

VOLUNTEER FUNCTIONS INVENTORY (VFI)

Reference:

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

Description of Measure:

A 30-item measure of motivations to volunteer. The authors use a functionalist approach to volunteering, examining the functional motives individuals have for choosing to volunteer. The scale is divided into 6 separate functional motives (i.e., factors):

- 1.) Protective Motives – a way of protecting the ego from the difficulties of life.
- 2.) Values – a way to express ones altruistic and humanitarian values.
- 3.) Career –a way to improve career prospects.
- 4.) Social –a way to develop and strengthen social ties.
- 5.) Understanding –a way to gain knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- 6.) Enhancement –a way to help the ego grow and develop.

For each item, respondents are to indicate “How important or accurate each of the 30 possible reasons for volunteering were for you in doing volunteer work.”

Respondents answer each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all important/accurate) to 7 (extremely important/accurate).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Clary, E. G. & Snyder, M. (2002). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 156-159.

Why do significant numbers of people engage in the unpaid helping activities known as volunteerism? Drawing on functional theorizing about the reasons, purposes, and motivations underlying human behavior, we have identified six personal and social functions potentially served by volunteering. In addition to developing an inventory to assess these motivational functions, our program of research has explored the role of motivation in the processes of volunteerism, especially decisions about becoming a volunteer in the first place and decisions about continuing to volunteer.

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

Community service often involves sustained prosocial actions by individuals. This article focuses on one kind of such actions, volunteerism. Volunteerism involves long-term, planned, prosocial behaviors that benefit strangers, and usually occur in an organizational

setting. A selective review of the literature on the correlates of volunteerism is presented. One part of the review concerns the relationship between dispositional variables and volunteerism; it includes new data from an on-line survey that show significant relationships among personality traits, religiosity, and volunteer activities. The other part concerns how organizational variables, alone and in combination with dispositional variables, are related to volunteerism. A theoretical model of the causes of sustained volunteerism is presented and the practical implications of this model are discussed.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2002). The effects of "Mandatory Volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10*, 59-64.

Abstract—With the widespread emergence of required community-service programs comes a new opportunity to examine the effects of requirements on future behavioral intentions. To investigate the consequences of such "mandatory volunteerism" programs, we followed students who were required to volunteer in order to graduate from college. Results demonstrated that stronger perceptions of external control eliminated an otherwise positive relation between prior volunteer experience and future intentions to volunteer. A second study experimentally compared mandates and choices to serve and included a premeasured assessment of whether students felt external control was necessary to get them to volunteer. After being required or choosing to serve, students reported their future intentions. Students who initially felt it unlikely that they would freely volunteer had significantly lower intentions after being required to serve than after being given a choice. Those who initially felt more likely to freely volunteer were relatively unaffected by a mandate to serve as compared with a choice. Theoretical and practical implications for understanding the effects of requirements and constraints on intentions and behavior are discussed.

Scale

Please indicate how important or accurate each of the 30 possible reasons for volunteering were for you in doing volunteer work.

(1 = not at all important/accurate; 7 = extremely important/accurate.)

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

Scoring:

Items 7, 9, 11, 20, 24 make up the Protective factor.

Items 3, 8, 16, 19, 22 make up the Values factor.

Items 1, 10, 15, 21, 28 make up the Career factor.

Items 2, 4, 6, 17, 23 make up the Social factor.

Items 12, 14, 18, 25, 30 make up the Understanding factor

Items 5, 13, 26, 27, 29 make up the Enhancement factor.

Scoring is kept at the factor level and kept continuous.

ATTITUDES TOWARD HELPING OTHERS SCALE (AHO)

Reference:

Webb, D. J., Green, C. L., & Brashear, T. G. (2000). Development and validation of scales to measure attitudes influencing monetary donations to charitable organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*, 28, 299-309.

Description of Measure:

A 4-item measure of helping attitudes. The authors define AHO as “global and relatively enduring evaluations with regard to helping or assisting other people (pp. 303).” Respondents answer each item using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Note: this scale was published along side the Attitudes toward Charitable Organizations scale (see the ACO page on this website for a description).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Nickell, G.(1998). The Helping Attitudes Scale. Paper presented at 106th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at San Francisco, August, 1998.

