



1-1-1999

Performance and Commitment: Issues in Management of Volunteers in Human Service Organizations

Ram A. Cnaan

University of Pennsylvania, cnaan@sp2.upenn.edu

Toni Cascio

University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/spp_papers



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cnaan, R. A., & Cascio, T. (1999). Performance and Commitment: Issues in Management of Volunteers in Human Service Organizations. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/spp_papers/1

Copyright Haworth Press. Postprint version. Published in *Journal of Social Service Research*, Volume 24, Issue 3/4, 1998, pages 1-37.
The authors assert their right to include this material in the ScholarlyCommons@Penn.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/spp_papers/1
For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Performance and Commitment: Issues in Management of Volunteers in Human Service Organizations

Abstract

Volunteers are difficult to monitor because they are not liable to serious sanctions. We propose that we cannot learn about volunteer work from existing knowledge of paid employees. We then review the literature regarding volunteer commitment and performance. Based on a sample of 510 consistent volunteers in human service organizations, we assess three sets of variables (demographic, personality, and situational) to determine their significance in explaining variability in volunteer commitment and performance. The findings suggest that careful screening and use of symbolic rewards are significant in explaining variation in volunteer satisfaction, hours volunteered per month (commitment), and length of service (tenure).

Disciplines

Sociology

Comments

Copyright Haworth Press. Postprint version. Published in *Journal of Social Service Research*, Volume 24, Issue 3/4, 1998, pages 1-37.

The authors assert their right to include this material in the ScholarlyCommons@Penn.

**Performance and Commitment:
Issues in management of volunteers in human service organizations**

Ram A. Cnaan
University of Pennsylvania

and

Toni A. Cascio
University of South Carolina

Accepted for publication in: Journal of Social Service Research

Mailing address:

Ram A. Cnaan
School of Social Work
University of Pennsylvania
3701 Locust Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Tel: (215) 898-5523

Fax: (215) 573-2099

E-mail: CNAAN@SSW.UPENN.EDU

Running head: Performance and commitment...

**Performance and Commitment:
Issues in management of volunteers in human service organizations**

Abstract

Volunteers are difficult to monitor because they are not liable to serious sanctions. We propose that we cannot learn about volunteer work from existing knowledge of paid employees. We then review the literature regarding volunteer commitment and performance. Based on a sample of 510 consistent volunteers in human service organizations, we assess three sets of variables (demographic, personality, and situational) to determine their significance in explaining variability in volunteer commitment and performance. The findings suggest that careful screening and use of symbolic rewards are significant in explaining variation in volunteer satisfaction, hours volunteered per month (commitment), and length of service (tenure).

Authors' note: This study was supported in part by a grant from the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy on behalf of the Lilly Endowment and other donors. The authors wish to thank Ugo Ascoli, University of Ancona, Italy; Jeffrey L. Brudney, University of Georgia; Lester M. Salamon, the Johns Hopkins University, and five anonymous reviewers of this journal, for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript.

Introduction

Volunteers make a significant contribution to American society. Each year, about half of all adult Americans volunteer their services to assist others (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1992). The size of this volunteer population is of particular importance to Human Service Organizations (HSOs) which will continue to face budgetary constraints in the 1990s and beyond due to a conservative political trend that began with the Reagan and Bush administrations in the 1980s (Perlmutter & Cnaan, 1993). This continued swing to the right has brought in its wake a sharp curtailment in government funding and, given the sweeping Republican victory in 1994, continued cutbacks seem inevitable for the remainder of the 1990s. This situation places even greater pressures on HSOs whose limited human resources are already being severely taxed by an ever widening range of human needs. One way for HSOs to meet this challenge is by encouraging even more volunteerism (Brudney, 1989; Cnaan, 1990; Schilling, Schinke, & Weatherly, 1988). Nevertheless, our knowledge of what we can do to improve volunteer performance and commitment is extremely limited.

Increased reliance on volunteers over the past two decades has spurred the growth of volunteer administration, especially in hospitals and social welfare agencies (Brudney, 1992; Ellis & Noyes, 1990; Naylor, 1985; Smith & Berns, 1981; Stubblefield & Miles, 1986). Yet, many long-time volunteer administrators have reported that their education did not prepare them for their position (Brudney, 1992; Stubblefield & Miles, 1986), and that they need more knowledge and training in areas such as recruitment of volunteers, motivation, retention, rewards, and supervision (Brudney, 1992). The purpose of this study is to provide volunteer administrators and scholars of voluntary action with some answers to the question of how volunteer work in HSOs may be

managed effectively.

In this article, we first contend that there are inherent differences between paid and volunteer work, and, therefore, findings from the vast body of literature on the organizational behavior of paid staff are not applicable to volunteers. Next, we define volunteer performance and review the available literature. Following the study hypotheses and research methods, we present our findings and conclusions.

Paid and Volunteer Work: Key Differences

It is too often assumed in both practice and research that principles of management of paid employees can be generalized to managing volunteers. As we will document, individuals often become volunteers because of a desire to make a personal contribution and wish not to be involved with business concerns such as being managed or supervised. Thus, the extensive literature on performance and organizational behavior of paid employees cannot be generalized to volunteer workers because there are key differences between these two groups. One of the most important differences between paid and volunteer employees is that of motivation. Whereas most motivation-to-volunteer studies center on joining or deciding to volunteer (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991), employee motivation studies center on job performance, absenteeism, tenure, and productivity. Motivation to volunteer is of little relevance to the organizational behavior of volunteers because it is associated with the initial decision to join and tends to decline in importance once that decision has been made (Pearce, 1983). Sundeen (1988), for example, has found that "substantial differences exist between explaining who participates in these volunteer activities and who devotes the greatest number of hours to them" (p. 565).

There are ten other significant differences between volunteers and paid employees that prohibit the generalization of findings about paid employees to volunteers. These differences are as follows:

1) Pearce (1993) has noted that volunteers are not motivated monetarily: "Since they are unpaid, they are all 'paid' equally and relatively cheaply, so there is little economic reason to differentiate between them" (p. 10). Therefore, volunteers cannot neither be motivated by salary raises or bonuses nor sanctioned by salary freezes or financial penalties.

2) In addition, volunteers have only a moral and emotional commitment to their organizations, whereas employees also have an instrumental commitment.

3) Most volunteers work only a few hours a week, while most employees work full-time. Employees, therefore, pay more attention to the workplace, have more frequent contacts with colleagues, are more influenced by the organization's culture, and share more in common with coworkers than do volunteers (Capner & Caltabiano, 1993). The sporadic work schedule of volunteers also makes coordination of volunteer work extremely difficult. Often, a volunteer administrator must supervise the performance of a large number of people who work a few hours weekly as compared with a supervisor of paid full-time employees. Furthermore, continuity of care can be jeopardized when a large number of individuals provide this care in a piece-meal fashion rather than having one or two full-time providers assume this responsibility (Wharton, 1991). It should be noted that while there are some individuals who volunteer almost full-time, the overwhelming majority of volunteers give only a few hours a week, and only fourteen percent have been estimated to volunteer five hours per week or more (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1992).

4) Many volunteers are affiliated with more than one organization, while employees are generally affiliated with only one. The degree of loyalty and commitment to an organization generally varies according to how central the organization is to one's life. In this respect, multiple affiliations may mean that the individual's commitment to each organization is limited.

5) Volunteers are less dependent on their workplace than are employees. Volunteers can leave at will without worrying about the next pay check, pension rights, health care benefits, or where they will work next.

6) Volunteers are often recruited directly (informally) and tend to "try-out" a position, whereas employees usually go through a formal hiring process and generally accept a position only after careful deliberation. Thus, the process of becoming committed to the HSO's mission and procedures is shorter for a paid employee than for volunteer.

7) As Perrow (1970) has noted, volunteers can make no legal allegation regarding inadequate compensation or discrimination in the workplace. Although theoretically this situation can occur, by and large, the usual recourse taken when volunteers are disappointed is to leave the position, and courts may consider that no damage has been done if there is no monetary loss.

8) Volunteers do not always feel bound by the norms and values of an organization. For example, they may pay less attention to the requirement to report and follow bureaucratic instructions (Cooley, Singer & Irvin, 1989; Milligan, Maryland, Ziegler, & Ward, 1987). Compared with employees, volunteers may feel more independent in applying their own values and norms, because they are not being paid to do the job (Fagan, 1986).

