2000

Understanding volunteerism: an exploratory study of the theory of The commons

Richard L. Fey
Portland State University

Recommended Citation
Fey, Richard L., "Understanding volunteerism: an exploratory study of the theory of The commons" (2000). *Dissertations and Theses.* Paper 6386.
https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.3532

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Richard L. Fey for the Master of Science in Sociology were presented June 16, 2000, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

[redacted]
Grant M. Farr, Chair

[redacted]
Robert Liebman

[redacted]
Peter Collier

[redacted]
Robert Eder
Representative of the Office of Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL:

[redacted]
Grant M. Farr, Chair
Department of Sociology

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Richard L. Fey for the Master of Science in Sociology presented June 16, 2000.

Title: Understanding Volunteerism: An Exploratory Study of the Theory of the Commons

Volunteerism in the United States has a history dating back to this countries origin. This form of giving originated out of the Great Awakening in the early 17th century. Previous studies on the nature of volunteering have had many different disciplines of research attempting to explain why organizations and individuals spend time in civic service.

In 1992, Roger A. Lohmann wrote The Commons as an attempt to create a bridge between the varying theoretical perspectives on volunteerism. Lohmann suggested that the reason for so many different theoretical approaches is largely due to divisions along disciplinary lines, rather than a practical division. Emphasizing the overlap of conceptual meanings between all of the perspectives, the theory of the commons is framed around nine basic assumptions. The purpose of this quantitative research was to explore five of the assumptions within the theory of the commons; social action, affluence, authenticity, continuity, and rationality, from a sociological

perspective to test its explanatory power as an interdisciplinary approach to individual volunteerism.

Secondary data for this research was taken from a 1999 Portland State University study that examined the involvement of corporate employees in volunteering. Social action and affluence were examined as influencing factors on the amount of volunteering. Authenticity, continuity and rationality were explored as instrumental in the decision to volunteer.

The results of this research were suggestive of support for the assumption of continuity, and the findings were cautiously supportive of the assumption of social action. Support was not found for the assumptions of affluence, authenticity and rationality.

Future research is needed to explore the theory of the commons to a more generalized population to further test its explanatory power as an approach to understanding volunteerism. Additionally, this research suggests the need for future studies within individual disciplines to examine the theory of the commons as an interdisciplinary perspective.

UNDERSTANDING VOLUNTEERISM:

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE

THEORY OF THE COMMONS

by

RICHARD L. FEY

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University
2000

This thesis is dedicated to Sheree' S. Fey whose dedication

to this work has made it possible, therein it is as much her success as mine.

and to

Sundara Shalet Fey, Dakota Lee Alan Fey, & Jazmine Rose Fey

who have for so many nights waited for daddy to get home.

Acknowledgements

I am so thankful to my thesis committee for their patience and understanding. To Grant Farr, whose leadership and guidance throughout my Portland State University education has inspired me to continue towards my goals. To Robert Liebman, for his continued support as an undergraduate scholar on to my masters thesis. His belief in me and lending ear saw me through many rough times, allowing me to complete this work. To Peter Collier, to whom I should have listened to a couple of years ago when he stated the need to keep it simple and get moving. You were right. I am also grateful for the support of my cohort, in particular Jared Hindman, Chris Tamborini, and Pat O'Reilly. And I would like to make special notation to my friend and colleague, Sheila Light. She became not only one of my most active support people, but a true friend.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Volunteerism in the United States has a long history dating back to the countries earliest days. Since early in the 17th century, philanthropy has been an American practice. This form of giving originated out of the Great Awakening, a period of religious revivalism and populist humanitarianism from approximately 1725 to 1745 (Lohmann, 1992). In this early time however, it was prominent individuals that gave the money for social causes, not the corporation itself.

Alexis de Tocqueville's ([1862] 1945) observations of American associations in the nineteenth century distinguished the doctrine of associations as "mediating institutions" between the individual and the state (Lohmann, 1992). In de Tocqueville's view, Americans of all ages, social class, and focus form associations ranging from the commercial and industrial, to the moral and intellectual philanthropic and volunteer groups ([1862] 1945).

However, volunteer associations and philanthropic efforts during the nineteenth century were limited and local (Bremner, 1988). Welfare services were organized primarily by individuals and groups taking care of their own communities

(Katz, 1986). Since the local government during this time was largely ineffective, playing a limited role in individuals lives, it often encouraged private support for public problems (Bremner, 1988). Benevolent associations, religious groups and other volunteer combinations often worked with the local government to provide needed services such as education, charity, fire protection among others (Katz, 1986).

During the late nineteenth century extraordinary prosperity in America raised the standard of living (Karl & Katz, 1981). However, the new wealth was not evenly distributed between classes, which even further drove a wedge between those who had financial resources and those without them (Bremner, 1980). Volunteer activities began to become more systematic and organized in response to the growing number of poor within each community (Katz, 1986).

In the larger cities such as New York and Chicago, elite philanthropists created a larger base of support with zoos and public libraries, however, these institutions often further separated the classes by making membership unattainable for the masses (DiMaggio, 1982). There were some philanthropists who realized the dangers of separate cultures such as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller who became advocates for the responsibility of individuals to civil society (Levine, 1988).

By the First World War, volunteerism reached an unprecedented level of importance (Hawley, 1981). President Wilson organized the war management through the "dollar a year men", who were volunteers out of corporate America

(Kennedy, 1980). Private individuals also volunteered expertise and leadership skills to the public effort (Hawley, 1981). Herbert Hoover introduced a volunteer, associationalist view that there should be cooperation between corporate America, volunteers and the state to assist the needy through charity (Hoff-Wilson, 1975). However, corporations failed to rise to Hoover's requests, laying off hundreds of thousands of workers during the Depression stretching the limits of both government and voluntary association (Hoff-Wilson, 1975).

The period of time following the Depression introduced President Roosevelt's "New Deal" (Hawley, 1966). One of the largest outcomes of the New Deal, was the creation of the Social Security Act which provided cash assistance to widows, the disabled, children without fathers, and old-age pensions (Gordon, 1994). This marked the establishment of the modern American welfare state (Hawley, 1966). By the mid-twentieth century, the federal and state governments partnered with nonprofit organizations to provide for public needs not only in human services, but in the arts, health, education and environment (Young, 2000).

During the 1980's a shift in the view of nonprofit and voluntary associations as entirely separate entities was brought about (Bremner, 1988, Salamon, 1995). President Reagan decentralized many of America's federal programs, encouraging collaborative local efforts to meet community needs (Young, 2000). The Reagan policy encouraged building partnerships between corporations, communities, and local governments based on a belief that social and economic needs could only be identified and served on the local level. These policies emphasized the government

taking a passive role in public service and placing the expectation on the private sector to move to the front of charitable funding and volunteering (Young, 2000). The 1980's also brought about an evolutionary shift away from cash donations and direct giving philanthropy to creative, non-cash corporate community action that included the formation of volunteer programs. This trend seems to be continuing through the 1990's and into the twenty-first century (Young 2000).

There is no question that volunteerism and civic service has benefits within the American society. Robert Putnam, author of Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital (1995), has found evidence that education, unemployment, the control of crime and drug abuse, as well as health have all improved due to civic activities. However, Putnam brings to light that membership in a wide variety of organizations has been declining, such as with church attendance, union memberships, parent-teacher associations, civic and fraternal organizations, boy scouts and the Red Cross (1995). He uses the example of bowling to illustrate involvement. Today there are more Americans bowling than ever before, however, bowling league membership has dropped dramatically (Putnam, 1995).

However, there is a contradiction between those studies which show an increase in individual volunteer activities (Points of Light, 1998), and those showing a decrease in civic organization membership (Putnam, 1995; Harris, 1998). The different findings of these studies illustrate the shift in focus from the organizational level to the level of the individual volunteer (Young, 2000).

The changing nature of volunteerism and philanthropic efforts throughout

the history of the United States has had many different disciplines of research attempting to explain volunteerism. Economists (Hansmann, 1987; Young, 2000), psychologists (Cialdini, Darby & Vincent, 1973), and sociologists (Coser, 1977; Burke & Reitzes, 1991; Harris, 1998) among others have each sought to assert theoretical perspectives both as explanatory and predictive to the nature of volunteering and civic responsibility. For example, sociologist Max Weber sought to explain how an individual attaches subjective meaning to social reform and responds to those meanings through social action (Coser, 1977). Social psychologists Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley and Birch explored the altruistically motivated volunteer as being directly related to the empathy they feel for others (1981). In contrast, economists such as Hansmann (1987), defined volunteerism in terms of a profit or nonprofit relationship.

Lohmann suggests that the inconsistent level of government involvement, the modifying attempts from volunteer associations and organizations to remedy services to the needy, and the evolution of theoretical perspectives from a wide range of disciplines have all served to create a sense of normlessness with the current volunteer and civic services direction (1992). This situation is similar to Emile Durkheim's sense of "anomie" (1964). When a whole society, or in this case, its component groups have no regulations, or a sense of the collective "norm" to follow, their efforts suffer and diminish (Aron, 1989).

In response to varying theoretical perspectives and changing nature of volunteerism, Roger A. Lohmann (1992) wrote The Commons.

Lohmann postulated the interrelationships of the commons as a theory which is responsive to a call from Ostrander, Langton and Van Til (1988), who summarized the need for new ways of thinking about the interaction and interdependence of the state, for-profit markets, and nonprofit organizations.

The theory of commons was developed in response to concerns with "donative associations, organizations, and groups engaged in unproductive or volunteer labor, whether or not they are incorporated, recognized by the state, tabulated in national data, or made up of paid employees" (Lohmann, 1992, p.47). Suggesting that an adequate current theory of the non-profit and voluntary action sector must be constructed from interdisciplinary elements, Lohmann stipulated that the broad categories of social organizations are connected through nine basic assumptions underlying the theory of the commons: social action, affluence, authenticity, continuity, rationality, near-universality, autonomy, intrinsic valuation, and ordinary language (Lohmann, 1992).

Founding much of his framework in response to the economic explanations for volunteerism, he asserts that, "voluntary action theory and its cognate, nonprofit theory, are still insufficient for clarity of understanding, policy, and practice" (p. 46). This assertion is echoed by British sociologist Margaret Harris who finds that the evolution of voluntary service has found both nonprofit theory and voluntary action theory inadequate to explain emerging trends (Harris, 1998).

