December 2015

Predicting Volunteer Motives among University Faculty and Staff: A Functional Approach

Richard J. Harnish
Penn State University, New Kensington, rjh27@psu.edu

K. Robert Bridges
Penn State University, New Kensington, krb3@psu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://encompass.eku.edu/prism

Predicting Volunteer Motives among University Faculty and Staff: A Functional Approach

Predicting Volunteer Motives among University Faculty and Staff: Implications for Anchoring Colleges and Universities in the Community

Richard J. Harnish
*Penn State University,
New Kensington*

K. Robert Bridges
*Penn State University,
New Kensington*

Anchor institutions tend to be non-profit organizations that are spatially immobile and are an economic engine for their communities. Because of pressures on institutions of higher education to generate new revenue, it may be more difficult for such institutions to meet the criteria or maintain their status as an anchor institution. In this article, we argue that volunteerism may be one means to strengthen partnerships in the community thereby assisting the university or college in their attempts to meet the criteria or maintain their status as an anchor institution. Volunteerism is an other-oriented prosocial behavior in which one's self is given freely to benefit an individual, group, or organization. Using a functional perspective, we identify the motivations for becoming involved in volunteer activities among faculty and staff. Results suggested that only values motives (i.e., altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others) predicted volunteering in the community, while both values and enhancement motives (i.e., desire to increase self-esteem) predicted service to the university, campus, and profession. Implications for encouraging volunteer activities among faculty and staff are discussed so that institutions of higher learning can meet the criteria or maintain their status as an anchor institution.

Keywords: Volunteerism, Functionalism, Motivation, Faculty, Staff

The concept of anchor institutions, which emerged in the early 2000s, is still being refined; according to a recent literature review there are approximate 41 definitions of the concept (Taylor & Luter, 2013). However, there are similarities among the various definitions that illustrate four important aspects of the concept: Spatial immobility, corporate status, size, and mission (Hodges & Dubb, 2012). Each aspect helps to anchor or embed institutions into communities. Anchor institutions are characterized by capital investments in their communities through its infrastructure, personnel and customer base that in turn limit its spatially mobility (Dubb & Howard, 2012; Webber & Karlstrom, 2009). Because of spatial immobility, larger educational, medical, or cultural institutions typically are conceived as anchor institutions while corporations are not. Corporations are not considered to be anchor institutions because they are more likely to relocate due to mergers, acquisitions, or more favorable economic development opportunities (e.g., proximity to specialized labor, suppliers and customers) (Birkinshaw, Braunerhjelm, Holm, & Terjesen, 2006; Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Jackson, 2012). The size of an institution also is thought to play a critical role in determining if it will be an anchor in the community. Although there appears to be no size test regarding whether an institution is considered to be an anchor, an anchor institution is thought to play a central role in the community's economic health and well-being; they

are the economic engines that draw funding from outside the community, procuring local goods and services, employ a large number of residents from the community, and hold large tracts of land (Porter, 2010). Thus, it is assumed that for anchor institutions to have an impact on the local economy, it needs to have scale in the marketplace. Finally, Taylor & Luter (2013) argue that anchor institutions are ones that have a social-purpose mission that create a more democratic and just society. Taken together, the characteristics that define an anchor institution make relocation exceedingly costly because of the social and economic costs it would incur in moving.

The concept of anchor institutions has important implications for institutions of higher learning and regional engagement because anchor institutions provide important support for their communities in at least three ways. First, institutions of higher learning tend to bring about economic development due to employment opportunities, the inward migration of students, and the purchase of goods and services from the local community. Second, the transfer of knowledge and training to the private sector through business incubators and accelerators attracts talent and investment that sustain or revive communities. Finally, institutions of higher learning provide a life-long learning culture that allow the community flexibility to exploit opportunities in rapidly changing economies (Hassink & Klaerding, 2012; Keane & Allison, 1999).

The Current Study

This article does not seek to address the issue of whether institutions of higher education should be anchor institutions. Rather, because of the current economic and political climate, it is assumed that many institutions of higher learning may not meet the criteria of an anchor institution because their spatial immobility, corporate status, size, and social-purpose mission may change as they focus on new ways to generate revenue. Indeed, our central premise is that under such conditions, institutions of higher learning will find it more difficult to meet the criteria of an anchor institution. In this article, we argue that volunteerism, an often overlooked activity within the academy, may be one means to strengthen partnerships with the community.

Volunteerism as a Means of Strengthening Partnerships with the Community

Volunteerism is a planned, prosocial action that occurs in an organizational context which transpires over an extended period of time (Penner, 2002; Wilson, 2012). Prosocial behavior involves a broad array of actions (e.g., helping, comforting, sharing, and cooperating) that benefit others (Wilson, 2000). Putnam, Feldstein, and Cohen (2003) have argued that the number of Americans who volunteer in their communities has fallen dramatically much to their determent. Lower crimes rates, increased health and happiness, and economic prosperity are said to be the result of volunteerism (Putnam, 1993; 2000; Putnam et al., 2003; Putnam, Leonardi, & Nanetti, 1993). Despite these benefits, volunteerism in America has continued to decline. It is at its lowest point (25.4%) since the US Bureau of Labor Statistics first reported volunteer rates in 2002 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm).