The purpose of this research was to develop a multidimensional attitude scale which measures beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to helping. Four-hundred and eight undergraduate students took part in one of four studies used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Helping Attitude Scale (HAS). These preliminary studies suggest that the HAS is a reliable and valid measure of helping attitudes. The results also indicated that women had a more positive attitude toward helping.

Bekkers, R. (2007). Measuring altruistic behavior in surveys: The all-or-nothing dictator game. *Survey Research Methods*, 1, 139-144.

A field study of altruistic behaviour is presented using a modification of the dictator game in a large random sample survey in the Netherlands (n=1,964). In line with laboratory experiments, only 5.7% donated money. In line with other survey research on giving, generosity increased with age, education, income, trust, and prosocial value orientation.

Krueger, R. F., Hicks, B. M., & McGue, M. (2001). Altruism and antisocial behavior: Independent tendencies, unique personality correlates, distinct etiologies. *Psychological Science*, 12, 397-402.

The relationship between altruism and antisocial behavior has received limited attention because altruism and antisocial behavior tend to be studied and discussed in distinct literatures. Our research bridges these literatures by focusing on three fundamental questions. First, are altruism and antisocial behavior opposite ends of a single dimension, or can they coexist in the same individual? Second, do altruism and antisocial behavior have the same or distinct etiologies? Third, do they stem from the same or from distinct aspects of a person's personality? Our findings indicate that altruism and antisocial behavior are uncorrelated tendencies stemming from different sources. Whereas altruism was linked primarily to shared (i.e., familial) environments, unique (i.e., nonfamilial) environments, and personality traits reflecting positive emotionality, antisocial behavior was linked primarily to genes, unique environments, and personality traits reflecting negative emotionality and a lack of constraint.

Scale: Contact author for permission to use items.

HELPING ATTITUDES SCALE (HAS)

Reference:

Nickell, G.(1998). The Helping Attitudes Scale. Paper presented at 106th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at San Francisco, August, 1998.

Description of Measure:

A 20-item measure of respondents' beliefs, feelings, and behaviors associated with helping. Each item is answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Reizer, H. & Mikulincer, M. (2007). Assessing individual differences in working models of caregiving: The construction and validation of the Mental Representation of Caregiving scale. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 28, 227-239.

In the current series of studies, we developed a self-report measure of Mental Representation of Caregiving (MRC). Study 1 (N=841) describes the development and factor structure of the MRC scale. Studies 2-4 provided convergent, discriminant, and construct validity of the MRC scale, by examining its associations with attachment dimensions, empathy, emotional control, relational interdependent self-construal, communal orientation, and value priorities. Study 5 revealed significant associations between caregiving representations and parenting attitudes (desire to have a child, feelings toward

parenthood, and expectations of self-efficacy as a parent). Overall, the results provide highly consistent evidence for the reliability and validity of the new MRC scale. The implications of individual differences in mental representation of caregiving for prosocial behavior and helping are discussed.

Bekkers, R. (2007). Measuring altruistic behavior in surveys: The all-or-nothing dictator game. *Survey Research Methods, 1*, 139-144.

A field study of altruistic behaviour is presented using a modification of the dictator game in a large random sample survey in the Netherlands (n=1,964). In line with laboratory experiments, only 5.7% donated money. In line with other survey research on giving, generosity increased with age, education, income, trust, and prosocial value orientation.

De Cremer, D., & Van Lange, P.A.M. (2001). Why prosocials exhibit greater cooperation than proselfs: the roles of social responsibility and reciprocity. *European Journal of Personality, 15*, 5-18.

Two studies examined the choice differences between prosocials and proselfs by examining the influence of norms of social responsibility and reciprocity. In line with the integrative model of social value orientation, it was expected that prosocials differ from proselfs in their level of cooperation because they wish to maximize own and other's outcomes (i.e. paralleling the norm of social responsibility) and enhance equality in outcomes (i.e. paralleling the norm of reciprocity). Study 1 revealed that prosocials felt more responsible to further the group's interest than proselfs did and this social responsibility feeling appeared to account for choice differences. Study 2 revealed that prosocials were more likely to reciprocate their partner's actions than were proselfs. Also, feelings of social responsibility did not account for this observation, suggesting that enhancing joint outcomes and equality in outcomes constitute two relatively independent dimensions. The findings are discussed in light of the integrative model of social value orientation.