According to Lohmann, nonprofit and voluntary action theory are misleading because volunteerism is defined by being uncoerced. Lohmann poses the

question, "is uncoerced buying and selling in the marketplace part of the voluntary sector?" (p. 42). Lohmann responds to his own question by stating that there are several elements of definition, of which uncoerced behavior is only one (Lohmann, 1992).

Advocates of nonprofit theory assume that because of a lack of a consistent performance measure, that nonprofit organizations are inherently more inefficient than comparable for-profit organizations (Harris, 1998). However, it has been noted that this is an assumption, rather than having its base in empirical findings (Lohmann, 1992). Without systematic empirical evidence regarding nonprofit organizations, this assumption is unjustified and therefore can be considered inconclusive as a way of explaining the nature of nonprofit and voluntary groups.

Voluntary action theory has a theoretical Achilles heel similar to nonprofit theory, that of unsubstantiated assumptions (Lohmann, 1992). One of the largest difficulties to substantiating its premise is the lack of typology. Few efforts have been made to establish a classification and census of voluntary associations. In fact, many researchers regard this task as pointless and unfeasible (Lohmann, 1992). In response to traditional views, Lohmann sought to redefine the criteria for categorizing action as voluntary behavior through the theory of the commons.

Lohmann posits that the reason for so many different theoretical approaches, that of economics, policy, and the social sciences, is largely due to divisions along disciplinary lines, rather than a practical division (Lohmann, 1992). Noting that amidst the oftentimes confusing points between disciplines, there exists a great deal

of overlap between the conceptual meanings attributed to all of the approaches, Lohmann sought to emphasize their overlapping characteristics and frame a new theoretical approach to voluntary action. This "fusion" of the traditional theories became the theory of the commons which, "seeks to reconstruct voluntary action.... and broaden the conception of nonprofit organizations to include both formal and informal (or communal) organizations" (Lohmann, 1992, p. 45).

Lohmann's theory of the commons has led to a small, but growing number of researchers who are interested in exploring the application of the commons to volunteer associations. Margaret Harris utilizes Lohmann's definition of voluntary associations in her study of volunteerism connected with congregational organizations (1998). Hoge's research on church giving (1994), and Memon & Selsky's study on comanagement of an urban harbor (1998), are examples of research from multiple disciplines that reference Lohmann's work.

The purpose of this research is to build upon the theory of the commons in relation to understanding the nature of volunteerism. By examining the commons from a sociological perspective, it is hoped that value can be added and enlightenment into the common's potential as an interdisciplinary approach to explaining volunteerism can be found.

Lohmann primarily focuses his research on voluntary organizations. However, he also includes individual volunteers as similar to organizational behavior in his assertions without giving explicit evidence to reinforce his predication. Thus, this research will attempt to examine his theoretical approach by

exploring the relationship between the commons and individual-level volunteering.

To explore this relationship, corporate employee volunteers were chosen as a population that would be ideal for exploring the practical application of the theory of the commons. Volunteer efforts made by employees have previously been attributed to job enhancement, direct financial rewards, paid leave, and other such motivational factors (Points of Light Foundation, 1998). Since the employee's position places them between that of extrinsic motivational factors coming from the employer, and that of intrinsic personal motivations, it is assumed for the purposes of this research that employee volunteers are subject to extrinsic "temptations" at a greater rate than those of non-employee volunteers. Given this condition, if extrinsic factors were found to be more influential as motivations, it would follow that personal gain, not socially aware motivations and socially responsible behavior, was the primary force behind their volunteering. Thus, nonprofit and profit theory would be supported rather than the theory of the commons.

To gain a clearer understanding of volunteerism within the framework of this research, five of Lohmann's nine assumptions will be examined. These five, social action, affluence, authenticity, continuity and rationality, lend themselves to being understood in terms of frequency of volunteering and motivational factors involved with the decision to volunteer. The assumptions of near-universality, autonomy, intrinsic valuation, and ordinary language were beyond the scope of this research in terms of the available data utilized in this study.

Social Implications

It is the contention of this research that by exploring the theory of the commons in relation to employee volunteers, that two possible benefits will emerge. Firstly, if evidence is found to give validity to the application of the commons as a way of explaining individual voluntary action, the assumptions contained within its perspective could be applied to future research into a broader spectrum of individual and organizational volunteerism. It may also be possible to discover support for Lohmann's contention that a unified theoretical approach to volunteerism can be bridged between economists with nonprofit theory and the perspectives contained within the social sciences.

Secondly, on a practical level, organizations might be given an insight into the volunteer's intrinsic motivations and practical reasons for volunteering, and possibly apply these findings to promote and encourage volunteer opportunities aimed specifically at their needs. In turn, increased volunteer participation will benefit community organizations by supplying them with needed workers who are motivated and have a vested interest in the programs they choose to participate with.

Chapter 2

The Theory of the Commons

Lohmann framed the theory of the commons around the Greek term *koinonia,* which encompasses the basic intended concept of commons. Lohmann utilized the definition presented by historian M. I. Finley (1974), who stated that the ancient Greeks had five prerequisites for koinonia: "(1) participation must be free and uncoerced; (2) participants must share a common purpose, whether major or minor, long term or short term; (3) participants must have something in common that they share such as jointly held resources, a collective of precious objects, or a repertory of shared actions; (4) participation involves *philia* (a sense of mutuality, often inadequately translated as friendship); and (5) social relations must be characterized by *dikiaon* (fairness)" (Lohmann, 1992, p.58).

This definition, *koinonia,* includes all of the major elements, in a simple and elegant manner, that are advocated by non-profit, voluntary, independent, and third-sector groups (Finley, 1974; Lohmann, 1992). It is through the shared concepts of *koinonia*, that Lohmann attempts to cross the disciplinary lines of theoretical

perspectives to unify the approaches into a single, shared framework in which to understand volunteerism. Through patterns of interaction, feelings of unity, and shared consciousness that are expressed by the definition of social groups, the conceptual framework of the group parallels the shared purpose and mutuality as defined by koinonia and the commons (Smith and Preston, 1977; Vander Zander, 1977). By using these definitions when examining the commons, Lohmann states, "any set of related social acts characterized by uncoerced participation, common purpose, shared resources, mutuality, and fairness can be characterized as common, and social organizations and institutions in which such norms predominate can be called commons" (1992, p. 59).

Lohmann also deviates from traditional theories by asserting that the definition of commons is separate from the traditional aspects of the market and the state. The market is free and uncoerced similar to that of the commons, however the market includes elements such as private ownership of property, quid pro quo (give and take) and maximization of profits. These elements are separate from the shared resources and social fairness that are inherent to the commons. Additionally, the state is separate from the commons by elements of authoritative allocations of values, coercive participation (such as military drafts and jury duty) and state conceptions of public goods (as in public beaches, roads, and national parks) (Lohmann, 1992). These distinctions are best illustrated by examining a table of comparison that Roger A. Lohmann presents in his 1992 book, The Commons.

Table 1. Lohmann's Comparison of Commons, Market, and State (1992).

	Commons	Market	State
Participation	Uncoerced	Uncoerced	Coercive
Purpose	Shared (common goods)	Maximization (private goods)	Authoritative (public goods)
Resources	Common	Private	Public
Reciprocity	Mutuality	Quid pro quo	Equity
Social Relations	Fairness	Caveat emptor	Law

As the table interprets the definition of commons, market and state, volunteer action by definition would fall under the domain of the commons. The theoretical assertion of the commons leads away from prior traditional thinking that private self-interests, such as those with the market, or "public goods" as with the state, holds the primary reasoning behind volunteerism. The commons asserts that "common goods" which are shared in an unauthoritative fashion have a fairness that is different from the "public goods" that are governed by law under the state. Lohmann also contends that with state mandated public services, there existed a possibility that participation could be coercive in nature, which is separate from the uncoerced nature of the commons. This is not to say that the state has no role in social reform or services, but rather that the reciprocity between participants and beneficiaries is different on the conceptual level. Programs such as Affirmative Action, Medicaid, and others all serve to aid those in need. However, where they separate from the commons according to Lohmann is their governing regulations based on state law rather than uncoerced participation. To further understand volunteerism as defined by the commons, we will now turn to examine five of the assumptions that Lohmann made that pertain to the focus of this research.

Specific Assumptions of the Commons

Social Action

Historically, there has been a common thread of meanings attached to the ideas of improving mass conditions, enhancing social welfare, solving mass social problems, influencing basic social conditions and policies, and changing the environment (Richmond, 1922; Solender, 1957; Hill, 1951; Pray, 1945; Coyle, 1937). Social action, once more commonly referred to as social reform, has always been a part of volunteer efforts as a whole (Lohmann, 1992). Volunteer efforts in the past, and currently, take responsibility for controlling and preventing some of the broad social factors that caused, complicated, and/or intensified the problems that faced those with whom they helped (Putnam, 1995; Harris, 1998).

Nonetheless, oftentimes the ability to change social structures on the larger scale has proven to be slow and ponderous. Consequently, community organizations often develop to assist particular individuals and groups on a day-to-day basis with social change "from the ground up". According to Lohmann however, it is the feelings and desires to make social changes that spur the action thereby giving call to volunteers.

Lohmann states that, "One of the most interesting and challenging characteristics of non-profit and voluntary services is their intangible character" (1992, p.47). The intangible character that Lohmann refers to is the abstract concepts of helping others (1992). It is these ideological concepts that have been attributed to community and volunteer organizations as a belief structure that

inspires the group to form with the purpose of positively impacting those it was organized to aid. However, these concepts are abstract in nature since they often are difficult to measure empirically (Lohmann, 1992). However, by examining sociological perspectives it is possible to gain some understanding of the characteristics involved with volunteering.

Max Weber theorized, "In 'action' is included all human behavior when and insofar as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it" (1968, p. 4). According to Weber, there are two kinds of meanings (Coser, 1977). The first is the existing meaning that lies with a definitive case of a particular person or group, or *Zweckrationalitat* (Coser, 1977). The second meaning is descriptive of the assertions that Lohmann attaches to social action, that of *Wertrationalitat.* This meaning is the abstract meaning attached to a hypothetical individual who's actions are oriented towards social reform (Coser, 1977). Therefore, action in this sense is social since the acting individual attaches the subjective meaning that "takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course" (Weber, 1968, p. 4).