The decline of volunteerism and its impact on American society has influenced the academy by generating calls for universities and colleges to direct their attention to civic education (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Heeding the call, many institutions have

revised course offerings to emphasize an experiential component to socialize students in the value of community and civic engagement (i.e., volunteerism) and to teach why civic responsibility is a worthy and important value (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; O'Leary, 2014). Yet experiential components are often not incorporated into courses for several reasons: logistical support is not provided; faculty are not convinced it improves the academic outcomes of the course; and instruction in how to effectively incorporate experiential learning is not offered to faculty (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2012).

Those in the academy who do volunteer in the community perceive the activity to be an important part of the roles they perform; however, others within the academy do not share this opinion. Thus, faculty who view volunteer activities as important and central to their role needed to demonstrate its importance and impact so that it would be rewarded (i.e., receive attention and carry weight in promotion and tenure decisions). Rather than exploring all types of volunteer activities faculty perform in the community (also referred to as outreach), research has focused almost exclusively on activities which use faculty expertise in order to demonstrate that it is a scholarly activity. In this way, it was hoped that volunteer activities that use faculty expertise (i.e., the scholarship of service) would be rewarded in much the same way as research and teaching (Ward, 2003). Indeed, there is a rich literature exploring faculty motives for the volunteer activities that uses faculty expertise (e.g., Austin & Gamson, 1983; Beere, Votruba, &Wells, 2011), academic culture (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Mandarano, 2015), and reward systems within the academy (Kulis, Sicotte, & Collins, 2002; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Webber, 2011); however, there is a paucity of literature examining faculty motives for community and civic service (i.e., volunteerism).

Because researchers were interested in justifying the scholarship of service, staff have been largely ignored. Indeed, research exploring staff motives is practically nonexistent. This is unfortunate because staff (e.g., administrative assistants, accountants, graphic designers, nurses, counselors, laboratory assistants), much like faculty, may use their expertise when volunteering in the community. Insight into staff volunteerism, however, might be drawn from research that has explored the motives among employees who engage in corporate volunteerism. Corporate volunteerism has been defined as "employees' participation in corporate-sponsored activities, often on company time, that benefit some entity typically located in the community or broader society in which the organization does business" (Brockner, Senior, & Welch, 2014, p. 2). Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, and Ganapathi (2007) reported that over the past two decades corporate volunteerism has risen in part because of employees' desire to express personally meaningful values (Brockner et al., 2014).

Conceptual Foundation for the Study

One useful perspective to understand individuals' motives for volunteering is to identify the needs, plans, or goals that spur individuals to take action. This viewpoint, known as functionalism, has been described in various ways within the social sciences. In the current research, functionalism is defined as "the reasons and purposes that underlie and generate psychological phenomena – the personal and social needs, plans, goals, and functions being serviced by people's beliefs and their actions" (Clary & Snyder, 1991, p. 123). From this perspective, functionalism emphasizes an individual's adaptive and purposeful strivings to attain personal and social goals (Cantor, 1994; Snyder, 1993; Stukas, Snyder, &

Clary, 2015) and has yielded valuable insight into why individuals volunteer. As such, the functional perspective posits that while different individuals can perform the same actions, the actions performed may fulfill disparate psychological needs or motives for different individuals.

Clary et al. (1998) have proposed six motives that are served by volunteerism: *Values*, *understanding*, *social*, *career*, *protective*, and *esteem* or *enhancement* motives. The *values* motive refers to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others. *Understanding* motives address the need for new learning experiences and affords an individual the chance to share knowledge, skills, and abilities. *Social* motives speak to the need to fit in or to conform to normative or social pressures dictated by a reference group. *Career* motives focus on one's marketability or aids in career planning, development, and the advancement of career goals (e.g., networking, documenting skills, training). *Protective* motives reduce anxiety or guilt about being more fortunate than others. Finally, *esteem* or *enhancement* motives address personal development or personal growth goals. Research has demonstrated support for the theory proposed by Clary et al. (1998; see Cornelis, Van Hiel, & De Cremer, 2013; Houle, Sagarin, & Kaplan, 2005; Okun, Barr, & Herzog, 1998; Okun & Schultz, 2003). Additionally, research has suggested individuals are most satisfied with their volunteer experience when they are involved in activities that fulfill their motives (Clary et al., 1998; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Stukas, Worth, Clary & Snyder, 2009; Tschirhart, Mesch, Perry, Miller, & Lee, 2001).