9) Volunteers who cause damage may not be liable, but the organization surely will be. The

possibility of a law suit is an issue of concern to many HSOs. For example, HSOs such as Boy/Girl Scouts, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, and youth athletic leagues must deal with the highly publicized issue of possible sexual abuse of children.

10) Agencies may be reluctant to evaluate the work of volunteers because such evaluations may seem to question volunteers' efforts. Allen (1987) noted that: "Both the greater need of the agency for the volunteer (than vice versa) and the agency's inability to reciprocate the volunteer's efforts with more tangible rewards (for example, pay) serve to make the social roles clear. The volunteer is the 'helper'; the agency, the 'grateful recipient'" (p. 258).

In sum, both volunteer and paid staff perform important tasks for their HSOs. However, fundamental differences between volunteers and paid employees regarding motivation, expected rewards, possible sanctions, and management practices call for a study that focuses solely on the nature of volunteer commitment and performance.

Volunteer Performance and Commitment

The well-documented effectiveness of volunteer work makes the idea of volunteer service attractive to HSOs. For example, the effectiveness of volunteers has been studied in a variety of settings and found comparable to that of paid employees (Capner & Caltabiano, 1993; David, Enderby, & Bainton, 1982; Eskridge & Carlson, 1979; Lines, 1987; Meikle et al., 1979; Nagel, Newlin, & Cimboric, 1988; Paradis & Usui, 1987; Quinteros, Williams, White, & Pickering, 1984; Qureshi, Challis, & Davies, 1989; Scioli & Cook, 1976; Thornton, 1991). Nevertheless, the above findings shed very little light on the broader issue of how to enhance volunteer performance and commitment.

Brudney (1990) has noted that the performance of volunteers, like that of paid employees, varies, and the challenge is to assess what factors contribute to better performance and commitment. Yet, the issue of job performance and commitment among volunteers has received little attention in the literature (Capner & Caltabiano, 1993; Paradis & Usui, 1987). As Pearce (1993) pointed out: "Despite the extensive research on volunteers, we still know next to nothing about the organizational behavior of volunteers" (p. 107).

Harris (1994), in a study on the organizational behavior of congregational volunteers, stated the following:

Issues also arise in congregations around the control of lay leaders and senior volunteers. To what extent can their voluntary work be 'managed'? This is a sensitive issue as frequently lay leaders are motivated to take on key voluntary positions because of the opportunities they offer for autonomy and self-fulfillment; they do not expect to be 'managed' or 'monitored' (p. 7).

Volunteers can be very effective in carrying out certain tasks within an organization. However, volunteer administrators and scholars alike have little knowledge of how to improve performance and commitment, for only a few studies have addressed this important aspect of volunteerism. In the remainder of this section, we have summarized the available literature on the key factors associated with improved volunteer performance and commitment.

Before we turn to review studies that focused on organizational behavior of volunteers, we should keep Smith's (1994) warning in mind. Smith (1994) noted that most studies of volunteers use a framework that is alien to volunteers (i.e., study people who only plan to volunteer rather than actual volunteers or apply theoretical conceptualizations borrowed from other fields of study) and use a limited set of variables to test their hypotheses. Consequently, findings are inconsistent and

contradictory.

Smith (1994) further proposed that five sets of variables be considered in studies of volunteers rather than the usual one or two explaining variables. These sets of variables are: context, social background, personality, attitude, and situation. In our search of the literature, we have found, that some of these variables overlap. We, therefore, combined a) contextual with background variables and b) personality and attitudinal variables. Finally, we included situational variables in a larger category more relevant for a study of volunteer performance and commitment, namely, management of volunteers. This is a conglomerate of many issues ranging from recruitment to providing symbolic rewards.

Demographic variables

Sundeen (1992) has found that the higher the SES (education, occupation, and/or income) the higher the likelihood one will volunteer. Lammers' (1991) study found that the length of time trained volunteers remained with the organization was significantly associated with educational levels. Burke and Hall (1986), in a two-year study of 67 volunteers, found that education and occupation were good predictors of commitment and performance. Similarly, Spitz and MacKinnon (1993) found successful Big Brothers-Big Sisters volunteers, that is, those who completed the expected period of service, were older and more highly educated. Rohs (1986), in a study of 4-H volunteers, found that age, years as a 4-H member, having children in 4-H programs, and occupational status were very good predictors of volunteer tenure. Interestingly, gender was not a major factor in explaining volunteer experience within HSOs (see for example, Black and DiNitto, 1994).

In sum, these findings support two key theoretical approaches: the "dominant status approach" and the "personal investment approach." The dominant status approach postulates that people whose demographic characteristics are perceived by society as more desirable will rise to leadership positions and will tend more often to volunteer, and, by extension, to perform better than those whose demographic characteristics are perceived as less desired (Bronfenbrenner, 1960; Lemon, Paisleys, & Jacobson, 1972; Smith, 1993). The "personal investment approach," postulates that individuals who own property or business, who are married (living with a spouse), who have children growing up in the community, and who do not plan to relocate are more interested in the quality of life of their communities (have a vested interest in it) and thus are more willing to donate their time as they see the potential rewards as offsetting the cost of volunteering (Babchuk & Gordon, 1962; Wandersman, Florin, Friedmann, & Meier, 1987). Thus, both approaches indicate that those who are more educated, those with higher incomes, and those in more prestigious occupations will be more committed and perform better as volunteers.

Personality traits and attitudes

As Smith (1994) and Dailey (1986) pointed out, only a few studies of volunteers have examined the issue of personality traits and attitudes. Allen and Rushton (1983), in a review of the literature, found that volunteer participation was higher for individuals with a greater sense of efficacy (internal locus of control) and higher self-esteem. According to Wuthnow (1991), religion and strength of belief did not explain volunteerism, although fundamental religious attitudes increased the probability of and commitment to volunteering. However, Hodgkinson (1995)

contended that because the level of volunteering is highest among active church-goers, the Judeo-Christian teaching of helping strangers can explain this tendency toward active social volunteering. However, other studies on religiosity and volunteering either did not find a significant association between religious commitment and active volunteering (Cnaan, Kasternakis, & Wineburg, 1993) or found that it is moderated by the congregation's emphasis on secular social ministry (Wilson & Janoski, 1995). Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, and Craft (1995) found that participation in church groups increases secular and social volunteering but attending church does not. Puffer and Meindl (1987) noted that volunteers' performance was explained by involvement in the program and their sense of service mission (helping others). Similarly, Jenner (1981) found a significant positive correlation between the number of hours provided by Junior League volunteers and their sense of commitment to the organization and its mission. Similarly, Harrison (1995) tested the motivation of volunteers in homeless shelters and found that the key determinant of low absenteeism is the sense of moral obligation. In other words, those who are committed to the cause of the HSO are more likely to come on time and not to miss days of planned service.

Gidron (1985) and Lammers (1991) found attitudinal variables such as task achievement, relationships with other volunteers, and the work itself best discriminated between stayers and leavers. Spitz and MacKinnon (1993) stated that Big Brothers-Big Sisters volunteers who completed the expected period of service scored higher on intelligence, imagination, self-assurance, and trust; and lower scores on social inhibition. Chambre (1987) and Wuthnow (1991) indicated that volunteers tend to have higher levels of life satisfaction. Both attributed this

finding to the fact that satisfied people are more active and involved in volunteering than are dissatisfied people. Finally, Zeigenhaft, Armstrong, Quintis, and Riddick (1993) reported that motivation to volunteer did not explain the quality of volunteer performance.

In general, the limited available data suggest that those who are more motivated to volunteer (i.e., identify with the mission and client population of the HSO) and those who are psychologically well-adapted tend to perform better and be more committed as volunteers. Note, that the term well-adapted is loosely used here to denote people who are not at the extreme ends of any studied measure of personality traits.

