.29	2.30	2.26
Personal Growth	3.57	3.53	3.59	3.50	3.64	3.56
Recognition	3.61	3.52	3.58	3.56	3.53	3.49
Social Interaction	2.95	3.04	3.16	3.00	2.98	2.99
Reciprocity	3.75	3.90	3.72	3.94	3.88	4.01
Reactivity	2.77	2.70	2.90	2.69	2.74	2.72
Self-Esteem	3.35	3.34	3.44	3.36	3.36	3.20
Religion	2.61	2.50	2.61	2.82	3.05	2.88
Government	3.30	3.19	3.47	3.31	3.22	3.11
Community	3.40	3.14	3.45	3.33	3.27	3.36

Note. n ranges from 1854 to 1868.

Stage Five of the Main Study involved comparing the VMI to an established inventory assessing volunteering as a means of satisfying a person's need. This inventory, termed the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992) is described in more detail in the following section.

MAIN STUDY - STAGE FIVE

Comparing the VMI and VFI

Having developed a Volunteer Motivation Inventory with seven subscales, and three additional items measuring miscellaneous motivations to volunteer, the next step in the

research project was to compare this inventory to the VFI developed independently in the United States by Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992).

As previously mentioned in the research methodology, the final VMI from Stage Four containing 41 items was then combined with an adapted version of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992) containing 29 items. The VMI now consisted of a total of 70 items and was distributed to volunteers in three organisations and completed by a total of 778 volunteers (as compared to 1221 participants in Stage 4 of the Main Study).

Preliminary Analyses

The *first* step of the analysis involved an examination of the frequency distributions and descriptive statistics for all items. Whilst some items were strongly skewed, most of the items provided fairly good discriminatory power. No outliers were detected.

Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated for all seven of the VMI scales for this reduced sample, and for the six VFI scales (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992). These results are displayed in Table 17. As can be seen from Table 17, the reliability statistics for the VMI scales for this reduced sample were similar to those obtained from the full sample. Reliability coefficients for the VFI scales were all fairly high.

Table 17. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the VMI Scales and the VFI Scales

Volunteer Motivation Inventory		Volunteer Function Inventory	
Scale	Alpha	Scale	Alpha
Career Development	.7712	Social	.8273
Personal Growth	.6732	Values	.7393
Recognition	.6295	Career	.9261
Social Interaction	.8082	Understanding	.8095
Reciprocity	.6962	Protective	.7552
Reactivity	.7257	Esteem	.7930
Self Esteem	.7128		

Comparing the VMI to the VFI

Descriptive statistics for all of the scale scores were then computed. These results are displayed in Table 18. As can be seen from Table 18, there was a great deal of variation with respect to the relative importance of the motivational factors identified by the two inventories. The VFI Values scale stood out as a particularly important motivation, whereas the VFI

Career scale was regarded as the least important motivation. The standard deviation of the scale scores for the two motivational inventories were fairly similar, suggesting that both inventories exposed similar levels of variability across participants. The standard deviations of the Religion, Government, and Community items from the VMI, however, were relatively high, presumably because they were single-item measures, as opposed to scale scores.

Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for the VMI Scales and VFI Scales

Scale / Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error of Mean
VMI Scales			
Career Development	2.45	0.84	0.03
Personal Growth	3.54	0.73	0.03
Recognition	3.58	0.70	0.02
Social Interaction	2.99	0.84	0.03
Reciprocity	3.88	0.93	0.03
Reactivity	2.79	0.79	0.03
Self-Esteem	3.35	0.75	0.03
Religion	2.48	1.30	0.05
Government	3.31	1.18	0.04
Community	3.36	1.16	0.04
Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) Scales			
Social	2.38	0.82	0.03
Values	4.09	0.60	0.02
Career	1.89	0.86	0.03
Understanding	3.36	0.85	0.03
Protective	2.32	0.79	0.03
Esteem	3.13	0.91	0.03

Comparing VMI and VFI Scales

Correlations between the VMI and VFI scales were calculated, and displayed in Table 19. The purpose of these correlational analyses was to identify any VMI scales that may be assessing the same or similar motivational factors as those assessed by the Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) VFI scales.

As can be seen from Table 19, several of the VMI scales correlated very strongly with the VFI scales. The VMI Career Development scale correlated very strongly with the VFI Career scale, suggesting that these two scales both measure a similar volunteer motivation. Given the definitions of these two constructs, it is perhaps not surprising that the two scales correlate so highly.

The Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) Esteem factor correlated very strongly with the VMI Self-Esteem factor, also suggesting that the two scales are measuring similar constructs. Again, these results may be reflective of the overlap in definitions for the two constructs.

Table 19. Correlations between VMI and VFI Scales

		Volunteer Function Inventory Scales (Clary et al., 1992)					
		Social	Values	Career	Understanding	Protective	Esteem
Volunteer Motivation Inventory Scales	Career Development	0.25	0.04	0.69	0.49	0.39	0.40
	Personal Growth	0.30	0.30	0.24	0.60	0.44	0.55
	Recognition	0.13	0.14	0.20	0.35	0.22	0.45
	Social Interaction	0.44	0.10	0.34	0.45	0.45	0.59
	Reciprocity	0.25	0.15	0.13	0.24	0.25	0.28
	Reactivity	0.31	0.25	0.28	0.41	0.49	0.41
	Self-Esteem	0.31	0.20	0.35	0.43	0.55	0.70
	Religion	0.34	0.18	0.09	0.18	0.16	0.13
	Government	0.14	0.27	0.13	0.19	0.19	0.15
	Community	0.06	0.31	0.06	0.13	0.13	0.07

Notes. n ranges from 736 to 778. All correlations greater than .07 are significant at the $p < .05$ level.

A third correlation that was particularly high was that found between Understanding and Personal Growth. The high correlation suggests that there may be a great deal of similarity in the two constructs. Given the poor reliability of the Personal Growth scale, it may be that the observed correlation provides an underestimation of the true correlation between the two constructs. If this is the case, the results suggest that the two measures are fairly similar in terms of content. Given the psychometric superiority of the VFI Understanding measure over the Personal Growth measure, it was concluded that only the Understanding measure be retained in future developments of the VMI and the Personal Growth scale be dropped.

Another noteworthy correlation includes the moderate correlation found between the VMI Self-Esteem scale and the VFI Protective scale. It is difficult to explain why these two scales were correlated so strongly, given their differences in terms of definition and item content. Similarly, the VMI Social Interaction and Personal Growth scales correlated fairly strongly with the VFI Esteem scale. Again, it is not immediately obvious why these relationships are so strong, but one possibility is that the construct measured by the VFI Esteem scale provides an 'overarching' motivation to volunteer, which affects the degree to which other motivators

become important. Indeed, the VFI Esteem factor correlated reasonably strongly with almost all of the VMI scales.

Interestingly, the Social scale from the Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) VFI did not correlate very strongly with the Social Interaction scale of the VMI. While this result may appear surprising at first, it is important to highlight the distinction between the definitions of the two scales. The VFI Social scale assesses the extent to which volunteers are motivated to volunteer because they know people who also volunteer, whereas the VMI Social Interaction scale assesses the extent to which volunteers are motivated to volunteer because of the possibility of meeting *new* friends. While there are some similarities in these two constructs, they are by no means equivalent, and should therefore be treated as different constructs.

Creating an Improved Inventory of Volunteer Motivations

Also of particular interest are the scales from one inventory that do not correlate strongly with any of the scales from the other inventory. From the VFI, the Social and Values scales did not correlate very strongly with any of the VMI scales. Similarly, the Recognition, Reactivity, and Reciprocity scales from the VMI did not correlate strongly with any of the VFI scales.

