30

Conducive Motivations and Psychological Influences on Volunteering

David H. Smith (USA), with Boguslawa Sardinha (Portugal), Alisa Moldavanova (Ukraine), Hsiang-Kai Dennis DONG (Taiwan), Meenaz Kassam (India), Young-joo Lee (South Korea), and Aminata Sillah (Liberia)

A. Introduction

For over 60 years, research has shown that formal volunteering (FV) is influenced significantly by psychological factors and variables, which many scholars see as the results of individual genetics, socialization into one's culture and social roles, and idiosyncratic personal experiences. Such predictors are sometimes referred to as *dynamic variables*. This chapter reviews research from various nations mainly on such motivational factors as personality traits, values, general and specific attitudes, habits, intentions, and goals/values as influences on FV. Less research is available on other, potentially relevant, psychological factors, such as affects-emotions, intellectual capacities, cognitions–information–perceptions, and the self, let alone on serious pain as a factor affecting volunteering. Yet some, often much, empirical evidence and also relevant theory support the necessity of studying such psychological factors, as well as motivations in understanding FV, partially validating the recent S-Theory of Smith (2014b, 2015a, 2017b). Smith's (1994) Active-Effective Character (A-EC) Model, now re-named as the Active-Prosocial Character (A-PC) Model, is also supported. FV is one common example of prosocial behavior, which has received extensive study for several decades, especially by psychologists (cf. Dovidio et al. 2006; Schroeder and Graziano 2015; Schroeder et al. 1995; Wittek and Bekkers 2015).

There are huge numbers of studies and many research reviews that focus on how social status/role variables (demographics) are related to various measures of association membership and activity FV (Layton 1987; Musick and Wilson, 2008; Payne, Payne, and Reddy 1972; Pugliese 1986; Rochester, Paine, and

Howlett 2010; C. Smith and Freedman 1971; Smith 1975, 1994; C. Smith and Freedman 1972; Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972: Part II; Tomeh 1973; Wilson 2000, 2012; see also Handbook Chapter 28). Many other studies focus on demographic predictors of FV in volunteer service programs (VSPs) of nonprofit organizations (NPOs), government agencies, and some for-profit businesses, especially for-profit hospitals (Musick and Wilson 2008; Wilson 2000, 2012).

Study of psychological variables as influences has been less frequent, but has been increasingly substantial, especially in the past two decades (Musick and Wilson 2008; Smith 1994; Wilson 2000, 2012). All of these psychological variables/predictors are understood here in the larger context of Smith's (2014b, 2015a, 2017a, 2017b) new S-Theory, or *Synanthrometrics*, as a general theory of individual human behavior, especially pro-social behavior. As suggested in Handbook Chapter 25, many of these psychological factors have partial genetic roots (e.g., Bouchard 2004; Bouchard and Loehlin 2001; Chamorro-Premuzic, von Stumm, and Furnham 2011; Sternberg and Kaufman 2011).

B. Definitions and theory

1. Definitions

This chapter accepts the definitions presented in the Handbook Appendix. Special definitions are needed here, however, for the follow terms/concepts:

S-Theory (synanthrometrics): General, comprehensive new theory of human individual behavior, especially *pro-social* behavior, developed by Smith (2014b, 2015a, 2017a, 2017b). Emphasizes psychological variables in the prediction of behavior, such as formal volunteering, and serves as one organizing principle of this chapter. States that seven categories of Psyche/psychological variables are necessary and sufficient to describe the individual human mind for the purposes of understanding, explaining, and predicting any and all individual behavior: motivations, affects, goals, intellectual capacities, cognitions, felt pain, and the self.

Motivations (motives, dispositions): Individual tendencies or dispositions to act in certain ways, usually linked to situations with one degree or another of situational specificity or generality. Main types of motivations identified by S-Theory are personality traits, general attitudes, specific attitudes, habits, and intentions (Smith 2017a). However, goals/values, affects/emotions, and other psychological predictors also have relevance to motivations. Unfortunately, the terms *motives* and also *motivations* are often used loosely, so one cannot be sure what is meant when these terms occur in research without examining how they are measured.

Personality: Personality variables can be defined as "those dispositional characteristics than an individual manifests in his [or her] behavior in a wide variety of different types of situations" (Smith 1966:250; see also 2017a). How personality variables are measured has a major impact on their relationship to behavior. Explicit/self-report measurement of personality, usually by questionnaires or sometimes interviews, is the widespread *trait approach*, while implicit/unconscious approaches characterize the *motive* or *need approach* (e.g., McClelland 1985; McClelland, Koestner, and Weinberger 1989; Winter, John, Stewart, Klohnen, and Duncan 1998).

General attitudes: General attitudes are combinations of cognitions-perceptions-beliefs and emotions-affects regarding types of things, activities, events, situations, groups, or persons that *do not involve specific examples or names*, but that have associated motivational dispositions. Examples are general attitudes toward women, organizations, work, volunteering, associations, nonprofit agencies, and so on (Smith 1966, 2017a).

Specific attitudes: Specific attitudes are combinations of cognitions-perceptions-beliefs and emotions-affects regarding *specific, named objects*, interpreting the latter term broadly as including activities, events, situations, groups, or persons and that have associated motivational dispositions. Examples are specific attitudes *toward a named (specifically identified)* thing, activity, event, situation, company, government agency, family, voluntary association, nonprofit agency, volunteer role, and so on (Smith 1966, 2017a).

Habit dispositions/habits: There are two distinct senses of the term habits.

(a) *Psychological habits:* Learned, enduring, situation-specific, behavior-dispositions for the detailed performance of instrumental tasks with one's hands or other body parts, usually having significant and often strong psychological force (cf. Bargh and Chartrand. 1999; Duhigg, 2012; Schwartz and Begley 2002; Smith 2017a).
(b) *Life course habits (sociological habits):* Repetitive patterns of individual behavior that tend to endure for years, sometimes throughout the adult life course of an individual (Smith 2017a).

Intentions (behavioral intentions): Dispositions to act in some particular manner in the near future to achieve some goal or outcome, based on all aspects of motivations (Fishbein and Ajzen 2010; Smith 2017a).

Affects (emotions): Affects refer to one or more types of emotions and feelings as perceived by an individual, ranging from more enduring temperament factors (emotional traits) to temporary emotional feelings at a given time and even micro-emotions, felt only fleetingly, often only implicitly/unconsciously (Smith 2017a).

Goals (values): Goals are outcomes sought and preferred ways to achieve these. As a broad type of goal, values are trans-situational preferences that reflect major choices of activities and goals in a person's life, but they are often more abstract than personality traits and tend to be weaker in affecting behavior (Hitlin 2003; Hitlin and Piliavin 2004; Smith 1994:252, 2017a). Examples are patriotism, democracy, ecological balance, peace, and prosperity.

Intellectual capacities (intelligences): Various aspects of how an individual's mind can achieve optimal performance, when properly motivated, in regard to various activities that involve language, mathematical symbols/logic, music, bodily movements, spatial relationships, one's own emotions, other people, etc. (cf. Gardner 2011; Smith 2017a; Sternberg and Kaufman 2011).

Cognitions (perceptions, beliefs, schemas): Cognitions have many aspects, ranging from immediate perceptions (of circumstances internal and external to the body) to beliefs and to sets of beliefs, as coherent ideologies (Smith 2017a).

Felt pain levels: Pain refers to noxious and aversive feelings that relate to perceived damage or dysfunction in one's body, usually localized but not always (Smith 2017a).

Self: The Self is a sense of personal identity that organizes the Life Stance IVs (*LS*, or M, A, G, I, C, π), as six key aspects of the Psyche. The Self also provides substantial consistency in a specific individual's behavior over time, usually creating significant individuality in the patterning of Core Life Stance IVs, and hence significant uniqueness of each individual's mind or psychological system/Psyche (cf. Allport 1955; Barkley 2012; Hood 2013; Smith 2017a).

2. Theory

In his dissertation (Smith 1964) and the subsequent article based on it, Smith (1966) took research on psychological or dynamic influences much further than prior researchers. He developed brief interview measures (indices, each based on a few interview items) for many personality traits, several general association-relevant attitudes, and many specific association-relevant attitudes. The general theory behind this development of relevant psychological measures was a combination of the personality and social structure approach of Inkeles and Levinson (1954) and the comprehensive approach to explanation in the social-behavioral sciences of Allport (1950). From these, Smith developed a theory of *the ideal participant* in associations, based on the fit between personality broadly viewed and the role of a volunteer/participant in associations. In various later publications, Smith has labeled this theory of the *ideal participant* the *active-effective character (A-EC) model* (Smith 1975; 1994). More recently, Smith refers to this set of character aspects as the active-prosocial character (A-PC) model, stating that the A-PC refers to more than just personality traits.

Earlier statements of the Active-Effective Character Model can be found in Smith (1975, 1980 a, b, c, 1983, 1985, 1994, 2004, 2010 a, b, 2014a); and Smith and Theberge (1987). Preliminary results of factor analyses indicated that the Active-Effective Character is a valid construct, which permits a highly reliable composite index to be created (see Smith 2017b). This A-EC Index is a substantial predictor of formal volunteering (ibid.). Relevant *personality* traits were measured by multi-item indices (Smith 1966:265), including trust, willingness to meet new people, lack of personal cynicism, social confidence, lack of need for autonomy, achievement orientation, efficacy/internal control, planning, optimism, [life] satisfaction, self-confidence, moralism, psychic adjustment, and non-fatalism (as a single item).

The *general* association-relevant *attitudes* were attitudes toward "how to spend one's leisure time, toward formal organizations in general, and toward [associations] as a type of formal organization" (Smith 1966:250). Multi-item indices were constructed (Smith 1966:265) for general [association] instrumental value, formal group preference, service orientation to leisure time; but some single-item indices were also used: free time perceived, general obligation to participate in [associations], parents' participation in [associations] in general, informal relations [with other people], church attendance, and number of times voted. The latter three measures of activities were seen as proxies for attitude measures, which would be preferable. But such items mainly measure social-leisure participation, which usually predicts FV (e.g., Smith 1975, 1985, 1994, 2015a; see also Handbook Chapter 5). Measures of various other volunteering-relevant and participation-relevant general attitudes could be added in future research.

Specific association-relevant *attitudes* were "attitudes that pertain to a particular named [association] of interest" (Smith 1966:251). Multi-item indices were constructed (Smith 1966:265–266) for rewards for participation in a specific [association], social support within the specific [association], commitment to the specific [association], attractiveness of the specific [association], personal fit with the specific [association], efficacy of the specific [association], outside significant-other support for the [association]. In addition, single item indices were used for obligation to participate in the specific [association], and parents' approval of specific [association]. This set of indices was the most comprehensive ever used to measure specific association attitudes, and likely remains so. Such measures could be used in studying any kind of FV. The predictors of this set could be extended in the future by adding measures of attitudes toward specific types of volunteering and volunteer roles.

In multivariate regression analyses, Smith (1966:255) explained 71% of the variance in discriminating active members from demographically matched non-members using three types of psychological variables – personality traits, general attitudes, and specific attitudes. Social background variables added no

variance explained, given the matching procedure. In a second subsample, 56% of the variance was explained discriminating active from inactive members within associations, using no matching procedure (p. 259). Personality traits were the strongest set of variables (p. 259) and when social background variables were added, no added variance was explained. This latter finding suggests that although people may be influenced to join associations by social background variables, such variables are of little importance in explaining the intensity of their activity once people are members. At that stage, psychological influences predominate. Subsequent research has confirmed this finding.

In subsequent literature review papers and chapters, Smith (1975, 1985, 1994, 2015b, 2015c; Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972: Part 2) and other researchers (e.g., Musick and Wilson 2008; Wilson 2000, 2012) have shown that many other studies generally support these early findings on the substantial importance of psychological variables in explaining volunteering and association participation. However, multivariate analyses including all of these sets of psychological variables and also social background variables have been rare until the past two decades (e.g., except for earlier studies by Berger 1991; Crigler 1973; Grupp and Newman 1973; Hougland and Wood 1980; Reddy 1974; Rogers 1971; Rohs 1986; Smith 1973; Townsend 1973).

When any of the main types/subsets of psychological dispositions is studied, the tendency is to include only one or two types of measures, rather than the broad range studied by Smith (1966), suggested and expanded by S-Theory (Smith 2014b, 2015a, 2017a, 2017b), and listed above under Definitions. Psychologists usually prefer to have lengthy (30–100 item) measures of only one or two constructs, which practically prohibits studying many psychological variables simultaneously. When three or more domains of explanatory variables are included in multivariate analyses of volunteering, including psychological variables, the amount of variance explained is usually far greater than otherwise, sometimes in the 40%–60% range (Berger 1991; Rohs 1986; Smith 1975:260, 1994:256, 2015a; 2017b).

With measures of personality traits, general attitudes, intention, affects, goals, intelligence, cognition, felt pain, and the self as psychological predictors, *and no other types of predictor*s (i.e., without demographics, biological factors, or external context), Smith (2017b) accounted for 63.6% of the variance in FV with data from a large national sample of adult Russians (see details in Handbook Chapter 31). This is likely the most variance in FV ever explained by a variety of psychological predictors in national sample survey data.

The more recent research reviews by Musick and Wilson (2008) and by Wilson (2012) generally support the Smith (1966, 1975, 1985, 1994) model, using various personality and attitude measures (usually measures of general attitudes, not of specific attitudes). The additional research reviewed or

highlighted in this chapter continues to support the substantial importance of psychological variables, properly measured, on FV, both in associations and in service volunteer programs.

Smith's (1975, 1994, 2010a) *active-effective character (A-EC) model* (or now, active-prosocial character model/A-PC) is a further elaboration of his 1966 ideal participant psychological model sketched above. This A-EC/A-PC Model hypothesizes that various forms of FV and other productive or instrumental leisure activities are explained significantly by a variety of types of psychological influences that are inter-correlated in the general population, including the following:

(a) conducive personality traits and motivations (altruism, trust, sociability, sense of efficacy; optimism; achievement orientation; openness to new experiences, etc.);
(b) conducive values (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism, independence vs. dependency, self-help vs. being helped by others;);
(c) conducive general attitudes toward leisure, formal organizations, associations, volunteer service programs (VSPs), civic engagement, community participation, formal and informal volunteering, and productive/instrumental leisure;
(d) conducive specific attitudes toward one or more named associations, association types, VSPs, and/or toward particular volunteer/participation roles;
(e) conducive intentions to join or participate in such FV contexts/roles (e.g., Fishbein and Ajzen 2010);
(f) conducive affect/emotions (e.g., empathy, emotional stability, low impulsiveness, low social anxiety, and other social and moral emotions; Frank 1988);
(g) conducive goals/values sought that relate to FV, including goals of productive/ instrumental leisure activities, helping other people outside the home and in the local community, joining and/or participating in associations or VSPs, not spending leisure time on TV/CD-listening or napping/resting, and not mainly enjoying socializing with one's family in the home;
(h) conducive intellectual capacities (general intelligence, and especially verbal-linguistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (emotional) capacities; Gardner 2011);
(i) conducive cognitions (e.g., beliefs or ideologies about civil liberties and the role of associations in democracies; perceptions of the value and efficacy of associations, VSPs, volunteering, and civic participation; perceptions of social pressures by others to volunteer, join, and be active or more active in associations or VSPs);
(j) conducive zero, low, or non-serious pain felt or fleeting pain if serious; and

(k) conducive aspects of the self, such as identification with the FV role, having a very social self, and seeing the association or VSP as one's own—part of one's ego-extensions (e.g., Gomez, Brooks, Buhrmester, Vazquez, Jetten, and Swann 2011; Piliavin and Callero 1991).

C. Historical background

Early sociologists (e.g., Durkheim [1897] 1970) presented hypotheses about the influences leading to pro-social behavior in general, which includes both formal and informal volunteering. Max Weber also wrote about associations ([1910] 1972). However, the empirical study of psychological dispositions as influences on volunteering is quite recent historically, beginning only in the 1950s in the United States by sociologists. An important early article was by Beal (1956), who proposed "Additional Hypotheses in Participation Research." Similarly, Bronfenbrenner (1960) wrote of "Personality and Participation: The Case of the Vanishing Variables." Several others in this period similarly pointed to the importance of personality and attitudes as *dynamic* variables that took us beyond social background/demographic variables in explaining volunteering or participation in associations (e.g., Copp and Clark 1956; Gough 1952; Harp 1959; Larson and Catton 1961).