Scale (taken directly from <http://www.mnstate.edu/nickell/help20.htm>):

INSTRUCTIONS: This instrument is designed to measure your feelings, beliefs and behaviors concerning your interactions with others. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Using the scale below, indicate your level of agreement or disagreement in the space which is next to each statement.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly
Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly
Agree

- ___ 1. Helping others is usually a waste of time.
- ___ 2. When given the opportunity, I enjoy aiding others who are in need.
- ___ 3. If possible, I would return lost money to the rightful owner.
- ___ 4. Helping friends and family is one of the great joys in life.
- ___ 5. I would avoid aiding someone in a medical emergency if I could.
- ___ 6. It feels wonderful to assist others in need.
- ___ 7. Volunteering to help someone is very rewarding.
- ___ 8. I dislike giving directions to strangers who are lost.
- ___ 9. Doing volunteer work makes me feel happy.
- ___ 10. I donate time or money to charities every month.
- ___ 11. Unless they are part of my family, helping the elderly isn't my responsibility.
- ___ 12. Children should be taught about the importance of helping others.
- ___ 13. I plan to donate my organs when I die with the hope that they will help someone else live.
- ___ 14. I try to offer my help with any activities my community or school groups are carrying out.
- ___ 15. I feel at peace with myself when I have helped others.
- ___ 16. If the person in front of me in the check-out line at a store was a few cents short, I would pay the difference.
- ___ 17. I feel proud when I know that my generosity has benefited a needy person.
- ___ 18. Helping people does more harm than good because they come to rely on others and not themselves.
- ___ 19. I rarely contribute money to a worthy cause.
- ___ 20. Giving aid to the poor is the right thing to do.



Scoring:

Items 1, 5, 8, 11, 18, 19 are reverse scored. The scores for each item are summed up to form an overall score, ranging from 20 to 100. According to the author, a 60 is a neutral score.

ATTITUDES TOWARD CHARITABLE GIVING SCALE

Reference:

Furnham, A. (1995). The just world, charitable giving, and attitudes to disability. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 577-583.

Description of Measure:

A 20-item measure of an individual's attitudes toward giving to charity. The scale has 10 positively worded and 10 negatively worded items. The scale is divided into 5 factors:

- 1.) Inefficiency of Charitable Giving
- 2.) Efficiency of Charitable Giving
- 3.) Cynical Giving
- 4.) Altruistic Giving
- 5.) Purpose of Charity

Respondents answer each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Begue, L. (2002). Beliefs in a just world and faith in people: Just world, religiosity, and interpersonal trust. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 375-382.

Fifty-eight French subjects (28 women and 30 men, 16–65 years) from diverse occupational status completed Belief in a Just World Scales for Self and Others [Lipkus, I. M., & Bissonnette, V. L. (1996). Relationships among belief in a just world, willingness to accommodate, and marital well being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(10), 1043–1056.] Belief in Immanent and Ultimate Justice Scales [Maes, J. (1998). Immanent justice and ultimate justice: two ways of believing in justice. In L. Montada, & M. J. Lerner, *Responses to victimizations and belief in a just world* (pp. 9–40). New York: Plenum Press], and a measure of Interpersonal Trust adapted from Wrightsman [Wrightsman, L. (1991). Interpersonal trust and attitudes toward human nature. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman, *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 373–412). New York: Academic Press]. Religious commitment was also measured. As hypothesized, results indicated that Belief in a Just World (BJW) for Self, BJW for Others and religious commitment were positively correlated with Interpersonal trust ($r=0.51, 0.54$ and 0.34). No gender differences appeared on any scale. A regression analysis indicated that BJW for Others and religious commitment accounted for 36% of explained variance in the prediction of interpersonal trust.

Sargeant, A. & Woodliffe, L. (2007). Gift giving: An interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, 275-307.

The issue of why individuals choose to support charity has been the focus of considerable research in the disciplines of economics, psychology, social psychology, sociology, anthropology and more recently, management and marketing. This paper draws together extant work, developing a content model of giving behavior that fundraisers may use to inform their professional practice. A number of specific propositions are developed from the literature to assist in this goal. The paper provides summary tables of existing empirical studies categorized by the dimensions of the model, explores ambiguity in research findings, and concludes by highlighting opportunities for further research.

Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketings*, 8, 12-29.

