Involuntary Volunteerism: What Happens When You Require People to "Do Good?"

Susan M. Henney
University of Houston-Downtown

Justin D. Hackett
California University of Pennsylvania

Marie Rose Porreca
University of Houston-Downtown

Introduction

Volunteering is most commonly perceived as a purely voluntary and optional act. However, the act of requiring service is nothing new; it occurs in schools at all levels (i.e., service-learning), as a consequence of misbehavior (i.e., "court-ordered" community service), as part of the requirements for advancement in social organizations (i.e., Scouting), or as part of workplace expectations (i.e., service at an employer-backed charity). The voluntary nature of volunteerism is motivationally and socially complex; it can be clear that a person is following a mandate (course requirement or court order), but others may appear to be freely giving their time, when in reality they feel pressured to serve by others. If volunteerism is on a continuum between intrinsic, strongly encouraged, and required behavior, it becomes difficult to definitively separate required and non-required service (Beehr, LeGro, Porter, Bowling, & Swader, 2010).

Prior research defines volunteering and volunteerism in a variety of ways, often because they are focusing on certain aspects of behavior. Participation in long-term prosocial behavior (behavior that benefits others and/or the community) is the predominant definition of volunteering found in the current research (Barber, Mueller, & Ogata, 2013; Batson, Ahmad, & Tsang, 2002; Beehr, LeGro, Porter, Bowling, & Swader, 2010; Bekkers, 2005; Finkelstein & Brannick, 2007; Finkelstein, Penner & Brannick, 2005; Helms, 2013; Matsuba, Hart, & Atkins, 2007; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; Van Vianen, Nijstad, & Voskuijl, 2008), with *others* being defined as strangers and not friends or family (Finkelstein, Penner & Brannick, 2005; Finkelstein & Brannick, 2007). It is important in some definitions that the behavior be non-obligatory and unselfish (Beehr, LeGro,

ABSTRACT

The voluntary nature of volunteerism has increasingly been called into question, particularly in situations where people are required to volunteer as part of a class or activity. This study questioned 357 students at a diverse urban university about their experiences with volunteerism, both as part of a class and not part of a class. Results suggest a disconnect between what participants "think" when asked about their hypothetical views about involuntary volunteering, versus their actual attitudes after having engaged in mandated service for a class. Although negative perceptions existed when participants thought about being forced to volunteer, after actually volunteering, the vast majority were very supportive of the experience. Overall, taken together the results suggest that the experience of forced volunteerism did not have a negative impact on future volunteer intentions.

Porter, Bowling, & Swader, 2010; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; Van Vianen, Nijstad, & Voskuijl, 2008) and/or performed without pay or external rewards (Bekkers, 2005; Finkelstein & Brannick, 2007; Helms, 2013; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; Van Vianen, Nijstad, & Voskuijl, 2008). Some authors define volunteerism as a planned behavior within an organizational context in order to differentiate volunteer activities from spontaneous acts of kindness (Barraza, 2011; Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Matsuba, Hart, & Atkins, 2007; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010). Other definitions include unstructured informal volunteer activities that are not within an organizational context, such as donations of money and providing informal assistance to others (Helms, 2013; Finkelstein, & Brannick, 2007).

In contrast to the many definitions of volunteerism, little work describes what involuntary volunteering is. Beehr, LeGro, Porter, Bowling, and Swader (2010) defined required volunteerism as service being performed for external reward. It has also been defined as an individual's involvement in volunteering activities that is not done by choice but rather mandated by an outside organization (Volunteer Canada, 2006). Barber, Mueller, and Ogata (2013) specified that this type of service is not performed for the greater good or personal satisfaction, but rather because school, church, parents or a personal goal required the behavior. The State of Maryland's volunteer service requirement for high school graduation is a good example of this (Helms, 2013). However, does this mean that the student who seeks out volunteer opportunities to increase the chance of getting into college is not freely volunteering, since the act is not only performed for the greater good? What about the stay-at-home mom who volunteers to broaden her social contacts? Or the employee who joins the March of Dimes Walk with his colleagues in order to avoid being labeled 'not a team player' at work--is he not contributing to the cause? We suggest a definition of involuntary volunteerism stating that it is prosocial behavior, perceived by the individual as *predominantly* performed for external reward or to avoid negative consequences. We can therefore acknowledge that one can still 'freely volunteer' even if some of their motives for volunteering are not unselfish and internal.