Situational (managerial) variables

Volunteer management has often been addressed in the literature through prescriptive or anecdotal orientations. For example, Allen (1987) and Netting (1986) noted that on-going evaluation is rare among volunteer programs. Paradis and Usui (1987) found that training helped to sensitize volunteers and increase retention. Similarly, Gidron (1985) and Lammers (1991) found that retention was correlated with preparation for the task (training). Similarly, Watson (1993-94) suggested training and also use of veteran volunteers in training and supervision may help improve tenure and productivity. She distinguished between orientation, pre-service, and in-service training and recommended the use of all three. Pierucci and Noel (1980), in a study of correctional volunteers, found that personal variables were poor predictors of retention while situational variables such as satisfaction with the orientation process and staff support were good predictors. There are many studies that looked at one agency, usually one volunteer administrator, and one

issue of management of volunteers and which demonstrate how effective the studied approach is. For example, McGee (1988) suggested that recognition and symbolic incentive rewards can improve morale and productivity. She further indicated that these rewards have a deeper meaning which is greater than the value of the prize itself and that award programs create a positive attitude, bond volunteers with the organization, and build commitment. Similarly Brown and Zahrlly (1989) referred to the nonmonetary aspects of volunteer work at a crisis and suicide prevention center (see also Vineyard, 1994). Zischka and Jones (1987), based on a study of volunteer ombudsmen, found that careful orientation to decrease anxiety and role ambiguity is important in increasing tenure and productivity of volunteers. Hollwitz and Wilson (1993) suggested that careful selection through structured interviews that focus on the job to be performed helps increase tenure and satisfaction. Lafer (1991) reported, in a study of hospice volunteers, that volunteer attrition can be decreased if the volunteer administrator carefully recruits and trains the volunteers, helps them transition into the role, and provides individual supervision. Similar findings are reported by Stevens (1991) regarding elderly volunteers. In the same vein, Dailey (1986) noted that feedback is important for understanding of organizational commitment. Many of the available guides for volunteer administrators (see for example, Fisher & Cole, 1993; Ilsley, 1990; Omoto & Snyder, 1993) stress careful and planned recruitment, orientation, screening, placement in work, supervising, evaluating, and providing symbolic rewards.

The difficulty with these studies is that they have no comparison groups. Also, they are based on small samples, and their methods are often weak. However, their findings, taken together, suggest that concentrated efforts of volunteer administrators on orientation, supervision, and most

importantly, symbolic rewards, yielded greater retention, volunteer commitment, lower absenteeism, and greater satisfaction. In sum, the above findings suggest that the more volunteer administrators or other staff member invest in volunteers, the better the volunteer performance will be. This notion can be captured in what Gerhard (1988) called the development and recognition model. That is to say, as volunteers are not paid, they must be made feel wanted, appreciated, and invested in. Good volunteer management invests in all stages of volunteer work from recruitment to evaluation and provides means of symbolic rewards that intrinsically enhance volunteer motivation and productivity.

Research Hypotheses

The literature cited above has several limitations. First, it is highly based on theories and premises of paid-work settings. Second, the literature focused mostly on who becomes a volunteer, rather than on volunteer performance and commitment. Third, it tested only a small set of variables many of which have never been replicated by other studies. Finally, the literature does not provide a fully developed set of findings that will direct us into specific hypotheses. Consequently (and as suggested by Smith, 1994) we elected to include a large number of independent variables in an exploratory manner. Based on the available knowledge as well as Smith's framework for studying volunteers, the hypotheses addressed in this study are as follows:

- H1. Volunteers whose demographic characteristics are consistent with the dominant status approach and the personal investment approach will score higher on the three measures of performance and commitment: volunteer satisfaction, commitment (number of volunteer hours per month), and tenure (duration of service in months), when compared with

volunteers who do not have similar demographic characteristics.

- H2. Volunteers who are more motivated and those who are psychologically well-adapted will score higher on the three measures of performance and commitment when compared with volunteers who are less motivated and those who are psychologically less well-adapted.
- H3. Volunteers who are more carefully managed (through active efforts by volunteer administrators in recruitment, orientation, training, supervision, and providing symbolic rewards) will score higher on the three measures of performance and commitment when compared with volunteers who receive fewer symbolic rewards and are not well managed.

Methods

Respondents: The sample population consisted of 510 volunteers from 105 HSOs in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, or Providence, Rhode Island. The HSOs represented in this study included nursing homes, hospitals, schools, programs for the frail elderly, Big Brother and Big Sister programs, women's services, services for the homeless, and prison programs. The sample in each locality was a sample of convenience and was based on available lists of social and human services agencies. Those eligible for the study were volunteers who, in the six-month period prior to the interview, provided at least one hour of direct service (assisting individuals or groups in need) at least once every other week in an HSO.

Characteristics of the sample are outlined in Table 1. Respondents ranged in age from 15-86 years, with a mean age of 50.6 years. Approximately 43 percent were 60 years and older. This older mean age of respondents reflects the shift in the volunteer pool with wider

representation of healthy and productive elderly (Cnaan & Cwikel, 1992). In some respects, our sample population differ from the general population of volunteers because the respondents, for the most part, are women, people who are not employed full-time, and older. Nevertheless, the characteristics of this sample are representative of those found in many other studies (cf. Smith, 1994), in that the respondents are well-educated, have an above-average level of income, and are primarily white.

Insert table 1 about here

A methodological note regarding using of the data is warranted here. We studied 510 volunteers from 105 agencies. This poses a threat in that one agency that may have a practice that may influence findings beyond individual experiences. We analyzed large agencies (providing more than 10 volunteers) and found that they did not show a trend toward managing volunteers in a uniform manner. It should also be noted that none of the agencies contributed more than 30 volunteers to this study, hence, such an impact on the overall findings may be limited.

Procedures: The face-to-face interviews, usually an hour in duration, were conducted in three phases: February-March 1989, January-February 1990, and January-March 1991. In the first phase, 117 volunteers were interviewed; in the second phase, 141 volunteers; and in the final phase, 252 volunteers. All interviews were conducted by graduate research students at the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work. To ensure uniformity in data collection, we required the student-interviewers to attend five training sessions which included role playing, discussion of problematic questions, and interpretation of ambiguous responses. There was a very low refusal rate. Less than three percent of those approached to participate refused to be interviewed. This and

the large sample size may compensate for the lack of randomness in the sample. Respondents were asked to focus their answers on the last year in the HSO in which the study was conducted.

It should be noted that no significant differences were found among the respondents from the three geographical locations. Because we collected data over time, moving from one agency to another, we could not test time effect. However, it is important to reiterate that this is not a random sample. We did not have a master list of volunteers in HSOs, and the cost of random sampling of the population would have been prohibitive.

Instruments: The data reported in this study were collected as part of a more comprehensive study on volunteers. The study questionnaire consisted of four major sections: 1) background variables; 2) Motivation to Volunteer (MTV) scale developed specifically for this study (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). The Cronbach's alpha reliability of this scale was .86; 3) assessment of the volunteer experience (e.g., recruitment, screening, orientation, supervision, activities performed, rewards, and satisfaction from the volunteer activity); 4) and social-psychological scales including internal-external locus of control (Rotter, 1982), liking people (Filsinger, 1981), life-satisfaction (Dinner, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), intrinsic-religious motivation (Hoge, 1972; Kivett, Watson & Bush, 1977), and self-esteem (Hudson, 1982). The psychometric properties of these scales are reported in the cited sources.

We focused on three dependent variables of commitment and performance: length of stay with the agency (tenure), number of volunteer hours per month (commitment), and volunteer satisfaction. We selected volunteer satisfaction based on Dailey's (1986) conclusion that "Job satisfaction played a critical role in understanding commitment for volunteers" (p. 28). Similarly,

Jenner (1984) found strong positive correlations between satisfaction with the volunteer experience and feelings of commitment to and level of involvement in the program.

Data relevant to the three performance variables were obtained as follows: To measure tenure we asked: "How long have you participated in this program?" and measured the answers in months. Length of time ranged from 6 to 696 months with a mean of 61.72 months (S.D. = 89.14). To determine commitment we asked "How many days a month do you volunteer to this program?" and "Approximately how many hours do you invest each time you come to volunteer?" We then multiplied the answers and measured them in hours. Hours per month ranged from 2 to 297 hours with a mean of 25.23 (S.D. = 29.70). To measure volunteer satisfaction we used an eight item Likert-type scale with five categories ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The mean rating for volunteer satisfaction was 1.86 (S.D. = .59). It should be noted that the lower the score, the higher the level of satisfaction. We included items such as: "Overall, I enjoy my volunteer activity at this agency;" "I would like to continue being a volunteer at this agency;" "Each day of volunteering is special for me;" and "I believe others would enjoy volunteering at this agency." The Cronbach alpha reliability of this scale was .88, and the Guttman Split-half was .85.