Faculty and Staff Motives

Using the functional approach to motivation, Harnish and Snider (2013) posited that any of the six motives identified by Clary et al. (1998) may impel faculty to become involved in volunteer activities. They argued that faculty may volunteer because of *values* motives (i.e., faculty may hold the belief that higher education has an obligation to improve the quality of life for society). *Understanding* motives may also play a role because they may provide a forum to display and use the knowledge and skills possessed by faculty. *Social* motives may also be fulfilled because such activities would develop, extend, and deepen social networks with those inside and outside the university. Volunteering may fulfill *career* motives because doing so might meet a faculty member's service expectations. *Protective* motives could be addressed because giving back to the community would help reduce faculty's feelings of anxiety and guilt over their good fortune in life. Finally, *esteem* or *enhancement* motives may be fulfilled by engaging in volunteer activities in that the opportunity would allow faculty to self-enhance (e.g., gain status in the community).

Because the functional perspective suggests that different motives may be fulfilled by volunteering, it is important to consider the interaction between a faculty or staff member's goals and the academy's practices, policies, and norms. Thus, when considering the question of why faculty or staff volunteer in their communities, we hypothesized that *values* motives would predict their volunteer activity. This is because volunteer activities are often undervalued by the academy in promotion and tenure decisions (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010), and efforts to perform volunteer activities are often time-consuming taking time away from activities (e.g., research) that are rewarded (O'Meara, 2008). Consequently, faculty and staff who volunteer for community, university, campus or professional service are likely to do so for intrinsic reasons (i.e., a belief that they should help others). Indeed, Anderson and Moore (1978) found that over 70% of individuals who

volunteer endorsed the statement, "to help others" as a reason for volunteering.

The University Context

The present research wished to address the issue of why faculty and staff engage in volunteerism. Doing so may shed light on: (1) the motives for engaging in volunteerism; (2) how volunteerism may be increased among faculty and staff; and (3) how institutions of higher learning may harness faculty and staff volunteerism to build and strengthen their relationship with the communities they serve ultimately increasing the likelihood of becoming an anchor institution or continuing to be one. In order to meet the research objectives, an exploratory study was conducted using the faculty and staff at a smaller campus of Penn State University.

Penn State New Kensington is one of 24 campuses that comprise the University. It is located approximately 20 miles northeast of Pittsburgh, and is surrounded by three, third-class cities (New Kensington, Arnold, and Lower Burrell) and two second-class townships (Allegheny Township and Upper Burrell Township) that cover approximately 62 miles with a combined population of 41,500. The campus primarily serves first-generation college students, offering 14 bachelor and associate degree programs. Students may graduate from these programs or transfer to another campus to complete their degrees. Enrollment at the campus has steadily decreased from approximately 1,200 full-time students prior to the collapse of the steel industry in the 1980s to approximately 650 full-time students at the present. As enrollment fell, so did the number of faculty lines; currently there are 20 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 21 non-tenure-track faculty and 47 adjunct faculty. Over this time period, the campus also witnessed fewer staff positions as well; there are 32 individuals employed as staff at the campus. Such downsizing has had an impact on the campus and the communities in which it serves.

Downsizing has affected the campus because at Penn State, campuses are semi-independent with almost all administrative functions executed locally. The campus is responsible for admissions, advising, alumni relations, business and finance, career counseling, fund-raising and development, human resources, public relations and communications, and student affairs and services. Thus, there are fewer employees to perform all of the functions required to operate the campus. To compensate for the small number of faculty and staff at our campus, service expectations are similar for both (e.g., both faculty and staff recruit, advise, and counsel students). Further, at our campus, faculty and staff serve on many of the same committees (e.g., administration search committees, staff search committees, faculty search committees, admission marketing committee, information technology committee), although each has its own local senate.

Method

Participants

Data were obtained from 59 of 120 faculty and staff. Staff was defined as those in non-administrative leadership positions such as administrative assistant, media services specialist, information technology support specialist, nurse, counselor, laboratory assistant, etc. We observed a response rate of 49%. Approximately the same number of faculty completed the survey (41%) as staff (39%); 20% of the participants did not indicate their employment category. The majority of faculty (19%) were tenured (i.e., associate or full

professor), with senior instructor/instructor (14%), and part-time/adjunct faculty (8%) represented; 59% of faculty respondents did not indicate their standing. In the subsequent analyses, the total sample was used. This was done for both theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretical reasons included: 1) the research is exploratory in nature and additional research will be needed to confirm and support the findings; and 2) service expectations are similar for both faculty and staff (e.g., each serves on the same committees). A practical reason is the sample sizes for the subsamples are too small to use alone even for exploratory research.

Examining the total sample, 46% were women, 31% were men and 24% of the respondents did not indicate their gender. The modal age of respondents was 40 to 44 years old (14%); ages ranged from 25 to 29 years old (7%) to 75 to 79 years old (2%). Twenty percent (20%) of the respondents did not indicate their age. About half (49%) were married with children, while 9% were married without children, 15% were single (never married), 3% were widowed, 2% were divorced, and 2% were living with a partner. Twenty (20%) did not answer the question. Finally, a little over one-fourth (27%) were Protestants, with Catholics (15%), Buddhists (2%) and "other religion" (14%) represented. A little over one-fifth (22%) indicated no religious affiliation. Twenty percent (20%) did not indicate a religion. The study was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board, and all participants consented to the study.