Smith (1964, 1966) studied empirically the extent to which personality and attitude variables affected participation/volunteering in various associations in Chile. For the first time, he contrasted these various psychological influences with the effects of social background variables. Large numbers of studies of psychological influences, especially personality and attitudes, on volunteering and association activity have been published in the past 20–30 years.

Part Two of the book edited by Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin (1972) contained review chapters that on how FV was influenced by social background and roles (Payne, Payne, and Reddy 1972), attitudes (Mulford and Klonglan 1972), personality and capacities (Reddy and Smith 1972), and contextual and organizational determinants (Smith and Reddy 1972b). Chapter 15 (Smith and Reddy 1972a) provided an overview of how all these factors might be fit together, with an illustrative diagram reproduced in the present Handbook. This Part Two was a forerunner of Part IV of the present Handbook, now 44 years later. Our research field of voluntaristics has come a long way (cf. Smith 2016a).

Studies of affects–emotions, intellectual capacities, cognitions–perceptions, and pain as psychological influences on FV have been rare, and seldom done simultaneously in combination. However, Smith's (2014b, 2015a, 2017a, 2017b) S-Theory insists that such variables are essential to understanding volunteering and other individual behavior, whether pro-social, antisocial, or otherwise characterized. Research by Smith (2015a, 2017b) on a national sample of Russian adults demonstrates the general validity of S-Theory

using such a very broad range of psychological explanatory variables (see below, Section D, #13).

D. Key issues

1. Complexities of explaining motivations for volunteering

For all psychological factors, an underlying issue is how enduring or stable these are in an individual's lifetime. Empirical data are weak on this point, owing to researcher inattention even in longitudinal studies, but most such factors seem to be relatively enduring over months and even years. For instance, Bekkers (2012) found that trust was rather stable over a four-year period. Similarly, Cheung, Lo, and Liu (2014) found the general attitude of social responsibility to be stable over a six-month period.

An enduring problem in studying psychological variables has been the problem of identifying accurately and reliably the differences among various concepts/constructs. The *same* construct may have *various* names as studied by different researchers and in different historical decades (e.g., locus of control, efficacy, competence). Also, *different* constructs may have the *same* name (e.g., *functional motives* as in the Volunteer Functions Inventory of Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene 1998; *implicit motives* as measured by coding of spontaneous responses to pictures such as the Thematic Apperception Test of McClelland, Koestner, and Weinberger 1989; *trait-based motives* as measured by objective tests or questionnaires, as described by Winter, John, Stewart, Klohnen, and Duncan 1998). Only by carefully examining the measurement procedures can such problems be somewhat resolved, but the situation remains perennially confusing. Smith (2017a) states that eventually brain-imaging techniques may help us resolve such issues.

Related to the foregoing point, psychologists and other socio-behavioral scientists often disagree about which category of psychological factor a given construct/variable fits into best. Consider empathy, which involves imaginatively feeling as another is feeling, especially given problems or difficulties. Some researchers see this as a personality trait. Others, including Smith, view empathy as an affect trait, given the emphasis on feelings/emotions. Because of the necessity for cognitive activity to have empathy, this factor might also be seen as a kind of cognition. Thus, disagreement can be expected about the categorizations used in this chapter.

Another, causally deeper problem lies in the meaning of the terms *motive* and *motivation* in common language as contrasted with technical terminology. In common language (everyday speech by laypersons), both terms refer to self-reported reasons that individuals give for why they behave as they do. These terms may also refer to estimated reasons why other people behave as they do. Either way, such purported reasons may or may not be accurate, *often not*.

People may lie, or give socially desirable answers or statements. At the deepest level in the brain, however, *individuals never actually know why they do anything that is not an automatic reflex action* (e.g., knee-jerk patellar reflex). People in general have no neural/brain linkages between the actual decision-making circuits in their brains and their conscious minds (cf. Gazzaniga 2008:294–300, 2011:chapter 3). People routinely fabricate stories/narratives/estimates about why they (or others) behave as they do, using the *interpreter region* of their brains (ibid.).

Even before such neuro-scientific facts were know fairly recently, astute socio-behavioral scientists/observers had invented the concept of *motive talk*. Motive talk refers to individuals talking about their own motives, often truthfully in terms of intention, but still usually erroneously, for the basic reason of essential ignorance, given above. Thus,

Smith (1994:257) wrote the following on this topic:

> For example, investigators ask respondents why they participate and content themselves with the resulting answer. This can be termed the motive talk approach (Groom, 1969; Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1986; Uzzell, 1980). Personality traits and attitudes toward the volunteer group or groups in general are not explored. Part of the problem is lack of time or space in the interview or questionnaire. But something else needs to give so that there is room for more attitude, personality, and situational variables. Rochford (1985, p. 73) shows that other variables can be much more important than *motive talk*.

Empirical evidence for the importance of many of the following types of psychological factors can be found in prior literature reviews on volunteering through the year 2000 (Mulford and Klonglan 1972; Reddy and Smith 1972; Rochester, Paine, and Howlett 2010; Smith 1964, 1966, 1975, 1994; Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972: Part 2; Tomeh 1973; Townsend 1973; Wilson 2000; Wilson and Musick 1997, 1999.) This chapter will focus mainly (but not solely) on relevant research published since the year 2000 on volunteering in associations, although the book by Musick and Wilson (2008) reviews much research on volunteering in service volunteer programs, as does the review article of Wilson (2012).

2. Personality factors

(a) Explicit personality traits approach

This approach to personality factors/variables depends on conscious self-report by respondents, usually via objective tests and questionnaires, but sometimes also by survey interviews more recently. Such traits tap into conscious self-perceptions as cognitions of an individual, which may or may not be deeply

accurate and predictive of behavior. Explicit traits measured also tend not to correlate highly with alternative, implicit measures of the same hypothetical constructs (e.g., achievement, affiliation, extraversion). This is not so much a matter of which approach is *correct*, as it is that these alternative measurement approaches tap into different levels of the self and Psyche, explicit and implicit (e.g., McClelland et al.1989; Spangler 1992; Winter et al. 1998). A basic problem with the personality trait approach is the sheer number of potential traits that can be measured and that might affect any behavior. Long ago, Allport and Odbert (1936) examined a comprehensive English dictionary (about 400,000 words) seeking all of the words that referred to aspects of personality. They found nearly 18,000 words that apply to different aspects of personality (p. vi). Among these, the authors decided that about 4,500 adjectives described relatively enduring personality traits. At the other extreme, much attention is given these days to the *Big Five* traits, also referred to the *Five Factor Model* (FFM)—Openess to new experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism/ OCEAN (Fetvadjiev and van de Vijver 2015; John and Srivastava 1999). In this chapter, we can only treat superficially the relevant personality traits that have received recent empirical attention, giving illustrative examples, rather than trying to be comprehensive.

(i) Five Factor Model/FFM. Not surprisingly, given the popularity of the FFM among psychologists, research involving these FFM traits in relation to FV and other prosociality (pro-social behavior/PSB) has been most common recently. Lodi-Smith and Roberts (2007) did four meta-analyses, one of which focused on FV as a DV, examining only seven prior studies. They found that both conscientiousness and emotional stability (positive end of neuroticism) of the FFM to be systematically associated with more FV. They also present a useful multivariate model of many S-Theory predictors in relation to *social investments,* meaning PSB involvements like FV (p. 71). Using a US national sample with a longitudinal design, Atkins, Hart, and Donnelly (2005) found that children classified as *resilient* (in terms of three, combined FFM factors—conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness) were more involved in FV 8–10 years later as adolescents, compared to other children. Okun, Pugliese, and Rook (2007) used longitudinal data from a US national sample of older adults (aged 65–90 years) to show that extraversion had a significant total effect on FV in VSPs, but not a significant direct effect. Matsuba, Hart, and Atkins (2007) used a cross-sectional US national adult sample to show similarly that more resilient people spent more time in FV. Vantilborgh, Bidee, Pepermans, Willems, Huybrechts, and Jegers (2013) used a convenience sample of Belgian volunteers to account for an R^2 of .20 using demographics, FFM, psychological contracts and interaction terms to explain hours volunteered. Conscientiousness and

agreeableness traits were statistically significant, as were types of contracts, as goals.

In a national Dutch sample of adults, Bekkers (2005) found that people higher in conscientiousness were higher in civic participation, with various confounds controlled. People higher in extraversion were higher in volunteering. Bekkers also found significant interaction effects between hourly wages and three personality dimensions. Other studies have also found interaction effects in studying personality and FV (Carlo, Allen, and Buhman. 1999: Carlo, Okun, Knight, and de Guzman 2005; Vantilborgh et al. 2013).

Several studies with varied, non-representative samples of volunteers also found that one or more FFM predictors (especially extraversion and emotional stability) had significant influences on FV (Bakker, Van der Zee, Lewig, and Dollard 2006; Carlo, Okun, Knight, and de Guzman, 2005; Paterson, Reniers, and Völim 2009). Studying a convenience sample of US university students, Carlo et al. (2005:Table 1) found that a reliable four-item index of volunteering was significantly predicted (.01 level) by FFM agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness, but not neuroticism

(ii) Active-prosocial character (A-PC) and prosocial personality (P-P). Significant earlier work by Smith on the A-PC as associated positively with FV has been described previously in this chapter in Section B, #2. Other prior research on the A-PC is also described in Handbook Chapter 5, in relation to explaining the Leisure General Activity Pattern (LGAP). Here we will note briefly recent work on the *prosocial personality* (P-P) construct. Because of the focus only on personality traits, this construct is narrower than Smith's A-PC construct, which also involves other dispositions, as well as affects, goals, etc.

There are various threads of research with different versions of P-P. For instance, Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) asked a convenience sample of 258 human services volunteers and 104 non-volunteers to rank the importance of 28 motives. The term *motives* is used loosely to mean potential reasons for FV. Factor analyses showed that most items clustered into a single, general factor. Smith views this factor as related to the A-PC. Another independent study, by Scheufele and Shah (2000), uses US national sample survey data to study how various predictors affect social capital, including civic engagement (a version of FV). Personality strength (combining self-confidence and opinion leadership) significantly affected all three social capital measures, including FV. Smith argues that such results suggest that personality strength is an aspect of the A-PC.

Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, and Freifeld (1995) devised a scale to measure the P-P (or *altruistic personality)* construct, drawing on the fine qualitative study by Oliner and Oliner (1988). In doing so, Penner et al. were ignoring the firm conclusion of a review book on prosocial emergency intervention/ helping

(Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, and Clark 1981) that seeking evidence for such a personality construct had been futile. Ironically, that same year Rushton (1981) published an article entitled *the altruistic personality* (see also Rushton, Chrisjohn, and Fekken 1981). Penner et al. (1995) described the process of constructing and validating the 56-item Prosocial Personality Battery which has two factor components, (1) other-oriented empathy and (2) helpfulness, both with usual high alpha reliabilities (.80+). In validation studies described, one or both of the two Prosocial Personality Battery factors correlated significantly with FV measures, with the helpfulness scale usually being stronger. Using a convenience sample of US volunteers and non-volunteers (N = 1100+), Penner (2002:455) showed that both Prosocial Personality Battery dimensions were significantly associated with three measures of FV. Carlo, Eisenberg, Troyer, Switzer, and Speer (1991) had devised a similar scale for Altruistic Personality a few years earlier. Jeffries (1998) suggested an altruistic personality index based on five primary virtues, suggesting a positive relationship with altruistic (prosocial) behavior.

Subsequent use of the Prosocial Personality Battery has shown one or both factors to predict FV and other prosocial behavior significantly in various samples (e.g., Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, and Schroeder 2005). Penner (2002:461) includes PSP in his general model of sustained FV, which has been significantly confirmed empirically in longitudinal research on volunteers in an AIDS service nonprofit (Penner and Finkelstein 1998) and separately among hospice volunteers in a related cross-sectional study (Finkelstein, Penner, and Brannick 2005).

In his collaborative research on FV in Russia, Smith (2016c) measured briefly many personality traits in the survey of 2,000 adults (see methodology details in Handbook Chapter 31). He included 17 interview items that tried to assess nine facets of his construct of Active-Prosocial *Personality* (A-PP), as a key aspect of the broader Active-Prosocial *Character* (A-PC), which also includes non-personality factors. Pairs of relevant items (once a triplet) were included that sought to measure four of the FFM traits (with neuroticism vs. emotional stability measured separately, under mental health and affects), plus energy, altruism, efficacy, optimism, and interpersonal trust as traits. All but trust cohered as a general, first factor in a principal components factor analysis, leading to a highly reliable (alpha = .85) 14-item index of A-PP (MAINPERS3_IX; Smith 2017b).

This A-PP index had a Pearson bivariate correlation of r = .38 (below .001 level, two-tailed) with a highly reliable DV index of FV (alpha = .91). Hence, an even broader version of A-PP is validated in these data as a moderate predictor of FV. However, this A-PP predictor was not statistically significant in the 58-predictor OLS regression with FV, likely because of demonstrated collinearity of A-PP with measures of attitude, affect, goal, and self. Trust, which did not cohere with the A-PP, had a much lower but positive and statistically significant

correlation (r = .11) with FV, but also dropped out of the total 58-predictor regression.

(iii) The dark triad: Socially aversive traits. There are some negative/socially aversive personality traits that likely have negative relationships with FV and other pro-social behavior. Paulhus and Williams (2002) identified and labeled narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy as the *Dark Triad* – three related negative traits. All three traits are related to emotional empathy deficits, but not to cognitive empathy deficits (Wai and Tiliopoulos 2012). A meta-analytic review by O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, Story, and White (2014) examines the research on this set of traits, showing their relationship to the very widely studied Big Five personality traits (Digman 1990; Fetvadjiev and van de Vijver, 2015). Antisociality is a major component of psychopathy, according to a global research review by Neumann, Hare, and Pardini (2014). Although there seems to be no direct research relating such traits to FV or other key measures of pro-social behavior, there is some relevant indirect research dealing with social support, social symptomatology, and counterproductive workplace behavior (e.g., Kellett 2008; Stead, Fekken, Kay, and McDermott 2012; Wu and LeBreton 2011). Significant negative impact of the Dark Triad traits on FV and other pro-social behavior is likely, given the anti-social nature of these traits.

Social anxiety, social phobia, and Avoidant Personality Disorder: There is an important personality dimension having to do with fear of people that can have marked effects on all kinds of pro-social behavior, including FV, that involves direct interaction with others, especially with people outside one's immediate household and nuclear family. The initial stage involves shyness, but when more serious, the trait is termed *social anxiety*, then potentially progressing *to social phobia*, and finally, at the extreme, to *Avoidant Personality Disorder* or *APD* (Reich 2009; Rettew 2010). APD has only recently entered the standard mental health diagnostic manual for clinicians in the United States (DSM-III-R and DSM-IV; Rettew, p. 284). The diagnostic criteria stated in the latter manuals clearly suggest that individuals with APD will likely not do much pro-social behavior in person, including FV. Zimmerman, Rothschild, and Chelminski (2014) interviewed and classified 859 psychiatric outpatients in Rhode Island. Personality disorder was the most frequent diagnosis (45.5%), and within that group, APD was the most frequent such disorder (14.7% of total outpatients studied). Research on 1,427 Norwegian twin pairs indicated that both APD and social phobia had significant genetic influences, as well as environmental influences (Reichborn-Kjennerud, Czajkowski, Torgersen, Neale, Ørstavik, Tambs, and Kendler 2007). Among normal individuals, there is evidence of a related trait, termed *attachment avoidance,* which has been shown to have a negative relationship with FV by Erez, Mikulincer, van Ijzendoorn, and Kroonenberg 2008).

(iv) Other explicit traits. There are at least 100 other explicit traits that could potentially affect FV and/or other prosocial behavior (PSB), either positively or negatively, but only a few have been investigated recently with this DV (e.g., the intimacy motive should affect PSB; McAdams 1992). Prior research reviews have noted many additional personality traits, not repeated here (Smith 1975, 1994; Musick and Wilson 2008; Wilson 2000; 2012). We will only give a couple of examples here. In a four-year, national sample, longitudinal, panel study in the Netherlands, Bekkers (2012) found that volunteers had higher average trust because less trusting people were more likely to quit volunteering. Van Ingen and Bekkers (2013) used five national sample panel studies to show that individuals who do civic engagement are more trusting, but attributed this to selection effects, not socialization effects. Hence, there is consistent evidence that greater general trust may lead to civic engagement. Greenberg (2001) also found trust to predict FV in a sample from the Philadelphia region in the USA. Uslaner (2002) used US national sample data to show that the trait of optimism led to more trust, which in turn was associated with more civic participation. But trust mainly predicted communal (non-political) FV, not political FV (Uslaner and Brown 2005). In Japan, national sample survey data showed that trust predicted irregular (e.g., episodic) FV, but not regular FV.