George Herbert Mead on the other hand viewed social acts between individuals or groups that are mutually oriented towards each other as the basis for the development of society (Coser, 1977). In this view, social action comes from the "me" part of the self that reacts with a sense of awareness to the expectations of the community thereby taking on a role (Coser, 1977), which in this case is that of a volunteer. In this context, shared meanings occur when the individual takes into account the "generalized other", giving that individual a sense of common symbols

and meanings (Meltzer, 1967). According to Mead, a social act stems from an "organism experiencing a disturbance of equilibrium" (Meltzer, 1967. p.18). In the case of humans, this results in an impulse that is erratic and unfocused until governed by the directions of the "other" (Meltzer, 1967). In the case of volunteerism, by sharing the common subjective meanings with previous acts of social service, the individual who becomes aware of the need for help in other individuals experiences an impulse that guides them into taking action.

For Lohmann, shared meanings attached to action takes form in the way of community development, aid to the poor, teaching, counseling, and individual care, and volunteering among others (1992). He asserts that it is the social action that gives value to volunteer labor (1992). Therefore in his view, value attachment moves volunteerism from prior nonprofit theoretical assertions of "unproductive labor" to that of "productive labor" (Lohmann, 1992).

It is also Lohmann's assumption of social action that the individual, while maintaining a social-psychological interactionist model in relation to the individual as Mead defines it, is similar to Weber's assessment of the larger social group in function and meaning. The creation of the bridge between the individual volunteer and the organization is one of the purposes that Lohmann attempts to make in the theory of the commons (Lohmann, 1992).

Affluence

Lohmann surmises, "Bona fide participation in the commons is available

only to the affluent: those people whose individual and group survival and reproduction are sufficiently assured so that their own self-interest is not their paramount concern" (1992, p. 48-9). While the assumption of "only" may be too broad a statement, the basic premise of this assertion, that social action is implemented when primary concerns are alleviated, is similar to Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

According to Maslow's hierarchy, there are five layers beginning with the most basic needs, that of physiological ones. This level includes the needs for air, water, sleep, in short all of the physical needs existence needs (Maslow, 1970). In Maslow's view, the second layer is that of safety and security needs, followed by the third level of the needs for love and belonging (Maslow, 1970). The esteem needs are the fourth layer in this tier, with the final layer being that of self-actualization (Maslow, 1970). If Maslow's hierarchy is compared with Lohmann's speculation, then when the needs of the first two levels have been met by a situation of affluence, then an individual is able to realize the third layer of love and belonging. With this view, if the third layer is attainable, then one possible outcome is for the individual to spend part of their time in civic service to fulfill their need for belonging.

According to Lohmann, those without affluence are often busy concerning themselves with survival, and are unable to reach beyond their condition to help others (1992). Lohmann further elaborates that when given the relief from survival that comes with affluence, individuals discover rational and moral grounds for

service to their community (1992). These grounds give cause to act outside of "the institutional contexts of markets, households and the state" (Lohmann, 1992, p. 48).

This embellishment is similar to the higher two layers of Maslow's hierarchy, that of esteem and self-actualization. In the basic terms of Maslow's esteem and self-actualization, it is possible to see where Lohmann arrives at his assumption. The needs of esteem; the need for self-respect, feelings of confidence, achievement, respect from others and appreciation can be met when the lower level need are fulfilled (Maslow, 1970). These factors may influence an individual's volunteer habits.

The highest level, self-actualization, may also actuate an individual's social action. Maslow describes people who have achieved this layer are often oriented to solving problems (1970). These individuals have a sense of what he termed *Gemeinschaftsgefuhl,* defined as a social compassion, interest and humanity (Maslow, 1970).

The condition of affluence, according to this assumption of the commons, is also given as a substitute for the customary economic assumption of scarcity (Neal, 1984). This condition leads to the theoretical view that when one has achieved the means to "make ends meet"; those individuals with inclinations towards volunteering will exhibit a greater degree of social action than those individuals of lessor means.

Authenticity

Authenticity implies that those groups and individuals operating in the nonprofit and volunteer arena's are what they appear to be (Etzioni, 1968). Volunteers who are involved with social action that seek to pursue their own self-interests, or whose individual or organizational goals are for increasing their own profit-oriented concerns, can not be included within the framework of the commons (Lohmann, 1992).

The premise of this assumption is that in order for the group or individual to remain within the commons, there must be a consistency between what is represented by the group and what the actual motivations are. Lohmann uses the example of utilizing oaths to help professionals place their own self-interests behind those of the client (1992). If the professional were to allow self-interests to come before the client, for instance in the case of a physician, the ability to help the client would become clouded.

Peter Burke and Donald Reitzes (1991) had similar views to the importance of commitment to a role that an individual identifies with, such as that of being a volunteer. In their view, maintaining an identity or role is congruent with what Lohmann intended with the assumption of authenticity. Burke and Reitzes maintain that, "Commitment occurs as individuals strive to preserve a congruity between their identity and the identity implications of interactions with others." (1991, p.243). Burke and Reitzes also further the assumption with their proposal of a type of commitment, they refer to as "socioemotional bases of commitment" (1991,

p.244). This type of commitment involves a sense of belonging to a role group and the continued interaction between the members increases the individual's resolution to maintain identity-confirming behavior (Burke & Reitzes, 1991, p.244).

One of the problems of this assumption that Lohmann notes, is the ability to enforce authenticity (1992). Additionally, it is difficult to verify an individual's or group's inherent motivation. The "State charity fraud statutes throughout the United States..." that "...seek to enforce such norms of authenticity" serve as an example of the attempt to regulate authenticity (Lohmann, 1992, p. 49). However, it is difficult to enforce such regulations, particularly upon small, local community organizations or individual efforts. However difficult or problematic the enforcement of authenticity may be, it is an assumption that, in its importance to the nature of voluntarism within the commons, must be investigated.

Continuity

The assumption of continuity lends itself to consistent lifestyle choices. In the case of voluntary action, this is characterized by past, present and future behavior (Lohmann, 1992). Under this assumption, voluntary efforts build upon previous experience, furthering knowledge towards the attainment of its objectives and creating incentives for continued action.

Lohmann points out that, "Continuity in nonprofit and voluntary action is often experienced in the form of tradition. I, (and others), will continue to exist in a known and knowable world through the repetition of time-honored ceremonies and

habitual and familiar ritual acts. We will act in the appropriate manner because it is reasonable, predictable, or productive of desirable consequences to do so" (1992, p. 51).

Support for this assumption is found in Weber's description of the uniformity of social action (Coser, 1977). Uniformity in this sense is defined by the frequently repeated action of an individual or group that is consistant with the subjective meanings attributable to that individual or group (Coser, 1977). In terms of volunteering, the individual would be likely to continue volunteering if the act of giving is consistent with their intrinsic values that they place upon their actions.

It is in this sense of continuity, social action, once realized that the outcome is beneficial, fuels the desire to continue in the same vein. This concept is loosely similar to Durkheim who believed that the more one has, the more one wants (Aron, 1989). In this sense, once a beneficial outcome is realized, instead of satiating the individual causing them to cease volunteering, the outcome stimulates the need for more of the same (Aron, 1989).

Moreover, Mead defined acts as entangled in previous acts that are built upon in succession (Meltzer, 1967). Indeed, social change according to Mead "becomes a continuous indigenous process in human group life instead of an episodic result of extraneous factors playing on established structure (Blumer, 1966, p.242).

Thus, under this assumption, evidence of continuity must be present for the nonprofit group or volunteer to retain membership in the commons.

Rationality

There are two levels of rationality under the commons. The first is the practical aspect that concerns the individual solving problems that arise during day to day matters (Lohmann, 1992). The philosophical notion of having, and following a life plan is the definition of the term *rational* (Rawls, 1971). Practical rationality therefore, when used in conjunction with voluntary action, defines the real patterns of efforts that the group or individual makes consistent with their philosophical beliefs.

The other level within this assumption is that of a prosocial rationality. This type of rationality is "devoted to solving problems primarily affecting others; engaging in various forms of representation, and obtaining the resources necessary to carry out these pursuits" (Lohmann, 1992, p. 52).

Within Lohmann's framework of the commons, prosocial behavior is defined as being different from altruism (1992). Lohmann speculates that the individual or organization that acts with cooperative behavior is demonstrating prosocial attitudes and behavior (1992). From these standpoints, it would seem as though Lohmann is utilizing the strict definition of the terms, prosocial behavior and altruism. In it's explicit definition, prosocial behavior is defined as any behavior that benefits others or has positive social consequences, and altruism means helping or doing something that often comes at a risk or cost, without the expectations of any material or social rewards.

By separating the concepts of prosocial and altruism, a concern for his logic is raised as it would seem that Lohmann has separated the assumption of rationality as he has defined it from that of the commons. Under the commons, helping behavior must be free from personal gain (Lohmann, 1992). This would appear to be more symbolic of altruism, for with prosocial behavior, individuals might volunteer for reasons that may include some reward (Cialdini, Darby & Vincent, 1973).

According to Cialdini, Darby & Vincent, oftentimes individuals will help others to relieve their own negative state of pain, guilt, etc. (1973). This would imply a personal, relief gain that would be consistant with Lohmann's assumption stated here, but outside that of the commons as a whole. In this sense, the helping behavior called egoistic in nature because it satisfies an individuals needs even when those needs are unknown (Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch, 1981). An example of this might be when coming across a person lying in pain by the side of the road, an individual stops to assist, not only to help the person, but to avoid feeling guilty for walking past. In the instance of a volunteer, an egoistic motivation could be to satisfy a need to belong to a group, over the motivation of helping those the service is intended for.

In contrast, altruistically motivated volunteering is possibly more closely related to what Lohmann intended through the commons. According to Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, and Birch (1981), altruistic motivations are the desire to help without regard for one's own welfare. They find that even when an

individual does gain a reward of some kind, in altruism the reward was not the intended motivation for helping, but rather a byproduct (Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch, 1981). Their interesting research into the empathy-altruism connection contradicted the egoistic model by proving their hypothesis which suggested that empathy could be directly related to altruistic motivations for helping (Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch, 1981).

However, the egoism-altruism debate of prosocial behavior is not the focus of this research. It is necessary to bring this argument to the front to hopefully illuminate what Lohmann may have intended with the assumption of rationality as it pertains to the commons. For the purposes of this research, the assumption of prosocial behavior as Lohmann defined it will be used with the *caveat* that he may have ultimately intended a more altruistic model that would be more consistant with his framework of the commons.

Hypothesis

Exploring five assumptions through survey results; social action, affluence, authenticity, continuity and rationality, is the primary focus of this thesis. By examining each assumption, this research will test the explanatory power of the theory of the commons as a viable framework to define and understand volunteerism. Five hypotheses regarding volunteerism will be explored in relation to the theory of the commons.