To assure that each performance variable measured a distinct content area, we correlated them with one another. We found no significant correlation between volunteer satisfaction and commitment ($r=.007$, $p>.05$). Tenure was significantly, but weakly, correlated with commitment ($r=.14$, $p<.01$) and volunteer satisfaction ($r=.19$, $p<.05$). Although two of the three correlations were significant, given the large sample size, the low correlations justified their separate inclusion in the study.

While we could use only three dependent variables, we were able to use a number of independent variables. Our choice was either to select a few variables based on the existing literature or employ a large set of variables in an exploratory manner. As indicated above, the problem with the existing literature is that it is based on paid-work literature and theories (such as Herzberg's motives and hygienes, see both Gidron, 1985 and Lammers, 1991 or Maslow's hierarchy of needs, see Danoff & Kopel, 1994).

Smith (1994) argued that only studies that test a multiple set of independent variables and assess their relative contribution to explaining volunteerism are of real value to knowledge generation. Thus, we elected to apply and test a large set of independent variables. We, therefore, included 16 demographic characteristics, 9 personality traits, and 29 management practices variables in addition to 17 symbolic rewards.¹

We also used three measures of extended involvement with the HSOs, namely policy, advocacy, and administration. Although the selection criterion for this study was provision of

¹ Due to the large number of variables employed in this study, space limitation prohibits a full report of their range, standard deviations, and other properties. Interested readers should contact the first author for a copy of the instrument and information about the variables.

direct services, we found that many volunteers were also engaged in activities at the macro level which indicated broader interests. The categories of these three variables ranged from (1) no involvement to (5) very much involved.

Statistical methods: In order to assess the impact of the many independent variables on the three dependent performance and commitment variables, we applied a two-tier approach. We first used a set of many bivariate analyses (applying X^2 test of association, independent groups t-test, and Pearson moment correlation as appropriate) to explain which, if any, of these many independent variables explain variability in the performance and commitment variables. For example, variation in volunteer satisfaction based on marital status (a nominal variable) was tested using independent group t-test. We acknowledged that it is quite likely that in a multiple set of bivariate analyses some of the significant results are chance errors and some will be masked in a multiple variable analysis. However, as no previous study tested such a large set of independent variables and too many studies focused on one or two independent variables alone, there is merit in knowing the difference between bivariate and multivariate results.

Thus, in the second tier of analyses we performed three sets of multiple correlation analyses (using only variables that showed significant association in at least one of the bivariate analyses and treating nominal variable as dichotomous based on an analysis of the categories that accounted for the bivariate significant results (for example, Jews, Catholics, and Protestants reported similar trends that were very different from the group of others) for each of the performance and commitment variables separately. We tested for multi-collinearity by checking all possible inter-correlations of the independent variables. These inter-correlations were either non-existent or

weak ($r < .20$). As expected, some variables that appeared significant in the bivariate analyses dropped out as insignificant in the multiple variable analysis. We found these variables which were dropped out to be of great interest both methodologically and substantially. As will be shown later, these variables came more from one set of variables than from others and, thus, yielded a different set of possible implications for practice and future research. Having both students of research and practitioners as our audience in mind (in addition to scholars), we elected to present both tiers of analyses.

Findings

Findings from the bivariate analysis.

Demographic characteristics and performance:

To test the first hypothesis, we used a set of demographic variables in bi-variate sets to account for variability in the performance variables. The demographic variables that were not significantly associated with any performance variables included gender (similar to Black and DiNitto's findings), volunteering in the past, and employment status. The finding regarding employment status is important because it indicates that neither tenure (number of months volunteering to this HSO) or commitment (number of hours volunteering per month) is significantly associated with availability of free time. Those who worked full-time or part-time and those not in the workforce volunteered more or less equally. While employment status may initially be of great importance in volunteering (Lammers, 1991), our findings indicate that it is not significant for those who are consistent HSO volunteers.

Volunteer satisfaction was significantly associated with eight demographic variables

(Table 2). Age positively correlated with volunteer satisfaction ($r=.24$, $p<.001$). Married volunteers were more satisfied than those who were unmarried (means of 1.79 and 1.90 respectively); those living with a spouse or alone were more satisfied than those living with relatives or friends (means of 1.78 and 2.00 respectively). Volunteers with a college degree or above were less satisfied than those with less education, especially those with high school and post-high school education (means of satisfaction were 1.91 and 1.75 respectively). Caucasians were more satisfied than minority volunteers (means of 1.83 and 1.98 respectively). People who were helped by a volunteer in the past were more satisfied than those who were not (means of 1.81 and 1.92 respectively). People who volunteered in more than one agency reported higher levels of volunteer satisfaction when compared with those who volunteered to a single agency (means of 1.75 and 1.89 respectively). Finally, those whose sibling(s) also volunteered reported lower volunteer satisfaction (mean of 1.94) when compared with those whose sibling(s) did not volunteer (mean of 1.81).

Insert table 2 about here

No demographic characteristic was significant in explaining commitment (number of hours volunteered per month). This finding did not support our first hypothesis which assumed that volunteers whose characteristics are consistent with the "dominant status approach" or "personal investment approach" would score higher. However, this finding further supports our premise that the three performance measures are independent and measure separate content areas.

Tenure (length of on-going volunteering) was explained by eight demographic variables. Married people volunteered for longer periods than those not married (means of 80.62 and 47.16

months respectively). People living alone or with a spouse stayed longer (mean of 69.70) than those living with friends or relatives (mean of 38.16). Those of Judeo-Christian origin (Protestants, Catholics, and Jews) volunteered for longer periods (mean of 65.47 months) when compared with others (mean of 25.21). This finding may be of major importance to students of religion and volunteerism since it suggests that the Judeo-Christian tradition and teaching is successful in instilling principles and practice of helping others (Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, & Craft, 1995; Wuthnow & Hodgkinson, 1990). People helped in the past by a volunteer had longer tenure when compared with those not assisted by volunteers (means of 72.23 and 48.71 months respectively). People who volunteered for other agencies reported significantly longer service periods (means of 83.14 and 50.81 months respectively). As shown by Perlmutter and Cnaan (1993), people who expand their volunteer involvement tend to assume further responsibilities and stay devoted to the cause. There was a significant, though weak, correlation between income and tenure ($r=.09$, $p<.01$). Finally, volunteering in family of origin was significant in explaining the variability in tenure. Tenure was longer for those whose fathers volunteered when compared with those whose fathers were non-volunteers (means of 71.93 and 52.10 months respectively). Similarly, those whose sibling(s) as volunteered had longer tenured when compared with those whose sibling(s) were non-volunteers (means of 68.23 and 51.06 months respectively).

In sum, age, marital status, living arrangement, volunteering to other agencies, and sibling(s) volunteering significantly accounted for both tenure and volunteer satisfaction. These findings provide weak support for the dominant status approach (employment status was not at all significant; income was weakly correlated only with tenure, and race was associated significantly

only with volunteer satisfaction). Slightly more support was provided to the personal investment approach in that marital status, living arrangement, and volunteering to other agencies were all significantly associated with volunteer satisfaction and tenure.

Personality traits, attitudes and performance

Several personality traits and attitudes were significant in explaining volunteer commitment and performance. Although every personality trait, with the exception of self-esteem, was significantly associated with one performance variable, the Pearson coefficient correlation was quite weak in many cases. Note that weak significant correlations are insufficient because in a large sample size such as this, even weak correlations can yield significant results.

Five personality traits were significantly correlated with volunteer satisfaction: motivation to volunteer (MTV), liking people, involvement in advocacy, involvement in administrative work, and life satisfaction. The only personality trait significantly associated with commitment was MTV. The higher the MTV, the more hours volunteers worked per month. (See Table 3).

Insert table 3 about here

Five personality traits were significantly associated with tenure: intrinsic religious motivation, involvement in administration, involvement in policy, locus of control, and life satisfaction. It should be noted that life satisfaction and involvement in administrative work were both associated with volunteer satisfaction and tenure whereas MTV was associated with volunteer satisfaction and commitment. Finally, of all personality traits, only self-esteem was not significantly associated with any of the three dependent variables.