Two hundred and fifty members of the general public were interviewed in central London and asked to assume that they had been given a certain sum of money, all of which they had to donate to a single good cause. The interviewees were presented with the names of three organisations in different fields (cancer care, animal welfare and human rights) and asked to make a selection. Respondents were then questioned about their personal values, inclinations and other characteristics potentially relevant to the choice. It emerged that personal values and inclinations exerted powerful influences on selections. Moreover, the possession of certain personal values and inclinations correlated significantly with specific organisational values that the respondents most admired.

Scale:

	1 = strongly disagree				
	2 = disagree				
	3 = neither agree nor disagree				
	4 = agree				
	5 = strongly agree				
1. Far too much money is wasted in the administration of charities	1	2	3	4	5
2. Each of us has B (Christian) duty to help other through charities giving	1	2	3	4	5
3. Too many charities do not distinguish between deserving and undeserving	1	2	3	4	5
4. Helping people to help themselves is the ultimate aim of most charities	1	2	3	4	5

S. Charity is an intelligent way of distributing money	1	2	3	4	5
6. Giving to charity is a personal form of thanks-giving	1	2	3	4	5
7. There should be no need for charity: the state should pay for the needy through money collected in taxes	1	2	3	4	5
8. Most people give to charity out of pure sympathy with the recipient	1	2	3	4	5
9. The trouble with charity is that it leads to dependency	1	2	3	4	5
10. Unlike taxation, through charitable giving people can target or control exactly where their money is going	1	2	3	4	5
11. There seems to be a lot of corruption in charity collection and distribution	1	2	3	4	5
12. People who give to charity, and work for, charity are genuinely altruistic	1	2	3	4	5
13. Many individuals (and large organization) who donate sums of money to charity have ulterior motives	1	2	3	4	5
14. Charitable giving is the most efficient way of getting help to needy	1	2	3	4	5
15. For many charity donation is simply a tax dodge	1	2	3	4	5
16. Charities have to exist to assist causes not covered by the state	1	2	3	4	5
17. Charities rely too much on sentimentality and not enough on realities	1	2	3	4	5
18. People give more money to causes they identify with	1	2	3	4	5
19. Many people try to solve their conscience by small gifts to charity	1	2	3	4	5
20. Too many organizations hide behind the mask (and tax advantages) of being a charity	1	2	3	4	5

Scoring:

Items 1, 3, 9, 11, and 17 make up the Inefficiency of Charitable Giving factor.

Items 5, 10, 14, and 16 make up the Efficiency of Charitable Giving factor.

Items 13, 15, and 19 make up the Cynical Giving factor.

Items 2 and 12 make up the Altruistic Giving factor.

Items 4, 7, and 8 make up the Purpose of Charity factor.

Scoring is kept separate and continuous for each factor.

BALES VOLUNTEERISM-ACTIVISM SCALE

Reference:

Bales, K. (1996). Measuring the propensity to volunteer. *Social Policy and Administration, 30*, 206-226.

Description of Measure:

A 20-item measure of the foundational motivations for serving as a volunteer/activist. The scale is divided up into 4 dimensions:

Sense of Effectiveness – feeling that one can make a difference in addressing social problems.

Sociability or Generalism – the sense that volunteering is a normal part of life.

Idealism or Philosophical Commitment – feeling that social justice is necessary.

Feel Good Factor – feeling rewarded for volunteering.

Respondents answer each item on 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Uggen, C. & Janikula, J. (1999). Volunteerism and arrest in the transition to adulthood. *Social Forces, 78*, 331-362.

Tocqueville ([1835] 1956) posited that “by dint of working for one’s fellow citizens, the bait and taste for serving them is at length acquired” (197). Informal social control theories similarly suggest that voluntary service gradually draws persons to virtue. Are volunteers less likely to breach the social contract? This article estimates the effects of volunteer experiences on the occurrence and timing of arrest using data from the Youth Development Study, a prospective longitudinal survey of 1,000 adolescents. After statistically controlling for the effects of antisocial propensities, prosocial attitudes and behavior, and commitments to conventional lines of action, we find a robust negative relationship between volunteer work and arrest. We then investigate age dependencies in the nature and effect of volunteer work.

Hall, D., Hall, I., Cameron, A., & Green, P. (2004). Student volunteering and the active community: Issues and opportunities for teaching and learning in sociology. *Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences, 1*, 33-50.