Any scales on one inventory that fail to correlate with scales on the other inventory are good starting points for identifying motivations that are ‘unique’ to one inventory. By taking the ‘unique’ motivations from both inventories, and combining them with the motivations assessed with both inventories (such as Career Development/Career and Self-Esteem/Esteem) a more complete inventory of volunteer motivations can be generated.

Following this process, Appendix 4 shows the final list of scales and items that the authors believe should be retained and used to provide an improved picture of volunteer motivations. It should be noted, however, that despite the Religion, Government, and Community items not being strongly correlated with the VMI and VFI scales, they were omitted from the improved VMI because they were single-item measures. Furthermore, Government, Religion, and Community were not based on previous research but rather were added as a result of informal discussions with managers of volunteers at some organisations involved in the research. Consequently, the authors concluded that there was an insufficient research basis

for the inclusion of these items in the final version of the VMI. The authors, however, recommend that future research investigate these potentially important motivators in greater detail with the intention of possibly including multi-item scales assessing these motivations to volunteer.

Descriptive Statistics from the Improved VMI

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each motivational factor assessed by the improved VMI inventory. These descriptive statistics are shown in Table 20, and are listed in rank order according to motivational strength.

As can be seen from Table 20, Values was considered the most important motivation, followed by Reciprocity and Recognition. Social Interaction, Reactivity, Social, Protective, and Career Development motivations were perceived as being fairly unimportant, with mean scores below the mid point of 3.00. Reciprocity, Social Interaction, Career Development, and Reactivity exhibited the greatest amount of variation amongst volunteers.

Table 20. Descriptive Statistics for Improved VMI Scales Ranked in Order of Importance

Scale	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error of Mean
Values	1	4.09	0.60	0.02
Reciprocity	2	3.88	0.93	0.03
Recognition	3	3.58	0.70	0.02
Understanding	4	3.36	0.85	0.03
Self Esteem	5	3.35	0.75	0.03
Social Interaction	6	2.79	0.91	0.03
Reactivity	7	2.78	0.87	0.03
Social	8	2.38	0.82	0.03
Protective	9	2.32	0.79	0.03
Career Development	10	2.31	0.87	0.03

Notes. Descriptive statistics and rankings are based on a sample of 778 volunteers from three organisations as described above.

Overall, the data analyses conducted here have resulted in the development of a more robust instrument that is capable of measuring ten unique volunteer motivations. Whilst some of the ten motivations have been identified and examined in previous research (e.g. Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992), these combined with the remaining motivations provide a more complete picture of the complex study of volunteer motivation.

OVERALL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research project incorporated two objectives. The main and central objective involved undertaking a large-scale study to develop an instrument to understand and assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers in Western Australia.

The second objective involved undertaking a small-scale study to understand the reasons why people do *not* volunteer and involved 213 non-volunteers. This study identified that the reasons people give for not volunteering included their lives being too busy to consider volunteering. Participants in this study also described the need to know that if they did volunteer that their voluntary work would make a difference in people's lives. Further, if they believed in the philosophy and mission of an organisation, or if they were helping out an organisation of which they were a member, then some participants would consider volunteering.

Although on a small-scale, this study did provide a further contribution to the very limited research as to why people do not volunteer. However, it is the main objective of this study and the development of the Volunteer Motivation Inventory (VMI) that has been the central focus of this research project.

Involving 2,444 volunteers from 15 diverse organisations and incorporating *three* studies and *five* stages in total, there is no doubt that this study is one of the most extensive studies undertaken in Western Australia to understand and assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers.

Each of these stages contributed to the continued refinement of the VMI and an enormous amount of data collection and subsequent analysis took place, as described in the results section of this report.

This final section of the report will consider three aspects in the development and refinement of the VMI: (i) understanding the underlying motivations of people who volunteer; (ii) the assessment of these motivations through the VMI; and (iii) the limitations of this research and future research directions.

Understanding the Underlying Motivations of People Who Volunteer

So what is it that motivates people to volunteer their time, energy and resources? This research, through the continued development of the VMI, provided valuable information about the actual motivations and their importance to volunteers. Clearly, it was identified that different motivations were of different relative importance to volunteers in this study. These differences are of great interest to managers of volunteers involved in the recruitment, placement and retention of volunteers within their organisation (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992; Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Esmond, 2001a). When the final VMI (consisting of 70 items combining the VMI with the VFI) considered the motivations of those who volunteer, it was clear that *Values*, based on deeply held beliefs of the importance of helping others (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992), was the most important motivation. Interestingly, this finding is consistent with the other major research undertaken into volunteer motivation by Clary, Snyder and their colleagues who also found *Values* to be an important motivator.

This finding would suggest that people who choose to volunteer for an organisation see it as important that the value system of the organisation is congruent with their own underlying value system. For as Fischer and Schaffer (1993:109) explain: “the more people believe in the purpose of an organisation, the more committed they will be to committing their time and continuing their work”. Further, any organisation utilising volunteers should recognise the importance of continually reinforcing that the voluntary activity undertaken is contributing to helping others. This may seem obvious but far too often volunteers are unable to see how their voluntary work contributes to the bigger picture of the organisation and making a difference in many people’s lives (Esmond, in press).

Another motivation identified as very important in this present study was that of *Reciprocity*. This relates to the belief that ‘what goes around comes around’ and a process of equal exchange. In a sense, in the process of helping others and of ‘doing good’, we too will be helped. Interestingly, this motivation was not examined in the comparable research by Clary, Snyder and their colleagues. This motivation presents a deeper underlying belief and is believed to be unique to this study.

The third most important motivation to volunteer identified in this study was that of *Recognition*. Once again, this motivation was not examined by Clary, Snyder and their

colleagues but was clearly relevant to volunteers in this study. Receiving recognition and being recognised for their skills and contribution was important to volunteers. This need for recognition reinforces the importance for managers of volunteers to continue to find ways to both formally and informally recognise and reward their volunteers. Indeed, a major reason for volunteers leaving an organisation was that 'they did not feel appreciated' (Esmond, in press). It is therefore of paramount importance that organisations continue to recognise their volunteers in order to retain their involvement and commitment (McCurley & Lynch, 1994; Vineyard, 1991).

Beyond the top three motivations, Understanding and Self-Esteem were further motivations identified by volunteers in this study and highlighted by Clary, Snyder and their colleagues. Understanding essentially described people who were motivated to learn through involvement in volunteering activities. Self-Esteem described the situation where volunteering enhances the person's own feelings of worth and sense of esteem.

The remaining motivational factors were, in general, perceived as somewhat less important. Interestingly, although Career Development was perceived as the least important motivator there was a relationship with the age of the volunteer. It seems that younger volunteers were more motivated to improve their employment prospects through volunteering than older volunteers. This finding was identified by Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992), who also examined Career as a potential motivation to volunteer.

Although limited to three organisations and unable to be generalised to the population of volunteers at large, the motivations identified in the final VMI certainly contribute to a greater understanding of the underlying motivations of people who volunteer. Many of these motivations were consistent with those examined by Clary, Snyder and their colleagues but several of the most important motivations were identified and highlighted in this research as unique motivations – *Recognition* and *Reciprocity*.

Although the order and importance of these motivations can vary across demographic age groups and in relation to volunteers engaged in different types of activities in different organisations, it is clear that some motivations are more important to each individual volunteer than others.

For managers of volunteers, not only understanding but assessing the motivations of each volunteer can be of great assistance in attracting, placing and retaining their volunteers.

Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers through the VMI

The VMI that is the focus of this discussion has undergone extensive development throughout this research and has been trialled, revised, re-trialled, modified and trialled again.

The final VMI now consists of 44 statements of motivations that a person may have for volunteering (see Appendix 5). There are 10 scales as shown below:

1. *Values* (Va) whereby the individual volunteers in order to express or act on firmly held beliefs of the importance for one to help others (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992). This scale consists of five statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because I feel it is important to help others'.
2. *Reciprocity* (Rp) whereby the individual volunteers in the belief that 'what goes around comes around'. In the process of helping others and 'doing good' their volunteering work will also bring about good things for the volunteer themselves. This scale consists of two statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because I believe that you receive what you put out in the world'.
3. *Recognition* (Rn) whereby the individual is motivated to volunteer by being recognised for their skills and contribution and enjoys the recognition volunteering gives them. This scale consists of five statements, e.g. 'I like to work with a volunteer agency, which treats their volunteers and staff alike'.
4. *Understanding* (Un) whereby the individual volunteers to learn more about the world through their volunteering experience or exercise skills that are often unused (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992). This scale consists of five statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because I can learn how to deal with a variety of people'.

5. *Self-Esteem* (SE) whereby the individual volunteers to increase their own feelings of self-worth and self-esteem. This scale consists of five statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel like a good person'.

6. *Reactivity* (Rc) whereby the individual volunteers out of a need to 'heal' and address their own past or current issues. This scale consists of four statements, e.g. 'Volunteering gives me a chance to try to ensure people do not have to go through what I went through'.

7. *Social* (So) whereby the individual volunteers and seeks to conform to normative influences of significant others (e.g. friends or family) (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992). This scale consists of five statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because people I'm close to volunteer'.

8. *Protective* (Pr) whereby the individual volunteers as a means to reduce negative feelings about themselves, e.g., guilt or to address personal problems (Clary, Snyder & Ridge, 1992). This scale consists of five statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt for being more fortunate than others'.

9. *Social Interaction* (SI) whereby the individual volunteers to build social networks and enjoys the social aspects of interacting with others. This scale consists of four statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because volunteering provides a way for me to make new friends'.

10. *Career Development* (CD) whereby the individual volunteers with the prospect of making connections with people and gaining experience and field skills that may eventually be beneficial in assisting them to find employment. This scale consists of four statements, e.g. 'I volunteer because I feel that I make important work connections through volunteering'.

Of these 10 scales, four scales are minor wording adaptations of the work of Clary, Snyder and their colleagues, these being Values, Understanding, Protective and Social. Two further scales being Career Development and Self-Esteem have similarities to the scales developed by Clary,

Snyder and their colleagues but contain different statements. The final four scales being Reciprocity, Recognition, Reactivity and Social Interaction are unique scales for this research.

When used, this instrument contains a 5 point Likert scale with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 5 being 'strongly agree' and those completing the VMI are asked to rate their level of agreement with each of the 44 statements. When the score for each of the 10 scales is totalled and then averaged it provides an overall profile of the motivations an individual has for volunteering. The higher scores reflect that a motivation is of greater importance to the individual and a lower score reflects a motivation that is of less concern to the individual.

This scoring of the scales can provide a rank order of the most salient motivations for the individual who completed the VMI.

So of what value is the VMI in assessing the underlying motivational drives for volunteering? The VMI with further research could provide a useful tool to organisations in assisting the managers of volunteers in these organisations in three areas: attracting, placing and retaining volunteers.

Firstly, in *attracting potential volunteers* the VMI can be a helpful tool. Many managers of volunteers may assume that they have a very good understanding of the motivations of both current and future volunteers to their organisation. Often the type of organisation and nature of the volunteer activities gives clues to the motivations of those that volunteer. However, in assessing motivations through the VMI, managers of volunteers may be surprised to find that their assumptions may not be entirely accurate. For example, if the assumption is made that potential volunteers are predominantly motivated by the Social Interaction scale, then recruitment messages and materials designed to attract potential volunteers may be produced to focus upon this motivation. However, if the VMI was administered to target audiences of individuals when they contacted the organisation about potentially volunteering and Career Development was a more dominant motivation, then much of the current recruitment material would be wasted as it does not respond to the motivational needs of the potential volunteer audience. For as Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992:341) explain in discussing the use of their VFI by managers of volunteers, they can "...assess the motivational concerns of audience members and then promote their organisations or activities as a means by which relevant motivations of the target audience can be satisfied". The VMI can assist in tailoring

recruitment messages and material to attract potential volunteers and closely match their motivational needs.

Secondly, in the *placement of volunteers* the VMI can be a useful tool. Assessing the motivational needs of new volunteers can assist the manager of volunteers in providing the most effective placement of a volunteer into activities that meet their needs and that the volunteer would find highly satisfying. For example, the volunteer who is high on the Social Interaction scale would not be suitably placed in activities that involve working in isolated surroundings. Although not entirely as simplistic as this (Puffer, 1991) there is a good argument to suggest that the placement of a new volunteer into volunteering activities that fulfil their motivational needs will certainly increase their level of satisfaction in their new voluntary role.

Further, as the motivations of volunteers can change for volunteers over time (Fischer & Schaffer, 1993) the VMI can provide a useful insight into these changing motivations. For example, a volunteer may have joined to meet their Career Development needs but several years later may be more motivated by the Social Interaction scale and the friendships formed through the volunteering experience. This is important information for the manager of volunteers when obtaining feedback and discussing future volunteer activities with this particular volunteer. Administering the VMI periodically to volunteers throughout their length of service with the organisation may allow managers of volunteers to keep up-to-date with the changing motivations of those that volunteer.

Thirdly, in the *retention of volunteers* the VMI can be a useful tool. High turnover in volunteer numbers can be a costly and time-consuming exercise for any organisation. Further, high turnover severely affects organisational morale and can be highly disruptive to the management and administration of volunteer programs within the organisation (Fischer & Schaffer, 1993; Vineyard, 2001).

The VMI by assisting in understanding the motivations of both new and current volunteers can ensure that volunteers are better placed in volunteer activities that continue to meet their main motivational needs. For as Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992:345) point out, managers of volunteers who "...provide volunteers with activities that match their motivations and satisfy

their needs and goals will foster an atmosphere in which volunteers receive more satisfaction from their work and will thus continue longer in their service”.

By understanding the motivations of their volunteers through the VMI, the manager of volunteers can assign new activities that satisfy the initial needs of volunteers and then provide different activities as the motivational needs of volunteers change. Matching and meeting these needs can only strengthen the commitment of volunteers and increase the retention rate of these valuable individuals.

The VMI may be seen as a useful tool in relation to the process of recruitment, placement and retention of volunteers. However, it should be noted that understanding and assessing motivations is a complex process. Although the VMI can assist in identifying the more salient motives for an individual's decision to volunteer, often there can be multiple motives involved in this decision. Indeed, "...people's motivations for performing actions as diverse, complex and sustained as volunteerism are very likely to be multifaceted (Clary & Snyder, 1999: 157).

The VMI therefore, should be viewed as just one of the tools and techniques that may be utilised by managers of volunteers in seeking to enhance the recruitment, effective placement and greater retention of volunteers in their organisations.

Limitations of the Current Research

The authors acknowledge that there are limitations associated with this research and have identified a number of cautions and reservations that need to be noted:

Firstly, as with most studies into volunteer motivations including those undertaken by Clary, Snyder and their colleagues, this research involved the *self-reporting of volunteers* in completing the VMI. This self-reporting format required a willingness on the part of volunteers to complete the inventory and to respond candidly to the statements contained in the VMI. It is not inconceivable that a number of volunteers who completed the VMI may have based their answers on what they believed their organisation and the authors wanted to read. Although the anonymity of the survey and wording of statements would have somewhat reduced this concern, it must be acknowledged as part of any self-reporting process.