Volunteer management and performance

We studied seven recruitment practices, namely: referring agency, agency telephone call, agency letter, media advertisement (radio, T.V., etc.), leaflet and brochures, word of mouth, and billboards. Note that practices which were not significantly associated with any of the dependent variables are not reported in table 4. The only recruitment practice to yield significant results was referring agency. Volunteers recruited through a referring agency reported more hours per month when compared with those recruited by other methods (mean of 34.51 and 23.62 hours, respectively). This finding has no plausible theoretical explanation nor does it resonate with practice experience of the volunteer administrators we interviewed; it thus may be the result of chance error. The fact that most recruitment practices are not significantly correlated with any of the three dependent variables and that the one that is significantly associated with commitment is not theoretically based suggests that the effect of recruitment practices on the actual volunteer work may be quite limited. That is, recruitment brings people into HSOs, but it does not help to explain their volunteer performance.

Insert table 4 about here

Of the three types of initial contacts studied -- mail, telephone, and visit -- only mail was significantly associated with volunteer satisfaction and commitment. Volunteers who applied by mail, when compared to others, reported higher commitment (40.55 and 22.99 hours per month, respectively) but lower levels of volunteer satisfaction (means of 2.08 and 1.85, respectively). The first finding is surprising in that it is commonly assumed that the most effective recruitment method is by personal contact (Berger, 1991). Yet, again, it is helpful for bringing people in, but

does not indicate how well they will perform while in the HSO. Volunteers first contacted the agency by telephone reported lower levels of tenure when compared to others (41.98 and 67.48 months respectively). Finally, volunteers whose initial contact was an agency visit reported higher levels of satisfaction when compared to others (means of 1.82 and 1.95 respectively). Thus, volunteer satisfaction was significantly associated only with two modes of contacting the agency: by mail (lower satisfaction) and by a visit to agency (higher satisfaction).

Commitment (hours per month) was significantly explained by four management practices: referral by an agency and contacting the agency by mail (both had a negative association; that is, those who used this method were donating fewer hours per month), filling out an application form, and individual supervision. Volunteers who filled out a form worked more hours than those who did not (mean of 28.16 and 22.30 hours, respectively). Finally, those who received individual supervision volunteered more hours per month than those who received no supervision or group supervision (mean of 28.1 and 20.0 hours, respectively).

Tenure was significantly explained by five management practices: initial phone contact, orientation, supervision, direct supervision by volunteer administrator, and filling out an application form. Those receiving orientation reported shorter tenure than those not attending orientation programs (50.95 and 84.37 months, respectively). Unsupervised volunteers reported longer tenure than those who were supervised (means of 51.89 and 69.93 months, respectively). This latter finding may be a sign of the agency's trust in veteran volunteers who do not need on-going supervision. Conversely, those supervised directly by the volunteer administrator reported longer tenure than those not directly supervised (means of 56.36 and 39.35 months,

respectively). Volunteers who had to fill in an application form reported shorter tenure than those who did not (means of 46.14 and 74.72, respectively).

Finally, we sought to determine whether symbolic rewards account for variability in the performance variables. Only 2 out of 17 rewards -- in-house conferences and media publicity -- showed no correlation with any of the performance variables. However, as can be seen in Table 5, almost all symbolic rewards except conference participation and volunteer of the month/year award are associated with volunteer satisfaction. This finding underscores the importance of rewards in enhancing volunteer satisfaction.

Insert table 5 about here

The rewards significantly associated with commitment were: prizes, out-of-house conferences, free medical services, and free meals. Those who had received such rewards reported more volunteer hours per month. Three rewards were associated with tenure: thank you letters, certificates of appreciation, and luncheons. Generally those awarded reported longer times. Finally, we composed an overall indicator of symbolic rewards ranging from zero (no reward) to 17 (all types of rewards) and determine whether it accounted for the variability in performance and commitment. This new measure significantly explained only volunteer satisfaction ($r=.25$, $p<.001$). However, this finding may be tautological as 13 out of the 17 rewards were significantly associated with volunteer satisfaction.

Findings from regression models

In this study, we used a large set of independent variables as was proposed by Smith (1994) in his critique of volunteer studies. A major problem with bivariate multiple analyses as was

performed above is that by chance, some analyses will inevitably appear significant. Furthermore, among those that are significant, it is difficult to discern which one may mask the influence of another; thus, a multiple analysis that includes many independent variables is required.

As noted above, each of the three performance and commitment variables was considered an independent content area. Furthermore, as in the above bivariate analyses, different sets of variables explained variability in the three performance variables. Thus, three separate regression models were performed to test what set of explanatory variables best explained variability in each of these three dependent variables. Note that in the three equations, unless otherwise specified, a positive correlation was obtained; that is, increase in the variable was correlated with an increase in volunteer satisfaction, tenure or commitment.

Eight variables significantly entered to the equation explaining volunteer satisfaction. The combined multiple R is .60 with an R^2 of .36 ($F=19.24$, $p<.0001$). This a relatively strong R^2 suggesting that some of the variance in volunteer satisfaction can be explained with these variables (see table 6). The significant variables used in this step-wise regression approach, in order of entry, were as follows: age, liking people, MTV, in-house lectures, living arrangement (whereby those living alone or with a spouse were more satisfied), thank you letters, race (Caucasians were more satisfied than ethnic minorities), and advocacy.

Insert table 6 about here

Six variables significantly entered the equation explaining commitment. The combined multiple R is .46 with an R^2 of .21 ($F=10.21$, $p<.0001$). This relatively low R^2 suggested that our knowledge as to what accounts for commitment (investing hours of volunteer work) is quite

limited and requires further study and inclusion of additional variables. Some possible variables could include changes in the volunteer's life (graduating from school, change of employment, new social commitments, or the development of new interests) or changes in the HSOs (such as new volunteer administrator, new agency policies, changes of personnel in the agency, or physical remodelling). When applying a step-wise regression approach, six variables significantly entered the equation as follows: application by mail, free medical services, referral by a referring agency, MTV, out of house conferences, and free meals. In general, the variance in commitment can be explained, in part, by symbolic rewards and recruitment practices -- factors that volunteer administrators can control and use to improve commitment.

Six variables significantly entered the equation explaining tenure. The combined multiple R is .59 with an R^2 of .35 ($F=10.16$, $p<.0001$). When applying a step-wise regression approach, the variables that entered are as follows: a certificate of appreciation, participation in orientation programs, filling out of an application form, luncheons, volunteering to another agency, and age. Note that participating in an orientation program and filling out an application form are inversely correlated; that is, those who participated in any of these activities reported on the average lower months of participation.

Discussion and Conclusions

The literature on the organizational behavior of volunteers in general and on their performance, in particular, is sparse. Often, volunteer administrators and authors of texts in the field apply principles and techniques borrowed from management of paid employees. However, the structure and meaning of work of volunteers and that of paid employees differ are markedly,

and no valid generalizations can be drawn from the organizational behavior literature which is based on paid employees. Furthermore, the few studies focusing on organizational behavior of volunteers, and volunteers in general, tend to focus only on one category of variables (Smith, 1994).

Our major finding is that variation in volunteer performance variables, especially volunteer satisfaction and tenure, can be explained in part by practices of volunteer management. For example, some of the variables used in our three regression models, were demographic variables which may be relevant for recruitment practices. However, no demographic variable was significantly associated with commitment. Age was associated with volunteer satisfaction and tenure. This finding accords with that of previous studies, namely, that for the elderly, volunteering in and of itself is a source of satisfaction; thus, they are often more committed and loyal (Cnaan & Cwikel, 1992; Fischer & Schaffer, 1993; Gillespie & King, 1985).