1. Corporate employee volunteers who report as having subjective meanings attached to social change will exhibit a greater amount of time spent in social action than those who identify with having low, or no subjective meanings attached to social change.

2. Corporate employees who report higher levels of affluence will exhibit a greater amount of time spent in social action than with those of lessor affluence.

3. Corporate employees who volunteer will exhibit authenticity by reporting that they volunteer due to intrinsic motivational factors.

4. Corporate employees who volunteer will exhibit a continuous pattern of volunteerism over a span of time.

5. Corporate employees who volunteer will exhibit prosocial attitudes towards social change.

Chapter 3

Research Methods

Secondary data for this research was taken from a 1999 Portland State University survey that examined the involvement of corporate America in volunteering. The first section of this chapter will cover the history and survey design of the original study. The second section will present the sample characteristics. The third section will operationalize the variables that will be used in this research.

Survey History

The original study was designed and completed in the fall of 1999 and focused on current trends of corporate volunteerism, motivations for employees to volunteer, and employee perceptions of the existing programs and policies. The study was a one-time measure that used a single group of respondents. A focus group was utilized to qualitatively explore questions that would serve in the creation of the quantitative survey instrument that would be used to gather data. The desire

was to sample employees from a variety of companies in order to get a broader range of response and to get a full understanding of volunteerism in corporate America.

The study addressed five questions: (1) what motivates employees to join volunteering programs or volunteer? (2) what areas employees felt needed the most attention from corporate sponsored programs? (3) the frequency of, and years involvement in volunteering as an employee, (4) what are types of strategies that employers can follow to encourage their employees to volunteer and areas needing more attention?, and (5) prosocial attitudes versus corporate reasons for volunteering. It was thought that these elements could be essential tools that could help corporations to broaden their understanding of employee volunteerism and increase employee involvement.

Focus Group

Twelve volunteer coordinators from a variety of programs, all of whom were experts in their fields, were invited to the focus group. The coordinators that were selected for the focus group had each been involved in volunteering for a number of years.

A wide range of generalized topics of interest pertaining to the nature of volunteerism, essential for designing the survey questions, was covered in the focus group session. The session included asking the coordinators questions pertaining to the reasons they volunteer and their observations as coordinators of volunteers. The interview guide included questions concerning motivations that encourage

individuals to volunteer, characteristics of people who are more likely to volunteer, which volunteer programs typically attract the most individuals, as well as what programs people would like to see implemented.

The focus group data was then used to design the survey questions. The focus group was approximately one and half-hours long covering each of the aforementioned areas, until it was apparent that each topic had been saturated.

Survey Instrument Design

The final survey design resulted in 39 self-report questions. The questionnaire started with a section of questions pertaining to demographic characteristics, personal habits and motivations for volunteering. Additional questions addressed who should be most responsible for volunteering and program management, their primary areas of interest, which areas needed increased focus, and what are their company reward preferences.

Survey Distribution

Due to policy restrictions by many large corporations, which do not allow surveys generated outside of the company to be distributed, the sample was taken of corporate employees from small businesses and corporations in the local area. The final types of companies included grocery chains, financial institutions, law firms, graphic design and property management companies, among others.

The limitations of corporate policies regarding outside surveys led to one of the shortcomings in the original study. It was necessary to use convenience-

sampling techniques by approaching corporations with an open policy regarding surveys and asking if they would participate in the study. Care was given to select samples that would give a broad representation of the corporate population in the United States using a quota method. The quota was determined by corporate size.

Data Collection

A total of 700 surveys were distributed to the selected businesses and corporations. 302 surveys were completed, with a response rate of 43%. The surveys were hand distributed at companies willing to partake in the study and collected after time had been given for the respondents to fill them out, thus insuring their privacy. Some participants chose not want to answer some of the more private questions such as income and job titles.

Sample Characteristics

The respondents for the study were corporate employees who varied in positions from management to office help. Table 2 gives a summary of the following demographic variables for easy reference.

Sixty-six percent of the respondents were female (N=200), and thirty-three percent were men (N=101). Although it was originally assumed that the study would only include those of ages 18 and over, it was found that some companies hired younger employees for summer or internship work. It was concluded that since those respondents under 18 oftentimes worked in a full time position, their responses had equal weight to other employees. Therefore those respondents who

stated as being younger than 18, which was a total of three respondents (less than 1%), were included in the study. Thus the respondent's ages ranged from sixteen to seventy-four, with the average age being thirty-four years old.

It was assumed that income might have an influence over volunteer activity similar to Lohmann's assumption of affluence that is examined in this research. Consequently household income was gauged in two ways. The first was annual household total income and the second was whether the income came from single or dual income sources. In 57% (N=172) of the households had dual incomes and the remaining 39% (N=119) stated as having a single income household. The mean average total income was between $45,000 and $55,000 annually. Additionally, a total of forty-four percent of the respondents reported an annual income of $45,000 or less per year and the remaining sixty-five percent garnered $45,000+ annually.

It was determined that household size impacts time spent on volunteering, so total household size and the number of children living in the home were measured. It was reasoned that these two variables should be measured as separate demographics since some respondents might have extended family members living with them, without under age children present. The range was from one person in the household to a total of nine household members. Just under half of the respondents (45.3%) lived with 3 or more people and 54.7% of the households had less than three members. The mean average size of households in the sample was 2.66. Additionally, half of all households (50.9%) reported having no children, and 49.1% having one or more children.

Since marital status effects volunteering (Points of Light Foundation, 1998), a question regarding current marital status was included in the demographics. The sample had an average marriage rate that falls close to the national average household composition (51.7% single/divorced/widowed making $25,000+ annually), (Bureau of the Census, 1995). 47.4% of the sample were married at the time of the survey. Another 51.7% stated that they were single, and 1% asserted that they were widowed.

The employees consisted of the majority (49.8%) working a standard 40-hour workweek, with another 21.1% of the respondents reported working over forty hours weekly. Twenty-nine percent reported working less than full time, with eight percent working approximately halftime. Flextime or possibly management positions may have accounted for the less-than fulltime or halftime schedules.

Educational acquirement of the sample included: 80% had some college and above, while 15.2% were high school graduates. 37.7% of respondents were college graduates, 31.1% had some college education, and those with graduate level or greater captured 8.3% of opinions polled. It should also be noted that 3% attended vocational training, and 2% had less than a high school degree.

The survey measured whether an employee volunteered or not. Out of the respondents, 40.4% stated that they did not volunteer. The remaining 59.6% of the respondents reported volunteering. The phrasing of the question included whether this time was weekly, monthly, or annually. The responses were then divided by 52 for an annual response, and divided by 4.5 for those respondents who

stated having counted their hours on a monthly basis. The division of four was used as an average of the amount of weeks in a month over the full year. As a result, the number of hours given to volunteer efforts ranged from .09 hours a week, to 15 hours per week devoted to volunteering.

The survey also measured the number of years the employee had been involved in volunteering their time. Most (63.2%) had a previous history that included 1 or more years of voluntary service and another 9.9% had become involved with volunteering within the last year. Seventy-nine respondents, or 26.2%, reported that they have not been a member of the volunteer community at any time. When the data was examined, some of the respondents who stated that they are not volunteering also overlapped with the respondents who have a history of involvement. It was assumed that the overlap might have been due to volunteering in the past, but those respondents were not currently volunteering.

As it was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Table 2 gives the demographics for the sample.

Table 2. Sample Characteristics

Variables		Mean or Percent	Range
Age			
Valid	285	34 yr. old	16 - 74 yr. old
Missing	17		
Gender			
Male	101	33.6%	---
Female	200	66.4%	
Annual Income			
Valid	279	$45,000 - $55,000	$0 - $105,000+
Missing	23		
Income			
Single	119	39.8%	---
Dual	172	57.5%	
Household size			
Under three	156	54.9%	1 - 9
Over three	129	45.1%	
Children			
None	142	50.9%	0 - 7
One or more	137	49.1%	
Marital Status			
Single/Div.	156	51.7%	---
Married	143	47.3%	
Widowed	3	1.0%	
Hours worked			
Valid	279	39.18	4 - 100
Missing	23		
Education			
H.S. Grad/less	53	18.0%	
Some College	94	32.0%	
College Grad	114	38.8%	---
Graduate/higher	25	8.5%	
Vocational	8	2.7%	
Hours Volunteer			
Do not volunteer	122	45.5%	0 - 15
Do volunteer	146	54.5%	
Years Volunteer			
Never	79	26.7%	0 - 15+
Have	217	73.3%	

Operalization of Lohmann's Assumptions.

The five hypothesis derived from Lohmann's assumptions that will be examined in this study can be divided into two categories. The first two assumptions of social action and affluence lend themselves to be analyzed in terms of influencing the amount of hours that are spent volunteering. The other three assumptions, authenticity, continuity and rationality, are instrumental in the decision to volunteer.

The dependent variable for both hypotheses one and two is the amount of hours spent volunteering. Since all of the responses in this item were converted to weekly amounts to maintain consistency in the original study, the raw data of this variable was collapsed into smaller hourly ranges for ease of analysis. The recoded hours included; zero hours, .01 – 5 hours, and 6 or more hours.

Table 3. Recoded Volunteer Hours.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
0 hours volunteering	122	45.5
.01 - 5 hours volunteering	138	51.5
6 or more hours volunteering	8	3.0
Total	268	100.0

Hypothesis one suggests employees who report subjective meanings, as Lohmann has defined them, attached to social change will exhibit a greater level of volunteering efforts than those who have low or no subjective meanings attached to social change. For the purposes of analyzing this assumption, subjective meanings

attached to social change will be defined by feelings of importance associated with community involvement, and personal feelings towards the need to volunteer. This concept measures Lohmann's assumption of intangible characteristic meanings attached to a group or individuals that serves as a spur towards social action.

The independent variables were constructed from two questions: "How important is volunteering to you?" and "How important is it for you to be involved with your community?" These items used 5-point Likert scales that had the response choices of not important, little importance, neutral, important, and very important.

In an effort to constitute a reliable independent variable to measure the subjective meanings attached to social action, a factor analysis was utilized as an item analysis to investigate if both items were indicative of similar subjective meanings. The two items were loaded into a factor analysis using the Principal Component extraction method. Each item loaded above .76 on the same factor.

Table 4. Rotated Factor Matrix - Subjective Meanings.