Student volunteering is currently being promoted through the Higher Education Active Community Fund, which runs to August 2004 and may be extended further. This development of higher education’s ‘third mission’ has strong links with the government’s agenda for citizenship and the active community. This initiative appears to have taken little account of debates concerning both the

ideological bases of volunteering, in particular the contested nature of citizenship and social capital, and the practicalities of students volunteering. In an increasingly instrumental climate for higher education this represents a possible strategic flaw. The merits of integrating volunteering activity into the curriculum are discussed through comparison with service-learning in the USA, and illustrations of present practice from a number of UK universities. In conclusion, a case is made for more open and widespread dialogues between higher education institutions, the voluntary sector and policy-makers in exploring service-learning and its role in the curriculum and the community.

Dolcinar, S. & Randle, M. (2007). What motivates which volunteers? Psychographic heterogeneity among volunteers in Australia. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 18, 135-155.

Six psychographic segments of volunteers in Australia are constructed on the basis of their volunteering motivations. The resulting segments include “classic volunteers,” whose motivations are threefold: doing something worthwhile; personal satisfaction; and helping others. “Dedicated volunteers” perceive each one of the motives for volunteering as relevant, while “personally involved volunteers” donate time because of someone they know in the organization, most likely their child. “Volunteers for personal satisfaction” and “altruists” primarily wish to help others, and finally, “niche volunteers” typically have fewer and more specific drivers motivating them to donate time, for example, to gain work experience. The segments are externally validated and demonstrate significantly different socio-demographic profiles. Consequently, it seems that motivation-based data-driven market segmentation represents a useful way of gaining insight into heterogeneity amongst volunteers. Such insight can be used by volunteering organizations to more effectively target segments with customized messages.

Scale

	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neither agree nor disagree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree				
1. The more you put into life the more you will get out of it.	1	2	3	4	5
2. A person just has to rely on our leaders to deal with big problems.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Sometimes things happen in your life that <i>make</i> you take action.	1	2	3	4	5
4. People with ordinary lives don't feel the need to get heavily involved in social causes.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Some issues are much more important than my personal life.	1	2	3	4	5

6. You can't really change things in your community, that's just the way things are.	1	2	3	4	5
7. There will be peace only when there is justice.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Most people who get involved in social causes usually have some sort of personal problem.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Putting money in a collecting tin isn't enough, you've also got to <i>act</i> on your beliefs.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Taking care of my family takes all the time I've got.	1	2	3	4	5
11. It's not enough to just talk about what's wrong- you've got to do something.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I'd like to do more for charity, but other things just get in the way.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Anything I do can't really change the world's problems.	1	2	3	4	5
14. A person should live simply so that others can simply live.	1	2	3	4	5
15. When a person gets involved in a cause it just upsets the people they are close to.	1	2	3	4	5
16. You can't really change the world, that's just the way things are.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I know that when I'm working to help others, I'm also helping myself.	1	2	3	4	5
18. There are some people in the world who just can't be helped.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I guess I'm just one of those people who has to <i>do</i> something when I feel strongly.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Speaking up for what you believe in will just get you into trouble.	1	2	3	4	5

Scoring:

Items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20 are reverse scored.

Items 2, 3, 6, 13, 16 make up the *Sense of Effectiveness* factor

Items 4, 8, 10, 15, 18, 20 make up the *Sociability or Generalism* factor

Items 5, 7, 9, 11, 14 make up the *Idealism or Philosophical Commitment* factor

Items 1, 12, 17, 19 make up the *Feel Good* factor.

Scores for each factor can be kept separate or combined to form a general volunteerism-activism attitude score. All scoring is kept continuous.

HELPING POWER MOTIVATION SCALE

Reference:

Frieze, I. H. & Boneva, B. S. (2001). Power motivation and motivation to help others. In *The use and abuse of power*, ed. J. A. Bargh, A. Y. Lee-Chai, pp. 75-89. Ann Arbor, MI: Sheridan Books.

Description of Measure:

A 21-item measure of one's motivation to help others. The scale has two factors: 1.) Helping Friends or Close Others, and 2.) Helping People/Society in general. Respondents answer each item on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Van Dyke, M. & Poppe, M. (2006). Striving for personal power as a basis for social power dynamics. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 537-556.