Secondly, this research has been *confined mostly to volunteers based in the Perth Western Australian metropolitan area*. Although a very large sample was involved, there are no assurances that the VMI will translate effectively to other Australian states or overseas countries. The uniquely Western Australian focus of this research suggests that for the VMI to have broader application, more research needs to be done in a range of locations both interstate and internationally.

Thirdly, the demographic profile of the participants saw an *overrepresentation of female volunteers*. The greater number of female participants may well have reflected the predominance of social service based organisations whose volunteer profile may include a far greater number of female volunteers. Again, for the VMI to have broader application it needs to be administered to a greater number of male volunteers and in a wider range of organisations outside the social service sector. For example, only one emergency service based organisation, Volunteer First Aid Service, St John Ambulance Australia (WA) Inc. was involved in this research and no sport and recreation based organisations were represented at all.

Fourthly, the participants in this study were *predominantly current volunteers*, rather than new volunteers to the organisation. Future research investigating the VMI in relation to the motivations of new volunteers would add to its usefulness.

Finally, it should be noted that motivational profiles produced by the VMI are *expressed in an absolute sense*. As a placement or recruitment instrument, however, the VMI would be of much more use if a volunteer organisation could use it to determine, *relative to other volunteers of similar demography*, what are the important motivating factors for a particular volunteer. For example, if a new volunteer scored 3.00 on Career Development and 3.50 on Values, Career Development would be perceived as being the less important motivation in an absolute sense. This new volunteer, however, has actually scored substantially higher on Career Development than most of the participants in this study. Furthermore, this new volunteer actually scored substantially lower on Values than most of the participants in this study. Thus it would be a mistake to conclude that this particular volunteer is more interested in Values than they are in developing their Career, because relative to other volunteers, the new volunteer is in fact more motivated by Career Development and less by Values.

In order for the VMI to be used for comparative purposes, it is first necessary to accumulate a set of norms for various demographic groups that can serve as a basis for comparison. This should be the first step in any future research project involving the VMI.

Although the VMI can provide a motivational profile of a given volunteer, it is important to recognise that this profile can only serve to provide a *descriptive* account of a volunteer's motivations. In effect, it can provide an indication as to what factors are particularly motivating for a volunteer, and what factors are not so motivating for that volunteer. At this stage, however, the VMI *cannot be used* to make any inferences about what a particular volunteer's future behaviour might be. In order to make any claims about its predictive capabilities, the VMI needs to be subjected to longitudinal research.

It is clear from these limitations that the VMI in its current form and state of development is *not a commercially viable product*. More extensive research should be undertaken to increase the robustness, usefulness and universal application of the VMI. Its limitations notwithstanding, the VMI has provided a valuable contribution to increasing our understanding of the complex motivational drives of current and future volunteers.

APPENDIX 1 – THE NON-VOLUNTEERING STUDY

Introduction

Although each and every day millions of people around the world give of their time and energy to make a difference through volunteering, a far greater number do *not* volunteer. Yet, Clary, Snyder and Ridge (1992) in their study identified that many more people believe that they ‘should’ volunteer as compared to those who do volunteer.

Although there has been an ever increasing number of studies exploring the underlying motivations of those individuals who do volunteer, very little research has been undertaken to understand why individuals do *not* volunteer.

A further objective of this research project was to undertake a small-scale study to:

- Understand the reasons why people do *not* volunteer.

Method

Measures

A survey to be completed by people who do *not* volunteer was developed by the authors. This survey was partly adapted from the study undertaken by Cheang and Braun (2001). This Hawaiian state-wide study included a section on possible reasons as to why seniors would *not* be involved in volunteering.

The non-volunteering survey consisted of questions relating to the demographic details of the participants including age, gender, marital status, annual household income, retired from occupation and time spent volunteering each week. The survey also included 21 statements collected from the literature and the Cheang and Braun (2001) study as to reasons why people do *not* volunteer (e.g. ‘I would start volunteering if I weren’t so busy’). Participants were asked to rate these statements as to why they did not engage in volunteering, or had ceased their involvement, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ through to 5 being ‘strongly agree’.

Procedure

The distribution of the non-volunteering survey was undertaken at the same time as the distribution of the VFI. Six organisations were involved in the distribution of this survey. These were: Australian Red Cross (WA), CLAN WA Inc., Volunteer First Aid Service, St Johns Ambulance Australia (WA) Inc., The School Volunteer Program (WA) Inc., Volunteering WA and City of Stirling, Community Services Department.

The non-volunteering survey was included with the VFI when it was mailed out to volunteers on the database of these organisations or internally handed to volunteers by the manager of volunteers, with a letter of explanation and a reply paid envelope. Volunteers receiving the VFI were asked to pass on the non-volunteering survey, the letter of explanation about the survey and the reply paid envelope to a person they knew who was *not* involved in formal volunteering and ask them to complete the survey and return it in the reply paid envelope. The distribution of the non-volunteering survey was therefore left to the discretion of the volunteers themselves.

Participants

A total of 213 participants responded to the non-volunteer survey. The mean age of respondents was 48.6 years and 63 percent were female. A total of 66 percent indicated that they had dependent children and 37 percent had retired from their occupation. Tables 21 and 22 show the numbers of non-volunteer responses broken down by marital status and income levels.

Table 21. Number of Non-Volunteer Responses Broken Down by Marital Status

Marital Status	Number of Responses
De Facto	7
Divorced	7
Married	113
Separated	3
Single	64
Widow	15
Did Not Provide	4
Total	213

Table 22. Number of Non-Volunteer Responses Broken Down by Income Levels

Marital Status	No. of Responses
Less than \$10 000	32
\$10 000 - \$19 999	37
\$20 000 - \$29 999	41
\$30 000 - \$39 999	15
\$40 000 - \$49 999	23
\$50 000 - \$59 999	7
\$60 000 - \$69 999	6
Greater than \$70 000	22
Did Not Provide	30
Total	213

As can be seen in Table 21, over half of the non-volunteer participants were married, and almost one third indicated that they were single. It can be seen from Table 22 that non-volunteer participants exhibited a range of different income levels, although the majority of participants earned less than \$50 000 per annum.

Results

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all items in the non-volunteer survey. These items are listed in Table 23 in rank order of mean. As can be seen from Table 23, many people indicated that they would volunteer if they knew that the volunteer opportunity was meaningful, or made a difference in people's lives. Other important factors included family obligations, congruence with an organisation's philosophy, and a belief that the volunteer environment will be pleasant and safe. Other factors that prevented people from volunteering were that people felt they were too busy with work and hobbies. On average the remaining factors tended not to be significant reasons why people did not volunteer, with most items averaging less than the mid-point of 3.00.

Table 24 provides frequency distributions of the responses to each of the non volunteer items. Many of the items brought about a relatively even distribution across response options, but most of the items tended to be more negatively weighted, where more people tended to respond Strongly Disagree or Disagree.