The trait of efficacy (locus of control) has also been found to predict FV and civic participation (Fischer and Schaffer 1993; Greenberg 2001; Hidalgo, Moreno-Jiménez, and Quiñonero 2013; Sardinha 2011; Smith 1966; Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown, and Aisbett 2015).

Prouteau and Wolff (2008) used French national sample survey data to show that an affiliation trait (not directly measured) predicted FV, both association membership and volunteer work. Many people volunteer to make friends and meet other people (see Handbook Chapter 7). Lu (2013) did research on 500 college students in China, finding that people who are more passionate, sincere, and considerate are more likely to volunteer. Dockhorn and Werlang (2009) studied NPO volunteers in Brazil, finding that volunteers tended to be more capable of intimacy, empathetic, considerate, emotionally stable, independent, and conforming than the average for the general population. Bekkers (2010) found empathy associated with greater intention to volunteer. Dong (2015) used US national sample data to show that greater risk propensity is associated with volunteering and with doing so more often.

(b) Implicit Deep Motives and Needs Approach

A fairly recent kind of complexity in studying psychological factors as predictors of FV has been the issue of implicit versus explicit measurement strategies, as noted briefly under the Definitions Section B #1bove. We quote here the relevant text from Handbook Chapter 31 on this issue:

S-Theory states that all of the seven Psyche Macro-IVs (motivations, affects, goals, intellectual capacities, cognitions, pain, and the self *must* be measured both implicitly/unconsciously as well as explicitly/consciously (e.g., by self-report; Smith 2016b). There are several studies that demonstrate the significant influence of implicit motivation on formal volunteering (e.g., Aydinli, Bender, and Chasiotis 2013; Aydinli, Bender, Chasiotis, Cemalcilar, and van de Vijver 2014; Aydinli, Bender, Chasiotis, van de Vijver, and Cemalcilar 2015; Aydinli, Bender, Chasiotis, van de Vijver, Cemalcilar, Chong, and Yue 2015). In Aydinli, Bender, Chasiotis, van de Vijver, Cemalcilar, Chong, and Yue (2015), both explicit and implicit prosocial motivation significantly influence sustained FV.

Perugini, Conner, and O'Gorman (2011) showed that an *explicit* prosocial personality measure of helpfulness significantly affected an index of general volunteering, but *implicit* measures of altruistic attitude and altruistic self-concept did not. By contrast, an implicit measure of altruistic attitude predicted a related DV, specific monthly FV, but the explicit prosocial personality measures did not. Thus, implicit disposition measures may or may not predict FV, thus either reinforcing explicit disposition measures or not. The main point, however, is that implicit disposition measures can at times affect FV and other prosocial behavior. This fact is to be expected from the very large research literature showing the effects of implicit motives on many types of behavior (e.g., Schultheiss and Brunstein. 2010).

3. General attitudes

(a) National sample studies

Not many general attitudes have been examined in multinational research projects, beyond the World Values Survey (Inglehart, Basañez, Caterberg, Diez-Medrano, Moreno, Norris, Siemienska, and Zuasnabar 2010). One exception is a study of religiosity in 15 Western European nations by Paxton, Reith, and Glanville (2014). They found religious salience (as well as private prayer and belief) to predict FV. Some US national sample studies have found general attitudes to predict FV. For instance, Kim and Wilcox (2013) found that *familism*, as a general attitude favoring activity and relationships within the household and family, reduced FV in secular associations. This relationship was stronger when combined with religious congregation involvement. The authors defined *insularity* as a leisure lifestyle that emphasizes congregational and family involvement, while ignoring broader secular and civic involvement. Smith (2017b) found evidence of such insularity in his study of FV in Russia. In the Netherlands, Bekkers (2005) found that a general interest in politics predicted civic volunteering with many other potential confounds controlled. Brady, Verba, and Schlozman (1995), using a US national sample, found political

interest to predict significantly political participation, which is a related kind of pro-social behavior done in leisure time. Clements (2012) used a British national sample panel survey to show that political interest and partisanship predicted environmental FV.

In other national sample research, Manatschal and Freitag (2014) found that among Swiss adults strategic reciprocity predicted FV in non-solidary associations, while altruistic reciprocity had a negative relationship. Sokolowski (1996) found in US survey data that altruism and an interest in self-improvement predicted FV. In another US adult sample, Farrell (2013) found that a general attitude toward the moral status of nature (i.e., being unenchanted/neutral vs. seeing intrinsic value vs. seeing nature as sacred) affected FV, with the middle category of individuals most likely to get involved in an environmental group. Using US national sample data, Okun and Michel (2006) found volunteering was predicted by generative concern, as a general attitude toward helping younger people. Using a US national sample survey, Einolf and Chambré (2011:305) also found generativity (essentially, generative concern) to be a significant predictor of hours of FV per month with many other predictors controlled. They also found obligation to volunteer to be a significant predictor. With a national sample in Japan, Okuyama (2012) found secular (but not religious) association FV to be predicted by positive attitudes toward nonprofits and by civic mindedness, in a regression with other predictors controlled. With a French national sample of associations and some members, Prouteau and Tabariés (2010) found that association leaders had more activist general attitudes/motives than average members.

The general attitude of religiosity has been found to predict FV in many studies. Gibson (2008) used a longitudinal US sample to show that teenaged youth did more FV when they were intensely religious (measured by theological conservatism and frequent church attendance). Using a national adult sample in the UK, Storm (2015) found that secular FV was predicted by religiosity, generalized trust, and individual autonomy attitudes. Haruyo (2014) found that religiosity predicted FV in a Japanese national sample.

Using longitudinal US national sample data, Einolf (2010) measured general moral obligations with a 19-item factor score, and also *extensivity* as a moral sense extended to non-kin and even strangers, with a second factor score. Volunteering time and money to social causes was one item in the set. Moral obligations in the 1995 wave significantly predicted volunteering for altruistic organizations in both the 1995 and 2005 waves of the study (p. 148). Extensivity also significantly predicted volunteering (for non-kin). In a related study, Einolf (2013) found that spirituality predicted FV, with other predictors controlled, including other religious involvement predictors.

(b) Convenience sample studies

As an example of studies using convenience samples, Gallagher and Strauss (1991) reviewed research on union member participation, finding many examples of the influence of general attitudes toward unions and politics. In review articles, Kollmuss and Agyeman (2002) and Dennis and Zube (1988) found various general attitudes toward the environment and ecology predicted environmental FV. Penner (2002:455, 457) used a US convenience sample of 1100+ volunteers and non-volunteers to show that religiosity predicted three measures of FV. Akintola (2011) examined motivations underlying South Africans volunteering in AIDS care, using qualitative data from 57 volunteers, finding that FV was predicted by general attitudes, such as concern about the community, concern for others, and employment benefits. Tsai, Chen, Lui, Tung, Chung, Hu, Yeh, and Huang (2008) found familism to predict low FV in Hong Kong. In a survey with data from 17 nations (mostly Anglo and Western European), Gesthuizen and Scheepers (2012) showed that the general attitude of cosmopolitanism (vs. localism), inferred from the kind of media used by an individual, significantly predicted frequency of association participation per year as FV, with several demographic factors (including education) controlled.

Many other studies of special volunteer samples show that general attitudes predict FV in various nations, sometimes using attitude measures that might be used systematically in predicting any type or measure of FV: altruism (Unger 1991), pro-social attitudes (Briggs, Peterson, and Gregory 2010), prosocial value motive (Carlo et al. 2005), public service motivation (Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor 2009), social responsibility (Cheung, Lo, and Liu 2014); pro-volunteering attitude (Lammers 1991); civic obligation (Matsuba, Hart, and Atkin. 2007), and confidence in charitable NPOs (Bowman 2004); higher life satisfaction (Sardinha 2011).

Most of the similar general attitudes used by Smith (1966) that could be used in studying any type or measure of FV have been neglected in subsequent research. The extensive research literature on general attitudes in relation to FV show that, for any specific activity type or measure of FV, general attitude items could easily be constructed that will help predict FV (e.g., Dennis and Zube 1988; Forsythe and Welch 1983). Sometimes these prosocial general attitude measures mediate the effects of personality traits on FV (Carlo et al. 2005).

4. Specific attitudes

(a) National sample studies

As noted in the Definitions Section B, #1 above, specific attitudes are combinations of cognitions–perceptions-beliefs and emotions–affects regarding *specific, named objects*, interpreting the latter term broadly. Given this specificity,

national sample research has been rare with this type of predictor of FV. When measured regarding a specific association in a national sample, the procedure has asked respondents about which one or two associations are (a) most important to them or (b) in which they participate most often. Then respondents are asked about specific attitudes toward one or both such associations, if any are named. However, most research on specific attitudes involves special, non-national, convenience samples, usually participants in some specific association.

A few national sample studies have focused on specific attitudes toward one's community of residence. For instance, Okun and Michel (2006) used US national sample data on older respondents to show that FV was predicted by a greater sense of community, with other factors controlled. In his national sample survey of FV in Russia (see methodology description in Handbook Chapter 31), Smith (2017b) found that liking one's community more had a significant correlation (r = .24; .001 level) with an FV index, and remained significant (.001 level) in a regression analysis with many other predictors controlled.

(b) Convenience sample studies

Too many convenience sample studies find specific attitudes to predict FV to be able to cite here, given space constraints, but we will cite a few as examples. Penner (2002:461) found that specific attitudes regarding an individual's relationship to an NPO predicted three measures of FV in a US convenience sample of volunteers and non-volunteers. Grube and Piliavin (2000) used a convenience sample of volunteers for the American Cancer Society to show that rated prestige of an NPO was positively associated with hours worked and negatively associated with intent to leave the volunteer role. Brayley et al. (2015) used a small convenience sample of older Australians to show that subjective norms and attitude toward specific volunteering predicted willingness to volunteer in the future. Omoto and Snyder (1995, 2002) with US volunteer data presented and successfully tested a *volunteer process model* that involves some organizational predictors, such as organizational integration, that are special attitudes (see also Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, and Schroeder 2005:14.14). Bekkers and de Witt (2014:10) in a literature review suggest that several specific attitudes toward a volunteer-involving organization (VIO) predict FV (i.e., awareness of need, severity of need, reputation of VIO, efficacy of FV in VIO). In a US panel study of members of a socio-political association, the respect received from other members predicted more individual FV (Stürmer, Simon, and Loewy 2008).

Greenslade and White (2005) used panel data from older volunteers in an Australian NPO to show that specific attitudes toward FV in the group predicted more FV. Veludo-de-Oliveira, Pallister, and Foxall (2013) used a sample of

volunteers from a UK charity to show that sustained FV was predicted by a felt specific attitude of subjective norm to participate. In a panel study of volunteers in three Israeli community centers, some specific attitudes predicted volunteer retention as FV (Gidron 1985). Cova, Pace, and Skålén (2015) used Italian data on Alfa Romeo car fans to show specific attitudes led to FV in a fan club, terming such members *brand volunteers*. Chang (2011) found that individuals in Taiwan who are leisure oriented and entertainment oriented, as general attitudes, are more likely to participate in casual/leisure volunteering. For example, people who like to dance, act, or play music (as amateurs, not professionally) tend to devote themselves to similarly performance-oriented volunteer activities at the local and community levels. Sardinha and Cunha (2012), in their study of the Catholic Scouts Association in Portugal, identified two key, general attitudes (latent constructs) that affected volunteering, based on the Volunteer Motivations Inventory: social-oriented motives (SOM) and personal-oriented motives (POM). The first factor, social-oriented motives (SOM), clusters the following key categories of volunteer motivations: values, recognition, social interaction, reciprocity, and understanding. The second factor, POM, clusters the following key categories of motivations: reactivity, self-esteem, social, career development, and protective.

5. Habits

(a) Psychological habits

Research now shows that much of human behavior is rather automatic, performed by habits with little conscious attention, if any (Bargh and Chartrand 1999; Duhigg 2012). However, such psychological habits have seldom been investigated as a predictor of FV, in part because they are difficult to measure accurately, especially in survey research or questionnaires. We could find no empirical studies to cite regarding how and whether psychological habits affect FV, as S-Theory indicates they do.

(b) Life course habits

Life course (L-C) habits have received only superficial research attention in the sense that some research relates current FV to prior FV, especially to childhood or adolescent FV. Because measuring L-C habits nearly always involves self-reports from individuals, these predictors can also be categorized under Cognitions in S-Theory, which is where most demographic predictors are classified. Researchers sometimes use the term *volunteering habits* when inquiring about prior volunteering, without any special attention to the degree to which FV has been an individual's habit (e.g., Haski-Leventhal, Ronel, York, and Ben-David 2008). We treat L-C habits in this chapter under Habits more generally. In general, FV at one point in time tends to predict very well FV at a later point in time, other things equal. (e.g., Penner and Finkelstein 1998; Wilson

and Musick 1997). But the longer the time interval in months, or especially years, the weaker the associations usually become.

L-C habits themselves tend to originate in childhood or adolescence, as part of the developmental and socialization processes for pro-social behavior, building on relevant behavior genetics (Eisenberg 1992; Eisenberg and Mussen 1989; Penner et al. 2004:14.9–14.10; see Handbook Chapter 25). There is now much explicit, often longitudinal, research on experiential antecedents of L-C habits, but not necessarily using the term *L-C habits* or just *habits*. Both parental FV during an individual's childhood and involvement in FVs and student government in secondary school have been shown to predict subsequent individual FV in various studies reviewed in Handbook Chapter 28. For instance, Andolina, Jenkins, Zukin, and Keeter (2003) used US data on youth to show that habits learned at home, lessons from school, and experiences in associations were positively associated with subsequent civic participation. In a US national sample survey, the Corporation for National and Community Service (2005) showed the positive association with more FV when one or both parents do FV (especially regularly) and when the youth attends religious services more frequently, as socialization experiences. A Dutch panel study by Vermeer and Scheepers (2012) showed that religious socialization in Christian families predicted both religious and secular FV later, even controlling for religious congregation involvement. However, Mustillo, Wilson, and Lynch (2004) used US data on two generations of women to show that, over the long-term in one's life, the socio-economic status received from one's parents has a more important as influence on FV than one's parents as role models. But none of these types of studies directly measure the psychological habit involved.

6. Intentions

Although intentions are important predictors for nearly any human behavior, research on intentions as predictors of FV mainly has occurred in the context of testing the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA; Fishbein and Ajzen 2010) or the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB; Ajzen 1991), as discussed in Handbook Chapter 31. For instance, using panel survey data on volunteers from an Australian NPO, Greenslade and White (2005) found intention to do FV at time 1 to predict FV at time 2 in regression analyses. The TPB was superior to the functional approach, using the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, and Ridge (1992), although both approaches had value. In a panel study of a convenience sample of young people, Marta and Pozzi (2008) found that intention to do FV at time 1 predicted FV at time 2. Marta, Manzi, Pozzi, and Vignoles (2014) in a panel study with a convenience sample of Italian volunteers found that role identity as a volunteer predicted intention to volunteer three years later, which in turn predicted FV.

7. Affects/emotions

In the past two to three decades, various measures of affects/emotions have been shown to predict FV in many studies. Commonly used measures have included empathy (and sympathy), positive emotionality, volunteer satisfaction with FV, a match between original goals/motives for FV and actual experience of FV (leading to volunteer satisfaction), volunteer organizational commitment, and volunteer emotional burnout (which predicts exiting the FV). Again, the research literature is large, so only a few examples will be cited.

(a) *Empathy and sympathy*: Eisenberg and Miller (1987:91) did a literature review that showed trait empathy was positively associated with "both prosocial behaviour and cooperative/socially competent behaviour," where implicit, picture/story measures were not. Bekkers (2005) used a Dutch national sample to show that empathic concern predicted FV, with other predictors controlled. Haruyo (2014) found the same relationship in a Japanese national sample. Starnes and Wymer (2000:61) reviewed research on hospice FV, concluding that such volunteers were more empathetic, as well as being more compassionate and sensitive. Paterson, Reniers, and Völim (2009) studied UK telephone helpline volunteers, finding them to be better at perspective taking and empathic concern than non-volunteers among university students.