We found that in the bivariate analyses, ten different demographic background variables were significantly associated with the performance and commitment variables. However, only age, living arrangement, and race entered the multiple regression analyses. This finding sheds doubt on the usefulness of our two theoretical approaches. The variables of income, employment status, and education, which are included in the dominant status approach, did not enter any of the multiple regressions. We also found only a weak support to the personal investment approach (with living arrangement being associated only with volunteer satisfaction and those volunteering to more than one agency having a higher tenure with the agency). This may suggest that the dominant status approach (Lemon, Paisleys, & Jacobson, 1972; Smith, 1993) and the personal investment approach

(Babchuk & Gordon, 1962; Wandersman, Florin, Friedmann, & Meier, 1987) are more relevant for who is becoming a volunteer; however, once one becomes a volunteer s/he will perform regardless of social status or personal investment. These findings are in contradiction to our first hypothesis and to the findings of Burke and Hall (1986), Lammers (1991), Rohs (1986), and Spitz and MacKinnon (1993). The inclusion of a multiple set of independent variables makes possible the suggestion that the dominant status approach and the personal investment approach are of very limited value for volunteer performance and commitment in HSOs. Furthermore, based on the bivariate analysis we assumed that Judeo-Christian tradition and teaching are successful in instilling principles and practice of helping others, yet, in the multiple regression analyses, this impact became insignificant.

Of the two personality traits that entered any of our three regression models, only MTV (part of our second hypothesis) was associated with more than one performance variable (commitment and volunteer satisfaction). We contend that MTV may seem more relevant for volunteer recruitment than for volunteer management as it may help volunteer administrators assess which type of volunteers they want. Further, there is somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophecy in this finding because people who are highly motivated to volunteer and are identified with the cause of the HSO tend to volunteer and care for their impact, consequently, they are more satisfied with that volunteer experience and stay longer if it meets their expectations (they would find out otherwise long before our threshold of six months and withdraw). Yet, it is a potential diagnostic tool for successful volunteering. The other significant personality trait was liking people. Again, individuals who enjoy personal contacts find satisfaction in helping clients and being in touch with

agency staff. As Zeigenhaft, Armstrong, Quintis, and Riddick (1993) concluded: "Apparently the best volunteers are those who genuinely want to volunteer, and the weakest ones are those who are there because of an assignment or a recruitment" (p. 23).

Thus, we found some support for our second hypothesis, in that MTV (volunteers who are more motivated) was associated with both volunteer satisfaction and commitment. However, of all other personality traits and attitudes, only liking people was associated with any of the performance and commitment variables (volunteer satisfaction); thus our hypothesis that those who are psychologically well-adapted will score higher on the three performance variables was, by and large, not supported.

We found the greatest support for our situational (managerial) hypothesis; that is, certain aspects of volunteer management and agency structure affect volunteer satisfaction, tenure, and commitment. This finding suggests that volunteer administrators may be able to influence performance and commitment of HSOs volunteers.

Of utmost importance for volunteer administrators are managerial activities that they can control. It is one thing to select volunteers based on their demographic background or Motivation to Volunteer (MTV); however, volunteer administrators themselves can influence performance through their personal leadership and managerial style. It is interesting to note that many managerial practices, especially symbolic rewards, were included in the regression equations.

Managerial practices, to a large extent, accounted for the variability in commitment and tenure. The managerial variables that accounted for the variability in commitment were: first contact by mail, free medical services, joining the agency through a referral agency, conference

participation, and free meals. A separate analysis showed no significant associations among the three variables which are part of symbolic rewards: that is, each separately contributed to the variability in commitment. These findings suggest that volunteer administrators can influence commitment (number of hours volunteered). Two of the first three variables to enter the equation were application by mail and the use of a referral agency (negative correlations). These variables pose a conceptual challenge. We failed to find an established explanation for these findings. If we also look at the negative correlations between tenure and both using an application form and going through a formal orientation a trend may emerge. We may explain the use of mail and referral agencies as well as an application form and formal orientation as too formal; that is to say that those individuals who are attracted to these more formal methods are less likely to enjoy work with individuals in need. Whatever the explanation may be, the findings do not support our second hypothesis suggesting that more managerial activities will increase tenure and productivity. However, more studies should focus on this issue and support our findings, and a conceptual explanation be developed before it can be accepted and used in practice. As noted above, all volunteer administrators who were asked to comment on these findings found them puzzling at best.

The relatively lower R^2 that we obtained for commitment indicates that we did not study the more pertinent variables such as the volunteer's attitude towards some agency employees, interaction with particular clients, pride in doing the assigned work, relationships with one or more of the other volunteers, and other personal perceptions. In addition, we did not ask the volunteers what costs they incur while volunteering, if and how they are reimbursed for work-related

expenses, and if they are periodically evaluated. It is suggested that these variables be included in future research.

The managerial variables that accounted for the variability in tenure were: use of an application form (inverse relationship), participation in an orientation program, certificates of appreciation, and luncheons. The latter two variables were very important in a sample of consistent volunteers which indicates that symbolic rewards are relevant for long-term retention. What may be of even greater importance is that managerial practices, especially symbolic rewards, are significantly associated with commitment and performance. Thus, volunteer administrators are advised to consider investments in orientation, personal supervision, and volunteer recognition as means of enhancing performance. While salary and fiscal sanctioning are not appropriate means for controlling volunteer performance, the above practices may be helpful in managing volunteers.

The management practices that entered the regression equations namely, use of referral agency, application by mail, and contact by mail, all had inverse correlations with the dependent variables. As was noted above, these combined findings may suggest that volunteers do not want to be treated formally. As Harris (1994) noted, volunteers do not expect to be 'managed' or 'monitored.' They want an experience which is personal and different than the working experience. However, this should be further studied and supported in other contexts and settings before it can be asserted.

Of the performance variables studied, volunteer satisfaction showed interesting results. Although 13 of 17 symbolic rewards were significantly associated with volunteer satisfaction in the bivariate analyses, only thank-you-letters and in-house lectures were included in the regression

equation. In addition, not even the aggregate variable of number of symbolic rewards entered the equation explaining the variability in volunteer satisfaction. Furthermore, none of the two managerial practices presented in Table 4 (contact by mail and visit to the agency), made it to the final regression equation explaining variability in volunteer satisfaction. The findings, thus, suggest that demographic (age, living arrangement, and race) and personality traits (MTV and liking people) are most important in explaining volunteer satisfaction. The fact that only two symbolic rewards and no managerial practice entered the final equation, suggests that, perhaps, volunteer satisfaction is more what the volunteer makes of it than of what is done by the agency.

It is important to note that this study is based on a group of 510 consistent volunteers who provide direct service in a variety of HSOs. However, as this sample is not random and is limited to three geographical locations, we cannot know to what extent it represents the entire population of HSO volunteers. Furthermore, the fact that these volunteers were interviewed at least six months after beginning to volunteer makes it a sample of excellence: only volunteers who were retained for over six months and who provided service on an on-going basis were included. Moreover, this sample was drawn from many agencies. We, therefore, could not assess either the quality of volunteer work in each agency or other relevant performance variables. Nevertheless, we believe that this sample is representative of consistent (and, therefore, desired) volunteers who provide the backbone of support for HSOs. As Cnaan and Amroffell (1994) warned, any conclusions beyond the studied specific sub-population of volunteers should be made without extreme caution.

Clearly, this article has not totally explained variability in commitment and performance.

At best, we have defined the parameters of this domain, showed its complexity, and paved the way for future studies that will use different sets of variables to explain the variability in volunteer commitment and performance. Furthermore, future studies will also assess whether these findings are limited to consistent volunteers in human services or whether they are applicable to other volunteers as well.

References

- Allen, N. J. (1987). The role of social and organizational factors in the evaluation of volunteer programs. Evaluation and Program Planning, 10, 257-262.
- Allen, N. J., & Rushton, J. P. (1983). Personality characteristics of community mental health volunteers: A review. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 12 (1), 36-49.
- Babchuk, N., & Gordon, C. W., (1962). The voluntary association in the slum. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska.
- Berger, G. (1991). Factors explaining volunteering for organizations for organizations in general and for social welfare organizations in particular. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Heller School of Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.
- Black, B., & DiNitto, D. (1994). Volunteers who work with survivors of rape and battering: Motivations, acceptance, satisfaction, length of service, and gender. Journal of Social Service Research, 20 (1-2), 73-97.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1960). Personality and participation: The case of the vanishing variables. Journal of Social Issues, 16, 64-63.
- Brown, E. P., & Zahrl, J. (1989). Nonmonetary rewards for skilled volunteer labor: A look at crisis intervention volunteers. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 18, 167-177.
- Brudney, J. L. (1989). The use of volunteers by local governments as an approach to fiscal stress. Research in Urban Policy, 3, 109-121.
- Brudney, J. L. (1990). Fostering volunteer program in the public sector: Planning, initiating, and managing voluntary activities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. L. (1992). Administrators of volunteer services: Their needs for training and research. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 2, 271-282.