Females, those with higher education levels, and students with parents involved in volunteer activities have consistently been found to volunteer more (Barber, Mueller, & Ogata, 2013; Bekkers, 2005; Matsuba, Hart, & Atkins, 2007; Helms, 2013), as do people who regularly attend and participate in religious services (Barber, Mueller, & Ogata, 2013; Helms, 2013). Researchers have examined how motivations affect one's propensity towards future volunteerism. Clary et al. (1998) proposed six categories of motivations and how they affect volunteering: Value (altruistic); understanding (to learn new or use skills); Social (enhance interpersonal relationships); Career (career enhancement or resume building); Protective (build up low self-esteem); and Enhancement (psychological growth). Social, understanding, and career motivations could all be factors leading to "required" volunteerism. Social pressures have been linked to long term volunteering, but also to decreased satisfaction (VanVianen, Nijstad, & Voskuijl, 2008), which can decrease one's commitment to volunteer (Finkelstein, Penner & Brannick, 2005). These same pressures may play a positive role, with other people's expectations that one will volunteer linked to increased volunteer activity and integration of the volunteer role identity (Finkelstein, Penner & Brannick, 2005). Frequency of participation and increased identification with the volunteer role also

increases future volunteerism (Barraza, 2011; Finkelstein, & Brannick, 2007). This makes sense because participation increases activity in the community and builds relationships with other people, such as networking and creating professional opportunities, which in turn create more opportunities to volunteer. Thus, it is possible that the decrease in satisfaction and subsequent decreased future intentions to volunteer caused by social motivations are offset by the positive effects of increased volunteer activity and role identification. It must be noted that other studies have found that self-focused (understanding, protective or career motivations), instrumental, and extrinsic motives all decrease the likelihood of future volunteerism (Finkelstein, 2010; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; Beehr, LeGro, Porter, Bowling, & Swader, 2010).

A strong relationship has been found between future volunteerism and student participation in both voluntary and required prosocial behaviors (Barber, Mueller, & Ogata, 2013; Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007). An early study on mandated volunteerism and future intentions to volunteer found that students' intentions were marginally affected by the mandated requirement, if they were initially more likely to freely volunteer (Stukas, Synder, & Clary, 1999). All of these studies noted the detrimental effects on future intentions to volunteer when the initial exposure was *solely* required volunteerism. Since volunteers' motives are often mixed with internal and externally required reasons to participate, it is hard to claim that only freely chosen prosocial behaviors will reap benefits. Rather, consideration should be given to which motive is most salient for the individual at the time of volunteering. Ryan and Deci (2000) explain how external factors contribute to self-motivation, which seems to be related to ongoing volunteer engagement. They also suggest that, according to self-determination theory, individuals who get a sense of competence and independence while being able to relate within the community experience an increase in self-motivation. Therefore, school engagement, by providing a structure that fosters experience and opportunities to build competencies may be beneficial to ensuring future volunteerism (Barber, Mueller, & Ogata, 2013). Batson, Ahmad, and Tsang (2002) found that four factors of motivation are related to successful volunteerism: egoism, altruism, collectivism, and principalism. Enhancing personal welfare (egoism), concern for the welfare of others (altruism) or a group (collectivism), and the maintenance of moral principles (principalism) are all factors that require a careful balance between strengths and weaknesses that may be facilitated by organizational efforts. If the motives are more internal than external, or if participants have some control over their choice, then involuntary volunteering can still be beneficial to the volunteer, the organization and the recipients.