It has often been proposed that people are intrinsically motivated to gain or increase power over others. We argue that theoretical underpinnings of such a claim are lacking. Moreover, empirical support for this claim is more convincingly explained by strivings to increase one's sense of agency (personal power) by decreasing dependence on others, rather than by strivings to increase power over others (social power). In two experiments, we directly tested the explanatory value of the personal power concept. In Experiment 1, participants performed a decision-making task, together with a (simulated) other person. The power of the two persons over each other was manipulated orthogonally by varying the control they had over each other's decisions. As expected, the participants mostly increased their personal power, by decreasing their dependence on the other person's power. They did not increase their social power but even decreased it when they were very superior themselves. Comparable findings were obtained in Experiment 2, in which participants interacted with another person whose decisions conflicted with those made by the participant.

Nickell, G.(1998). The Helping Attitudes Scale. Paper presented at 106th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at San Francisco, August, 1998.

The purpose of this research was to develop a multidimensional attitude scale which measures beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to helping. Four-hundred and eight undergraduate students took part in one of four studies used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Helping Attitude Scale (HAS). These preliminary studies suggest that the HAS is a reliable and valid measure of

helping attitudes. The results also indicated that women had a more positive attitude toward helping.

Rusbult, C. E. & Van Lange, P.A.M.(2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375.

Interdependence theory presents a logical analysis of the structure of interpersonal situations, offering a conceptual framework in which interdependence situations can be analyzed in terms of six dimensions. Specific situations present specific problems and opportunities, logically implying the relevance of specific motives and permitting their expression. Via the concept of transformation, the theory explains how interaction is shaped by broader considerations such as long-term goals and concern for a partner's welfare. The theory illuminates our understanding of social-cognitive processes that are of longstanding interest to psychologists such as cognition and affect, attribution, and self-presentation. The theory also explains adaptation to repeatedly encountered interdependence patterns, as well as the embodiment of such adaptations in interpersonal dispositions, relationship-specific motives, and social norms.

Scale:

Instructions: Using the scale below, please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by writing the appropriate number in the space next to it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree	disagree	disagree a little	neither disagree or agree	agree a little	agree	strongly agree

- ___1. When people I know are trying to solve a problem, my gut instinct is to offer them helpful suggestions.
- ___2. I often give advice to friends.
- ___3. Friends often ask me for advice.
- ___4. When I see someone who needs help, I take the initiative to do something for them.
- ___5. I feel good when I can give useful advice to someone.
- ___6. I loan money to friends when they need it.
- ___7. Friends know they can count on me when they are in trouble.
- ___8. I dislike it when others bother me with their troubles.
- ___9. Doing volunteer work is very satisfying.
- ___10. It is important to give money to charities.
- ___11. Making other people feel comfortable is important to me.
- ___12. When strangers ask for directions, I try to help them out.
- ___13. I would enjoy being a therapist.
- ___14. The best thing about being a nurse would be to make a difference in people's lives.
- ___15. I would love to be a teacher who inspires students.

- ___16. I would like to make a difference in someone's life.
- ___17. I would like for my ideas to help people.
- ___18. I hope to one day make an impact on others or the world.
- ___19. I often worry that the next generation will live in a worse world than the one I live in.
- ___20. I am very concerned over the welfare of others.
- ___21. It would be very satisfying to be able to have impact on the quality of others' lives.

Scoring:

Item 8 is reverse scored.

Items 1-8 make up the Helping Friends or Close Others factor.
Items 9-21 make up the Helping People/Society in General factor.

Scores on each factor can be kept separate or can be combined to form an overall helping power motivation score.

ATTITUDES TOWARD CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS (ACO)

Reference:

Webb, D. J., Green, C. L., & Brashear, T. G. (2000). Development and validation of scales to measure attitudes influencing monetary donations to charitable organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*, 28, 299-309.

Description of Measure:

A 5-item measure of respondents' attitudes toward charitable organizations or non-profit organizations that aim to help individuals. Respondents answer each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Note: The ACO was published together with the Attitudes toward Helping Others scale (AHO). For a description of the AHO, please see the AHO page on this website.

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Venable, B. T., Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., & Gilbert, F. W. (2005). The role of brand personality in charitable giving: An assessment and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33, 295-312.

Marketing concepts such as corporate identity, image, and branding are important strategies for nonprofit organizations. In particular, brand personality has been advocated by practitioners but has not been empirically investigated in the nonprofit context. According to social exchange theory and trust, the authors argue that nonprofit stakeholders perceive nonprofit organizations at an abstract level because of the organizations' intangibility and social ideals. This study develops and refines a parsimonious measure of brand personality specifically for the nonprofit context. The authors conduct a series of six multimethod studies of nonprofit stakeholders to validate the role of brand personality in nonprofit organizations. The results yield four dimensions of brand personality for nonprofits: integrity, nurturance, sophistication, and ruggedness. Thus, current and potential donors ascribe personality traits to nonprofit organizations and differentiate between nonprofits on the basis of the organizations' personality. Finally, nonprofit brand personality may influence potential donors' likelihood to contribute.