Measures

Respondents completed the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary et al., 1998). The VFI consists of 30 reasons individuals volunteer. Each item is rated in terms of its importance to the respondents. Items were rated on a seven-point scale that ranged from 1 (*not at all important*) to 7 (*extremely important*). Example items include: "I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself." "Volunteering makes me feel important." "By volunteering I feel less lonely." Cronbach's alphas are presented in Table 1 below. In addition, respondents were asked if they volunteered in their community (*1 = Yes, 2 = No*), if they volunteered for service to the university, campus, or profession (*1 = Yes, 2 = No*), and the type of work they performed. For those who did not volunteer, they were asked to indicate the potential barriers to volunteering in the community and for performing service to the university, campus, or profession.

Table 1

Cronbach's Alphas for the Subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory

Motive	Cronbach's Alpha
Values	.91
Understanding	.86
Social	.85
Career	.89
Protective	.83
Enhancement	.90

Results

Community Volunteer Activities

Food banks (12%), churches (10%), Boy Scouts (5%), and Rotary (5%) were the most frequently mentioned organizations in which faculty and staff volunteered (See Table 2).

Table 2
Community Organizations where Faculty Volunteer

Item	Number of Responses	%
Food bank	7	12
Church	6	10
Boy Scouts	3	5
Rotary	3	5
Other	36	61

Note: $N = 59$.

Activities faculty and staff performed at community organizations included stocking shelves and packing groceries at food banks (17%), serving as a board member or trustee (10%), and being a helper or part of the support staff (10%) (See Table 3). To assess the

Table 3
Volunteer Activity Performed by Faculty at Community Organizations

Item	Number of Responses	%
Stock shelves/ pack grocery bags	11	17
Serve on Board/Trustee	6	10
Support Staff/Helper	6	10
Other	36	61

Note: $N = 59$.

association between volunteerism and the subscales of the VFI, scores were correlated. Table 4 presents the correlations between the volunteering and the subscales of the VFI. Volunteering in the community was positively related to *values* and *understanding* motives.

Our hypothesis posited that *values* motives would predict involvement in community volunteer activities. To test this hypothesis we conducted a standard regression analysis where faculty and staff involvement in community volunteer activities was the dependent variable and the six subscale scores of the VFI as predictors. Using the enter method, a significant model emerged, $F(6, 40) = 2.30$, $p = .05$. The model accounted for 15% of variance (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.15$). Consistent with expectations, *values* motives were strongly linked to volunteerism at civic and social organizations (See Table 5).

Table 4

Correlations between Volunteering for Community Service and Subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory

	Do you volunteer in the community?	Protective Subscale	Values Subscale	Career Subscale	Social Subscale	Under-standing Subscale
Protective Subscale	-.18					
Values Subscale	-.43**	.39**				
Career Subscale	.01	.61**	.15			
Social Subscale	-.06	.67**	.37**	..43**		
Understanding Subscale	-.31*	.58**	.71**	.45**	.50**	
Enhancement Subscale	-.23	.79**	.35*	.47**	.71**	.57**

Note: *$p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 5

Prediction of Volunteering on the Subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory

Motive	B	SE B	β	p
Values	-.03	.02	-.45	.03
Understanding	-.001	.02	-.01	.96
Social	.02	.01	.29	.14
Career	.008	.01	.12	.49
Protective	.006	.02	.07	.78
Enhancement	-.02	.02	-.35	.16

Service to the University, Campus, or Profession

Serving on a committee (51%), and serving on the campus senate (7%) were the most frequently mentioned service to the university, campus or profession by faculty and staff (See Table 6).

Table 6
Type of University, Campus or Profession Service

Item	Number of Responses	%
Committees	30	51
Senate	4	7
Other	25	42

Note: N = 59.

The most frequently mentioned activities faculty and staff performed for the university, campus, or profession included committee tasks (53%) and serving as a chair (20%) (See Table 7).

Table 7
Service to the University, Campus, or Profession Performed by Faculty

Item	Number of Responses	%
Committee tasks	31	53
Chairing committee	12	20
Other	16	27

Note: N = 59.

To assess the association between volunteering for university, campus and professional activities and the VFI, scores were correlated. Table 8 presents the correlations between volunteering for university, campus and professional activities and the VFI. Volunteering for university, campus or professional service was positively associated with *values* motives. We hypothesized that *values* motives also would predict volunteering in university, campus, and professional service among respondents. To test this hypothesis, we conducted a standard regression analysis where faculty and staff involvement in volunteer activities for the university, campus, and profession was the dependent variable and the six subscale scores of the VFI as predictors. Using the enter method, a significant model emerged, $F(6, 41) = 2.85$, $p = .02$. The model accounted for 29% of variance (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.19$). *Enhancement* and *values* motives were strongly linked to volunteering in university, campus, and professional service (See Table 9).