The relationship between the variety of human motivations that may be present when one "involuntarily" volunteers and the desire to continue volunteering is complex and not well understood. The current study seeks to explore factors associated with "involuntary volunteering." That is, are there positive, prosocial benefits associated with experiencing "forced volunteerism," or are there drawbacks to not being able to freely choose volunteer experiences? For instance, are there negative consequences that result from requiring individuals already motivated to "give back" to volunteer in specific domains? What are the implications of involuntary volunteerism for future volunteerism intentions? Finally, we had a unique opportunity to use the present data to develop typologies of volunteers based on their beliefs about being forced to volunteer and other

relevant factors identified in the literature. Specifically, we were interested in whether meaningful typologies could be developed that classify volunteers based on their beliefs about the importance of being free to choose their own volunteer activities, their volunteerism intentions, and their overall enjoyment of volunteering. The ability to identify students who might persist in and maintain enjoyment of volunteer activities under conditions of mandatory volunteerism will be a benefit to those who design classes or programs with this component.

Method
Participants

Three hundred fifty-seven students were recruited from the Psychology Research Pool of an urban, Hispanic- and Minority-serving institution. The university is atypical of four-year universities, in that it is ethnically diverse (Hispanic=38.9%, Black/African American=28.8%, White=20%, other=12.3%) and enrolls older-than-average students (average undergraduate age= 26.8; average age at first admission=24.3). As one would expect from this population, the current sample is equally diverse. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 62 (Median age=23), and 15.7% were freshman, 17.6% were sophomores, 31.9% were juniors, and 33.6% were seniors in academic standing. Two hundred and thirty were women (65.7% of 350 responding), and the ethnic identification of the participants was 33.9% Hispanic, 28% African American, 22.7% White, non-Hispanic, 7.3% Asian, and 7% with other ethnic identifications, such as biracial and Native American. Most participants were employed at least part-time (67%), and the average personal income was about $15,000. All participants reported that they had volunteered at least once in their lifetime. While a majority of respondents indicated that they had only volunteered once, on isolated occasions, or sporadically (73.1%), the remainder indicated that they volunteered whenever they could fit it into their schedules (12%) or on a regular basis (14.8%). Most participants reported that the time spent during each incidence of volunteerism was one to three hours (62.4%), although some spent less than one hour (9%), four to six hours (20.8%), all day (5.9%), or overnight (2%).

Procedure

Participants completed a survey that included a short demographic survey, a series of questions about their volunteerism while in college, and a standardized questionnaire. Within the volunteerism section, participants were first asked to respond to general questions about their attitudes and behaviors regarding volunteerism on a 5-point scale (strongly disagree ("1") to strongly agree ("5")). Examples of this type of question include: "I enjoy volunteering in general;" "It is important to me to be free to choose volunteer activities as I see fit;" and "I will participate in volunteer activities in the future."

Participants were then asked to report on up to three specific volunteer activities that they participated in while attending college as part of a class. Items included the nature of the activity, hours spent per week on the activity, and the extent to which they perceived the activity to be mandatory or optional. The same questions were then asked regarding volunteer activities they engaged in that were not part of a class. We were initially concerned about a self-selection bias. Specifically, that students may have selected these courses based on the volunteer requirements involved with the class.

However, at the time the study was conducted the course descriptions in the university catalogue did not list volunteer requirements for any course. As a result, students would not have been aware that volunteering was an aspect of any course that they chose, nor would it have been a way to choose between courses. Moreover, among the participants who had volunteered as part of a college class, exactly half had a high level of previous volunteer experience (often or regularly) and half had a low level of previous volunteer experience (sporadically or less). Finally, there was no difference between those who had volunteered as part of a college class and those who had not on their enjoyment of volunteer activities prior to college, $t(125)= -.55$, p=ns.