(b) *Positive emotionality*: Using a factor measure of positive emotionality as being positively and pleasurably engaged with one's social and work environments, based on a very lengthy personality questionnaire, Dawes, Settle, Loewen, McGue, and Iacono (2015) analyzed data from a panel study of twins from the population of Minnesota, USA. They found that time 1 positive emotionality significantly predicted time 2 volunteering. The Mikulincer and Shaver (2009:part III) book has chapters that discuss how positive emotions predict prosocial behavior in general, including empathy, compassion, and forgiveness. Jiménez and Chacón Fuertes (2005) used Spanish data on volunteers to show that positive emotionality was associated with intention to continue FV. Swain, Konrath, Brown, Finegood, Dayton, and Ho (2012) hypothesize the existence of a general non-kin altruism affect/feeling, based on neuroscience research.

(c) *Volunteer satisfaction/enjoyment:* In general, higher volunteer satisfaction predicts the duration of FV in a specific role or NPO, and also predicts that a volunteer with make more financial donations to the NPO, hence being quite important to any association or NPO agency (Barraza 2011; Finkelstein 2007; Wisner, Stringfellow, Youngdahl, and Parker 2005). Galindo-Kuhn and Guzley (2002) devised and tested the Volunteer Satisfaction Index (VSI), which identified four dimensions of this variable: organizational support, participation efficacy, empowerment, and group integration. Testing the VSI on a convenience sample of volunteers, regressions by the authors showed that

participation efficacy and group integration significantly predicted volunteer satisfaction and were also predictors of intent to continue FV. Okun, Infurna, and Hutchinson (2015) used older people (65+ years) in a US national sample panel survey to show that both volunteer satisfaction and volunteer enjoyment predicted more FV hours, which in turn predicted longer FV period of service. Barraza (2011) used panel data on a sample of college student volunteers in California to show that time 1 positive emotional expectations (for sympathy and satisfaction with FV) predicted time 2 intentions to continue volunteering, identification with the volunteer role, and persistence as a volunteer 6 months later for new volunteers. Haivas, Hofmans, and Pepermans (2013) used data on Romanian volunteers to show that the degree of autonomy and competence needs satisfaction mediated the influence of satisfaction on FV intentions. Similarly, satisfaction of the initial VFI motives/goals of sports event volunteers led to more sustained FV (Peachey, Lyras, Cohen, Bruening, and Cunningham 2014). Barbaranelli, Caprara, Capanna, and Imbimbo (2003) used a convenience sample of volunteers in Italian human service NPOs to show that volunteer satisfaction is determined by a disposition to help, self-perceived efficacy, perception of organizational efficacy, and a motivation to volunteer.

(d) *Match between initial goals/motives for FV and actual experience*: According to the extended functional motives approach to explaining FV (Stukas, Worth, Clary, and Snyder 2009), volunteers will be more satisfied with their volunteering if their initial motives/goals for FV are met in their experiences of FV. This is often termed a *matching approach* to the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary, Snyder, and Ridge 1992). Stukas et al. (2009) use a volunteer sample to show that measures of such marching for individuals predict FV better than the VFI goals and affordances (opportunities) alone. Better matching of the individual's initial motives leads to greater satisfaction and resulting organizational commitment, as intentions to continue FV. Many other studies find similar results for FV experiences marching initial VFI motives/goals (e.g., Finkelstein 2007; Güntert, Neufeind, and Wehner 2015; Peachey, Lyras, Cohen, Bruening, and Cunningham 2014).

(e) *Volunteer organizational commitment:* Commitment is an affective/emotional variable, linking the self to an organization and usually to a role within it. In this sense, organization commitment (OC) is also related to the self, as discussed below. OC usually predicts significantly intent to continue FV and actual future FV. For instance, Penner and Finkelstein (1998) used panel data for volunteers in an AIDS service NPO, finding that time 1 OC significantly predicted time 2 FV. Cha, Cichy, and Kim (2011) in a cross-sectional survey of volunteer board and committee members of clubs found similarly that OC predicted intention to continue FV. Grube and Piliavin (2000) and Penner and Finkelstein (1998) both found that OC predicted the length of time volunteers worked for a

service NPO. Laverie and McDonald (2007) found that OC was associated with emotional attachment and role identity importance, which influenced FV.

(f) *Emotional burnout:* Burnout (emotional burnout) occurs in many roles, not just for volunteers, and usually is a response to role stress. This concept refers to an individual being emotionally *sick and tired* of an FV role or associations/VSP, very often leading to a volunteer quitting the FV role. Bakker et al. (2006) note three key aspects of burnout in volunteers; emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of accomplishment, all of which can be predicted significantly by the Big Five/FFM personality traits, reviewed earlier. Starnes and Wymer (2000:61) reviewed research on hospice FV, concluding that such volunteers exited from FV because of "volunteer service [emotional] burnout, communication problems, unrealistic expectations, and insufficient use of the volunteer staff." Cyr and Dowrick (1991) developed and tested a *Burnout Questionnaire* to assess burnout susceptibility among volunteers.

8. Goals/values

(a) The values construct/concept:

The construct or concept of *values* has undergone a renaissance of interest recently in various fields and disciplines (cf. Brosch and Sanders 2016). In 2004, Hitlin and Piliavin titled their review article, "Values: Reviving a Dormant Concept." These authors distinguish values from attitudes, traits, norms, and needs (p. 360). They note (p.361) that, "Roccas et al. (2002) suggest the following differences [between personality traits and values]: Traits are enduring dispositions; values are enduring goals. Traits may be positive or negative; values are considered primarily positive." Hitlin and Piliavin (2004:362) note that "Perhaps the most influential definition of value traces back to Kluckhohn 1951, p. 395): 'A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the *desirable,* which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action.' "

Miles (2015) updates the usual explicit view of values/goals to include implicit/unconscious values. He uses European Social Survey national sample data from 25 nations to show that, like personality and attitudes, values operate with a dual-process model, both implicit and explicit. He shows (p. 680) that, "values predict self-reported behaviors in a variety of substantive domains [including pro-social behaviour] across 25 nations and they operate using automatic cognitive processes."

Dunlop, Bannon, and McAdams (2016) found moderate rank order consistency of the goals across three years in a convenience sample of young adults. Oesterle, Johnson, and Mortimer (2004) found similar consistency in values from adolescence to early adulthood in a panel study of volunteers. However, Okun and Shultz (2003), using a sample of NPO volunteers, found that older

people were more likely to favor social values on the Volunteer Functions Inventory (see below), where younger people favored career and understanding values.

Schwartz has developed the most extensive recent theory of values, or *theory of basic values,* in his terminology (Schwartz 2012). Empirical research in 82 countries so far supports this theory (p. 1), and he developed two instruments to measure individual value priorities (pp. 10–12). Of the 10 virtually universal values, the one most relevant to FV is *benevolence* (p. 7) whose defining goal is "preserving and enhancing the welfare of those whom one is in frequent contact with." That this is a *universal value,* and also that it is ranked #1 in priority among the 10 basic values by people, suggest that here is a solid value basis for prosocial behavior (PSB) and even FV in most cultures/nations. Schwartz distinguishes values from competing constructs such as attitudes, briefs, norms, and [personality] traits (pp. 16–17).

Schwartz and Butenko (2014) have recently validated the Schwartz refined basic values theory (now with 19 values) with Russian data, examining correlations of specific value measures with examples of behavior expected to correlate or not correlate with each value. Benevolence was decomposed into two facets: *caring* for the in-group members and *dependability* in benevolence to in-group members. A meta-analysis of research by Parks-Leduc, Feldman, and Bardi (2015) shows that correlations of the Schwartz values with FFM measures of personality are low, indicating that such traits and values are empirically distinct measures. Fischer and Boer (2015) found somewhat closer correlations between FFM traits and Schwartz values, but variability across 14 nations.

Hitlin and Piliavin (2004:381) stated in their review chapter that "Values are only distally related to behavior." And (ibid.), "Behaviors may also be influenced by more than one value." Further, they argue (p. 382) that values influence behavior through their linkage to the self (see sub-section below). In a recent review article, Cieciuch, Schwartz, and Davidov (2015:45) discuss when values tend to be activated by individuals as influences on behavior (e.g., when individuals are planning and acting rationally, rather than impulsively, and have thought about tangible implications of implementing values).

(b) The Value Functions Inventory (VFI):

Clary and Snyder (1991) introduced the *functional approach* to motivation for FV, and developed the VFI instrument, which has been widely used in the past two decades. In terms of S-Theory, the motives studied by the VFI are indeed values or Goals, as in the name of the instrument. Basically, the authors have identified six goals/values that they believe are common motives for formal volunteers, and measure them with significant distinctiveness (cf. Clary and Snyder, 1999; Clary, Snyder, and Ridge 1992; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene 1998). Both these authors, and many others, have

shown for US data and some other nations that one or more of the six VFI goals/values predicts both volunteer satisfaction and (variably) either intention for future FV, duration of future FV, and/or hours of FV done (Brayley et al. 2015; Clary and Snyder 1999; Finkelstein 2007; Omoto and Snyder 1995; Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown, and Aisbett 2015; Stukas, Snyder, and Clary 2015). Multiple values and especially other-oriented/altruistic values of the VFI (helping, understanding) usually predict FV better than the other values (e.g., Gage and Thapa 2012; Marta, Guglielmetti, and Pozzi 2006; Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown, and Aisbett 2015). The VFI values predicted organizational commitment for student volunteers in Malaysia (Nazilah, Rozmi, and Fauziah 2012). When FV experiences match initial VFI motives, volunteers tend to be more satisfied with their FV, which leads to more future FV intentions and behavior, as discussed previously in sub-section D, #7, d.

Although the VFI approach has shown itself to be useful in explaining and predicting volunteer satisfaction, commitment, future intention for FV, and actual FV, this approach by itself rarely if ever explains much of the variance in FV. VFI measures added 7% of the variance to explain willingness to volunteer in the future in a small Australian convenience sample of older people (Brayley et al. 2015; Shye (2010) provides a general critique of the VFI functional approach, summarized in Wilson (2012:181): "Overall, the scheme can be faulted for being eclectic with no clear theoretical basis for the functions or their overall number; the functions cannot be shown to be exhaustive or exclusive; and they are not all of the same level of generality." In addition, there is susceptibility to social desirability response set, with VFI items suggesting volunteering motives/goals that the respondent would not otherwise have considered and that also may be false. Motivations can vary in their salience in different situations, and the VFI approach does not deal with this issue. Nonetheless, the VFI/functional approach is useful in its place, especially if or when supplemented with other measures of goals/values and by the rest of the predictors of FV suggested by S-Theory (e.g., Smith 2017a, 2017b).

(c) Miscellaneous values

A variety of studies in the United States and elsewhere have shown different goals/values than the VFI set to be relevant to predicting FV. For instance, Güntert et al. (2015) found it necessary to add two new values to the set of six measured by the VFI (excitement and good citizenship) when studying sports event FV, and found these to help predict FV. There is no good reason for a researcher to confine oneself to measuring only the six VFI goals/values if one wishes to explain more variance in FV (see prior paragraph).

A general problem in asking any respondents about their various goals/values regarding FV is that the results are unlikely to be accurate. The qualitative/

open-ended verbal responses are generally *motive talk*, rather than deep revelations regarding causality (see Section D, #1, above). The key reason for that inherent ignorance is the fact discovered by recent neuroscience that the conscious segments of human brains are totally unconnected to the central decision-making segments (cf. Gazzaniga 2008:294–300, 2011:chapter 3). Unfortunately, the same criticism of self-reports applies also perfectly to fixed-answer questionnaire items of any kind.

All self-reports of any kind are estimates, sometimes mere uninformed guesses, regarding motivations, affects, and goals/values. The demonstrated existence of implicit/unconscious motivations, affects, goals, and cognitions adds to the unreliability of self-report data in predicting FV or any other behavior, even when people are trying to tell the truth as they see it. However, the very large amount of variance in FV explained by S-Theory (Smith 2017b) using Russian survey interview data suggests that not all is lost. With careful and redundant (that is, repeated, multi-item) questioning, a researcher can find out by self-report many useful estimates of an individual's true motivations, etc. If this were *not* true, large amounts of variance in FV or other pro-social behavior could not be explained in large samples, with corrections for degrees of freedom. Random numbers cannot explain much variance in any behavior if appropriate corrections are made for statistical degrees of freedom.

There have been some national sample surveys in various nations that investigated goals/values with fixed-answer self-report formats. Bekkers (2005) used Dutch national sample survey data to show that post-materialist values/goals significantly predicted FV with many other predictors controlled. In another article, Bekkers and Bowman (2009) used a Dutch national sample panel survey to show that FV was predicted by confidence in charities (as a general attitude), which was taken to be a proxy for altruistic values (which predicted FV when charity confidence was not in the regression). In a national sample of elderly Belgians (65+ years), Dury, De Donder, De Witte, Buffel, Jacquet, and Verté (2015) found that altruistic values and also religiosity (treated in this chapter as a general attitude, but also reflecting a personal value) significantly predicted FV with many other predictors controlled statistically. Both of these factors also predicted potential volunteering, if an individual were to be asked to do FV.

Various other studies, using convenience samples, have also found goals/values to predict FV in various nations: Boz and Palaz (2007) for Turkey; Chang (2011) and Chou (1995) for Taiwan; Corbin, Mittelmark, and Lie (2016) for Tanzania; DiMaggio (1996) for the United States; Ghose and Kassam (2014) for India; Ralston and Rhoden (2005) for the UK; Shantz, Saksida, and Alfes (2014) for the UK; Vellekoop-Baldock (1990) for Australia; Wilkinson Maposa, Fowler, Evans, and Mulenga (2005) for South Africa. Batson, Ahmad, and Tsang (2002) emphasized four broad types of goals/values that are hypothesized to

predict civic participation, based on much prior research on helping behavior: egoism, altruism, collectivism, and principlism.

9. Intellectual capacities/IQ

Contemporary research on intelligence distinguished many kinds of intelligence, or *intelligences*, no longer relying on a single measure of IQ (e.g., Gardner 2011). S-Theory suggests that the key types of intelligence influencing FV are general intelligence (as a holdover version of IQ), verbal-linguistic intelligence, and social intelligence. Some research supports these hypotheses, although the influence of intelligences on FV has rarely been studied.

Gesthuizen and Scheepers (2012), included in their cross-national research one overall measure for cognitive competence connected to formal education as a determinant of volunteering. They created an index of cognitive competence (general intelligence) based on performance measures that referred to prose, document, and quantitative literacy. With various other demographic factors, including formal education, controlled statistically in multilevel regression analyses, the authors showed that cognitive competence of the individual was a significant predictor of frequency of association participation per year as FV (p. 70). Formal education of the individual and of his/her parents were still statistically significant, but were much reduced in strength as predictors of FV. *Thus, much of the apparent influence of formal education on FV, found nearly everywhere, is likely a result of educational selectivity for more cognitively competent individuals*.

There are very few national sample surveys studying FV that include measures of intellectual capacities. Most researchers seem either uninterested in this variable or unaware that it can be simply measured in a survey interview by a few vocabulary items. The national US sample survey by Brady, Verba, and Schlozman (1995) is an exception, focusing on the explanation of political participation, which is a kind of pro-social behavior done in leisure time. Verbal intelligence was measured by a 10-item vocabulary test, which correlated r = .51 with formal education (p. 273). In an OLS regression analysis (p. 280), verbal intelligence was a significant predictor of overall political participation, which included a few direct FV measures like political meeting attendance.

In the national sample survey of FV by Russian adults reported by Smith (2015a, 2017b), the verbal intelligence measure was six-item antonyms test (alpha = .66). The bivariate correlation of intelligence with a highly reliable, six-item measure of FV (alpha = .91) was r = .17 (significant at the .001 level, two-tailed). When verbal intelligence was entered into an OLS regression with 57 other potential predictors of FV, it remained significant (.05 level), though weak in beta weight strength.

Social intelligence has also been studied a bit, but not much, in relation to FV. Clearly, this kind of intelligence should theoretically have some positive

association with FV, especially for leadership roles. In 1939, Chapin was the first researcher to examine how social intelligence relates to FV, finding a positive relationship in a convenience sample. Very recently, Carl and Billari (2014) used US national sample data to show that trust and *verbal* intelligence are significantly and fairly substantially correlated, as has been shown elsewhere several times. In seeking explanations for this finding, one hypothesis advanced was that more intelligent people are better able to assess the trustworthiness of other people, hence showing social intelligence. This needs to be tested with direct measures of emotional intelligence as well as verbal intelligence.