PRISM: A Journal of Regional Engagement

Table 8

Correlations between Volunteering for University, Campus or Professional Service and Subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory

	Do you volunteer in the community?	Protective Subscale	Values Subscale	Career Subscale	Social Subscale	Under-standing Subscale
Protective Subscale	-.11					
Values Subscale	-.30*	.39**				
Career Subscale	-.12	.61**	.15			
Social Subscale	-.13	.67**	.37**	.43**		
Understanding Subscale	-.09	.58**	.71**	.45**	.50**	
Enhancement Subscale	.13	.79**	.35*	.47**	.71**	.57**

Note: *$p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 9

Prediction of Volunteering for University, Campus and Professional Service on the Subscales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory

Motive	B	SE B	β	p
Values	-.03	.01	-.45	.03
Understanding	.01	.01	.24	.30
Social	-.01	.01	-.28	.16
Career	-.007	.008	-.16	.37
Protective	-.02	.02	-.34	.18
Enhancement	.03	.01	.69	.006

Barriers to Volunteering

Those who did not volunteer for service to the community, university, campus or profession were asked why they did not volunteer. Lack of time to devote to community service (57%) was the most frequently cited reason mentioned by respondents for not volunteering in the community (See Table 10). Similarly, respondents cited lack of flexibility in their schedules for not providing service to the university, campus or profession (See Table 11).

Table 10
Barriers to Volunteering for Community Service

Item	Number of Responses	%
I do not have the time	16	57
I am unware of how to apply to the community organization	3	11
I am unaware of community organizations	2	7
I am unaware of who to contact at the community organization	2	7
I feel that my effort will not make a difference	2	7
I am unaware of skills community organizations desire	2	7
I do not have the skills required	1	4

Note: $N = 28$.

Table 11
Barriers to Volunteering for University, Campus or Profession Service

Item	Number of Responses	%
Lack of flexibility in scheduling	3	50
Not rewarded by the university, campus or profession	1	17
Lack of service opportunities	1	17
Too much wasted time in useless or unproductive meetings	1	17

Note: $N = 6$.

Discussion

Our goals were to: 1) explore the motives of faculty and staff for volunteering in the community; 2) search for ways volunteerism may be increased among faculty and staff; and 3) examine how institutions of higher learning may utilize faculty and staff volunteerism to help meet or maintain their status as an anchor institution. We found that *values* motives were positively correlated and predicted volunteering in the community for faculty and staff at our campus. As in other studies which examined the motives of volunteers (e.g., Finkelstein, 2009; Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Stukas, Hoye,

Nicholson, Brown, & Aisbett, 2014), *values* motives were positively associated with and predicted volunteering in the community. *Values* motives are thought to be other-oriented rather than self-oriented motivations (Finkelstein, 2009; Stukas et al., 2014) and prior research has demonstrated that other-oriented motives were associated with less attrition at a community service organization (Clary & Orenstein, 1991), longer length of service to a community service organization (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998), and increased frequency of activism and civic engagement (Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010). Interestingly, *social* motives, which some researchers conceptualize as an other-oriented motivation did not predict community volunteerism.[1] Consistent with prior research (e.g., Omoto et al., 2010) *enhancement*, *protective*, *understanding*, and *career* motives, which can be categorized as self-oriented motivations, did not predict community volunteerism.

When examining motives for engaging in service to the university, campus or profession at our campus, we found *values* motives were positively correlated and predicted engagement in such activity, while *enhancement* motives were negatively correlated and predicted aversion from service activities. This finding suggests that our faculty and staff's motives are interacting with the university's practices, policies, and norms when they volunteer for service to the university, campus or profession. That is, those at our campus who are motivated by *values* motives volunteer for service to the university, campus or profession because of a belief that those in higher education have an obligation to improve the health and welfare of the university, campus, or profession regardless of its reward system (i.e., practices, policies, or norms). Additionally, our results revealed that those at our campus who are *not* seeking to self-enhance are motivated to perform service (*enhancement* motives). In other words, those faculty and staff at our campus who seek opportunities to increase levels of status (thereby increasing their level of self-esteem) avoid opportunities to provide service to the university, campus and profession because such behavior is not rewarded by the university's practices, policies or norms (e.g., Antonio et al., 2000; O'Meara, 2008; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010).

Interestingly, when those who did not volunteer were asked why, none of our colleagues suggested *values* or *enhancement* motives but indicated a lack of time due to their full schedules. It may be the case that respondents were not willing or able to report their underlying motives. Instead, they used a readily available reason because they may have experienced evaluation apprehension (Rosenberg, 1969), or impression management concerns (Tedeschi, Schlenker, & Bonoma, 1971) and selected a more socially appropriate reason (Shye, 2010).