Independent Variables	Factor One
Personal volunteering importance	.808
Community involvement importance	.845

Each item was also found to be correlated in relation to each other ($p = .00$), supporting their similarity. Therefore, each item will be used as a separate independent variable to measure social action. On both items, the expected finding was that of those respondents who reported volunteering and community involvement as important would reflect a greater amount of voluntary service.

Table 5. How Important is Volunteering to You.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	not important	13	4.3
	little importance	23	7.6
	neutral	76	25.2
	important	137	45.5
	very important	52	17.3
	Total	301	100.0

Table 6. How Important is it For You To be Involved In Your Community.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	not important	7	2.3
	little importance	23	7.7
	neutral	65	21.7
	important	124	41.3
	very important	81	27.0
	Total	300	100.0

Hypothesis two suggests that an individuals level of affluence has an affect on the amount of hours they will spend volunteering. According to Lohmann's assumption of affluence, greater wealth contributes to more freedom from maintaining personal survival that can be translated into the ability to commit more time to social action. Therefore, for analysis of this hypothesis, household income will be the independent variable.

From the available data set of corporate employees, total household income was one of the demographic variables collected. It was decided that this variable would be an accurate measure of affluence given that in many households, there is

often the possibility of having dual or single sources of income. For the purposes of this research, it was concluded that total household income would affect all members, relieving them of personal survival concerns and therefore, it was determined that this variable would suffice as representative of affluence as Lohmann has defined it..

Age and household size were controlled. The first control is age. There were eleven respondents who were between the ages of 16 and 18 years old. Since it is highly unlikely that they are self-supportive and possibly reside with parents, it is possible that their report of household income might be influenced by household income that they do not directly contribute to. While it is possible that the 18-year-olds are self-sufficient, there was not enough data to extrapolate which one of these respondents are solely supporting themselves. Therefore to maintain internal validity, the respondents in those age ranges were excluded from this analysis of affluence.

The second control was that of household size affecting the level of affluence. For example, if a respondent reported as having a high-income level but was also the sole member of that household, their spendable wealth on things other than household support would be greater possibly contributing more to available leisure time. On the other hand, if a respondent reported as having a high level of household income, but also had four or five household members, their household spendable wealth would be greatly reduced by cost of living factors.

Therefore, to account for these possible variations, total household income

was divided by the number of reported household members for each case. The results were then utilized to create a scale of affluence that controlled for both age and household size. A value of 1 indicates a lower level of affluence and a value of three indicates a high level of affluence. It was expected to find that those with high levels of affluence would also exhibit a greater amount of volunteering.

Table 7. Scale of Affluence.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	60	20.8
	2.00	91	31.6
	3.00	137	47.6
	Total	288	100.0

The dependent variable for hypotheses three, four and five is whether the respondent volunteers or not. Since the data measured those respondents who had already made the decision to volunteer, this variable was utilized in a *post hoc* sense to explore what some of the motivational factors were that influenced that decision.

Table 8. Respondents Who Volunteer and Those Who Do Not.

	Frequency	Percent
employees who don't volunteer	122	45.5
employees who do volunteer	146	54.5
Total	268	100.0

According to Lohmann's assumption of authenticity, it is necessary for the individual volunteer to maintain consistency with what is represented by the group and what the actual motivations are. In the case of volunteerism, the generally attributed motivation is that of helping others without being motivated by personal gain (Lohmann, 1992). The commitment to the role of being a volunteer (Burke & Reitzes, 1991) is necessary for membership in the commons. With this in mind, the independent variable for hypothesis three utilized the survey question, "How would you prefer to be recognized by your employer for volunteering in the community? The offered responses included; "monetary bonus", "gift packages", "recognition", "job advancement", "contribution dollars to the volunteer organization", and "I don't want to be recognized".

In Lohmann's definition of authenticity, responses of monetary bonuses, gift packages, recognition, and job enhancement, all are extrinsic reward factors in that the motivation of receiving one of these types of rewards would involve being motivated for personal gain. On the other hand, contribution dollars given to the volunteer organization and not wanting to be recognized are intrinsic motivators that would be consistant with the attributes of volunteering in keeping with the assumption of authenticity. It was expected that respondents who volunteer would choose recognition responses that reflected intrinsic values. Therefore, this item was used as the independent variable for hypothesis three.

Table 9. Recognition Rewards

	Frequency	Percent
Monetary bonus	77	25.8
Release time	55	18.5
Gift packages	11	3.7
Recognition	23	7.7
Job advancement	8	2.7
Contribution dollars to the volunteer organization	61	20.5
I don't want to be recognized	63	21.1
Total	298	100.0

Lohmann's assumption of continuity is characterized by consistent patterns of choices regarding lifestyles (1992). As it pertains to volunteers, this would be evident by an individual or group's history of volunteering that continues today. Under this assumption, it can be assumed that for those respondents who are currently volunteering, a large percentage of them would also have a history of being involved with voluntary service. To explore the nature of continuity, the variable of "How many years have you been involved in volunteering?" was utilized as the independent variable.

Table 10. How Many Years Involved With Volunteering.

	Frequency	Percent
never	79	26.7
less than 1 year	30	10.1
1-5 years	86	29.1
6-10 years	50	16.9
11-15 years	15	5.1
more than 15 years	36	12.2
Total	296	100.0

Turning next to the assumption of rationality, Lohmann discusses practical rationality and prosocial rationality. Practical rationality as defined by Lohmann, is simply the real patterns of action associated with their philosophical beliefs regarding "solving the problems of others" and working towards that end (Lohmann, 1992, p.52).

There were some problems of logic in Lohmann's assumption that came to light in chapter two. Additionally, arguments were briefly outlined regarding the definitions and motivations of prosocial behavior as either egoistic (Cialdini, Darby, & Vincent, 1973), or altruistic, as in the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch, 1981). However, for the purposes of examining the assumption of rationality within the commons, Lohmann's definition was used in this research.

There were two variables within the data set that were a measure of prosocial rationality within this assumption as Lohmann defined it. The first was "How important is volunteering to society". The second independent variable identified in the data set was " How important is it for corporations to be involved in volunteer activities?"

The items as given to the sample in the survey were 5-point Likert scale responses. The response choices ranged from a selection of one equaling "not important" to a selection of five equaling "very important". Both variables were analyzed using a factor analysis to determine that they measured the same factor of prosocial attitudes.

Table 11. - Rotated Factor Matrix - Prosocial Attitudes.

Independent Variables	Factor one
Importance of volunteering to society	.835
Involvement of corporations in volunteer activities	.835

A varimax rotation extraction method was used, however only one component was identified, which supports the association between the items as measures of prosocial attitudes.

Table 12. Importance of Volunteering to Society.

	Frequency	Percent
not important	14	4.7
little importance	11	3.7
neutral	19	6.3
important	129	42.9
very important	128	42.5
Total	301	100.0

Table 13. Importance of Corporate Involvement With Volunteering.

	Frequency	Percent
Not Important	4	1.3
Little importance	10	3.4
Neutral	75	25.3
Important	132	44.4
Very Important	76	25.6
Total	297	100.0

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the results of the analysis. The results are organized by individual hypotheses. Results of the analysis pertaining to each assumption explored, and discussion of the findings for that hypothesis. Analysis for each of the hypotheses was done utilizing crosstabulations and symmetric measures in order to maintain construct validity.

Hypothesis 1 - Social action

1. Corporate employee volunteers who report as having subjective meanings attached to social change will exhibit a greater amount of time spent in social action than those who identify with having low, or no subjective meanings attached to social change.

Analysis of the independent variable's influence on the dependent variable was performed using crosstabulations. Since it is difficult to determine whether meanings attached to personal involvment in volunteering and community are strong indicators of subjective meanings, each subjective meaning item was

examined separately to provide greater insight into each item's influence on the amount of hours spent involved with social action.

Table 14. Crosstabulation of Personal Involvement with Volunteering Hours.

		How important is volunteering important to you? N = 268				
		not important	little importance	neutral	important	very important
0 hours	Count	12	16	42	46	6
	%	92.3%	72.7%	66.7%	37.7%	12.5%
.01 - 1.99 hours	Count		4	20	56	1
	%		18.2%	31.7%	45.9%	29.2%
2 - 5 hours	Count	1	2	1	18	2
	%	7.7%	9.1%	1.6%	14.8%	45.8%
6 or more hours	Count				2	6
	%				1.6%	12.5%
Total	Count	13	22	63	122	4
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0

Table 15. Symmetric Measures of Personal Involvement With Volunteering.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	.451	.045	9.501	.000
Spearman Correlation	.502	.049	9.478	.000

When the subjective meaning of how important personal involvement with volunteering was analyzed in relation to the amount of involvement with social action, there was evidence that is suggestive of support for this assumption.

Out of the respondents who reported that personal involvement with volunteering was important (N = 122), 62% (n = 76) volunteered at least once in a while. Of those who reported that personal involvement with volunteering was very

important to them (N = 48), 42% (n = 42) responding as having some time spent in volunteering. Additionally, the symmetric measurement of Kendall's tau-b (.451) indicates a moderately positive relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Similarly, by analyzing the relationship of these variables through a Spearman correlation, a moderately positive relationship is found (.502) that is significant (p = .000).

Table 16. Crosstabulation of Community Involvement With Volunteering.

		How important is it for you to be involved in your community N = 267				
		not important	little importance	neutral	important	very important
0 hours	Count	5	15	32	43	2
	%	71.4%	68.2%	60.4%	38.7%	35.1%
.01 - 1.99 hours	Count	1	6	17	50	2
	%	14.3%	27.3%	32.1%	45.0%	27.0%
2 - 5 hours	Count	1	1	4	16	2
	%	14.3%	4.5%	7.5%	14.4%	29.7%
6 or more hours	Count				2	6
	%				1.8%	8.1%
Total	Count	7	22	53	111	7
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0

Table 17. Symmetric Measures of Community Involvement With Volunteering.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	.259	.052	4.861	.000
Spearman Correlation	.290	.059	4.938	.000

When the level of social action in relation to the importance placed upon community involvement was examined, those respondents reporting as having volunteered and subjective meanings attached to involvement increased slightly. Out of the respondents who felt that involvement with the community was important (N = 111), 61.2% (n = 68) had spent time in social action. Of those who reported that community involvement was very important (N = 74), 64.8% (n = 48) stated that they had participated in volunteering.