Table 23. Responses to Non-Volunteer Survey Items Listed in Rank Order of Mean Response Scores

Rank	I would volunteer if...	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error of Mean
1	I knew the volunteer opportunity was meaningful, or made a difference in people's lives.	3.50	1.28	0.09
2	I weren't so busy with family and other obligations.	3.43	1.33	0.09
3	I found an organisation, where I really believed in their philosophy and mission.	3.26	1.28	0.09
4	I knew the volunteer environment to be pleasant and safe.	3.12	1.27	0.09
5	I weren't so busy with other interests and hobbies.	3.12	1.35	0.10
6	I weren't so busy with work.	3.09	1.42	0.10
7	The volunteer opportunity was offered or needed by an organisation or group I belong to.	3.02	1.15	0.08
8	The volunteer opportunity had convenient hours.	3.00	1.18	0.09
9	I could be given a clear and specific task, or tasks, to do.	2.87	1.31	0.09
10	The organisation that needed help was one that had, in the past, helped me or someone I love.	2.87	1.37	0.10
11	I knew I had the skills needed to do a good job.	2.80	1.25	0.09
12	I had more information about volunteer opportunities.	2.79	1.20	0.09
13	I got to meet interesting people and make new friends.	2.75	1.16	0.08
14	I was actually asked to volunteer.	2.72	1.21	0.09
15	I were recognised and appreciated for my work as a volunteer.	2.62	1.22	0.09
16	The volunteer agency would train me to do the work.	2.61	1.26	0.09
17	I knew someone else who also worked or volunteered there.	2.39	1.20	0.09
18	I felt confident about myself.	2.33	1.26	0.09
19	I received some form of reimbursement - for example, meals or petrol allowance - in return for my time and services.	2.29	1.25	0.09
20	I were in better health.	2.09	1.30	0.09
21	I had better transportation to get to a volunteer opportunity.	2.07	1.14	0.08

Table 24. Frequency Distributions for all Non-Volunteer Survey Items

Survey Item	# of Responses					
	1	2	3	4	5	T
I would start volunteering if I weren't so busy with work.	37	36	32	50	39	194
I would start volunteering if the volunteer agency would train me to do the work.	45	56	46	31	19	197
I would start volunteering if I were in better health.	88	52	20	19	16	195
I would start volunteering if I knew someone else who also worked or volunteered there.	55	60	37	33	9	194
I would start volunteering if I had better transportation to get to a volunteer opportunity.	72	74	22	17	10	195
I would start volunteering if the organisation that needed help was one that had, in the past, helped me or someone I love.	39	50	31	46	28	194
I would start volunteering if I could be given a clear and specific task, or tasks, to do.	38	45	35	54	21	193
I would start volunteering if I weren't so busy with other interests and hobbies.	29	49	26	60	35	199
I would start volunteering if I knew I had the skills needed to do a good job.	36	50	38	54	15	193
I would start volunteering if I knew the volunteer environment to be pleasant and safe.	27	40	34	70	24	195
I would start volunteering if I felt confident about myself.	60	67	23	29	14	193
I would start volunteering if I was actually asked to volunteer.	38	50	51	43	14	196
I would start volunteering if I had more information about volunteer opportunities.	34	47	54	45	15	195
I would start volunteering if the volunteer opportunity was offered or needed by an organisation or group I belong to.	24	42	48	69	12	195
I would start volunteering if I got to meet interesting people and make new friends.	34	50	50	52	9	195
I would start volunteering if I knew the volunteer opportunity was meaningful, or made a difference in people's lives.	23	19	37	69	47	195
I would start volunteering if I weren't so busy with family and other obligations.	17	45	26	56	54	198
I would start volunteering if I were recognised and appreciated for my work as a volunteer.	39	62	47	31	17	196
I would start volunteering if I found an organisation, where I really believed in their philosophy and mission.	25	31	38	67	32	193
I would start volunteering if I received some form of reimbursement - for example, meals or petrol allowance - in return for my time and services.	64	61	31	22	15	193
I would start volunteering if the volunteer opportunity had convenient hours.	25	42	48	60	16	191

Note. 1 = 'Strongly Disagree', 2 = 'Disagree', 3 = 'Undecided', 4 = 'Agree', 5 = 'Strongly Agree', T = Total

Conclusion

Just as understanding the motivations and reasons why people do volunteer can be extremely important for those wanting to attract and retain volunteers, it is also important to understand the reasons why people do *not* volunteer.

Interestingly, the results of this small-scale study show the major reasons people give for not volunteering. The need to know that if they did volunteer that their voluntary work would make a difference in people's lives was highlighted by participants. Further, if they believed in the philosophy and mission of an organisation or if they were helping out an organisation of which they were already a member, then some participants would consider volunteering. Other significant reasons revolved around circumstances of participants and the busyness of people's lives, whether with family, work, hobbies and other obligations.

Although only a small-scale study, these results provide some understanding of the reasons why people do *not* volunteer. Those organisations wanting to recruit and ultimately retain volunteers could well consider techniques to respond to these main reasons in converting those people who *do not* volunteer into people who *do* volunteer.

In summary, there is a need to demonstrate to potential volunteers the meaningfulness of the work to be done, and address their concerns about feeling time-poor or being too busy.

APPENDIX 2 – DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO VMI ITEMS AT STAGES FOUR AND FIVE

Scale	Survey Item	# of Responses					
		1	2	3	4	5	T
Values	I volunteer because I believe I am meeting a need in the community in my volunteering role.	12	15	55	773	1109	1964
	I do not see volunteering as part of my value system. *	543	732	244	291	100	1910
	I would very much like my children to follow my volunteering experience.	27	103	443	855	432	1860
	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering makes the world a better place.	20	72	103	1081	672	1948
	I volunteer because I believe everyone should volunteer.	133	618	390	546	237	1924
	I volunteer because my family has always been involved in volunteering.	406	971	203	266	75	1921
Career Development	I do not think it is important that the skills I acquire through volunteering will help me in my employment.*	334	430	222	510	364	1860
	I have no plans to find employment through volunteering.	662	662	273	199	118	1914
	I volunteer because I feel that I make important work connections through volunteering.	534	829	261	218	84	1926
	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering will help me to find out about employment opportunities.	636	833	242	148	49	1908
	I volunteer because volunteering gives me an opportunity to build my work skills.	351	715	269	453	116	1904
Social Interaction	I have not made many friends through volunteering.*	558	691	219	329	114	1911
	I volunteer because I look forward to the social events that volunteering affords me.	367	795	311	364	105	1942
	The social opportunities provided by the agency are important to me.	266	755	398	427	74	1920
	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a way to build one's social networks.	310	734	383	418	85	1930
	I volunteer because volunteering provides a way for me to make new friends.	165	622	324	682	139	1932

Scale	Survey Item	# of Responses					
		1	2	3	4	5	T
Recognition	Being appreciated by my volunteer agency is important to me.	36	159	226	971	553	1945
	Being respected by staff and volunteers at the agency is not important to me.*	574	881	159	226	100	1940
	I do not need feedback on my volunteer work.	92	422	268	877	274	1933
	I like to work with a volunteer agency, which treats their volunteers and staff alike.	23	76	327	1038	463	1927
	I feel that it is important to receive recognition for my volunteering work.	245	724	357	474	121	1921
Reciprocity	I volunteer because I believe that you receive what you put out in the world.	42	171	200	787	744	1944
	I volunteer because I believe that what goes around comes around.	104	298	315	799	426	1942
Reactivity	My past experiences have nothing to do with my reasons for volunteering.*	269	523	175	659	321	1947
	I like to help people, because I have been in difficult positions myself.	139	530	234	680	362	1945
	Volunteering gives me a chance to try to ensure people do not have to go through what I went through.	322	800	410	253	114	1899
	I often relate my volunteering experience to my own personal life.	162	615	451	548	126	1902
	Volunteering helps me deal with some of my own problems.	396	883	293	305	51	1928
Self-Esteem	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a feel-good experience.	60	213	201	940	520	1934
	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel like a good person.	89	404	336	806	306	1941
	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel important.	388	933	234	303	80	1938
	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel useful.	36	158	154	1166	424	1938
	I volunteer because volunteering keeps me busy.	249	585	227	706	173	1940
Personal Growth	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering gives me a better understanding of what life is about.	31	179	202	903	639	1954
	Volunteering has had little effect on my self-esteem.*	416	802	252	331	118	1919
	I have not changed as a person through volunteering.*	265	614	375	512	172	1938
	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering has given me the opportunity to appreciate the differences in people.	54	270	278	979	369	1950
	I feel more settled in myself after volunteering.	109	395	450	786	173	1913
Religion	I volunteer because volunteering fits in with my religious beliefs.	510	621	223	397	164	1915