Implications for Anchor Institutions

Although our findings are based on a unique campus within a large university system, the findings have important implications for encouraging volunteer activities among faculty and staff at other institutions. By increasing volunteerism among faculty and staff to external service, the university or college becomes more firmly rooted in the community.

---

1 As Stukas et al. (2014) note, there is debate among researchers on how the functions posited by Clary et al. (1995) should be classified. Some researchers (e.g., Konrath, Fuhrel-Forbis, Lou, & Brown, 2012) argue that social motives are not altruistic in nature but rather are used to guide behavior. Thus, these researchers suggest social motives are other-oriented. Others (e.g., Gillath et al., 2005) suggest that those engaged in volunteer activities reap benefits by yielding to normative social influence of others. Thus, these researchers suggest social motives are self-oriented.

Appealing to one's values via other-oriented (i.e., prosocial) messages may help increase volunteering behavior. However, such messages should also emphasize how volunteering can allow the individual to express deeply held values and convictions through his or her actions. This is because the functional approach to persuasion suggests persuasive messages will be effective to the extent the message addresses the specific motivation of the recipient of the message (Snyder & DeBono, 1985). Prior research (e.g., Clary et al., 1998; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994; Ridge, 2000) employing a variety of media (i.e., video advertisements, brochures, print advertisements) found that attempts to recruit volunteers succeeded to the extent the communication addressed the specific motivational functions underlying the target's motives.

Because *values* and *enhancement* motives predicted volunteering for service to the university, campus or profession at our campus, it is likely that those who are seeking advancement in the academy (i.e., those on the tenure-track) may be *less* persuaded by messages that emphasize how volunteering for service would aid them in obtaining promotion and tenure (i.e., gaining status) because such messages typically do not reflect the academy's practices, policies or norms. Similarly, for those who have been promoted and have tenure, such a message may be equally ineffective because these individuals are not seeking to self-enhance.

To increase volunteerism among those who are seeking advancement (or who are motivated to self-enhance), socialization likely is a critical component. For example, Perks and Haan, (2011) have explored how early religious experience introduces and socializes children to adult volunteer roles while Lee and Brudney (2010) have investigated the import of social networks in facilitating volunteerism. This research suggests that early faculty and staff experiences should introduce and socialize junior faculty and staff to senior faculty and staff volunteer roles because when individuals are socially integrated into their communities, they have more social ties to a greater range of individuals who may serve as role models, they experience more social influence to volunteer (i.e., conform to social norms), they have more opportunities to learn about volunteer opportunities, and they come to believe that others are volunteering as well (Wilson, 2012). Indeed, the extant research suggests that institutional context impacts whether faculty (and staff) volunteer, what types of volunteering activity is performed, how volunteering is integrated into one's role in the academy, and how volunteering is rewarded and encouraged (e.g., Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007).

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the present research that should be acknowledged. First, the sample size is small and as a result our ability to generalize our findings is limited. That is, our findings, which are based on a limited number of individuals at a small campus that is part of a larger state-affiliated university system, may not apply to other types of campuses and other types of universities. Second, not all faculty and staff at the campus participated in the survey; we had a response rate of 49%. Although, Curtin, Presser and Singer (2000), and Merkle and Edelman (2002) suggest that changes in nonresponse rates do not necessarily alter survey results, most researchers attempt to minimize nonresponse rates. Babbie (2007, p. 262) argued "A review of the published social research literature suggests that a response rate of at least 50 percent is considered adequate for analysis and reporting. A response of 60 percent is good; a response rate of 70 percent is very good."

Relatedly, because not all faculty and staff participated, we were not able to differentiate motives between faculty and staff. It may be likely that motives for volunteering diverge between these groups.

Conclusions

Volunteering is an important form of involvement in one's community, university, campus or profession. Research has demonstrated that volunteering can provide not only psychological benefits (e.g., lower depression rates among volunteers than non-volunteers) for individuals but physical health benefits (e.g., lower rates of mortality among volunteers than non-volunteers) as well (see Harlow & Cantor, 1996; Hong & Morrow-Howell, 2010; Stukas et al., 2014). The current research is an initial effort to understand the motives of university employees who volunteer for community service and service to the university, campus and profession. We found that only *values* motives predicted community volunteering, while both *values* and *enhancement* motives predicted volunteering for service to the university, campus, and profession. However, larger scale projects and research at other types of institutions is needed to strengthen the current findings.

Acknowledgments

References

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Service Learning*, *9*, 5-17.

Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 836-863. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.25275678

Anderson, J. C., & Moore, L. F. (1978). The motivation to volunteer. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, *7*, 51-60. doi: 10.1177/089976407800700312

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, *23*, 373-397. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2000.0015

Austin, A. E., & Gamson, F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research* (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Beere, C. A., Votruba, J. C., & Wells, G. W. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus: A practical guide for institutionalizing public engagement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birkinshaw, J., Braunerhjelm, P., Holm, U., & Terjesen, S. (2006). Why do some multinational corporations relocate their headquarters overseas? *Strategic Management Journal*, *27*, 681-700. doi:10.1002/smj.541

Bloomgarden, A., & O'Meara, K. (2007). Harmony or cacophony? Faculty role integration and community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *13*, 5-18.