10. Cognitions, information, experiences, beliefs, ideologies

Cognitions as a concept refers to a very broad category of predictors in S-Theory. Its contents range from immediate perceptions during every waking moment of ones' life all the way to coherent ideologies that involve a large set of beliefs (e.g., religious ideology, political ideology). Also included are all of the memories one has of past experiences, including implicit memories of most (perhaps all) of the experiences one has ever had, remembered consciously or not. We can only scratch the surface of the relevant research literature here.

We have already considered experiences as predictors to some extent when we focused on the matching of FV experiences to initial motives/goals of volunteers in examining the VFI under Affects (e.g., Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene 1998; Finkelstein 2008; Peachey, Lyras, Cohen, Bruening, and Cunningham 2014; see also Section D, #7, c and d above). Clearly, all psychological factors develop over the lifespan, largely based on experiences, but initially also based significantly (often substantially) on maturation, genetics, and epigenetics (e.g., Grusec and Hastings 2008; Santrock 2015). Leu and Cheng (2005) found that *generational experience* (or the *cohort effect*) is an important determinant for volunteering behavior in Taiwan. Individuals within the same age cohort tended to embrace similar values. The authors found that people aged 50 or above in Taiwan were generally less willing to participate in voluntary activities than other generations.

Various studies of FV point to prior experiences as predictors of FV (e.g., Gazley 2013; Liarakou, Kostelou, and Gavrilakis 2011). But we will focus here on two types of cognition studies: cost-benefit perceptions, and beliefs/perceptions, as predictors of FV.

(a) Cost–benefit perceptions:

Many studies over the past six decades have examined perceptions of cost and benefits as predictors of FV, reflecting a rational choice theory (RCT) approach. An early example was the study by Rogers, Heffernan, and Warner (1972). Somewhat more recently, Prestby, Wandersman, Florin, Rich, and Chavis (1990) studied 29 block associations in New York City, finding that more FV was associated with perceiving more social/communal and more personal

benefits. Similarly, Norton, Wandersman, and Goldman (1993) found cost-benefit perceptions to be associated with FV in self-help groups. Some other recent studies find the same positive associations of perceived cost-benefit balance influencing FV (Handy and Mook 2011; Lee and Brudney 2009; Morrow-Howell, Hong, and Tang 2009; Warburton, Terry Rosenman, and Shapiro 2001).

(b) Other beliefs/perceptions:

Bekkers and de Witt (2014) hypothesized that FV would be greater when individuals perceived the efficacy/success of their activities. A few studies support this idea. Martinez and McMullin (2004) studied decisions to do FV for a recreational association, finding that perceived efficacy was an important factor, as were competing commitments. Passy and Giugni (2001) studied participants in the Swiss solidarity movement, finding that perceived effectiveness of one's possible future activity in the organization was a key factor affecting FV.

Other studies show that FV tends to be greater when individuals:

- Perceive a psychological contract with the organization (Vantilborgh et al. 2013).
- Have more intense religious belief (Forbes and Zampelli 2014).
- Perceive a norm of reciprocity (Layton and Moreno 2014).
- Perceive a social norm of protecting the environment (García-Valiñas, Macintyre, and Torgler 2012).
- Perceive neighborhood user-friendliness and sociability (Buffel, De Donder, Phillipson, Dury, de Witte, and Verté 2014).
- Have more religious belief (Paxton, Reith, and Glanville 2014).
- Perceive respect from other organization members (Stürmer, Simon, and Loewy 2008).
- Perceive a social norm about doing something illegal or unethical as long as no one finds out, scored negatively to predict less FV (Okuyama 2012).
- Expectations for satisfaction from FV (Barraza 2011).
- Perceive task and emotional support as likely from organization (Boezeman and Ellemers 2008).
- Perceive volunteering time is convenient for own work schedule (Miller, Powell, and Seltzer. 1990).
- Perceive efficacy/effectiveness of own FV in the volunteer-using organization (Mayer, Fraccastoro, and McNary 2007).
- Perceive more personal control over their FV behavior, as part of the Theory of Planned Behavior (Brayley et al. 2015).

11. Pain felt

Serious and lasting pain as a predictor of FV has received virtually no research attention, although S-Theory states that such pain markedly reduces or

eliminates FV and most other PSB (Smith 2017a). Thomas, Peat, Harris, Wilkie, and Croft (2004) found that severe pain interferes with many kinds of behavior, but do not mention FV. Smith (2017b) studied pain as a predictor of FV in his analysis of a Russian national sample. He found no significant effect of pain on FV, possibly because the interview item did not elicit enough individuals with serious pain in the past 12 months.

12. Self and role identity

Study of how the self relates to FV is a relatively recent development, mainly occurring in the past 25 years or so. Some identity researchers (e.g., Grube and Piliavin 2000; Piliavin and Callero 1991) analyzed the transformation of the sense of self that is affected by, and that in turn sustains, volunteering. Using the national representative survey of blood donors, Pilavin and Callero (1999) found that the individuals who identified themselves more as blood donors judged the likelihood of future blood donations to be higher than those for whom donor identities are less salient. This *role identity approach* has been subsequently taken up in studying FV. The concept has also been termed *identity fusion* by some, but still leads to sustained FV (Swann and Buhrmester 2015). Making a connection with value theory, Hitlin (2003) argues that values form a core of personal identity as the self, with various values predicting the volunteer identity.

Wilson (2012:180–181) reviews several recent studies that show that involvement of the self with the volunteering role predicts FV, often quite strongly. Self-identity as a volunteer can be a very important and salient social identity, with special relevance to continuing, sustained FV, as contrasted with initial FV (Chacon, Vecina, and Davila. 2007; Finkelstein 2008a, 2008b; Finkelstein, Penner, and Brannick 2005; Laverie and McDonald 2007; Marta and Pozzi 2008; Matsuba, Hart, and Atkins 2007; Penner 2002). Verplanken and Holland (2002) showed that behavioral decisions are much affected by values important to the self. Various panel/longitudinal studies confirm the importance of role identity for FV over the long term (eg., Barraza 2011; Finkelstein 2008a; Marta, Manzi, Pozzi, and Vignoles 2014; Stürmer, Simon, and Loewy 2008). Marta and Pozzi (2008) found role identity to be the best predictor of intention to do FV in a panel study of a convenience sample of young people.

The critical importance of the self to sustained FV is further shown by Boezeman and Ellemers (2007), whose study of fund-raising volunteers showed that pride and respect received from an organization directly affect volunteer commitment and hence FV. A meta-analysis by Lodi-Smith and Roberts (2007) supported the importance of role identity or psychological/self investment in the FV role for predicting FV. Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, and Neuberg (1997) provided evidence that role identity, or *oneness* as they term it, explains why empathic concern seems to predict FV. They show that using oneness as a

predictor reduces the importance of empathic concern as a predictor of FV, turning the situation into a self-oriented mode.

13. Combining all factors to predict FV

Studies on national sample survey data that use many, let alone all or nearly all, of the predictor types identified and discussed in this chapter, are very rare indeed. Some multivariate models with several types of factors used to explain FV are discussed in Handbook Chapter 31. In the most comprehensive attempt so far, Smith (2015a, 2017b) applied his new S-Theory (2014b, 2015a, 2017a) to explaining volunteering in a large (N = 2,000 adults) national sample survey of Russian adults (see more details in Handbook Chapter 31). Measures of psychological predictors such as personality traits, general attitudes, intention, affects, goals, verbal intelligence, cognitions, felt pain, and the self were included.

In OLS multiple regression analyses, the Russian interview data showed that these various psychological predictors, such as those reviewed in this chapter, were substantial predictors of a very reliable dependent variable criterion of FV (alpha reliability = .91). Some 63.6% of the FV variance was explained (Smith 2017b). Adding 34 more non-psychological (e.g., social background, health, context) predictors only increased the FV variance by a few percent (from 63.6 to 67.4%; ibid.).

E. Usable knowledge

When one considers genetic, health, macro- and meso-context, and demographic predictors of FV (see Handbook Chapters 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29), it is usually hard to make use of accumulated knowledge in supporting and enhancing FV and organizations where FV takes place, mainly associations worldwide. But many of the psychological factors described in this chapter have easier applications as usable knowledge. One could screen for individuals with more promising/pro-social personalities, but this does not fit well with the goals of most associations. Personality screening might work better with volunteer service programs (VSPs).

Perhaps the most readily manipulated FV causal factors reviewed here are attitudes, habits, intentions, goals, and cognitions, with affecting individual's sense of self also possible. Recruitment efforts can make use of the knowledge reviewed here in direct mail, email, and social media. Posters can also be used. The experiences of active members and volunteers can be managed so as to provide various rewarding experiences, foster role identity, and develop satisfaction of initial VFI values of a volunteer or member and other motives/goals.

National governments can play an important role in providing a favorable environment both for associations and for volunteering. Research has shown that active support for both youth and senior volunteering can grow only

where the general social and cultural context appreciates and supports the contribution both of youth and of elderly citizens and of voluntary action by them. Similar support by both governments and also by private foundations is also needed for associations and volunteering involving the mid-age-range of people.

F. Future trends and needed research

The likely future trend in the next few decades is for motivational and other psychological factors to become increasingly important as observed influences on volunteering. The observed relevance/importance of demographic predictors will likely decline substantially as the underlying psychological factors are measured properly and included in regressions, as in the Russian S-Theory survey (Smith 2017b).

Much more research is needed on psychological factors in volunteering and civic participation. While much relevant research has been done in past few decades, most of it has been done on small, often haphazard/convenience samples, and has used only a small set of types of psychological measures. Very rarely has any single study included a variety of measures of personality, attitudes, affects/emotions, goals/intentions, intellect, cognitions, and the self, as done in Smith (2015a, 2017b) with substantial success. To get very high R^2 results, there must be substantial variation in the FV or other criterion measure and also in crucial predictors, otherwise limited variation will significantly reduce the R^2 found.

Also very important is testing the various psychological predictors of FV in a wide variety of nations. As Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan (2010) have shown clearly, people from WEIRD nations are generally quite unlike most other people on the planet. This adjective *WEIRD* refers to nations that are Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic. However dominant such nations are in current geopolitics, data from samples of WEIRD nations are seriously biased if the researcher wishes to generalize to humans on earth. Thus, it is crucial for FV research and all other research to be done on samples from non-WEIRD nations as well as on samples from WEIRD nations

As Handbook Chapters 26 and 50 have shown, national characteristics vary markedly in relation to effects on FV and other criterion variables. Inkeles and Smith (1974), among others (e.g., Inglehart et al. 2010), have shown that the industrialization and modernization processes change the average personality of people in nations transitioning from agrarian to industrial societies/economies. The *modern* [modal; average] *personality* has traits that make such persons far more likely to join and participate in associations or VSPs than the average person in an agrarian economy. Inglehart et al. (2010) have further shown that post-modernization, as a result of becoming information-service

societies, also changes people's attitudes and values in ways conducive to certain kinds of volunteering and association participation.

Similarly, democratization tends to lead to average/modal personalities that are conducive to volunteering of both main types, FV and INV (Smith 1995). Both industrialization and democratization have been long-term trends in world societies for the past century or two, although the trend for democratization is variable through time (Huntington 1991; Inglehart 1997; Inglehart and Welzel 2005; Lijphart 1999). Some scholars and social observers think that democratization may have reached a plateau in the past decade or two, perhaps even retreating some globally (Diamond 1999; Kurlantzick 2013). For these reasons in part, the future trend toward more impact of psychological factors (vs. social roles and demographics) in volunteering and association participation is suggested here. Longitudinal panel surveys are also crucial here, to observe changes in national population characteristics in relation to psychological predictors of FV.

What we most need now are national sample surveys, especially multinational surveys such as the World Values Survey (Inglehart et al. 2010), that include many *types* of psyche measures identified here, as suggested comprehensively now by S-Theory (Smith 2014b, 2015a, 2017a). In addition, future research on Psyche IVs needs to measure *un*conscious/implicit versions of attitudes, emotions, goals, cognitions, and the self, rather than only conscious/explicit versions. This is a crucial methodological principle of S-Theory (Smith 2015a, 2017b). Panel studies with several time points or waves of data collection will be especially important as we try to sort out the multivariate complexity of explaining FV.

G. Cross-references

Chapters 28, 31, and 38.

H. Bibliography

Ajzen, Icek. 1991. "The Theory of Planned Behavior." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50(2):179–211.

Akintola, O. 2011. "What Motivates People to Volunteer? The Case of Volunteer AIDS Caregivers in Faith-Based Organizations in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa." *Health Policy and Planning* 26(10):53–61.

Allport, Gordon W. 1950. "Prejudice: A Problem in Psychological and Social Causation." *Journal of Social Issues* Suppl. Series, 6(S4):4–23.

Allport, Gordon W. 1955. *Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Allport, Gordon W. and Henry S. Odbert. 1936. "Trait Names – A Psycho-Lexical Study." *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied* 47 (1, whole issue 211).

Andolina, Molly W., Krista Jenkins, Cliff Zukin, and Scott Keeter. 2003. "Habits from Home, Lessons from School: Influences on Youth Civic Engagement." *Political Science and Politics* 36(2):275–280.

Atkins, Robert, Daniel Hart, and Thomas M. Donnelly. 2005. "The Association of Childhood Personality Type with Volunteering During Adolescence." *Merrill Palmer Quarterly Journal of Developmental Psychology* 51:145–162.

Aydinli, Arzu, Michael Bender, and Athanasios Chasiotis. 2013. "Helping and Volunteering Across Cultures: Determinants of Prosocial Behavior." *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* 5(3):1–27.

Aydinli, Arzu, Michael Bender, Athanasios Chasiotis, Zeynep Cemalcilar, and Fons JR van de Vijver. 2014. "When Does Self-Reported Prosocial Motivation Predict Helping? The Moderating Role of Implicit Prosocial Motivation." *Motivation and Emotion* 38(5):645–658.

Aydinli, Arzu, Michael Bender, Athanasios Chasiotis, Fons JR van de Vijver, and Zeynep Cemalcilar. 2015. "Implicit and Explicit Prosocial Motivation as Antecedents of Volunteering: The Moderating Role of Parenthood." *Personality and Individual Differences* 74:127–132.

Aydinli, Arzu, Michael Bender, Athanasios Chasiotis, Fons JR van de Vijver, Zeynep Cemalcilar, Alice Chong, and Xiaodong Yue. 2015. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Explicit and Implicit Motivation for Long-Term Volunteering." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*: DOI: 0899764015583314.

Bakker, Arnold B., Karen I. Van der Zee, Kerry A. Lewig, and Maureen F. Dollard. 2006. "The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Factors and Burnout: A Study Among Volunteer Counselors." *Journal of Social Psychology* 146(1):31–50.

Barbaranelli, Claudio, Gian Vittorio Caprara, Cristina Capanna, and Antonella Imbimbo. 2003. "Le ragioni del volontariato: un contributo empirico." *Giornale italiano di psicologia* 30(2):369–388.

Bargh, John A., and T. L. Chartrand. 1999. "The Unbearable Automaticity of Being." *American Psychologist* 54:462–479.

Barkley, Russell A. 2012. *Executive Functions: What They Are, How They Work, and Why They Evolved*. New York: Guilford Press.

Barraza, Jorge A. 2011. "Positive Emotional Expectations Predict Volunteer Outcomes for New Volunteers." *Motivation and Emotion* 35(2):211–219.

Batson, C. Daniel, Nadia Ahmad, and Jo–Ann Tsang. 2002. "Four Motives for Community Involvement." *Journal of Social Issues* 58(3):429–445.

Beal, George M. 1956. "Additional Hypotheses in Participation Research." *Rural Sociology* 21:249–256.

Bekkers, René. 2005. "Participation in Voluntary Associations: Relations with Resources, Personality, and Political Values." *Political Psychology* 26:439–454.

Bekkers, René. 2010. "Who Gives What and When? A Scenario Study of Intentions to Give Time and Money." *Social Science Research* 39(3):369–381.

Bekkers, René. 2012. "Trust and Volunteering: Selection or Causation? Evidence from a 4 Year Panel Study." *Political Behavior* 34(2):225–247.

Bekkers, René, and Woods Bowman. 2009. "The Relationship Between Confidence in Charitable Organizations and Volunteering Revisited." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38(5):884–897.

Bekkers, René, and Arjen de Witt. 2014. "Participation in Volunteering: What Helps and Hinders." Amsterdam, Netherlands: VU University Amsterdam, Department of Philanthropic Studies, ITSSOIN Project.