Burke, D. M., & Hall, M. (1986). Personality characteristics of volunteers in a companion for children program. Psychological Reports, 59, 819-825.

Capner, M., & Caltabiano, M. L. (1993). Factors affecting the progression towards burnout: A comparison of professional and volunteer counsellors. Psychological Reports, 73, 555-561.

Chambre, S. M. (1987). Good deeds in old age: Volunteering by the new leisure class. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Cnaan, R. A. (1990). Deployment of volunteers by governmental social services in Israel. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 17 (3), 150-173.

Cnaan, R. A., & Amroffell, L. M. (1994). Mapping volunteer activity. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23, 335-351.

Cnaan, R. A., & Cwikel, J. (1992). Elderly volunteers: Assessing their potential as an untapped resource. Journal of Aging and Social Policy, 4 (1-2), 125-147.

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

Cnaan, R. A., Kasternakis, A., & Wineburg, R. J. (1993). Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human services: Is there a link? Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 22, 33-51.

Cooley, E. A., Singer, G. H., & Irvin, L. K. (1989). Volunteers as part of family support services for families of developmentally disabled members. Education and Training in Mental

Retardation, 24, 207-218.

Dailey, R. C. (1986). Understanding organizational commitment for volunteers: Empirical and managerial implications. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15 (1), 19-31.

Danoff, A., & Kopel, S. (1994). What are the motivational needs beyond volunteer work? Journal of Volunteer Administration, XII (4), 13-18.

David, R., Enderby, P., & Bainton, D. (1982). Treatment of acquired aphasia: Speech therapists and volunteers compared. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry, 45, 957-961.

Dinner, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 71-75.

Ellis, S. J., & Noyes, K. H. (1990). By the people. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eskridge, C., & Carlson, E. (1979). The use of volunteers in probation: A national synthesis. Services and Rehabilitation, 4, 175-189.

Fagan, R. W. (1986). The use of volunteer sponsors in the rehabilitation of skid-row alcoholics. Journal of Drug Issues, 16, 321-337.

Filsinger, E. E. (1981). A measure of interpersonal orientations: The liking people scale. Journal of Personality Assessment. 45, 295-300.

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

Fisher, J. C., & Cole, K. M. (1993). Leadership and management of volunteer programs: A guide for volunteer administrators. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gerhard, G. W. (1988). A volunteer development & recognition model. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. Tulsa, OK. November.

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

Gidron, B. (1985). Prediction of retention and turnover among service volunteer workers. Journal of Social Service Research, 8 (1/2), 1-16.

Harris, M. (1994). The work and roles of lay people in religious congregations: Problems and issues. A paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action. October, Berkeley, CA.

Harrison, D. A. (1995). Volunteer motivation and attendance decisions: Competitive theory testing in multiple samples from a homeless shelter. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 371-385.

Hodgkinson, V. A. (1995). The connection between philanthropic behavior directed to religious institutions and small religious nonprofit organizations. Paper presented at the Conference on Small Religious Nonprofits: From Vulnerability to Viability. DePaul University, Chicago, October.

Hodgkinson, V. A. & Weitzman, M. S. (1992). Giving and volunteering in the United States. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hoge, D. R. (1972). A validated intrinsic religious motivation scale. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 136-376.

Hollwitz, J., & Wilson, C. E. (1993). Structure interviewing in volunteer selection. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21, 41-52.

Hudson, W. W. (1982). The clinical measurement package: A field manual. Chicago: Dorsey.

Ilsey, P. J. (1990). Enhancing the volunteer experience: New insights on strengthening volunteer participation, learning, and commitment. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Jackson, E. F., Bachmeier, M. D., Wood, J. R., & Craft, E. A. (1995). Volunteering and charitable giving: Do religious and associational ties promote helping behavior? Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 24, 59-78.

Jenner, J. R. (1984). Organizational commitment among women volunteers: Meaning and measurement. Psychological reports, 54, 991-996.

Jenner, J. R. (1986). Volunteerism is an aspect of women's work lives. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 19, 302-314.

Kivett, V. R., Watson, J. A., & Bush, J. C. (1977). The relative importance of physical, psychological, and social variables to locus of control orientation in middle life. Journal of Gerontology, 32, 203-210.

Lafer, B. (1991). The attrition of hospice volunteers. Omega, 23, 161-168.

Lammers, J. C. (1991). Attitudes, motives, and demographic predictors of volunteer commitment and service duration. Journal of Social service Research, 14 (3/4), 125-140.

Lemon, M., Paisleys, B. J., & Jacobson, P. E. (1972). Dominant statuses and involvement in formal voluntary associations. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 1 (2), 30-42.

Lines, D. R. (1987). The effectiveness of parent aides in the tertiary prevention of child abuse in South Australia. Child Abuse & Neglect, 11, 507-512.

McGee, L. F. (1988). Keeping up the good work. Personnel Administrator, 33 (6), 68-72.

Meikle, M., Wechsler, E., Berenson, A., Butler, J., Mulhall, D., & Stern, G. (1979). Comparative trial of volunteer and professional treatments of dysphasia after stroke. British Medical Journal, 2, 87-89.

Milligan, S., Maryland, P., Ziegler, H., & Ward, A. (1987). Natural helpers as street health workers among the black urban elderly. The Gerontologist, 27, 712-715.

Nagel, J., Newlin, M., & Cimboric, P. (1988). Efficacy of elderly and adolescent volunteer counselors in a nursing home setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 81-86.

Naylor, H. H. (1985). Beyond managing volunteers. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 14 (2-3), 25-30.

Netting, F. E. (1986). Evaluating the effectiveness of volunteer programs: No longer an option. A paper presented at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, Harrisburg, PA, October 1-4.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1993). AIDS volunteers and their motivations: Theoretical issues and practical concerns. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 4, 157-176.

Paradis, L. F., & Usui, W. M. (1987). Hospice volunteers: The impact of personality characteristics on retention and job performance. The Hospice Journal, 3, 3-30.

Pearce, J. L. (1983). Participation in voluntary associations: How membership in formal organizations changes the rewards of participation. In: D. H. Smith & J. Van Til (Eds.),

International perspectives on voluntary action research (pp. 148-156). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Pearce, J. L. (1993). Volunteers: The organizational behavior of unpaid workers. New York: Routledge.

Perlmutter, F. D., & Cnaan, R. A. (1993). Challenging human service organizations to redefine volunteer roles. Administration in Social Work, 17 (4), 77-95.

Perrow, C. (1970). Members as resources in voluntary organizations. In: W. R. Rosengren & M. Lefton (Eds.), Organizations and clients (93-101). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Pierucci, J., & Noel, R. C. (1980). Duration of participation of correctional volunteers as a function of personal and situational variables. Journal of Community Psychology, 8, 245-250.

Puffer, S. M. & Meindl, J. R. (1987). Altruism and self-interest in a voluntary organization: The interactive effect of motives and incentives on volunteers attitudes and performance. Academy of Management Proceedings (pp. 215-219). New Orleans, LA.

Quinteros, B., Williams, D. R. R., White, C. A. M., & Pickering, M. (1984). The costs of using trained and supervised volunteers as part of speech therapy service for dysphasic patients. British Journal of Disorders of Communication, 19, 205-212.

Qureshi, H., Challis, D., & Davies, B. (1989). Helpers in case-managed community care. Aldershot, The Netherlands: Gower.

Rohs, F. R. (1986). Social background, personality, and attitudinal factors influencing the decision to volunteer and level of involvement among adult 4-H leaders. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15 (1), 87-99.

Rotter, J. B. (1982). The development and applications of social learning theory. New York: Praeger.

Schilling, R. F., Schinke, S. P., & Weatherly, R. A. (1988). Service trends in a conservative era: Social workers rediscover the past. Social Work, 33, 5-9.

Scioli, F., & Cook, C. (1976). How effective are volunteers? Crime and Delinquency, 22, 192-200.

Smith, D. H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23, 243-263.

Smith, N. H., & Berns, G. T. (1981). Results of a national survey of recruitment and motivation techniques. Volunteer Administration, XIV (2), 1-4.