Scale	Survey Item	# of Responses					
		1	2	3	4	5	T
Government	I volunteer because I do not believe the government is doing enough to help those I assist as a volunteer.	89	470	463	543	366	1931
Community	I volunteer because I do not believe the community is doing enough to help those I assist as a volunteer.	73	479	401	643	342	1938

Notes. * Item is reverse-coded. 1 = 'Strongly Disagree', 2 = 'Disagree', 3 = 'Undecided', 4 = 'Agree', 5 = 'Strongly Agree', T = Total

APPENDIX 3 – MEAN RESPONSES AND RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE FOR ALL VMI ITEMS

Rank	VMI Item	Mean Score
1	I volunteer because I believe I am meeting a need in the community in my volunteering role.	4.50
2	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering makes the world a better place.	4.19
3	I volunteer because I believe that you receive what you put out in the world.	4.04
4	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering gives me a better understanding of what life is about.	3.99
5	I like to work with a volunteer agency which treats their volunteers and staff alike.	3.96
6	Being appreciated by my volunteer agency is important to me.	3.95
7	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel useful.	3.92
8	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a feel-good experience.	3.85
9	I would very much like my children to follow my volunteering experience.	3.84
10	Being respected by staff and volunteers at the agency is not important to me.	3.83
11	I do not see volunteering as part of my value system.	3.69
12	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering has given me the opportunity to appreciate the differences in people.	3.69
13	I have not made many friends through volunteering.	3.65
14	I volunteer because I believe that what goes around comes around.	3.59
15	Volunteering has had little effect on my self-esteem.	3.56
16	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel like a good person.	3.43
17	I do not need feedback on my volunteer work.	3.42
18	I volunteer because I do not believe the community is doing enough to help those I assist as a volunteer.	3.36
19	I volunteer because I do not believe the government is doing enough to help those I assist as a volunteer.	3.32
20	I like to help people because I have been in difficult positions myself.	3.31
21	I feel more settled in myself after volunteering.	3.27
22	I have not changed as a person through volunteering.	3.15
23	I volunteer because I believe everyone should volunteer.	3.07
24	I volunteer because volunteering provides a way for me to make new friends.	3.00
25	I volunteer because volunteering keeps me busy.	2.98
26	I often relate my volunteering experience to my own personal life.	2.93
27	I do not think it is important that the skills I acquire through volunteering will help me in my employment.	2.92

MEAN RESPONSES AND RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE FOR ALL VMI ITEMS (CONT.)

Rank	VMI Item	Mean Score
28	My past experiences have nothing to do with my reasons for volunteering.	2.88
29	I feel that it is important to receive recognition for my volunteering work.	2.74
30	The social opportunities provided by the agency are important to me.	2.63
31	I volunteer because volunteering gives me an opportunity to build my work skills.	2.62
32	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a way to build ones social networks.	2.60
33	I volunteer because volunteering fits in with my religious beliefs.	2.52
34	I volunteer because I look forward to the social events that volunteering affords me.	2.51
35	Volunteering gives me a chance to try to ensure people do not have to go through what I went through.	2.49
36	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel important.	2.36
37	Volunteering helps me deal with some of my own problems.	2.34
38	I volunteer because my family has always been involved in volunteering.	2.29
39	I volunteer because I feel that I make important work connections through volunteering.	2.22
40	I have no plans to find employment through volunteering.	2.19
41	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering will help me to find out about employment opportunities.	2.03

Note. All negatively-worded items have been reverse-scored

APPENDIX 4 – ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE IMPROVED VMI

Source	Scale	Item
VMI	Career Development	I volunteer because volunteering gives me an opportunity to build my work skills.
		I volunteer because I feel that I make important work connections through volunteering.
		I volunteer because I feel that volunteering will help me to find out about employment opportunities.
		* I have no plans to find employment through volunteering.
VMI	Recognition	Being appreciated by my volunteer agency is important to me.
		* Being respected by staff and volunteers at the agency is not important to me.
		* I do not need feedback on my volunteer work.
		I like to work with a volunteer agency, which treats their volunteers and staff alike.
		I feel that it is important to receive recognition for my volunteering work.
VMI	Social Interaction	I volunteer because I look forward to the social events that volunteering affords me.
		The social opportunities provided by the agency are important to me.
		I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a way to build one's social networks.
		I volunteer because volunteering provides a way for me to make new friends.
VMI	Reciprocity	I volunteer because I believe that you receive what you put out in the world.
		I volunteer because I believe that what goes around comes around.
VMI	Reactivity	I like to help people, because I have been in difficult positions myself.
		Volunteering gives me a chance to try to ensure people do not have to go through what I went through.
		I often relate my volunteering experience to my own personal life.
		Volunteering helps me deal with some of my own problems.

VMI	Self-Esteem	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a feel-good experience.
		I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel like a good person.
		I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel important.
		I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel useful.
		I volunteer because volunteering keeps me busy.
VFI	Social	I volunteer because my friends volunteer.
		I volunteer because people I'm close to volunteer.
		I volunteer because people I know share an interest in community service.
		I volunteer because others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
		I volunteer because volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
VFI	Values	I volunteer because I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
		I volunteer because I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
		I volunteer because I feel compassion toward people in need.
		I volunteer because I feel it is important to help others.
		I volunteer because I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
VFI	Understanding	I volunteer because I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
		I volunteer because volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
		I volunteer because volunteering lets me learn through direct hands-on experience.
		I volunteer because I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
		I volunteer because I can explore my own strengths.
VFI	Protective	I volunteer because doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt for being more fortunate than others.
		I volunteer because volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
		I volunteer because volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
		I volunteer because no matter how bad I am feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it.
		I volunteer because by volunteering I feel less lonely.

Note. * Item is negatively worded, and needs to be reverse-scored prior to scale calculations.

APPENDIX 5 – FINAL VMI INCLUDING SCORING GUIDE

Volunteer Motivation Inventory

Instructions

This section of the survey contains a list of statements that ask about your experiences as a volunteer. Please circle the appropriate number you actually believe is closest to your response to each statement using the scale below, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ through to 5 being ‘strongly agree’. There are no right or wrong answers, but please fill in only one response for each statement and please respond to all of the statements. If you need to change an answer, make an “X” through the error and then circle your true response.