Bekkers, René, and Pamala Wiepking. 2011. "A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms that Drive Charitable Giving." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(5):924–973.

Berger, Gabriel. 1991. "Factors Explaining Volunteering for Organizations in General and for Social Welfare Organizations in Particular." PhD dissertation, Heller School, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

Boezeman, Edwin J., and Naomi Ellemers. 2007. "Volunteering for Charity: Pride, Respect, and the Commitment of Volunteers." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(3):771–785.

Bouchard, Thomas J. 2004. "Genetic Influence on Human Psychological Traits." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 13(4):148–151.

Bouchard, Thomas J., and John C. Loehlin. 2001. "Genes, Evolution, and Personality." *Behavior Genetics* 31:243–273.

Bowman, Woods. 2004. "Confidence in Charitable Organizations and Volunteering." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33:247–270.

Boz, Ismet, and Serap Palaz. 2007. "Factors Influencing the Motivation of Turkey's Community Volunteers." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36(4):643–661.

Brady, Henry, Sidney Verba, and Kay L. Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89:271–294.

Brayley, Nadine, Patricia L. Obst, Katherine M. White, Ioni M. Lewis, Jeni Warburton, and Nancy M. Spencer. 2015. "Examining the Predictive Value of Combining the Theory of Planned Behaviour and the Volunteer Functions Inventory." *Australian Journal of Psychology* 67(3):149–156.

Briggs, Elten, Mark Peterson, and Gary Gregory. 2010. "Toward a Better Understanding of Volunteering for Nonprofit Organizations: Explaining Volunteers' Pro-social Attitudes." *Journal of Macromarketing* 30(1):61–76.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1960. "Personality and Participation: The Case of the Vanishing Variables." *Journal of Social Issues* 16(4):54–63.

Brosch, Tobias, and David Sanders, eds. 2016. *Handbook of Value: Perspectives from Economics, Neuroscience, Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Buffel, Tine, Liesbeth De Donder, Chris Phillipson, Sarah Dury, Nico De Witte, and Dominique Verté. 2014. "Social Participation Among Older Adults Living in Medium-Sized Cities in Belgium: the Role of Neighbourhood Perceptions." *Health Promotion International* 29(4):655–668.

Carl, Noah, and Francesco C. Billari. 2014. "Generalized Trust and Intelligence in the United States." *PLoS ONE* 9(3):e91786–e91786.

Carlo, Gustavo, James B. Allen, and Dion C. Buhman. 1999. "Facilitating and Disinhibiting Prosocial Behaviors: The Nonlinear Interaction of Trait Perspective Taking and Trait Personal Distress on Volunteering." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 21(3):189–197.

Carlo, Gustavo, Nancy Eisenberg, D. Troyer, G. Switzer, and A. L. Speer. 1991. "The Altruistic Personality: In What Contexts Is It Apparent?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61:450–458.

Carlo, Gustavo, Morris A. Okun, George P. Knight, and Maria Rosario T. de Guzman. 2005. "The Interplay of Traits and Motives on Volunteering: Agreeableness, Extraversion and Prosocial Value Motivation." *Personality and Individual Differences* 38:1293–1305.

Chacon, Fernando, Maria Luisa Vecina, and Maria Celeste Davila. 2007. "The Three-Stage Model of Volunteers' Duration of Service." *Social Behavior and Personality* 35(5):627–642.

Chamorro-Premuzic, Tomas, Sophie von Stumm, and Adrian Furnham, eds. 2011. *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Individual Differences*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chang, Ying-Chen. 2011. "Charity and Change: Characteristics of Voluntary Service Development in Taiwan." *Community Development Journal Quarterly* 113:500–510. [張英陣. 2011. "慈善與變遷：我國志願服務發展的特色. "*社區發展季刊* (113):500–510].

Chapin, F. Stuart. 1939. "Social Participation and Social Intelligence." *American Sociological Review* 4(2):157–166.

Cheung, Chau-kiu, T. Wing Lo, and Suk-ching Liu. 2014. "Relationships Between Volunteerism and Social Responsibility in Young Volunteers." *Voluntas* 26(3):872–889.

Chou, Chia-Hua. 1995. "The Theoretical Perspectives of Social Gerontology." *Journal of National Taipei College of Business* 28(2):1–25. [周家華. 1995. "社會老年學理論研究." *臺北技術學院學報* 28(2):1–25].

Churchland, Patricia. 2011. *Braintrust.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cialdini, Robert B., Stephanie L. Brown, Brian P. Lewis, Carol Luce, and Steven L. Neuberg. 1997. "Reinterpreting the Empathy–Altruism Relationship: When One into One Equals Oneness." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73(3):481.

Cieciuch, Jan, Shalom H. Schwartz, and Eldad Davidov. 2015. "Values, Social Psychology of." Pp. 41–46 in *International Encyclopedia of Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, edited by J. D. Wright. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Clary, E. Gil, and Mark Snyder. 1991. "A Functional Analysis of Altruism and Prosocial Behavior: The Case of Volunteerism." Pp. 119–148 in *Review of Personality and Social Psychology,* vol. 12, edited by M. Clark. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Clary, E. Gil, and Mark Snyder. 1999. "The Motivations to Volunteer Theoretical and Practical Considerations." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 8(5):156–159.

Clary, E. Gil, Mark Snyder, and Robert Ridge. 1992. "Volunteers' Motivations: A Functional Strategy for the Recruitment, Placement, and Retention of Volunteers." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 2(4):333–350.

Clary, E. Gil, Mark Snyder, Robert Ridge, John Copeland, Arthur A. Stukas, Julie Haugen, and Peter Miene. 1998. "Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(6):1516–1530.

Clements, Ben. 2012. "The Sociological and Attitudinal Bases of Environmentally-Related Beliefs and Behaviour in Britain." *Environmental Politics* 21(6):901–921.

Clerkin, Richard M., Sharon R. Paynter, and Jami K. Taylor. 2009. "Public Service Motivation in Undergraduate Giving and Volunteering Decisions." *The American Review of Public Administration* 39(6):675–698.

Cnaan, Ram A., and Robin S. Goldberg-Glen. 1991. "Measuring Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27(3):269–284.

Copp, James H., and Robert C. Clark. 1956. *Factors Associated with Re-enrollment in 4-H Clubs*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment, Station Research Bulletin No. 195.

Corbin, J. Hope, Maurice B. Mittelmark, and Gro T. Lie. (in press) 2016. "Grassroots Volunteers in Context: Rewarding and Adverse Experiences of Local Women Working on HIV and AIDS in Kilimanjaro, Tanzania." *Global Health Promotion*. doi: 1757975915569514.

Corporation for National and Community Service. 2005. *Building Active Citizens: The Role of Social Institutions in Teen Volunteering*. Washington, DC: Author.

Cova, Bernard, Stefano Pace, and Per Skålén. 2015. "Brand Volunteering: Value Co-creation with Unpaid Consumers." *Marketing Theory.* doi: 10.1177/1470593115568919.

Crigler, P. W. 1973. "Significant Variables Indicative of Commitment to the Women's Movement." PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Cyr, Carolyn, and Peter W. Dowrick. 1991. "Burnout in Crisisline Volunteers." *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research* 18(5):343–354.

Dawes, Christopher T., Jaime E. Settle, Peter J. Loewen, Matt McGue, and William G. Iacono. 2015. "Genes, Psychological Traits, and Civic Engagement." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 370(1683). doi 10.1098/rstb.2015.0015.

Dennis, Steve, and Ervin H. Zube. 1988. "Voluntary Association Membership of Outdoor Recreationists: An Exploratory Study." *Leisure Sciences* 10(4):229–245.

Diamond, Larry. 1999. *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Digman, J. M. 1990. "Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model." *Annual Review of Psychology* 41:417–440.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1996. "Are Art-Museum Visitors Different from Other People? The Relationship Between Attendance and Social and Political Attitudes in the United States." *Poetics* 24(2):161–180.

Dockhorn, I. C., and B. Werlang. 2009 "CVV Volunteers: Social Demographic and Psychological Characteristics." *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia* 61(1):1–15.

Dong, Hsiang-Kai Dennis. 2015. "The Effects of Individual Risk Propensity on Volunteering." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 26(1):5–18.

Dovidio, John F., Jane A. Piliavin, David A. Schroeder, and Louis Penner. 2006. *The Social Psychology of Prosocial Behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duhigg, Charles. 2012. *The Power of Habit.* New York: Random House.

Dunlop, William L., Brittany L. Bannon, and Dan P. McAdams. (in press) 2016. "Studying the Motivated Agent Through Time: Personal Goal Development During the Adult Life Span." *Journal of Personality*.

Durkheim, Emile. [1897] 1970. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dury, Sarah, Liesbeth De Donder, Nico De Witte, Tine Buffel, Wolfgang Jacquet, and Dominique Verté. 2015. "To Volunteer or Not: The Influence of Individual Characteristics, Resources, and Social Factors on the Likelihood of Volunteering by Older Adults." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 44(6):1107–1128.

Einolf, Christopher J. 2010. "Does Extensivity Form Part of the Altruistic Personality? An Empirical Test of Oliner and Oliner's Theory." *Social Science Research* 39(1):142–151.

Einolf, Christopher J. 2013. "Daily Spiritual Experiences and Prosocial Behavior." *Social Indicators Research* 110(1):71–87.

Einolf, Christopher, and Susan M. Chambré. 2011. "Who Volunteers? Constructing a Hybrid Theory." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 16:198–310.

Eisenberg, Nancy. 1992. *The Caring Child*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Eisenberg, Nancy, and Paul A. Miller. 1987. "The Relation of Empathy to Prosocial and Related Behaviors." *Psychological Bulletin* 101(1):91–119.

Eisenberg, Nancy, and Paul H. Mussen. 1989. *The Roots of Prosocial Behavior in Children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erez, Ayelet, Mario Mikulincer, Marinus H. van Ijzendoorn, and Pieter M. Kroonenberg. 2008. "Attachment, Personality, and Volunteering: Placing Volunteerism in an Attachment-Theoretical Framework." *Personality and Individual Differences* 44(1):64–74.

Farrell, Justin. 2013. "Environmental Activism and Moral Schemas: Cultural Components of Differential Participation." *Environment and Behavior* 45(3):399–423.

Fetvadjiev, Velichko H., and Fons JR van de Vijver. 2015. "Universality of the Five-Factor Model of Personality." Pp. 249–253 in *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, Vol 9, edited by J. D. Wright. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Finkelstein, Marcia A. 2007. "Correlates of Satisfaction in Older Volunteers: A Motivational Perspective." *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration* 24(5):6–12.

Finkelstein, Marcia A. 2008a. "Predictors of Volunteer Time: The Changing Contributions of Motive Fulfillment and Role Identity." *Social Behavior and Personality* 36(10):1353–1363.

Finkelstein, Marcia A. 2008b. "Volunteer Satisfaction and Volunteer Action: A Functional Approach." *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 36(1):9–18.

Finkelstein, Marcia A., Louis A. Penner, and Michael T. Brannick. 2005. "Motive, Role Identity, and Prosocial Personality as Predictors of Volunteer Activity." *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 33(4):403–418.

Finkelstein, M. A., and Brannick. 2007. "Applying Theories of Institutional Helping of Informal Volunteering: Motives, Role Identity, and Pro-social Personality." *Social Behavior and Personality* 35:101–114.

Fischer, Lucy R., and Kay B. Schaffer. 1993. *Older Volunteers: A Guide to Research and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fischer, Ronald, and Diana Boer. 2015. "Motivational Basis of Personality Traits: A Meta-Analysis of Value-Personality Correlations." *Journal of Personality* 93(5):491–510.

Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen. 2010. *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. New York: Psychology Press.

Forbes, Kevin F., and Ernest M. Zampelli. 2014. "Volunteerism the Influences of Social, Religious, and Human Capital." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43(2):227–253.

Forsythe, David P., and Susan Welch. 1983. "Joining and Supporting Public Interest Groups: A Note on Some Empirical Findings." *The Western Political Quarterly* 36(3):386–399.

Frank, Robert, 1988. *Passions within Reason*. New York: Norton.

Fritzsche, Barbara A., Marcia A. Finkelstein, and Louis A. Penner. 2000. "To Help or Not to Help: Capturing Individuals' Decision Policies." *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 28 (6):561–578.

Gage, Richard L., and Brijesh Thapa. 2012. "Volunteer Motivations and Constraints Among College Students Analysis of the Volunteer Function Inventory and Leisure Constraints Models." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(3):405–430.

Galindo-Kuhn, Roseanna, and Ruth M. Guzley. 2002. "The Volunteer Satisfaction Index: Construct Definition, Measurement, Development, and Validation." *Journal of Social Service Research* 28(1):45–68.

Gallagher, Daniel G., and George Strauss. 1991. "Union Membership Attitudes and Participation." Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley, Institute for Research on Labor and Employment.

García-Valiñas, María A., Alison Macintyre, and Benno Torgler. 2012. "Volunteering, Pro-Environmental Attitudes and Norms." *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 41(4):455–467.

Gardner, Howard. [1983] 2011. *Frames of Mind*, 3rd edition. New York: Basic Books.

Gazley, Beth. 2013. "Predicting a Volunteer's Future Intentions in Professional Associations: A Test of the Penner Model." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 42*(6):1245–1267.

Gazzaniga, Michael S. 2008. *Human: The Science behind What Makes Us Unique*. New York: Ecco Press, HarperCollins.

Gazzaniga, Michael S. 2011. *Who's in Charge: Free Will and the Science of the Brain*. New York: HarperCollins.

Gesthuizen Maurice, and Peer Scheepers. 2012. "Educational Differences in Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Individual and Contextual Explanations" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41:158–181.

Ghose, Toorjo, and Meenaz Kassam. 2014. "Motivations to Volunteer Among College Students in India." *Voluntas* 25(1):28–45.

Gibson, Troy. 2008. "Religion and Civic Engagement Among America's Youth." *The Social Science Journal* 45(3):504–514.

Gidron, Benjamin. 1985. "Predictors of Retention and Turnover Among Service Volunteer Workers." *Journal of Social Service Research* 8(1):1–16.

Gomez, Angel, Matthew L. Brooks, Michael D. Buhrmester, Alexandra Vazquez, Jolanda Jetten, and William B. Swann, Jr. 2011. "On the Nature of Identity Fusion: Insights into the Construct and a New Measure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 100(5):918–933.

Gough, Harrison G. 1952. "Predicting Social Participation." *Journal of Social Psychology* 35:227–233.

Greenberg, Michael R. 2001. "Elements and Test of a Theory of Neighborhood Civic Participation." *Human Ecology Review* 8(2):40–51.

Greenslade, Jaimi H., and Katherine M. White. 2005. "The Prediction of Above-Average Participation in Volunteerism: A Test of the Theory of Planned Behavior and the Volunteers Functions Inventory in Older Australian Adults." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 145(2):155–172.

Groom, Phyllis. 1969. *Americans Volunteer.* Manpower/Automation Monograph No. 10. Washington, DC: US Department of Labor.

Grube, Jean A., and Jane A. Piliavin. 2000. "Role-identity, Organizational Experiences, and Volunteer Performance." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26:1108–1119.

Grupp, F. W., and W. M. Newman. 1973. "Political Ideology and Religious Preference: The John Birch Society and the Americans for Democratic Action." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 12:401–413.

Grusec, Joan E. and Paul D. Hastings, eds. 2008. *Handbook of Socialization*. New York: Guilford Press.

Güntert, Stefan T., Max Neufeind, and Theo Wehner. 2015. "Motives for Event Volunteering Extending the Functional Approach." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 44(4):686–707.

Haivas, Simona, Joeri Hofmans, and Roland Pepermans. 2013. "Volunteer Engagement and Intention to Quit from a Self-Determination Theory Perspective." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 43(9):1869–1880.

Handy, Femida, and Laurie Mook. 2011. "Volunteering and Volunteers: Benefit–Cost Analyses." *Research on Social Work Practice* 21(4):412–420.

Harp, John. 1959. "A General Theory of Social Participation." *Rural Sociology* 24:280–284.

Haruyo, Mitani. 2014. "Influences of Resources and Subjective Dispositions on Formal and Informal Volunteering." *Voluntas* 25(4):1022–1040.

Haski-Leventhal, Debbie, Natti Ronel, Alan S. York, and Boaz M. Ben-David. 2008. "Youth Volunteering for Youth: Who Are They Serving? How Are They Being Served?" *Children and Youth Services Review* 30(7):834–846.

Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan. 2010. "The Weirdest People in the World?" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33(2–3):61–83.