However, the strength of the relationship between these two variables decreased somewhat although the relationship was still correlated significantly (p = .000). When the summery measures of association were examined through Kendall's tau-b, the positive relationship between volunteering and the importance of community involvement decreased to .259. This would indicate that there is only a slight association between the independent and dependent variable. Additionally, the correlation between these variables maintained it's significance (p = .000), but also exhibited a smaller degree of association (.290). These findings are suggestive of a weak association between subjective meanings attached to community involvement and volunteering.

Corresponding to the definition of social action as Lohmann describes it, it can be suggested that there is moderate support for his assertions. However, when the assumption of social action is examined with a sociological overview, that support is mild at best. Mead found social acts to be the "me" reacting with a sense of awareness to the expectations of the community and taking on role of the volunteer (Coser, 1977).

According to Mead's assertions it would be expected to find a large percentage of the respondents who reported as having some level of importance placed on the subjective meanings of community involvement and volunteering who also exhibited evidence of voluntary action. The results from this study illuminated that there were also a relatively high percent of those reporting importance attachment, but not volunteering. A total of 50.2% of the respondents who stated that volunteering was important to them to some degree also reported as not volunteering. Additionally, 73.8% of those who stated that community involvement was either important or very important, reported that they did not volunteer. These surprise findings would indicate that, while mild to moderate support for Lohmann's assumption of social action could be attributed to this research, there is very little evidence of a sociological perspective within this assumption.

Hypothesis 2 - Affluence.

2. Corporate employees who report higher levels of affluence will exhibit a greater amount of time spent in social action than with those of lessor affluence.

Lohmann's assumption of affluence details how the greater the wealth of the individual contributes to the ability to spend more leisure time involved with civic services. By examining a controlled variable for total household income in relation to the amount of hours spent volunteering, some interesting results emerged.

Table 18. Crosstabulation of Household Income With Volunteering Hours.

		affluence scale. N = 266		
		1.00	2.00	3.00
0 hours	Count	21	32	69
	%	35.6%	40.0%	54.3%
.01 - 1.99 hours	Count	27	26	40
	%	45.8%	32.5%	31.5%
2 - 5 hours	Count	11	20	13
	%	18.6%	25.0%	10.2%
6 or more hours	Count		2	5
	%		2.5%	3.9%
Total	Count	59	80	127
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 19. Symmetric Measures of Household Income With Volunteer Hours.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	-.132	.052	-2.539	.011
Spearman Correlation	-.150	.059	-2.468	.014

When examined the results from the crosstabulation matrix with the controlled affluence independent variable in relation to hours spent in voluntary service, support could not be found for this assumption.

In fact a negative relationship was identified. Those respondents who reported low on the affluence scale (N = 59), 64.4% (n = 38) reported as having some time spent with volunteering. In contrast, those who reported high on the affluence scale (N = 127), only 45.6% (n = 58) gave evidence of voluntary service. This would indicate that the more wealth one has, the less time they will spend in civic service.

These results are consistent with those found through Kendall's tau-b and a Spearman correlation. Tau-b indicated a very weak, negative relationship between these variables (-.132), and the Spearman correlation shows a similar negative relationship (-.150). All three measures indicate that support for Lohmann's assumption of affluence, at least among corporate employees through hypothesis two, is not evident.

According to these results, relief from survival through affluence does not equate to an individual discovering rational and moral grounds for community service (Lohmann, 1992). Although it was explored that some of Lohmann's contentions were similar to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, other factors involved with the hierarchy that Maslow refers to that were not explored in this research may account for these findings (Maslow, 1977).

Hypothesis 3 - Authenticity.

3. Corporate employees who volunteer will exhibit authenticity by reporting that they volunteer due to intrinsic motivational factors.

Within Lohmann's assumption of authenticity, extrinsic motivational factors such as rewards or monetary gain are not part of the commons. Rather it is the intrinsic motivational factors that remain consistant with attributed reasons for helping behavior (Lohmann, 1992). If intrinsic factors are present as reported motivations for volunteering, than the assumption of authenticity is supported through hypothesis three.

Table. 20. Crosstabulation of Recognition With Volunteers - Transposed.

		employees who don't volunteer	employees who do volunteer	Total
Monetary bonus	Count	38	30	68
	%	55.9%	44.1%	100.0%
Release time	Count	29	23	52
	%	55.8%	44.2%	100.0%
Gift packages	Count	5	4	9
	%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
Recognition	Count	7	13	20
	%	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
Job advancement	Count	2	6	8
	%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Contribution dollars to the	Count	18	38	56
	%	32.1%	67.9%	100.0%
I don't want to be recognized	Count	22	32	54
	%	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%

Table 21. Symmetric Measures of Recognition With Volunteers.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	.144	.054	2.671	.008
Spearman Correlation	.162	.061	2.672	.008

Table 20 is transposed so that the dependent variable is in the columns and independent variable is in the rows. This is not customary, but in this case it was necessary for fitting it to the page.

When the crosstabulation matrix was examined, it was apparent that the assumption of authenticity was not supported. It is expected that those respondents who volunteered would also have chosen the intrinsic motivation items of

contribution dollars and no recognition at a greater rate than those who do not volunteer, however, this was not evident. Respondents who do volunteer did report the intrinsic motivations at a greater rate (n = 70 combined) than those respondents who do not volunteer (n = 40 combined). Despite these results, when those respondents who volunteer were examined along each offered choice of recognition, they accounted for very close or higher percentages on each item. Those who volunteered were 44.1% (n = 30) of those wishing monetary bonuses for recognition (N = 68), and were 44.2% (n = 23) of those who reported that release time would motivate them to volunteer (N = 52). Volunteering employees accounted for 44.4% (n = 4) of the respondents desiring gift packages (N = 9), 65.0% (n = 13) who were motivated by recognition awards (N = 20), and 75.0% (n = 6) who hoped for job advancement (N = 8). The distribution of the respondents who volunteer across each of the preferred recognition item was illustrative that support was not found for Lohmann's assumption of authenticity within this research.

Additionally, Kendall's tau-b measured a very weak relationship between these variables (.144), and the Spearman correlation confirmed this lack of an association (.162). Perhaps to better understand the assumption of authenticity, future research could look into a more specific analysis of identity theory than was presented in this study.

Hypothesis 4. - Continuity.

1. Corporate employees who volunteer will demonstrate a continuous pattern of volunteerism over a span of time.

Lohmann's assumption of continuity stipulates that volunteerism is a self-fueling effort built upon previous experience (1992). From his definition it is expected that those respondents with a continuing pattern of volunteering will also be currently active in social action.

Table 22. Crosstabulation of Years Involved With Volunteers.

		Approximately, how many years have you been involved with volunteering? N = 265					
		never	less than 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	more tha 15 years
don't volunteer	Count	65	14	26	11	3	
	%	54.2%	11.7%	21.7%	9.2%	2.5%	.8
do volunteer	Count	2	10	52	37	11	3
	%	1.4%	6.9%	35.9%	25.5%	7.6%	22.8
Total	Count	67	24	78	48	14	3
	%	25.3%	9.1%	29.4%	18.1%	5.3%	12.8

Table 23. Symmetric Measures of Years Involved With Volunteers.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	.564	.036	15.693	.000
Spearman Correlation	.630	.040	13.153	.000

From the results of the correlation matrix, suggestive evidence supporting hypothesis four was found. Out of all the respondents who reported that they are currently involved with volunteering (N = 145), 98.7% (n = 143) stated that they have had a history of volunteering that ranged from less than one year, to more than fifteen years. It was also noteworthy that 22.8% (n = 33) of the current volunteers

reported that they have been involved with volunteering for more than fifteen years.

Additionally, when Kendall's tau-b was utilized to test the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, a moderately positive relationship was exhibited of .564 ($p = .000$). Similarly, the Spearman correlation revealed a fairly strong association ($p = .000$) between the variables of .630.

The results from hypothesis four are strong enough to be suggestive that previous acts of volunteerism have some influence over volunteer habits as described by Lohmann. These findings are consistant with Durkheim's belief that the more one has, the more one wants (Aron, 1989). The evidence is also supportive of Mead's concept of a "continuous indigenous process" as outlined by Blumer (1966, p.242).

Hypothesis 5. - Rationality.

5. Corporate employees who volunteer will exhibit prosocial attitudes towards social change.

It is expected to find that those respondents with positive prosocial attitudes would also be those who volunteered. Conversely, it is expected that those respondents placing little importance with prosocial beliefs, would also be those respondents who report as not volunteering.

Table 24. Crosstabulation of Society Importance With Volunteers.

		How important is volunteering to society? N = 268				
		not important	little importance	neutral	important	very important
don't volunteer	Count	11	4	9	52	4
	%	9.0%	3.3%	7.4%	42.6%	37.7
do volunteer	Count	3	6	7	57	7
	%	2.1%	4.1%	4.8%	39.0%	50.0
Total	Count	14	10	16	109	11
	%	5.2%	3.7%	6.0%	40.7%	44.4

Table 25. Symmetric Measures of Society Importance With Volunteers.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	.140	.057	2.445	.014
Spearman Correlation	.148	.060	2.436	.015

Upon examining the importance of society's involvement in volunteering and the volunteer habits of the respondents, evidence supporting Lohmann's assumption of rationality was not supported. 50.0% (n = 73) of the respondents who volunteer stated that it was very important for society to be involved with volunteering (N = 119). Additionally, 39.0% (n = 57) of the respondents who reported that it was important for society to be involved (N = 109), also responded that they volunteered. However, 37.7% (n = 46) of the respondents who said that society's involvement was very important, do not volunteer. Furthermore, 42.6% (n = 52) of those who stated that it was important for society to be involved, do not volunteer.

The difference of percentages between those who do and those who do not

volunteer is not large enough to make claims of support for this assumption. These findings are consistant with those found through Kendall's tau-b analysis and the Spearman correlation. Kendall's tau-b identified a very weak relationship (.140) between the independent and dependent variables. The same result was found through the Spearman correlation (.148).

Table 26. Crosstabulation of Corporation Importance With Volunteers.