1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1	I volunteer because I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Being appreciated by my volunteer agency is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I volunteer because I look forward to the social events that volunteering affords me.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I volunteer because I believe that you receive what you put out in the world.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I like to help people, because I have been in difficult positions myself.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a feel-good experience.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I volunteer because my friends volunteer.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I volunteer because I feel that I make important work connections through volunteering.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I volunteer because I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I volunteer because doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt for being more fortunate than others.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I volunteer because I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Being respected by staff and volunteers at the agency is not important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
13	The social opportunities provided by the agency are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Volunteering gives me a chance to try to ensure people do not have to go through what I went through.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel like a good person.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I volunteer because people I'm close to volunteer.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I have no plans to find employment through volunteering.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I volunteer because volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I volunteer because volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I volunteer because I feel compassion toward people in need.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I do not need feedback on my volunteer work.	1	2	3	4	5

		1	2	3	4	5					
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree					
							SD	D	U	A	SA
22	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering is a way to build one's social networks.						1	2	3	4	5
23	I often relate my volunteering experience to my own personal life.						1	2	3	4	5
24	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel important.						1	2	3	4	5
25	I volunteer because people I know share an interest in community service.						1	2	3	4	5
26	I volunteer because I feel that volunteering will help me to find out about employment opportunities.						1	2	3	4	5
27	I volunteer because volunteering lets me learn through direct hands-on experience.						1	2	3	4	5
28	I volunteer because volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.						1	2	3	4	5
29	I volunteer because I feel it is important to help others.						1	2	3	4	5
30	I like to work with a volunteer agency, which treats their volunteers and staff alike.						1	2	3	4	5
31	I volunteer because volunteering provides a way for me to make new friends.						1	2	3	4	5
32	Volunteering helps me deal with some of my own problems.						1	2	3	4	5
33	I volunteer because volunteering makes me feel useful.						1	2	3	4	5
34	I volunteer because others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.						1	2	3	4	5
35	I volunteer because volunteering gives me an opportunity to build my work skills.						1	2	3	4	5
36	I volunteer because I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.						1	2	3	4	5
37	I volunteer because no matter how bad I am feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it.						1	2	3	4	5
38	I volunteer because I can do something for a cause that is important to me.						1	2	3	4	5
39	I feel that it is important to receive recognition for my volunteering work.						1	2	3	4	5
40	I volunteer because I believe that what goes around comes around.						1	2	3	4	5
41	I volunteer because volunteering keeps me busy.						1	2	3	4	5
42	I volunteer because volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.						1	2	3	4	5
43	I volunteer because I can explore my own strengths.						1	2	3	4	5
44	I volunteer because by volunteering I feel less lonely.						1	2	3	4	5

Scoring Guide

							TOTAL	No. of Questions Answered	Average score
Va	1	11	20	29	38			/ 5	
Rn	2	12*	21*	30	39			/ 5	
SI	3	13	22	31				/ 4	
Rp	4				40			/ 2	
Rc	5	14	23	32				/ 4	
SE	6	15	24	33	41			/ 5	
So	7	16	25	34	42			/ 5	
CD	8	17*	26	35				/ 4	
Un	9	18	27	36	43			/ 5	
Pr	10	19	28	37	44			/ 5	

Scoring Instructions

This Volunteer Motivation Inventory (VMI) consists of forty four reasons that one might have for volunteering and participants are asked to indicate, on the five point scale, the extent to which they agree or disagree with each reason as it applies to them.

For each individual, ten scores are calculated that correspond to the ten different motivations to volunteer that are assessed by this inventory. The highest scale score reflects the motivation of greatest importance to the participant while the lowest score reflects the motivation of least concern.

When these scale scores are obtained, a manager of volunteers will be able to identify and rank order what are the most important motivation(s) for that particular volunteer.

Step 1. Enter the responses as numbers in order down the columns (the question numbers are written in small text as a guide). Allow some space for corrections in each box. Where an answer is not provided for a question, leave the square blank.

Step 2. Questions **12**, **17**, and **21**, marked with an asterisk (*) must be *recoded*. To *recode* these questions simply change all 1 responses into 5, 2 responses into 4, 4 responses into 2, and 5 responses into 1. Be sure to cross out the original response, leaving only the recoded response.

Step 3. Add the numbers up in their respective rows and write the total score in the TOTAL column. In the No. Q's Answered column, write the number of questions that have an answer for each row. In most cases this will be equal to the maximum number of answers, which is specified in the columns.

Step 4. Divide the figure in the TOTAL column by the figure in the Q's Answered column, and write this number in the Average Score column. Repeat this procedure for each row.

Description of Results

Values (Va) – Describes the situation where a volunteer is motivated by the prospect of being able to act on firmly held beliefs that it is important for one to help others. High scores on this scale suggest that a volunteer is motivated to help others just for the sake of helping. Low scores indicate that a volunteer is less interested in volunteering as a means of helping others (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992).

Recognition (Rn) – Describes a situation where a volunteer enjoys the recognition that volunteering gives them. They enjoy their skills and contributions being recognised, and this is what motivates them to volunteer. High scores indicate a strong desire for formal recognition for their work, whereas low scores indicate a lesser level of interest in formal recognition for their volunteering work.

Social Interaction (SI) – Describes a situation where a volunteer particularly enjoys the social atmosphere of volunteering. They enjoy the opportunity to build social networks and interact with other people. High scores indicate a strong desire to meet new people and make friends through volunteering. Low scores indicate that the prospect of meeting people was not an important reason for them to volunteer.

Reciprocity (Rp) – Describes a situation where a volunteer enjoys volunteering and views it as a very equal exchange. The volunteer has a strong understanding of the ‘higher good’. High scores on this scale indicate that the volunteer is motivated by the prospect that their volunteering work will bring about good things later on. Low scores indicate that the prospect of their volunteering work bringing about good things later on is not as important to them.

Reactivity (Rc) – Describes a situation where a volunteer is volunteering out of a need to heal or address their own past issues. High scores on this scale may indicate that a need to ‘right a wrong’ in their lives is motivating them to do the volunteer work. Low scores indicate that there is little need for the volunteer to address his or her own past issues through volunteering.

Self-Esteem (SE) – Describes a situation where a volunteer seeks to improve their own self esteem or feelings of self-worth through their volunteering. High scores on this scale indicate that a volunteer is motivated by the prospect of feeling better about themselves through volunteering. Low scores indicate that a volunteer does not regard volunteering as a means of improving their self-esteem.

Social (So) – Describes a situation where a volunteer seeks to conform to normative influences of significant others (e.g. friends or family). High scores on this scale indicate that the volunteer may be volunteering because they have many friends or family members who also volunteer, and they wish to ‘follow suit’. Low scores may indicate that a volunteer has few friends or family members who already volunteer (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992).

Career Development (CD) – Describes a situation where a volunteer is motivated to volunteer by the prospect of gaining experience and skills in the field that may eventually be beneficial in assisting them to find employment. High scores on this scale are indicative of a strong desire to gain experience valuable for future employment prospects and/or to make work connections. Low scores on this scale are indicative of a lesser interest in gaining experience for future employment or in making work connections.

Understanding (Un) – Describes a situation where a volunteer is particularly interested in improving their understanding of themselves, or the people they are assisting and/or the organisation for which they are a volunteer. High scores on this scale indicate a strong desire to learn from their volunteering experiences. Low scores on this scale indicate a lesser desire of a volunteer to improve his or her understanding from their volunteer experience (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992).

Protective (Pr) – Describes a situation where a volunteer is volunteering as a means of escaping negative feelings about themselves. High scores indicate that a volunteer may be volunteering to help escape from or forget about negative feelings about him/herself. Low scores indicate that the volunteer is not using volunteering as a means to avoid feeling negatively towards him/herself (Clary, Snyder and Ridge, 1992).