Weber, P. S., Weber, J. E., Sleeper, B. R., & Schneider, K. L. (2004). Self-Efficacy Toward Service, Civic Participation and the Business Student: Scale Development and Validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49, 359-369.

This paper presents the development and validation of new measurement tools to explore self-efficacy toward service and toward civic participation. We developed and administered a survey to 851 students in an AACSB-accredited college of business at a comprehensive public university located in the Midwest. Traditional scale development methodologies plus confirmatory factor analysis and simultaneous factor analysis in several populations were used to analyze both a primary sample and a hold back sample. Results strongly support the validity and reliability of the survey instrument. Future use for the instrument includes verification of the effectiveness of pedagogies designed to increase self-efficacy toward service and motivation for civic participation in business students.

Krueger, R. F., Hicks, B. M., & McGue, M. (2001). Altruism and antisocial behavior: Independent tendencies, unique personality correlates, distinct etiologies. *Psychological Science, 12*, 397-402.

The relationship between altruism and antisocial behavior has received limited attention because altruism and antisocial behavior tend to be studied and discussed in distinct literatures. Our research bridges these literatures by focusing on three fundamental questions. First, are altruism and antisocial behavior opposite ends of a single dimension, or can they coexist in the same individual? Second, do altruism and antisocial behavior have the same or distinct etiologies? Third, do they stem from the same or from distinct aspects of a person's personality? Our findings indicate that altruism and antisocial behavior are uncorrelated tendencies stemming from different sources. Whereas altruism was linked primarily to shared (i.e., familial) environments, unique (i.e., nonfamilial) environments, and personality traits reflecting positive emotionality, antisocial behavior was linked primarily to genes, unique environments, and personality traits reflecting negative emotionality and a lack of constraint.

Scale: Contact author for permission to use items.

CHARITY VALUES SCALE

Reference:

Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketings*, 8, 12-29.

Description of Measure:

A 13-item measure of what respondents believe are necessary organizational values and/or goals for an organization to have in order for the respondent to be willing to donate money to that organization. Each item has an identical root: "I would prefer to donate money to a charity that, as a top priority, believes in ..." This root is then followed by differing charity values (see scale below). Respondents answer each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Kottasz, R. (2004). Differences in the donor behavior characteristics of young affluent males and females: Empirical evidence from Britain. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 15, 181-203.

The objectives of this study were to obtain a deeper understanding of the donor behavior characteristics of young affluent individuals; and to ascertain whether young affluent women differed significantly from young affluent males in their approaches to philanthropy. Two hundred and seventeen investment bankers, accountants, and corporate lawyers, aged under 40 years, earning more than £50,000 annually and working in the City of London were questioned about their attitudes and behavior in relation to charitable giving. Significant differences emerged between the donor behavior characteristics of males and females. A conjoint analysis revealed that whereas men were more interested in donating to the arts sector in return for "social" rewards (invitations to gala events and black-tie dinners, for example), women had strong predilections to give to "people" charities and sought personal recognition from the charity to which they donated.

Sargeant, A. & Woodliffe, L. (2007). Gift giving: An interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, 275-307.

The issue of why individuals choose to support charity has been the focus of considerable research in the disciplines of economics, psychology, social psychology, sociology, anthropology and more recently, management and marketing. This paper draws together extant work, developing a content model of giving behavior that fundraisers may use to inform their professional practice. A number of specific propositions are developed from the literature to assist in this

goal. The paper provides summary tables of existing empirical studies categorized by the dimensions of the model, explores ambiguity in research findings, and concludes by highlighting opportunities for further research.

Webb, D. J., Green, C. L., & Brashear, T. G. (2000). Development and validation of scales to measure attitudes influencing monetary donations to charitable organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*, 28, 299-309.

Charitable organizations are under increasing financial pressure to attract and retain private donors. However, scales measuring consumer attitudes toward giving to charity have yielded ambiguous results in the past. Scales to measure consumer attitudes toward the act of helping others and toward charitable organizations are developed and tested for dimensionality and internal consistency using advocated procedures. The resulting measures are important to academicians, policymakers, and practitioners in the development of theory, public policy, and marketing strategy.

Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	neither disagree or agree	agree	strongly agree

I would prefer to donate money to a charity that, as a top priority, believes in ...

- ___ 1.) changing society as we know it
- ___ 2.) making people independent and self-sufficient
- ___ 3.) looking after every aspect of a beneficiary's life
- ___ 4.) being innovative and creative
- ___ 5.) being financially sound
- ___ 6.) making beneficiaries feel good about themselves
- ___ 7.) empowering the people the charity is seeking to help
- ___ 8.) making the public think hard about issues
- ___ 9.) being entrepreneurial
- ___ 10.) being adventurous

___ 11.) being sound and traditional

___ 12.) being highly competitive

___ 13.) being exciting

Scoring:

Each item on the scale is considered a separate factor.

PHILANTHROPY SCALE

Reference:

Schuyt, T., Smit, J., Bekkers, R. (2004). Constructing a philanthropy scale: Social responsibility and philanthropy. Paper presented at the 33d ARNOVA-conference, Los Angeles, November 2004.

Description of Measure:

A 7-item measure of attitudes about philanthropy, specifically examining respondents' beliefs about their own responsibility to the public good. The 7 items blend together attitudes about intergenerational solidarity (items 1 and 2), the decline of solidarity in society (item 3), and personal responsibility for the others' well-being (items 4-7). All together, the authors contend that these components form the foundations of social responsibility. (Note: the authors do not separate the scale into these three factors. Rather they measure the 7 items together as a single factor). Respondents answer each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree completely) to 5 (agree completely).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Bekkers, R. (2005). Charity begins at home: How socialization experiences influence giving and volunteering. Paper presented at the 34th ARNOVA-conference, Washington, D.C. , Novemeber, 2005.

This paper shows that charity begins at home. Using retrospective reports on youth experiences from the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey (n=1,964, 2001) I find that (1) parents who volunteer when their children are young promote giving and volunteering of their children once they have become adults; (2) the intensity of youth participation in nonprofit organizations is positively related to current giving and volunteering; (3) that parental volunteering and youth participation promote current volunteering because volunteering enhances human and social capital and makes people accessible for mobilization networks; (4) that parental volunteering and youth participation promote charitable giving mainly because they promote prosocial values and build social capital.

Bekkers, R. (2007). Measuring altruistic behavior in surveys: The all-or-nothing dictator game. *Survey Research Methods*, 1, 139-144.

A field study of altruistic behaviour is presented using a modification of the dictator game in a large random sample survey in the Netherlands (n=1,964). In line with laboratory experiments, only 5.7% donated money. In line with other survey research on giving, generosity increased with age, education, income, trust, and prosocial value orientation.

Polonsky, M. J., Shelley, L., & Voola, R. (2002). An examination of helping behavior – Some evidence from Australia. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing, 10*, 67-82.

This paper examines whether variables included in existing models of helping behavior (also referred to as giving behavior), as developed in the US and Europe, apply in Australia. The results of two focus groups suggest that variables included in these models generally do apply to the Australian context, however, some differences also exist. First, donors perceive that governmental support of charities in Australia is high and thus causes are perceived to be less likely to need individual support. Second, respondents placed more emphasis on intrinsic variables as compared to extrinsic variables. Third, the emphasis placed on the importance of factors influencing helping behavior in Australia seems to differ to what is suggested in the existing literature. A discussion highlighting differences and similarities between the qualitative findings and previous works are presented. The significance of these results is discussed in relation to model building and managerial implications in an Australian context are also identified.

Scale:

	1 = Disagree Completely 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Agree Completely
1. We have to leave this world a better place for the next generation.	1 2 3 4 5
2. Each generation has to solve its own problems.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Society is in danger because people are less concerned about each other nowadays.	1 2 3 4 5
4. The world needs responsible citizens.	1 2 3 4 5
5. The world community relies on international politics and corporations, and that is a good thing.	1 2 3 4 5
6. I give money to charitable causes, no matter what the government does.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Charity and public benefit should be supported by the government, and not by citizens and business corporations.	1 2 3 4 5

Scoring:

Items 2, 5, and 7 are reverse scored.
The scale is kept as one factor. Scores for each item are summed up and kept continuous.