		How would you rate the importance of how involved corporations should be in volunteer activities? N = 264				
		Not important	Little importance	Neutral	Important	Very Important
don't volunteer	Count	1	4	37	47	3
	%	.8%	3.3%	30.6%	38.8%	26.4%
do volunteer	Count	2	6	28	68	3
	%	1.4%	4.2%	19.6%	47.6%	27.3%
Total	Count	3	10	65	115	7
	%	1.1%	3.8%	24.6%	43.6%	26.9%

Table 27. Symmetric Measures of Corporation Importance With Volunteers.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Kendall's tau-b	.057	.058	.986	.324
Spearman Correlation	.061	.062	.989	.324

The analysis of corporation's involvement in volunteering and the volunteer habits of the respondents, produced results that were even less supportive of Lohmann's assumption. Of the respondents who do volunteer, 27.3% (n = 39) stated that it was very important for corporations to be involved with volunteering (N = 71). Additionally, 46.6% (n = 68) of the respondents who reported that it was

important for corporations to be involved (N = 115), also responded that they volunteered. Similar to the results from society's involvement, 26.4% (n = 32) of the respondents who said that corporations involvement was very important, do not volunteer. Furthermore, 38.8% (n = 47) of those who stated that it was important for corporations to be involved, do not volunteer.

Kendall's tau-b revealed an almost completely nonexistent relationship between the independent and dependent variables (.057). The results from the Spearman correlation exhibited the same lack of an association (.061).

Therefore, these results are indicative that the assumption of rationality as defined by Lohmann and operationalized through this hypothesis is unsupported. Future research might be directed toward examining the assumption of rationality through the empathy-altruism hypothesis that Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch proposed (1981).

Summary of Findings.

1. Results from hypothesis one were cautiously suggestive that subjective meanings as defined by Lohmann can lead to social action.
2. The analysis of hypothesis two did not support the assumption of affluence.
3. Hypothesis three was not supported, indicating that according to this research, intrinsic motivations were not more influential than extrinsic motivations for the individual making the decision to volunteer.

4. Support was found for the assumption of continuity. This was an interesting result, providing insight to future research that could examine the relationships between Lohmann's, Weber's, Durkheim's, and Mead's definitions of continuity.
5. The analysis did not support the assumption of rationality as Lohmann defines it. Future research may bring new light to the assumption of rationality by examining the egoistic – altruistic debate, or the empathy – altruism hypothesis in terms of the commons.

This study revealed some interesting results that adds value to the commons, however, questions were raised about the theory of the commons potential as an interdisciplinary approach. Findings from this research illustrated how the assumptions of authenticity, affluence and rationality as Lohmann has defined them may be more fully explained through sociological perspectives such as the identity theory of commitment (Burke & Reitzes, 1991), the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, et. al., 1981), or Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1970). However, support for the assumption of continuity, and mild support for the assumption of social action indicate that an interdisciplinary approach to understanding volunteerism may be feasible.

This research also brought to light that the theory of the commons in its current inception is not explanative in relation to individual volunteers. However, with a broader exploration into the various disciplinary lines that Lohmann wishes to bridge, the explanatory power of the commons may be increased.

Chapter 5

Limitations and Conclusion

This research has explored five of the nine assumptions made in the theory of the commons. However, there were certain limitations that must be noted, with suggestions for possible future research.

The first major limitation was that of a small sample size of 302 participants. Additionally, the sample was taken from local area corporations that were limited in size due to larger corporation's policies regarding outside surveys. In order to ideally explore the applicability of the commons, a larger sample size taken from a wider variety of corporate sizes and types would have allowed more variation in the responses.

It is also possible that because of surveying only one region, there are certain habits of volunteering particular to the region, such as amount of time spent and social or corporate support, which may be characteristic only to that area. Furthermore, some regions, particularly those of denser populations, have a greater number of volunteer programs either community based or corporate supported to

create more opportunities for social action. This would lead to the question of whether similar responses would be gathered in other areas of the country.

Additionally, future research could take a broader sample of volunteers outside of the corporate arena to examine if the findings from this study were consistent when applied to a more general population. This would be one way to also explore Lohmann's assumption of near-universality not covered in this study.

The survey item measuring volunteer time spent was flawed in one degree. The response choices were how many hours on average did the employee volunteer. However, the phrasing of the question also included whether this time was weekly, monthly, or annually. This problem was solved by converting all of the responses to weekly amounts of volunteering, but it should be noted that this made it possible to use the data, but it would have been a more valid measure if the question had been designed differently from it's inception. Future research should take care when designing a question of this nature.

This problem leads to another limitation, that of one found when using secondary data. By utilizing secondary data there are certain advantages such as availability, cost and time, however, the research is limited to the variables already addressed in the survey instrument. Even through careful selection of which items are analyzed, a fuller exploration of the research topic can be made when specific questions are designed to target precise areas of interest. Furthermore, this study would have benefited from supplemental data gathered through qualitative interviews. In particular, hypothesis one, three and five which measured subjective

meanings relating to personal involvement and prosocial attitudes ideally would have benefited from the understanding and depth of analysis through qualitative methods.

The limitation of the secondary data also restricted this study to focusing on five of the nine assumptions Lohmann makes regarding the theory of the commons. To fully analyze the applicability of the commons as a theoretical understanding of the nature of volunteerism, future research is needed to explore the assumptions of near-universality, autonomy, intrinsic valuation and ordinary language.

Future research is also needed to fully explore the "interdisciplinary" approach that Lohmann offers. Lohmann does pose some interesting suggestions, but it appears from this research that the commons primary explanatory power comes from the economic perspective of nonprofit theory and the social work perspective of voluntary action theory.

In conclusion, far from being a comprehensive study of the nature of volunteerism, it is my hope that the discoveries found within this research will spark new ideas and encourage future research to explore both the individual volunteer and voluntary organizations.

Bibliography

Aron, Raymond. (1989). *Main Currents in Sociological Thought II.* Doubleday. pp.1-117.

Babchuk, N., and Schmidt, A. J. (1976). "Voluntary Associations, Social Change And Racial Discrimination: An Analysis of Means and Ends". *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 5(2): 65-74.

Banu, S., and Puhan, B. N. "Social Responsibility and Dependence Proneness in Indian and Bangladeshi Men and Women." *Personality Study and Group Behavior. 3(1): 1-5.*

Baron, David P. (1996). *Business and Its Environment.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Batson, C.D., Duncan, B.D., Ackerman, P., Buckley, T., & Birch, K. (1981). "Is Empathetic Emotion a Source of Altruistic Motivation?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* Vol. 40.

Blumer, Herbert. (March, 1966). "Sociological Implications of the Thought of GeorgeHerbert Mead." *American Journal of Sociology.* pp. 535-548.

Bonnett, A. W. "Instrumental and Expressive Voluntary Organization Among Black West Indian Immigrants in New York." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 6(1-2): 89-97.

Bremner, Robert H. (1988). *American Philanthropy* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Brief, A. P., and Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). "Prosocial Organizational Behaviors." *Academy of Management Review.* 11(4): 710-725.

Burke, Peter J. and Reitzes, Donald C. (1991). "An Identity Approach to Commitment." *Social Psychology Quarterly.* Vol. 54. No. 3. 239-251.

Caulkins, D. D. (1976) "A Note on the Prevalence of Voluntary Associations in Two Norwegian Provinces." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 5(3-4). 155-159.

Cialdini, R. B., Darby, B. K., & Vincent, J. E. (1973). "Transgression and altruism: A case for hedonism." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.* 9. 502-516.

Commons, J. R. (1961, originally published 1934). *Institutional Economics: Its Place in Political Economy.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Connor, Tracy D. editor. (1995). *The Volunteer Management Handbook.* John Wiley And Sons, Inc. New York.

Coser, Lewis A. (1977). *Masters of Sociological Thought.* New York: Harcout, Brace, Jovanovich Publishers.

Coyle, Grace L. May, (1937). "Case Work and Group Work. II. Social Workers and Social Action". *Survey Midmonthly.* LXXIII. p.138-139.

Daniels, A. K. (1985). "Good Times and Good Works: The Place of Sociability in the Work of Women Volunteers." *Social Problems.* 32(4): 363-374.

de Tocqueville, A. (1945, originally published 1862). *Democracy in America.* 2 vols. New York: Vintage.

DiMaggio, Paul. (1982). "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America." *Media, Culture, and Society.* 4:33-50.

Durkheim, Emile. (1964). *Suicide.* Glencer, IL: Free Press. [Originally published 1897].

Etzioni, A. (1968). *The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes. New York: Free Press.*

Finley, M. I. (1974). *The Ancient Economy.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gallop Organization for Independent Sector, Inc. (1988). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey.*

Gifis, S. H. (1991). *Law Dictionary.* (3d. ed.). New York: Barrons.

Gordon, Colin. (1994). *New Deals: Business, Labor and Politics in America, 1920-1935.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gordon, W. C. and Babchuk, N. (1959). "A Typology of Voluntary Associations." *American Sociological Review.* 24(1): 22-29.

Hansmann, H.B. (1981). "Reforming Nonprofit Corporation Law". *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* 129(3). 500-563.

Hansmann, H.B. (1987). "Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization". In W. W. Powell (ed.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Harris, Margaret, (1998), "A Special Case of Voluntary Associations: Towards a Theory of Congregational Organization. *British Journal of Sociology.* Volume no. 49, Issue no. 4, 602-618.

Hawley, Ellis W. (1966). *The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hawley, Ellis W. (1981). *The Great War and the Search for Modern Order: A History of the American People and Their Institutions, 1917-1933.* Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

Hiatt, Arnold. (1996). *Growing the Business of Social Responsibility.* Boston Business Journal.

Hill, John L. (1951). "Social Action". *Social Work Yearbook.* New York: American Association of Social Workers. p.455.

Hoff-Wilson, Joan. (1975). *Herbert Hoover: The Forgotten Progressive.* Boston: Little and Brown Publishing.

Hoge, D.R. (1994). "Introduction: The Problem of Church Giving". *Review of Religious Research.* No.36. p.101.

Hudson Org. (1995). *On Giving and Volunteering in America: A Summary of the Essential Data: Historical Trends.* 1995.

Karl, Barry D. and Katz, Stanley. (1981). "The American Philanthropic Foundation And the Public Sphere." *Minerva.* 19:236-270.

Katz, Michael B. (1986). *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America.* New York: Basic Books.

Kennedy, David M. (1980). *Over Here: The First World War and American Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramer, R. M. (1966). "Voluntary Agencies and the Use of Public Funds: Some Policy Issues." *Social Service Review.* 40(1): 15-26.

Kramer, R. M. (1973). "The Future of the Voluntary Service Organization." *Social Work.* 18(6): 59-69.

Kramer, R. M. (1981). *Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lenkersdorf, C. (1976) "Voluntary Associations and Social Change in a Mexican Context." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 5(3-4): 214-220.