Spitz, R. T., & MacKinnon, J. R. (1993). Predicting success in volunteer community service. Psychological Reports, 73, 815-818.

Stevens, E. S. (1991). Toward satisfaction and retention of senior volunteers. Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 16 (3-4), 33-41.

Stubblefield, H. W., & Miles, L. (1986). Administration of volunteer programs as a career: What role for higher education? Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15 (4), 4-12.

Sundeen, R. A. (1988). Explaining participation in coproduction: A study of volunteers. Social Science Quarterly, 69, 547-568.

Sundeen, R. A. (1992). Differences in personal goals and attitudes among volunteers. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 21, 271-291.

Thornton, P. (1991). Subject to contract? Volunteers as providers of community care for

the elderly people and their supporters. Journal of Aging Studies, 5, 181-194.

Vineyard, S. (1994). Beyond banquets, plaques & pins: Creative ways to recognize volunteers and staff. Washington, DC: Heritage Arts.

Wandersman, A, Florin, P., Friedmann, R. R., & Meier, R. (1987). Who participates, who does not participate, and why? Participation in block and neighborhood organizations in the United States and Israel. Sociological Forum, 2, 534-555.

Watson, E. A. (1993-94). How effective is your training of volunteers? Journal of Volunteer Administration, XII (1-2), 58-60.

Wharton, C. S. (1991). Why can't we be friends? Expectations versus experiences in the volunteer role. Journal of Contemporary Anthropology, 20, 79-106.

Wilson, J., & Janoski, T. (1995). The contribution of religion to volunteer work. Sociology of Religion, 56, 137-152.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wuthnow, R. & Hodgkinson, V. A. (1990). Faith and philanthropy in America: Exploring the role of religion in America's voluntary sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zeigenhaft, R. L., Armstrong, J., Quintis, F., & Riddick, A. (1993). Hospital volunteers: Why do they volunteer, and which volunteers provide the highest quality service. Unpublished manuscript, Guilford College, NC.

Zischka, P. C., & Jones, I. (1987). Special skills and challenges in supervising volunteers. Clinical Supervisor, 5 (4), 19-30.

Table 1
Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (N=510)

Characteristics	Percent
Age: 15-30	27.9
31-60	31.6
61+	40.5
Gender: Males	28.9
Females	71.1
Marital status: Single	18.4
Married	40.5
Divorced/separated/widowed	41.1
Education No high school diploma	13.3
High school	20.4
Post high school	16.7
College completed	23.8
Graduate degree	25.8
Race: Caucasian	82.2
Other	17.8
Yearly household income	
\$ 0-10,000	20.9
\$10,001-20,000	17.5
\$20,001-30,000	14.6
\$30,001-40,000	11.4
\$40,001-50,000	9.1
\$50,001+	26.5
Employment status	
Employed full-time	25.3
Not employed/ employed part-time	18.2
Housewives/Students	23.5
Retirees	33.0
Religion	
Catholics	37.9
Protestants	32.6
Jews	16.2
Other	13.2

Table 2

Bivariate analyses of socio-demographic characteristics and volunteer commitment and performance

Demographic background	Volunteer satisfaction	Commitment (hours per month)	Tenure (months of volunteering)
Gender	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Age	$r = .24^{***}$	N.S.	$r = .36^{***}$
Marital status	$t = 2.08^*$	N.S.	$t = 4.17^{***}$
Living arrangement	$t = 3.71^{***}$	N.S.	$t = 3.47^{***}$
Religion	N.S.	N.S.	$t = 3.45^{***}$
Education	$t = 2.72^{***}$	N.S.	N.S.
Income	N.S.	N.S.	$r = .10^*$
Race	$t = 2.06^*$	N.S.	N.S.
Employment status	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Past help by a volunteer	$t = 2.05^*$	N.S.	$t = 2.90^{**}$
Volunteering to other agencies	$t = 2.60^{**}$	N.S.	$t = 3.74^{***}$
Volunteered in the past	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Volunteering in family of origin			
Father	N.S.	N.S.	$t = 2.24^*$
Mother	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Sibling(s)	$t = 2.30^*$	N.S.	$t = 2.05^*$
Grandparents	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

Note: A low score on Volunteer Satisfaction indicates high satisfaction; thus, the sign (negative or positive) of associations and correlations should be reversed.

* $p < .05$. ** $P < .01$. *** $P < .001$.

Table 3

Bivariate analyses of personality traits and volunteer commitment and performance

Traits	Volunteer satisfaction	Commitment (hours per month)	Tenure (months of volunteering)
Self-esteem	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Locus of control	N.S.	N.S.	r = .10 *
Liking people	r = .25 ***	N.S.	N.S.
Intrinsic religious motivation	N.S.	N.S.	r = .20 ***
Motivation to volunteer (MTV)	r = .30 ***	r = .18 ***	N.S.
Life satisfaction	r = .12 **	N.S.	r = .10 *
Administration	r = .16 ***	N.S.	r = .15 ***
Advocacy	r = .18 ***	N.S.	N.S.
Policy	N.S.	N.S.	r = .12 **

Note: A low score on Volunteer Satisfaction indicates high satisfaction; thus, the sign (negative or positive) of associations and correlations should be reversed.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4

Bivariate analyses of management practices and volunteer commitment and performance

Management	Volunteer satisfaction	Commitment (hours per month)	Tenure (months of volunteering)
Referral agency	N.S.	t = - 2.89 **	N.S.
Use of an application form	N.S.	t = 2.19 *	t = -3.62 ***
Contact by: Mail	t = 2.11 *	t = - 3.44 ***	N.S.
Telephone	N.S.	N.S.	t = 2.68 **
Visit to agency	t = 2.01 *	N.S.	N.S.
Orientation program	N.S.	N.S.	t = -3.83 ***
Having supervision	N.S.	N.S.	t = -2.12 *
Individual supervision	N.S.	t = 2.61 **	N.S.
Supervised by volunteer administrator	N.S.	N.S.	t = 2.80 **

Notes: A low score on Volunteer Satisfaction indicates high satisfaction; thus, the sign (negative or positive) of associations and correlations should be reversed.

We assigned the value 1 if the activity was performed; 0 if it was not performed. Thus, a significant negative correlation means activity that was performed is correlated with more satisfaction, less commitment, or less tenure.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5
Bivariate analyses of symbolic rewards and volunteer commitment and performance

Symbolic Rewards	Volunteer satisfaction	Commitment (hours per month)	Tenure (months of volunteering)
Thank you letters	t = 4.47 ***	N.S.	t = 2.42 *
Certificate of appreciation	t = 3.64 ***	N.S.	t = 2.60 **
Prizes	t = 3.36 ***	t = 2.50 *	N.S.
Organized trips	t = 2.65 **	N.S.	N.S.
Parties	t = 2.24 *	N.S.	N.S.
In-house lectures	t = 3.06 **	N.S.	N.S.
Conference participation	N.S.	t = 2.03 *	N.S.
Newsletter publicity	t = 3.85 ***	N.S.	N.S.
Luncheons	t = 3.55 ***	N.S.	t = 2.40 *
Annual dinner	t = 3.05 **	N.S.	N.S.
Volunteer of the month/year award	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Service pin	t = 2.83 **	N.S.	N.S.
Free parking	t = 3.33 ***	N.S.	N.S.
Free medical services	t = 3.02 **	t = 2.74 **	N.S.
Free meals	t = 3.49 ***	t = 2.73 **	N.S.
Media publicity	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Number of symbolic rewards	r = .25 ***	N.S.	N.S.

Notes: A low score on Volunteer Satisfaction indicates high satisfaction; thus, the sign (negative or positive) of associations and correlations should be reversed.

We assigned the value 1 if the activity was performed; 0 if it was not performed. Thus, a significant negative correlation means activity that was performed is correlated with more satisfaction, less commitment, or less tenure.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Performance and commitment... **50**

appreciation			30.65	.24	(1)
Orientation			-27.45	-.21	(2)
Application form			-22.93	-.18	(3)
luncheons			23.21	.19	(4)
Volunteering to other agencies			24.26	.18	(5)

Constant	4.27	68.15	47.32
R ²	.36	.21	.35
Adjusted R	.34	.18	.30
Number of cases	489	453	476