Brisbin, Jr., R. A., & Hunter, S. (2003). Community leaders' perceptions of university and college efforts to encourage civic engagement. *The Review of Higher Education*, *26*, 467-486. doi:10.1353/rhe.2003.0009

Brockner, J., Senior, D., & Welch, W. (2014). Corporate volunteerism, the experience of self-integrity, and organizational commitment: Evidence from the field. *Social Justice Research*, *27*, 1-23. doi: 10.1007/s11211-014-0204-8

Cantor, N. (1994). Life task problem solving: Situational affordances and personal needs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 235-243. doi: 10.1177/0146167294203001

Clary, E. G., & Orenstein, L. (1991). The amount and effectiveness of help: The relationship of motives and abilities to helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 58-64. doi: 10.1177/0146167291171009

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 119-148). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1516-1530. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Miene, P., & Haugen, J. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *24*, 1129-1149. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01548.x

Cornelis, I., Van Hiel, A., & De Cremer, D. (2013). Volunteer work in youth organizations: Predicting distinct aspects of volunteering behavior from self- and other-oriented motives. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *43*, 456-466. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2013.01029.x

Curtin, R., Presser, S., & Singer, E. (2000). The effects of response rate changes on the index of consumer sentiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61*, 413-428. doi: 10.1086/318638

Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2012). Beyond activity, place and partner: How publicly engaged scholarship varies by intensity of activity and degree of engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, *4*, 18-28.

Dubb, S., & Howard, T. (2012). *Leveraging anchor institutions for local job creation and wealth building*. Retrieved from http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dubb-howard_0.pdf

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Jackson, P. (2012). *Management research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2009). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*, 653-658. doi: v10.1016/j.paid.2009.01.010

Finkelstein, M. A., Penner, L. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2005). Motive, role identity, and prosocial personality as predictors of volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *33*, 403-418. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2005.33.4.403

Gillath, O., Shaver, P. R., Mikulincer, M., Nitzberg, R. E., Erez, A., & Van Ijzendoorn,

M. H. (2005). Attachment, caregiving, and volunteering: Placing volunteerism in an attachment-theoretical framework. *Personal Relationships*, *12*, 425-446. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2005.00124.x

Harlow R. E., & Cantor N. (1996). Still participating after all these years: A study of life task participation in later life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 1235-1249. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.6.1235

Harnish, R. J., & Snider, K. J. (2013). Understanding community engagement motives: A "functional" approach. *PRISM: A Journal of Regional Engagement*, *2*, 133-142.

Hassink, R. & Klaerding, C. (2012). The end of the learning region as we knew it; Towards learning in space. *Regional Studies*, *46*, 1055-1066. doi:10.1080/00343404.2012.705823

Hodges, R. A., & Dubb, S. (2012). *The road half traveled: University engagement at a crossroads*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State Press.

Hong, S., & Morrow-Howell, N. (2010). Health outcomes of experience corps: A high commitment volunteer program. *Social Science and Medicine*, *71*, 414-420. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.04.009

Houle, B. J., Sagarin, B. J., & Kaplan, M. F. (2005). A functional approach to volunteerism: Do volunteer motives predict task preference? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *27*, 337-344. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp2704_6

Keane, J., & Allison, J. (1999). The intersection of the learning region and local and regional economic development: Analysing the role of higher education. *Regional Studies*, *33*, 896-902.

Konrath, S., Fuhrel-Forbis, A., Lou, A., & Brown, S. (2012). Motives for volunteering are associated with mortality risk in older adults. *Health Psychology*, *31*, 87-96. doi: 0.1037/a0025226

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Kulis, S., Sicotte, D., & Collins, S. (2002). More than a pipeline problem: Labor supply constraints and gender stratification across academic science disciplines. *Research in Higher Education*, *43*, 657-691.

Lee, Y., & Brudney, J. (2010). Rational volunteering: A benefit-cost approach. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 29*, 512-530. doi: 10.1108/01443330910986298

Merkle, D., & Edelman, M. (2002). Nonresponse in exit polls: A comprehensive analysis. In R. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), *Survey nonresponse* (pp. 243-257). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Mandarano, L. (2015). Civic engagement capacity building: An assessment of the citizen planning academy model of public outreach and education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *35*, 174-187. doi: 10.1177/0739456X14566869

Okun, M. A., Barr, A., & Herzog, A. R. (1998). Motivation to volunteer by older adults: A test of competing measurement models. *Psychology and Aging*, *13*, 608-621. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.13.4.608

Okun, M. A., & Schultz, A. (2003). Age and motives for volunteering: Testing hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. *Psychology and Aging*, *18*, 231-239. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.18.2.231

O'Leary, L. S. (2014). Civic engagement in college students: Connections between involvement and attitudes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *162*, 55-65. doi:10.1002/ir

O'Meara, K. A. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *12*, 7-28.