Hitlin, Steven. 2003. "Values as the Core of Personal Identity: Drawing Links Between Two Theories of Self." *Social psychology quarterly* 66(2):118–137.

Hitlin, Steven, and Jane Allyn Piliavin. 2004. "Values: Reviving a Dormant Concept." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30. *Annual Reviews*: 359–393.

Hodgkinson, Virginia A., and M. S. Weitzman. 1986. *Dimensions of the Independent Sector*, 2nd edition. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hood, Bruce. 2013. *The Self-Illusion: How the Social Brain Creates Identity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hougland, Jr, James G., and James R. Wood. 1980. "Correlates of Participation in Local Churches." *Sociological Focus* 1394:343–358.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Hyde, Melissa K., and Simon R. Knowles. 2013. "What Predicts Australian University Students' Intentions to Volunteer Their Time for Community Service?" *Australian Journal of Psychology* 65(3):135–145.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization*: *Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald, Miguel Basañez, Gabriela Caterberg, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Alejandro Moreno, Pippa Norris, Renata Siemienska, and Ignacio Zuasnabar, eds. 2010. *Changing Human Beliefs and Values, 1981–2007: Across-Cultural Sourcebook Based on the World Values Surveys and European Values Studies*. Mexico, DF: Sigo XXI Editores.

Inglehart, Ronald, and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Inkeles, Alex, and Daniel Levinson. 1954. "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Social Systems." Pp. 977–1020 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, vol. 2, edited by G. Lindzey. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Inkeles, Alex, and David Horton Smith. 1974. *Becoming Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jeffries, Vincent. 1998. "Virtue and the Altruistic Personality." *Sociological Perspectives* 41(1):151–166.

Jiménez, María L. Vecina, and Fernando Chacón Fuertes. 2005. "Positive emotions in volunteerism." *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* 8(1):30–35.

John, Oliver, and S. Srivastava. 1999. "The Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives." Pp. 102–138 in *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 2nd edition, edited by L. Pervin and O. John. New York: Guilford Press.

Kellett, S. 2008. "Do Pro-social and Anti-social Attitudes Determine an Individual's Happiness and Social Support?" PhD dissertation, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

Kim, Young-Il, and W. Bradford Wilcox. 2013. "Bonding Alone: Familism, Religion, and Secular Civic Participation." *Social Science Research* 42(1):31–45.

Kollmuss, Anja, and Julian Agyeman. 2002. "Mind the Gap: Why Do People Act Environmentally and What Are the Barriers to Pro-Environmental Behavior?" *Environmental Education Research* 8(3):239–260.

Kurlantzick, Joshua. 2013. *Democracy in Retreat*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lammers, John C. 1991. "Attitudes, Motives, and Demographic Predictors of Volunteer Commitment and Service Duration." *Journal of Social Service Research* 14(3–4): 125–140.

Larson, Richard F., and William R. Catton. 1961. "When Does Agreement with Organizational Values Predict Behavior?" *American Catholic Sociological Review* 22:151–160.

Laverie, Debra A., and Robert E. McDonald. 2007. "Volunteer Dedication: Understanding the Role of Identity Importance on Participation Frequency." *Journal of Macromarketing* 27(3):274–288.

Layton, Daphne N. 1987. *Philanthropy and Voluntarism: An Annotated Bibliography.* New York: The Foundation Center.

Layton, Michael D., and Alejandro Moreno. 2014. "Philanthropy and Social Capital in Mexico." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 19(3):209–219.

Lee, Young-joo, and Jeffrey L. Brudney. 2009. "Rational Volunteering: A Benefit-Cost Approach." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 29(9/10):512–530.

Leigh, Robert, David H. Smith, Cornelia Giesing, Maria José León, Debbie Haski-Leventhal, Benjamin J. Lough, Jacob M. Mati, and Sabine Strassburg. 2011. *State of the World's Volunteerism Report 2011: Universal Values for Global Well-Being*. Bonn, Germany: United Nations Volunteers.

Leu, Chao-Hsien, and Ching-Hsia Cheng. 2005. "Factors Affecting the Participation in Voluntary Services Among the Middle Aged and Elderly in Taiwan." *NTU Social Work Review* 12:1–49. [呂朝賢, 鄭清霞. 2005. "中老年人參與志願服務的影響因素分析." *臺大社會工作學 刊* (12):1–49].

Liarakou, Georgia, Eleni Kostelou, and Costas Gavrilakis. 2011. "Environmental Volunteers: Factors Influencing Their Involvement in Environmental Action." *Environmental Education Research* 17(5):651–673.

Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lodi-Smith, Jennifer, and Brent W. Roberts. 2007. "Social Investment and Personality: A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship of Personality Traits to Investment in Work, family, religion, and volunteerism." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 11(1):68–86.

Lu, Chang-Tung. 2013. "Impacts of Non-intellectual Factors on Volunteering Behaviors among College Students." *Reform & Opening* 6:103–110. [盧長彤. 2013. "通過非智力因素促動大學生 志願服務的思考." *改革與開放* (6):103–110].

Manatschal, Anita, and Markus Freitag. 2014. "Reciprocity and Volunteering." *Rationality and Society* 26(2):208–235.

Marta, Elena, Claudia Manzi, Maura Pozzi, and Vivian L. Vignoles. 2014. "Identity and the Theory of Planned Behavior: Predicting Maintenance of Volunteering After Three Years." *The Journal of social psychology* 154(3):198–207.

Marta, Elena, and Maura Pozzi. 2008. "Young People and Volunteerism: A Model of Sustained Volunteerism During the Transition to Adulthood." *Journal of Adult Development* 15(1):35–46.

Marta, Elena, Chiara Guglielmetti, and Maura Pozzi. 2006. "Volunteerism During Young Adulthood: An Italian Investigation into Motivational Patterns." *Voluntas* 17(3):221–232.

Martinez, Teresa A., and Steve L. McMullin. 2004. "Factors Affecting Decisions to Volunteer in Nongovernmental Organizations." *Environment and Behavior* 36(1):112–126.

Matsuba, M. Kyle, Daniel Hart, and Robert Atkins. 2007. "Psychological and Social-structural Influences on Commitment to Volunteering." *Journal of Research in Personality* 41(4):889–907

Mayer, Brad W., Katherine A. Fraccastoro, and Lisa D. McNary. 2007. "The Relationship Among Organizational-Based Self-Esteem and Various Factors Motivating Volunteers." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36(2):327–340.

McAdams, Dan P. 1992. *The Intimacy Motive*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McClelland, David C. 1985. "How Motives, Skills, and Values Determine What People Do." *American Psychologist* 40(7):812–825.

McClelland, David C., Richard Koestner, and Joel Weinberger. 1989. "How do Self-Attributed and Implicit Motives Differ?" *Psychological Review* 96(4):690–702.

Mikulincer, Mario, and Phillip R. Shaver, eds. 2010. *Pro-social Motives, Emotions, and Behavior*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Miles, Andrew. 2015. "The (Re) genesis of Values Examining the Importance of Values for Action." *American Sociological Review* 80(4):680–704.

Miller, Lynn E., Gary N. Powell, and Joseph Seltzer. 1990. "Determinants of Turnover Among Volunteers." *Human Relations* 43(9):901–917.

Morrow-Howell, Nancy, Song-Iee Hong, and Fengyan Tang. 2009. "Who Benefits from Volunteering? Variations in Perceived Benefits." *The Gerontologist* 41(9):91–102.

Mulford, Charles L., and Gerald E. Klonglan. 1972. "Attitude Determinants of Individual Participation in Organized Voluntary Action." Pp. 251–276 in *Voluntary Action Research 1972*, edited by D. H. Smith, R. D. Reddy, and B. R. Baldwin. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Musick, Marc A., and John Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Mustillo, Sarah, John Wilson, and Scott M. Lynch. 2004. "Legacy Volunteering: A Test of Two Theories of Intergenerational Transmission." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(2):530–541.

Nazilah, M. A. Siti, I. Rozmi, and I. Fauziah. 2012. "Relationship Between Motivation and Organizational Commitment Among College Student Volunteers." *International Business Management* 6(4):512–516.

Neumann, Craig S., Robert D. Hare, and Dustin A. Pardini. 2014. "Antisociality and the Construct of Psychopathy: Data from Across the Globe." *Journal of Personality* 83:678–692.

Norton, Shelley, Abraham Wandersman, and Charles R. Goldman. 1993. "Perceived Costs and Benefits of Membership in a Self-Help Group: Comparisons of Members and Nonmembers of the Alliance for the Mentally Ill." *Community Mental Health Journal* 29(2):143–160.

O'Boyle, Ernest H., Donelson R. Forsyth, George C. Banks, Paul A. Story, and Charles D. White. 2014. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Redundancy and Relative Importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of Personality." *Journal of Personality* 83(6):644–664.

Oesterle, Sabrina, Monica K. Johnson, and Jeylan T. Mortimer. 2004. "Volunteerism During the Transition to Adulthood: A Life Course Perspective." *Social Forces* 82(3):1123–1149.

Okun, Morris A., and Amy Schultz. 2003. "Age and Motives for Volunteering: Testing Hypotheses Derived from Socioemotional Selectivity Theory." *Psychology and Aging* 18(2):231–239.

Okun, Morris, Frank J. Infurna, and Ianeta Hutchinson. 2015. "Are Volunteer Satisfaction and Enjoyment Related to Cessation of Volunteering by Older Adults?" *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbu159.

Okun, Morris A., and Josef Michel. 2006. "Sense of Community and Being a Volunteer Among the Young-Old." *Journal of Applied Gerontology* 25(2):173–188.

Okun, Morris A., John Pugliese, and Karen S. Rook. 2007. "Unpacking the Relation Between Extraversion and Volunteering in Later Life: The Role of Social Capital." *Personality and Individual Differences* 42(8):1467–1477.

Okun, Morris A., and Amy Schultz. 2003. "Age and Motives for Volunteering: Testing Hypotheses Derived from Socioemotional Selectivity Theory." *Psychology and Aging* 18(2):231–239.

Okuyama, Naoko. 2012. "Where Are Potential Donors and Volunteers? Exploring Preferences and Incentives in Japanese Giving and Volunteering Behavior." Paper presented at the 10th International Conference of ISTR, Siena, Italy, July.

Oliner, Samuel P., and Pearl M. Oliner. 1988. *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free Press.

Omoto Allen M., and M. Snyder. 1993. "AIDS Volunteers and Their Motivations: Theoretical Issues and Practical Concerns." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 4:157–176.

Omoto Allen M., and M. Snyder. 1995. "Sustained Helping Without Obligations: Motivation, Longevity of Service, and Perceived Attitude Change Among AIDS Volunteers." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68:671–686.

Omoto, Allen M., and Mark Snyder. 2002. "Considerations of Community the Context and Process of Volunteerism." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(5):846–867.

Omoto, Allen M., and Mark Snyder. 2010. "Influences of Psychological Sense of Community on Voluntary Helping and Prosocial Action." Pp. 223–244 in *The Psychology of Prosocial Behavior: Group Processes, Intergroup Relations, and Helping*, edited by S. Stürmer and M. Snyder. New York: Wiley.

Otten, Christine A., Louis A. Penner, and Gordon Waugh. 1988. "That's What Friends Are for: The Determinants of Psychological Helping." *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 7(1):34–41.

Ozer, Daniel J., and Veronica Benet-Martinez. 2006. "Personality and the Prediction of Consequential Outcomes." *Annual Review of Psychology* 57:401–421.

Pabriks, Artis. 2003. "Ethnic Limits of Civil Society: The Case of Latvia." Pp. 133–144 in *Civil Society in the Baltic Sea Region*, edited by N. Götz and J. Hackmann. London: Ashgate.

Parboteeah, K. P., J. B. Cullen, and L. Lim. 2004. "Formal Volunteering: A Cross-National Test." *Journal of World Business* 39:431–441.

Parks-Leduc, Laura, Gilad Feldman, and Anat Bardi. 2015. "Personality Traits and Personal Values: A Meta-Analysis." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 19(1):3–29.

Passy, Florence, and Marco Giugni. 2001. "Social Networks and Individual Perceptions: Explaining Differential Participation in Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 16(1):123–153.

Paterson, Hannah, Renate Reniers, and Birgit Völim. 2009. "Personality Types and Mental Health Experiences of Those Volunteer for Helplines." *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling* 37(4):459–471.

Paulhus, D. L., and K. M. Williams. 2002. "The Dark Triad of Personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy." *Journal of Research in Personality* 36:556–563.

Paxton, Pamela. 2007. "Association Memberships and Generalized Trust: A Multilevel Model across 31 Countries." *Social Forces* 86(1):47–76.

Paxton, Pamela, Nicholas E. Reith, and Jennifer L. Glanville. 2014. "Volunteering and the Dimensions of Religiosity: A Cross-National Analysis." *Review of Religious Research* 56(4):597–625.

Payne, Raymond, Barbara P. Payne, and Richard D. Reddy. 1972. "Social Background and Role Determinants of Individual Participation in Organized Voluntary Action." Pp. 207–250 in *Voluntary Action Research 1972*, edited by D. H. Smith, R. D. Reddy, and B. R. Baldwin. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Peachey, Jon Welty, Alexis Lyras, Adam Cohen, Jennifer E. Bruening, and George B. Cunningham. 2014. "Exploring the Motives and Retention Factors of Sport-for-Development Volunteers." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43(6):1052–1069.

Penner, Louis A. 2002. "Dispositional and Organizational Influences on Sustained Volunteerism: An Interactionist Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues* 58(3):447–467.

Penner, Louis A., John F. Dovidio, Jane A. Piliavin, and David A. Schroeder. 2005. "Prosocial Behavior: Multilevel Perspectives." *Annual Review of Psychology* 56:365–392.

Penner, Louis A., and Marcia A. Finkelstein. 1998. "Dispositional and Structural Determinants of Volunteerism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(2):525–537.

Penner, Louis A., Barbara A. Fritzsche, J. Philip Craiger, and Tamara R. Freifeld. 1995. "Measuring the Prosocial Personality." *Advances in Personality Assessment* 10:147–163.

Penner, Louis A., S. Shiffman, J. A. Paty, and B. A. Fritzsche.1994. "Individual Differences in Intraperson Variability in Mood." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66(4):712–721.

Perugini, Marco, Mark Conner, and Rick O'Gorman. 2011. "Automatic Activation of Individual Differences: A Test of the Gatekeeper Model in the Domain of Spontaneous Helping." *European Journal of Personality* 25(6):465–476.

Piliavin, Jane A. 2010. "Volunteering across the life span." Pp. 157–172 in *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping*, edited by S. Stürmer and M. Snyder. New York: Wiley.

Piliavin, Jane A., and P. L. Callero. 1991. *Giving Blood: The Development of an Altruistic Identity*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Piliavin, Jane A., John F. Dovidio, S. Gaertner, and R. D. Clark. 1981. *Emergency Intervention*. New York: Academic Press.

Prestby, John E., Abraham Wandersman, Paul Florin, Richard Rich, and David Chavis. 1990. "Benefits, Costs, Incentive Management and Participation in Voluntary Organizations: A Means to Understanding and Promoting Empowerment." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 18(1):117–149.

Prouteau, Lionel, and Boguslawa Sardinha. 2011. "Volunteering and Religiosity in European Union: Is Secularization a Threat for This Type of Civic Engagement?" Paper presented to ERNOP Conference, Vienna, Austria.

Prouteau, Lionel, and Muriel Tabariés. 2010. "The Unpaid Leaders of French Voluntary Associations." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 81(1):131–166.

Prouteau, Lionel, and F. C. Wolff. 2008. "On the Relational Motive for Volunteer Work." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 29(3):314–335.

Pugliese, Donato J. 1986. *Voluntary Associations: An Annotated Bibliography.* New York: Garland.

Ralston, Rita, and Steven Rhoden. 2005. "The Motivations and Expectations of Volunteers on Cycle Trails: The Case of the National Cycle Network, UK." *Tourism, Hospitality Planning & Development* 2(2):101–114.

Reddy, Richard D. 1974. "Personal Factors and Individual Participation in Formal Volunteer Groups." PhD dissertation, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA.

Reddy, Richard D., and David H. Smith. 1972. "Personality and Capacity Determinants of Individual Participation in Organized Voluntary Action." Pp. 277–298 in *Voluntary Action Research 1972*, edited by D. H. Smith, R. D. Reddy, and B. R. Baldwin. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Reich, James. 2009. "Avoidant Personality Disorder and Its Relationship to Social Phobia." *Current Psychiatry Reports* 11(1):89–93.