REFERENCES

- Baum, F., Modra, C., Bush R., Cox, E., Cooke, R., & Potter, R. (1999). Volunteering and social capital: An Adelaide study. Australian Journal on Volunteering, 4, 13-22.
- Blanchard, A., Rostant, J. & Finn, L. (1995). Involving Curtin in a volunteer community service program: A report on a quality initiatives project. Perth: Curtin University of Technology.
- Chapman, T.H. (1985). Motivation in university student volunteering. In L.F. Moore (Ed.), Motivating volunteers (pp.231-242). Vancouver: Vancouver Volunteer Centre.
- Chapman, J.G., & Morley, R. (1999). Collegiate service-learning: motives underlying volunteerism and satisfaction with volunteer service. Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community. 18, 19-33.
- Cheang, M., & Braun, K. (2001). Senior volunteers as assets: A statewide survey. 11, Hawaii: Center on Aging, Office of Public Health Studies, School of Medicine, University of Hawaii.
- Clary, E.G., & Snyder, M. (1990). A functional analysis of volunteers' motivations. Paper presented at the meeting of the Spring Research Forum, Boston.
- Clary, E.G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 12, 119-148.
- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2000). Why do people volunteer? Understanding volunteer motivations. The Not-for-Profit CEO Monthly Letter, 7, 3 – 5
- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., & Ridge, R. (1992). Volunteers' motivations: a functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 2, 333-350.

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

Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Miene, P.K., & Haugen, J.A. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, 1129-1149

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 25, 485-505.

Cnaan, R.A., & Goldberg-Glen, R.S. (1991). Measuring motivations to volunteer in human services. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27, 269-284.

Cowling, M.J. (2001). Maximising motivation: Tools for transformation. Proceedings of the Vision Conference (pp. 251-259). Fremantle; Volunteering WA.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Daniels, A.K. (1985). Good times and good works: The place of sociability in the work of women volunteers. Social Problems, 32, 363-374.

Esmond, J. (1997). Volunteer studies 150/450. Perth: Curtin University of Technology.

Esmond, J. (2000). The untapped potential of Australian university students. Australian Journal on Volunteering, 5, 3-9

Esmond, J. (2001a). Count me in! 501 ideas on recruiting volunteers. Perth: Newseason Publications.

Esmond, J. (2001b). BOOMNET: Capturing the baby boomer volunteers. Perth: Department of Premier and Cabinet.

<http://www.volunteering.communitydevelopment.wa.gov.au/files/boom.pdf>

Esmond, J. (2002). From BOOMNET to BOOMNOT: Part two of a research project on baby boomers and volunteering. Perth: Volunteering Secretariat, Department for Community Development.

<http://www.volunteering.communitydevelopment.wa.gov.au/files/boomnet.pdf>

Esmond, J. (2004). Booming recruiting: An action research project. Perth: Volunteering Secretariat, Department for Community Development.

<http://www.volunteering.communitydevelopment.wa.gov.au/files/booming-recruiting.pdf>

Esmond, J. (in press). Count on me! 501 Ideas on retaining, rewarding and recognizing volunteers. Newseason Publications.

Fitch, R.T. (1987). Characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering for community service. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 424-431.

Fischer, L.R., & Schaffer, K.B. (1993). Older volunteers: A guide to research and practice. California: Sage Publications.

Francies, G.R. (1983). The volunteer needs profile: A tool for reducing turnover. Journal of Volunteer Administration, 2, 17-33.

Frisch, M.B., & Gerrard, M. (1981). Natural helping systems: Red Cross volunteers. American Journal of Community Psychology, 9, 567-579.

Gidron, B. (1978). Volunteer work and its rewards. Volunteer Administration, 11, 18-32.

Gillespie, D.F., & King, A.E.O. (1985). Demographic understanding of volunteerism. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 12, 798-816.

Grieshop, J.I. (1985). How art thou motivated? Let me count the ways! In L.F. Moore (Ed.), Motivating volunteers (pp.215-228). Vancouver: Vancouver Volunteer Centre.

Henderson, K. (1984). Volunteerism as leisure. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 13, 55-63.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of men. Cleveland: World.

Horton-Smith, D. (1981). Altruism, volunteers, and volunteerism. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 10, 21-36.

Howarth, E. (1976). Personality characteristics of volunteers. Psychological Reports, 38, 855-858

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, 106-204.

Lucas, T. & Williams, N. (2000). Motivation as a function of volunteer retention. Australian Journal on Volunteering, 5, 13-21

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper.

McCurley, S., & Lynch, R. (1994). Essential volunteer management. London: Directory of Social Change.

McCurley, S., & Vineyard, S. (1988). 101 Tips for Volunteer Recruitment. Downers Grove: Heritage Arts Publishing.

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., & Lowell, E.L. (1953). The achievement motive. New York: Irvington.

Mc Ewin, M., & Jacobsen-D'Arcy, L. (1992). Developing a scale to understand and assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers in Western Australia: Final report. Perth: Lotterywest & CLAN WA Inc.

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

Morrow-Howell, N., & Mui, A. (1989). Elderly volunteers: Reasons for initiating and terminating service. Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 13, 21-33.

Noble, J., & Rogers, L. (1998). Volunteer management: An essential guide. Adelaide: Volunteering SA.

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

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.

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

Pitterman, L. (1973). The older volunteer: Motivation to work. Washington DC: Action.

Puffer, S.M. (1991). Career professionals as volunteers: Should their motives be accepted or managed? Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 2, 107-123.

Rubin, A., & Thorelli, I.M. (1984). Egoistic motives and longevity of participation by social service volunteers. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20, 223-235.

Schram, V. (1985). Motivating volunteers to participate. In L.F. Moore (Ed.), Motivating volunteers (pp. 13-29). Vancouver: Vancouver Volunteer Centre.

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

Smith, D.H. (1984). Altruism, volunteers, and volunteerism. In J.D. Harmon (Ed.), Volunteerism in the eighties; Fundamental issues in voluntary action (pp. 23-44). Washington DC: University Press of America.

Snyder, M., & Omoto, A.M. (1990). Basic research in action: Volunteerism and society's response to AIDS. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16, 152-165.

Snyder, M, Clary, E.G., & Stukas, A.A. (2000). The functional approach to volunteerism. In G. Maio & J. Olson (Eds.), Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stukas, A. A., Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). Service learning: Who benefits and why? Social Policy Report, 13, 1-19.

Stukas, A.A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E.G. (1999). The effects of mandatory volunteerism: Satisfaction, intentions, and motivations to volunteer. Psychological Science, 10, 59-64.

Switzer, C. L., Switzer, G. E., Stukas, A. A., & Baker, C. E. (1999). Medical students' motivations to volunteer. Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18, 53-64.

Tapp, J.T., & Spanier, D. (1973). Personal characteristics of volunteer phone counselors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 245-250.

Trudeau, K.J., & Devlin, A.S. (1996). College students and community service: Who, with whom, and why? Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26, 1867-1888.

Vellekoop-Baldock, C. (1990). Volunteers in welfare. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Vineyard, S. (1991). Secrets of motivation: How to get and keep volunteers and paid staff. Downers Grove: Heritage Arts Publishing.

Vineyard, S. (2001). Recognizing volunteers and paid staff: The art, the science and a gazillion ideas! Downers Grove: Heritage Arts Publishing.

Wang, P. Z. (2001). Motivations for sports volunteerism: Theory and measurement, Working Paper Series No. 6, Sydney: University of Technology, School of Marketing.

Warburton, J. (1997). Volunteering in the postretirement years. SPRC Reports and Proceedings, 36, November.

Wilson, M. (1983). How to mobilize church volunteers. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.

Zappala, G. (2000). How many people volunteer in Australia and why do they do it? Research and Advocacy Briefing Paper, 4, 1-4, Sydney: The Smith Family

Zweigenhaft, R.L., Armstrong, J., & Quintis, F. (1996). The motivations and effectiveness of hospital volunteers. The Journal of Social Psychology, 136, 25-24.