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. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.671

Omoto, A. M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J. D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality*, *78*, 1703-1734. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00667.x

Penner, L. A. (2002). Dispositional and organizational influences on sustained volunteerism: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*, 447-467. doi: 10.1111/1540-4560.00270

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 535-537. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.525

Perks, T., & Haan, M. (2011). Youth religious involvement and adult community participation: Do levels of youth religious involvement matter? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*, 107-129. doi: 10.1177/0899764009357794

Porter, M. (2010). *Anchor institutions and urban economic development: From community benefit to shared value*. Retrieved from http://sphere.icic.org/atf/cf/%7Bc81898b2-76e9-4a18-b838-a3f65c9f06b9%7D/102610%20MEP%20SPEECH%20ANCHORS_ FINAL%20V3.PDF

Putnam, R. D. (1993). The prosperous community. Social capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, *4*(13).

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

Putnam, R. D., Feldstein, L., & Cohen, D. (2003). *Better together: Restoring the American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R. & Nanetti, R. Y. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ridge, R. D. (2000). Targeting egoist motivations: A functional strategy for recruiting volunteers. *Contemporary Social Psychology*, *19*, 12-23.

Rosenberg, M. J. (1969). The conditions and consequences of evaluation apprehension. In R. Rosenthal & R. L. Rosnow (Eds.), *Artifact in behavioral research* (pp. 279-349). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Shye, S. (2010). The motivation to volunteer: A systemic quality of life theory. *Social Indicators Research*, *98*, 183-200. doi: 10.1007/s11205-009-9545-3

Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a "functional" personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 251-264. doi: 10.1177/0146167294203001

Snyder, M., & DeBono, K. G. (1985). Appeals to image and claims about quality: Understanding the psychology of advertising. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 586-597. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.49.3.586

Stukas, A. A., Hoye, R., Nicholson, M., Brown, K. M., & Aisbett, L. (2014). Motivations to volunteer and their associations with volunteers' well-being. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.* Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0899764014561122

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2015). Volunteerism and community involvement: Antecedents, experiences, and consequences for the person and situation. In D. A. Schroeder and W. G. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 459-493). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stukas, A. A., Worth, K. A., Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2009). The matching of motivations to affordances in the volunteer environment: An index for assessing the impact of multiple matches on volunteer outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *38*, 5-28. doi: 10.1177/0899764008314810

Taylor, Jr., H. L., & Luter, G. (2013). *Anchor Institutions: An Interpretive Review Essay* Retrieved from http://www.margainc.com/files_images/general/Literature_ Review_ 2013.pdf

Tedeschi, J. T., Schlenker, B. R., & Bonoma, T. V. (1971). Cognitive dissonance: Private ratiocination or public spectacle? *American Psychologist*, *26*, 685-695. doi: 10.1037/h0032110

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tschirhart, M., Mesch, D. J., Perry, J. L., Miller, T. K., & Lee, G. (2001). Stipended volunteers: Their goals, experiences, satisfaction, and likelihood of future service. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *30*, 422-443. doi: 10.1177/0899764001303002

U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Advancing civic learning and engagement in democracy: A road map and call to action*. Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/ sites/default/files/road-map-call-to-action.pdf

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Webber, K. L. (2011). Factors related to faculty research productivity and implications for academic planners. *Planning for Higher Education*, *39*, 32-43.

Webber, H. S., & Karlstrom, M. (2009). Why *community investment is good for nonprofit anchor institutions: Understanding costs, benefits, and the range of strategic options*. Retrieved from http://www.chapinhall.org/sites/default/files/Anchor_ Paper_04_20_ 09_0.pdf

Weerts, D. J., & Sandmann, L R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *81*, 702-727. doi:10.1353/jhe.2010.0011

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 215-240. doi:10.1146/ annurev.soc.26.1.215

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *41*, 176-212. doi: 10.1177/0899764011434558

About the Authors

• **Richard J. Harnish** is an Associate Professor of Psychology at The Pennsylvania State University, New Kensington. He earned his PhD and MA in Social Psychology from Michigan State University, and holds a BA in Psychology from The Pennsylvania State University. His research interests focuses on the intersection between attitudes, the self, and affect. Send correspondence to Richard J. Harnish, Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, New Kensington Campus, 3550 Seventh Street Road, Route 780, Upper Burrell, PA 15068-1765; e-mail: rjh27@psu.edu.

• **K. Robert Bridges** is a Professor of Psychology and Program Coordinator at The Pennsylvania State University, New Kensington. He earned his PhD in Child Development from the University of Pittsburgh, and holds an MA in Experimental Psychology from Temple University, and a BA in Psychology from Indiana University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include socialization during late adolescence, the effect of attributional style on academic performance, and the effect of irrational belies on a variety of behaviors.