Reichborn-Kjennerud, Ted, Nikolai Czajkowski, Svenn Torgersen, Michael C. Neale, Ragnhild E. Ørstavik, Kristian Tambs, and Kenneth S. Kendler. 2007. "The Relationship Between Avoidant Personality Disorder and Social Phobia: A Population-Based Twin Study." *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 164(11):1722–1728.

Rettew, David C. 2000. "Avoidant Personality Disorder, Generalized Social Phobia, and Shyness: Putting the Personality Back into Personality Disorders." *Harvard Review of Psychiatry* 8(6):283–297.

Rochester, Colin, Angela Ellis-Paine, and Stephen Howlett. 2010. *Volunteering and Society in the 21st Century.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rochford. E. Burke, Jr. 1985. *Hare Krishna in America.* New Brunswick. NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Rogers, David L. 1971. "Contrasts Between Behavioral and Affective Involvement in Voluntary Associations: An Exploratory Analysis." *Rural Sociology* 36:340–358.

Rogers, David L., William D. Heffernan, and W. Keith Warner. 1972. "Benefits and Role Performance in Voluntary Organizations: An Exploration of Social Exchange." *The Sociological Quarterly* 13(2):183–196.

Rohs, F. R. 1986. "Social Background, Personality, and Attitudinal Factors Influencing the Decision to Volunteer and Level of Involvement Among Adult 4-H Leaders." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 15(1):87–99.

Rushton, J. Philippe. 1981. "The Altruistic Personality." Pp. 251–266 in *Altruism and Helping Behavior*, edited by J. P. Rushton and R. Sorrentino. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rushton, J. Philippe, R. D. Chrisjohn, and C. Fekken. 1981. "The Altruistic Personality and the Self-Report Altruism Scale." *Personality and Individual Differences* 2:293–303.

Santrock, John. 2015. *Lifespan Development*, 15th edition. New York: McGraw Hill Education.

Sardinha, Boguslawa. 2011. "The Economics of the Volunteering Decision." PhD dissertation, Evora University, Department of Economics, Evora, Portugal.

Sardinha, Boguslawa, and O. Cunha. 2012. "Portuguese Catholic Scout Association-Motivations of Adult Volunteers." Paper Presented at ISTR Conference in Sienna, Italy.

Scheufele, Dietram, and Dhavan Shah. 2000. "Personality Strength and Social Capital: The Role of Dispositional and Informational Variables in the Production of Civic Participation." *Communication Research* 27(2):107–131.

Schroeder, David A., and William G. Graziano. 2015. *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Schroeder, David A., Louis A. Penner, John F. Dovidio, and Jane A. Piliavin. 1995. *The Psychology of Helping and Altruism: Problems and Puzzles*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schultheiss, Oliver, and Joachim Brunstein. 2010. *Implicit Motives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schwartz, Jeffrey M., and Sharon Begley. 2002. *The Mind and the Brain*. New York: Harper.

Schwartz, Shalom H. 2012. "An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values." *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* 2(1):1–20.

Schwartz, Shalom H., and Tania Butenko. 2014. "Values and Behavior: Validating the Refined Value Theory in Russia." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 44(7):799–813.

Shantz, Amanda, Tina Saksida, and Kerstin Alfes. 2014. "Dedicating Time to Volunteering: Values, Engagement, and Commitment to Beneficiaries." *Applied Psychology* 63(4):671–697.

Shye, Samuel. 2010. "The Motivation to Volunteer: A Systemic Quality of Life Theory." *Social Indicators Research* 98(2):183–200.

Smith, Constance, and Anne Freedman. 1972. *Voluntary Associations: Perspectives on the Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, David H. 1964. "Psychological Factors Affecting Participation in Formal Voluntary Organizations in Chile." PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Department of Social Relations, Cambridge, MA.

Smith, David H. 1966. "A Psychological Model of Individual Participation in Formal Voluntary Organizations: Application to Some Chilean Data." *American Journal of Sociology* 72:249–266.

Smith, David H. 1973. *Latin American Student Activism*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Smith, David H. 1975. "Voluntary Action and Voluntary Groups." *Annual Review of Sociology* 1:247–270.

Smith, David H. 1980a. "Determinants of Individuals' Discretionary Use of Time." Pp. 34–75 in *Participation in Social and Political Activities*, edited by D. H. Smith, J. Macaulay, and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, David H. 1980b. "General Activity Model." Pp. 461–530 in *Participation in Social and Political Activities*, edited by D. H. Smith, J. Macaulay, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, David H. 1980c. "ISSTAL Model." Pp. 407–460 in *Participation in Social and Political Activities*, edited by D. H. Smith, J. Macaulay, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, David H. 1981. "Altruism, Volunteers, and Volunteerism." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 10(1):21–36.

Smith, David H. 1983. "Synanthrometrics: On Progress in the Development of a General Theory of Voluntary Action and Citizen Participation." Pp. 80–94 in *International Perspectives on Voluntary Action Research* edited by D. H. Smith and J. Van Til. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Smith, David H. 1985. "Volunteerism: Attracting Volunteers and Staffing Shrinking Programs." Pp. 225–251 in *Social Planning and Human Service Delivery in the Voluntary Sector*, edited by G. A. Tobin. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Smith, David H. 1994. "Determinants of Voluntary Association Participation and Volunteering: A Literature Review." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 23:243–263.

Smith, David H. 1995. "Democratic Personality." Pp. 941–943 in *The Encyclopedia of Democracy*, Volume 3, edited by S. M. Lipset. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Books.

Smith, David H. 2004. "Grassroots Association." Pp. 211–215 in *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*, Volume I, edited by D. Burlingame. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Smith, David H. 2010a. "Grassroots Associations." Pp. 804–810 in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*, edited by H. K. Anheier, S. Toepler, and R. List. New York: Springer.

Smith, David H. 2010b. "Membership and Membership Associations." Pp. 982–990 in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*, edited by H. K. Anheier, S. Toepler, and R. List. New York: Springer.

Smith, David H. 2014a. "An Interdisciplinary Theory of Individual Volunteering and Why So Few Researchers Have Tested It." *Civil Society in Russia and Beyond* (English translation of journal name, published in Russian) 5(2):35–42.

Smith, David H. 2014b. "S-Theory: Explaining Individual Behavior" [In Russian]. *Институт языкознания РАН* [Journal of Psycholinguistics] 22(4):139–157.

Smith, David H. 2015a. "S-Theory as a Comprehensive Explanation of Formal Volunteering: Testing *The Theory of Everyone* on Russian National Sample Interview Data." Paper presented at the annual Conference of ARNOVA, Chicago, IL, November 19–21.

Smith, David H. 2015b. "Voluntary Associations, Sociology of." Pp. 252–260 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,* 2nd edn. Vol. 25. James D. Wright, Editor-in-Chief. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Smith, David H. 2015c. "Voluntary Organizations." Pp. 261–267 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,* 2nd edn. Vol. 25. James D. Wright, Editor-in-Chief. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Smith, David H. 2016. "A Survey of Voluntaristics: Research on the Growth of the Global, Interdisciplinary, Socio-Behavioral Science Field and Emergent Inter-Discipline." *Voluntaristics Review: Brill Research Perspectives* 1(2):1–81.

Smith, David H. (forthcoming) 2017a. *S-Theory (Synanthrometrics) as "The Theory of Everyone" – A Proposed New Standard Human Science Model of Behavior, Especially Pro-Social Behavior.* Bradenton, FL: David Horton Smith International LLC.

Smith, David H. (forthcoming) 2017b. "The Complex Psychology of Formal Volunteering: Testing S-Theory, as *The Theory of Everyone*, on Russian National Sample Interview Data." Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Dept. of Sociology. Unpublished paper submitted for editorial review.

Smith, David H., and Richard D. Reddy. 1972a. "An Overview of the Determinants of Individual Participation in Organized Voluntary Action." Pp. 321–339 in *Voluntary Action Research 1972*, edited by D. H. Smith, R. D. Reddy, and B. R. Baldwin. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Smith, David H., and Richard D. Reddy. 1972b. "Contextual and Organizational Determinants of Individual Participation in Organized Voluntary Action." Pp. 299–320 in *Voluntary Action Research 1972*, edited by D. H. Smith, R. D. Reddy, and B. R. Baldwin. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Smith, David H., Richard D. Reddy and Burt R. Baldwin, eds. 1972. *Voluntary Action Research: 1972*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Smith, David H., and Nancy Theberge. 1987. *Why People Recreate: An Overview of Research*. Champaign, IL: Life Enhancement Publications.

Sniehotta, Falko F., Justin Presseau, and Vera Araújo-Soares. 2014. "Time to Retire the Theory of Planned Behavior." *Health Psychology Review* 8:1–7.

Sokolowski, S. Wojciech. 1996. "Show Me the Way to the Next Worthy Deed: Towards a Microstructural Theory of Volunteering and Giving." *Voluntas* 7(3):259–278.

Spangler, William D. 1992. "Validity of Questionnaire and TAT Measures of Need for Achievement: Two Meta-Analyses." *Psychological Bulletin* 112(1):140–154.

Starnes, Becky J., and Walter W. Wymer Jr. 2000. "Demographics, Personality Traits, Roles, Motivations, and Attrition Rates of Hospice Volunteers." *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing* 7(2):61–76.

Stead, R., G. Cynthia Fekken, A. Kay, and K. McDermott. 2012. "Conceptualizing the Dark Triad of Personality: Links to Social Symptomatology." *Personality and Individual Differences* 53:1023–1028.

Sternberg, Robert J., and Scott B. Kaufman 2011. *Handbook of Intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Storm, Ingrid. 2015. "Civic Engagement in Britain: The Role of Religion and Inclusive Values." *European Sociological Review* 31(1):14–29.

Stukas, Arthur A., Russell Hoye, Matthew Nicholson, Kevin M. Brown, and Laura Aisbett. (in press) 2015. "Motivations to Volunteer and Their Associations with Volunteers' Well-Being." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. doi: 0899764014561122.

Stukas, Arthur A., Keilah A. Worth, E. Gil Clary, and Mark Snyder. 2009. "The Matching of Motivations to Affordances in the Volunteer Environment an Index for Assessing the

Impact of Multiple Matches on Volunteer Outcomes." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38(1):5–28.

Stukas, Arthur A., Mark Snyder, and E. Gil Clary. 2015. "Volunteerism and Community Involvement: Antecedents, Experiences, and Consequences for the Person and the Situation." Pp. 459–493 in *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior,* edited by D. A. Schroeder and W. G. Graziano. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stürmer, Stefan, Bernd Simon, Michael I. Loewy. 2008. "Intraorganizational Respect and Organizational Participation: The Mediating Role of Collective Identity." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 11 (1):5–20.

Swain, James E., Sara Konrath, Stephanie L. Brown, Eric D. Finegood, Leyla B. Carolyn J. Dayton, and S. Shaun Ho. 2012. "Parenting and Beyond: Common Neurocircuits Underlying Parental and Altruistic Caregiving." *Parenting Science and Practice* 12:115–123.

Swann, William B., and Michael D. Buhrmester. 2015. "Identity Fusion." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 24(1):52–57.

Thomas, Elaine, George Peat, Lindsey Harris, Ross Wilkie, and Peter R. Croft. 2004. "The Prevalence of Pain and Pain Interference in a General Population of Older Adults: Cross-Sectional Findings from the North Staffordshire Osteoarthritis Project (NorStOP)." *Pain* 110(1):361–368.

Tomeh, Aida K. 1973. "Formal Voluntary Organizations: Participation, Correlates, and Interrelationships." *Sociological Inquiry* 43(3–4):89–122.

Townsend, Edgar J. 1973. "An Examination of Participants in Organizational, Political, Informational, and Interpersonal Activities." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 2(4):200–211.

Tsai, Yi-Ching, Yi Chen, Ming-Fen Lui, Lung-Sheng Tung, Huei-Ru Chung, Yi-Fen Hu, Yi-Huang Yeh, and Wen-Ho Huang. 2008. "The Perception, Participatory Intention and Satisfaction of Volunteers at a Community Blood Pressure Measurement Station." *Taiwan Journal of Family Medicine* 18(4):233–241. [蔡怡靜, 陳怡, 呂旻芬, 董龍生, 鐘惠如, 胡怡芬, 葉一晃, 黃文河. 2008. "社區血壓站保健志工認知、參與意願及滿意度之調查研究." *台灣家庭醫學雜誌* 18(4):233–241].

Unger, Lynette S. 1991. "Altruism as a Motivation to Volunteer." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 12(1):71–100.

Uslaner, Eric M. 1998. "Social Capital, Television, and the 'Mean world': Trust, optimism, and civic participation." *Political Psychology* 19(3):441–467.

Uslaner, Eric M. 2002. *The Moral Foundations of Trust.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Uslaner, Eric M., and Mitchell Brown. 2005. "Inequality, Trust, and Civic Engagement." *American Politics Research* 33(6):868–894.

Uzzell, David L. 1980. "Conflicting Explanations of Participatory Group Membership." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 9(1–4). 201–210.

Van Ingen, Erik, and René Bekkers. 2015. "Generalized Trust Through Civic Engagement? Evidence from Five National Panel Studies." *Political Psychology* 36(3):277–294.

Vantilborgh, Tim, Jemima Bidee, Roland Pepermans, Jurgen Willems, Gert Huybrechts, and Marc Jegers. 2013. "Revisiting the Relationship Between Personality and Psychological Contracts: A Moderated Mediation Model Explaining Volunteer Performance." *Social Service Review* 87(1):158–186.

Vellekoop-Baldock, Cora. 1990. *Volunteers in Welfare.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Veludo-de-Oliveira, Tania, John G. Pallister, and Gordon R. Foxall. 2013. "Accounting for Sustained Volunteering by Young People: An Expanded TPB." *Voluntas* 24(4):1180–1198.

Vermeer, Paul, and Peer Scheepers. 2012. "Religious Socialization and Non-Religious Volunteering: A Dutch Panel Study." *Voluntas* 23(4):940–958.

Verplanken, Bas, and Rob W. Holland. 2002. "Motivated Decision Making: Effects of Activation and Self-Centrality of Values on Choices and Behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82(3):434.

Wai, Michael, and Niko Tiliopoulos. 2012. "The Affective and Cognitive Empathic Nature of the Dark Triad of Personality." *Personality and Individual Differences* 52(7):794–799.

Warburton, Jeni, Deborah J. Terry, Linda S. Rosenman, and Margaret Shapiro. 2001. "Differences Between Older Volunteers and Nonvolunteers Attitudinal, Normative, and Control Beliefs." *Research on Aging* 23(5):586–605.

Weber, Max (transl. Everett C. Hughes). [1910] 1972. "Max Weber's Proposal for the Sociological Study of Voluntary Associations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 1(1):20–23.

Wilkinson-Maposa, Susan, A. Fowler, C. Oliver Evans, and C. Mulenga. 2005. *The Poor Philanthropist: How and Why the Poor Help Each Other.* Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town, Graduate School of Business.

Wilson, John. 2000. "Volunteering." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:215–240.

Wilson, John. 2012. "Volunteerism Research a Review Essay." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(2):176–212.

Wilson, John, and Marc Musick. 1997. "Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work." *American Sociological Review* 62:694–713.

Wilson, John, and Marc A. Musick. 1999. "Attachment to Volunteering." *Sociological Forum* 14(2):243–272.

Winter, David G., Oliver P. John, Abigail J. Stewart, Eva C. Klohnen, and Lauren E. Duncan. 1998. "Traits and Motives: Toward an Integration of Two Traditions in Personality Research." *Psychological Review* 105(2):230–250.

Wisner, Priscilla S., Anne Stringfellow, William E. Youngdahl, and Lenore Parker. 2005. "The Service Volunteer–Loyalty Chain: An Exploratory Study of Charitable Not-for-Profit Service Organizations." *Journal of Operations Management* 23(2):143–161.

Wittek, Rafael, and René Bekkers. 2015. "The Sociology of Prosocial Behavior and Altruism." Pp. 579–583 in *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2nd Edition,* Volume 1, edited by J. D. Wright. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Wu, J., and J. M. LeBreton. 2011. "Reconsidering the Dispositional Basis of Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Role of Aberrant Personality." *Personnel Psychology* 64:593–626.

Zimmerman, Mark, Louis Rothschild, and Iwona Chelminski. 2014. "The Prevalence of DSM-IV Personality Disorders in Psychiatric Outpatients." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 162(10):1911–1918.