Lohmann, Roger. (1992). *The Commons: New Perspectives on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action.* Jossey-Bass Publishers - San Francisco.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). Motivation and Personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Meltzer, Bernard M. (1967). "Mead's Social Psychology." *Symbolic Interactionism.* Allyn and Bacon. pp. 5-24.

Memon, P.A. and Selsky, J.N. (1998) "Institutional Design for the Comanagement Of an Urban Harbor in New-Zealand. *Society and Natural Resources.* Vol. 11. Issue 6. p.587-602.

Mullen, B. (1983). "Operationalizing the Effect of the Group on the Individual: A Self-Attention Perspective." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 19(4): 295-322.*

Neal, M. A. (1984). "Reaching Out and Letting Go: Societal Transformations." *Religious Education.* 79(4): 495-509.

O'Reilly, C. A., and Chatman, J. (1986). "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 71(3): 492-499.

Ostrander, S., Langton, S., and Van Til, J. (1988). *Shifting the Debate: Public/Private Sector Relations in the Modern Welfare State.* New Brunswick, N.J.

Palisi, B. J. and Jacobson, P. E. (1977) "Dominant Statuses and Involvement in Types of Instrumental and Expressive Voluntary Associations." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 6(1-2): 80-88.

Perlstadt, H. (1975). "Voluntary Associations and the Community: The Case of Volunteer Ambulance Corps." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 4(1-2): 85-89.

Points of Light Foundation. (1998). *Corporate Volunteer Programs - A Strategic Resource: The Link Grows Stronger.*

Pray, Kenneth L.M. (1945). *Social Work and Social Action.* Preceedings, National Conference of Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ptak, Elizabeth. (June,1995). "The Corporate Volunteer Connection: What's In It For Them? What's In It For You?" *Grassroots Fundraising Journal.* p. 6-9.

Putnam, Roger. (Jan., 1995). "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy.* 6:1. p.65-78.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Reich, Robert B. (1996). *The High Road Report: Making the Case for Corporate Citizenship.* Washington DC: The U.S. Department of Labor.

Richmond, Mary E. (1922). *What is Social Case Work? An Introductory Description.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation. p.223-224.

Rose, A.M. (1954). *Theory and Method in the Social Sciences.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ross, J.C. (1977). "Arnold Rose on Voluntary Associations." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research.* 6(1-2): 7-17.

Salamon, L. M. (1995). *Partners in Public Service.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Schutz, A. (1970). *On Phenomenology and Social Relations: Selected Writings.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Seattle Times. January 28, 2000. *Volunteering is Becoming a Family Event for Nonprofits Around the Nation.*

Seel, Keith. (Summer) "Corporate Volunteerism: A Different Approach, A Greater Return". *Journal of Volunteer Resource Management* 3(3): 8-11.

Smith, Adam. (1981; originally published 1776). *The Wealth of Nations.* New York: Viking Penguin.

Smith, Craig. (May-June. 1994). "The New Corporate Philanthropy". *Harvard Business Review.*

Smith, D. H. (1974). "Research and Communication Needs in Voluntary Action." In J. Cull and R. Hardy (eds.). *Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession.* Springfield, Ill.: Thomas.

Smith, R. W. and Preston, F. W. (1977). *Sociology: An Introduction.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Solender, Sanford. (1957). *Social Action.* Social Work Yearbook. New York: American Association of Social Workers. p517-518.

Stallings, Betty B. (September, 1998). *Volunteers in the Workplace.* USIA, U.S. Society and Values.

Staw, B. M. (1984). "Organizational Behavior: A Review and Reformulation of the Field's Outcome Variables." *Annual Review of Psychology.* 35, p.627-666.

Urban, Danielle. 1997. *The Co-evolution of Business and Community: Trends in Corporate Community Relations.* MIT Sloan School of Management.

Vander Zander, J. W. (1977). *Social Psychology.* New York: Random House.

Weathers, J. E., Messe, L. A., and Aronoff, J. (1984). "The Effects of Task-Group Experiences on Subsequent Prosocial Behavior." *Social Psychology Quarterly.* 47(3): 287-292.

Weber, M. (1968). "Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology." (G. Roth and C. Wittich, eds.). New York: Bedminster Press.

Wuthnow, R. 1991. *Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Young, Dennis R. (2000). "Alternative Models of Government-Nonprofit Sector Relations: Theoretical and International Perspectives." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.* vol. 29. no. 1. 149-172.

Appendix

Volunteers of Corporate America Survey

Volunteers of Corporate America Survey
Senior Capstone – Portland State University

Thank you for participating in the Volunteers of Corporate America Survey. This Survey was developed as part of a Community Partnership project for a Senior Capstone at Portland State University. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary, and you may quit at any time without affecting your relationship with your employer. Your answers are completely anonymous and will not be shared with anyone. The survey administrators and research team does not have information that can associate you with your answers. Please answer all questions openly and honestly.

By completing this survey, you are giving your consent for your answers to be used in this study.

The following are the instructions for the survey. Please follow these instructions in completing your answers. You may use a pen or pencil. However, if you do change a response, please indicate the change by crossing out your old answer.

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS SURVEY.

The beginning of the survey will ask for some background information necessary for analysis purposes. **Please answer these to the best of your ability.** The next sections of the survey's core items will include personal patterns of volunteerism, feelings about volunteerism, and questions about your corporation.
There is no penalty for guessing, so please do not leave any blank spaces.
Please return this survey by February 1st, 2000

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your gender?

( ) Female
( ) Male

3. What is your current marital status?

( ) Single/Divorced
( ) Married
( ) Widowed

4. What is your level of education?

( ) Less than or some high school
( ) Less than or some high school
( ) High school graduate
( ) College graduate
( ) Graduate level or higher
( ) Vocational school

5. How many children do you have? _____

6. Including yourself, how many people are in your household? _____

7. How many hours do you work per week? _____

8. What is your job title? _____

9. What company do you work for? _____

10. Do you have a single or dual income household?

( ) Single income
( ) Dual income
( ) Other _____

11. What is your annual household income?

( ) 0-15,000
( ) 15,001-25,000
( ) 25,001-35,000
( ) 35,001-45,000
( ) 45,001-55,000
( ) 55,001-65,000
( ) 65,001-75,000
( ) 75,001-85,000
( ) 85,001-95,000
( ) 95,001-105,000
( ) over 105,000

12. How many hours do you volunteer? (example: 1 hour (√) weekly).

_____ ( ) weekly ( ) monthly ( ) annually

13. Approximately, how many years have you been involved with volunteering?

( ) Never
( ) Less than 1 year
( ) 1-5 years
( ) 6-10 years
( ) 11-15 years
( ) More than 15 years

On the following questions, please check the box that best describes your opinion.

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Little importance	Not Important
14. How important is volunteering to you?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. How important is volunteering to society?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. How important is it for you to be involved in your community?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

17. What is the one main reason that motivates you to volunteer?

( ) Personal gratification
( ) Helping Others
( ) Family involvement
( ) Job/school requirements
( ) Pursue interests for career
( ) Other _____
( ) Don't volunteer
( ) Don't know

18. Which one of the following was the greatest influence that got you involved in volunteering?

( ) Religious/ethnic groups
( ) Family
( ) School
( ) Job
( ) Peers
( ) Other _____
( ) Don't know

19. What one type of volunteer work are you most interested in working with?

( ) Youth
( ) Elderly
( ) Medical
( ) Environmental
( ) Handicapped
( ) Physical jobs (ie. construction, cleaning-up)
( ) Community enhancement
( ) Political/organizational
( ) Religious/ethnic groups
( ) Other _____
( ) Don't know

20. How far are you willing to travel to volunteer?

( ) Less than 5 miles
( ) 5-10 miles
( ) 11-20 miles
( ) 21 or more

21. What is the one main reason why you would not volunteer?

( ) Time
( ) Family Responsibilities
( ) Money
( ) No interest
( ) Other _____
( ) Don't know

22. In general, do you consider yourself an:

( ) Introvert
( ) Extrovert

23. What is the one main area in the community that you think needs more volunteers?

( ) Youth
( ) Elderly
( ) Medical
( ) Environment
( ) Handicapped
( ) Physical jobs (ie. construction, cleaning-up)
( ) Community enhancement
( ) Political/organizational
( ) Religious/ethnic groups
( ) Other _____

24. Do you consider donating money as a form of volunteering?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Don't know

25. For you, what is the one main disadvantage of volunteering?

( ) Lack of management
( ) Understaffed
( ) Burnout
( ) Requires too much time
( ) Other _____
( ) Don't know

26. Who should be the most responsible for providing volunteer activities in the community?

( ) Corporate America (Business)
( ) General Public
( ) Religious/Faith communities
( ) Government and Schools

On the following questions, please check the box that best describes your opinion.

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Little Importance	Not Important
27. How important is it for corporations to be involved in volunteer activities?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. How important is your employers encouragement to its employees to volunteer?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. How important is your employers support for the volunteer efforts of their employees?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

30. How important is your employers communication to its employees about volunteer opportunities in the community?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Overall, how would you rate the importance of your employer in the area of corporate volunteerism?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

32. What is currently the main way that your employer encourages its employers to volunteer?

( ) Monetary bonus
( ) Release Time
( ) Gift packages
( ) Recognition
( ) Contribution dollars to the volunteer organization
( ) Employer doesn't recognize and encourage volunteering
( ) Other _____

33. Does your place of employment advertise volunteer opportunities for their employees?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I don't know

34. In what way do you think volunteering enhances your career the most?

( ) Provides job experience
( ) Provides networking opportunities
( ) Enhances resume
( ) Other _____
( ) It does not enhance my career

35. Would you volunteer if you received release time from work?

( ) Yes, I would volunteer
( ) No, I would only consider it my job responsibility
( ) Both, I would volunteer, but it would still be part of my job responsibilities
( ) No opinion

On the following questions, please check the box that best describes your opinion.

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Neutral	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
36. How likely would you be to volunteer if your employer gave you time off -without pay?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. How likely would you be to volunteer if your employer provided a monetary bonus for volunteering?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
38. How likely would you be to volunteer if your employer gave recognition or awards for volunteer activities?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

39. How would you prefer to be recognized by your employer for volunteering in the community?

( ) Monetary bonus
( ) Release Time
( ) Gift packages
( ) Recognition
( ) Job advancement
( ) Contribution dollars to the volunteer organization
( ) I don't want to be recognized

Please hand in the completed survey to the survey administrator.

Thank you very much for participating in the Volunteers of Corporate America Survey. Your answers will help determine the course of corporate volunteerism.
Please return this survey by February 1st, 2000