A standardized questionnaire measuring Social Responsibility (SR) was included. This measure was included to assess a specific internal motivation for volunteerism, specifically, the belief that one is obligated to contribute to the greater good of society through one's actions. This addresses the "principalism" and "collectivism" motivations for volunteerism (Batson, Ahmad, & Tsang, 2002), and provides a way to relate the internal motivations of social responsibility to the externally mandated situation of involuntary volunteerism. The SR questionnaire (Nedwek, 1987; additional items developed by Flewelling, Paschall, & Ringwalt, 1993) provides a measure of civic responsibility and awareness. The mean score on the SR was 43.25 (SD=6.08), which translates to an average scale score of 3.93, indicating a "good" awareness of their social responsibility. For the current study, the eleven items, aggregated to form a composite measure of social responsibility, showed acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .73$).

Results

Consistent with previous work, women enjoyed volunteering (M=4.17, SD=.83) more than men (M=3.84, SD=.82), $t(348) = -3.49$, $p < .001$. Age and income (rs < -.04, ps = ns), and marital status, employment, and ethnicity were not related to enjoyment of volunteerism, Fs < 1.52, ps = ns). Overall, the frequency with which participants engaged in volunteer activities was significantly related to enjoyment of these activities, $F(4,352)=17.21$, $p<.001$. People who volunteer more are more likely to enjoy volunteering.

Males' scores (M=41.25, SD=6.24) were significantly lower than females' scores on SR (M= 44.43, SD=5.68), $t(338) = -4.76$, $p<.001$. SR was significantly related to age (r=.26, $p < .001$) and income (r=.12, $p < .05$); as age and income increased, so did social responsibility. In addition, SR was significantly related to enjoyment of volunteering, being free to choose the volunteer activity, belief that you can make a meaningful contribution, participation in the future, and participation in the next year (rs > .12, ps < .05). SR was not related to ethnicity, $F(3,314) = .54$, $p = ns$.

Involuntary Volunteerism

More than 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it is important to them to choose volunteer opportunities as they see fit. Being free to choose volunteer activities was related to greater enjoyment of volunteering (r=.27, $p<.01$), feeling that one is making a meaningful contribution (r=.43, $p<.01$), finding relevant volunteer activities (r=.34, $p<.01$), willingness to participate in volunteer activities in the future

(r=.34, *p*<.01), performance as a volunteer (*r* =.13, *p*<.05), and having friends in high school (*r* =.11, *p*<.05) and college (*r* =.12, *p*<.05) who volunteered. However, when asked about how they would feel if forced to volunteer, 51% disagreed or strongly disagreed that they would volunteer again if they felt forced to do the activity. These findings highlight that participants placed substantial emphasis on the importance of feeling free to select the types of volunteer activities that they choose to be involved in.

Seventy-six of the 351 participants had volunteered at least once as part of a class in college. This 'forced' volunteerism provides an opportunity to examine the influence of this experience. Of those who had volunteered in college as part of a class, the overwhelming majority enjoyed their volunteer experience(s) (86.8%). Participants who took part in a mandatory volunteer activity as part of a class (*M* = 3.75, *SD* =.53, n=24) were *more* likely than those who had non-mandatory activities (*M* =3.29, *SD* =.94, n=51) to say that they will volunteer again in the future, *t*(70)=2.67, *p*<.05. Although participants had indicated (without reference to actual behavior) that feeling forced to volunteer would attenuate future volunteer behaviors, actually engaging in 'forced' volunteer activities appears to encourage intentions to be more engaged in the future. Interestingly, engaging in involuntary volunteering is also related to participants' thoughts about others' responsibility to volunteer. Of 72 respondents who had engaged in volunteerism as part of a college class, 58 agree or strongly agree (80.6%) that they are in favor in general of having college students volunteer as part of a class.

Overall, there was no difference in enjoyment of these activities between those who participated voluntarily and those for whom it was mandatory, *t*(70) = -.61, *p* = *ns*. This indicates that being forced to volunteer does not appreciably change enjoyment of the activity. There was no difference between participants who engaged in a mandatory volunteer activity as part of a class and those who had not on whether they performed well on volunteerism tasks, *t*(69)=1.07, *p*=ns. Participants who were involved in a mandatory volunteer activity as part of a class were *less* likely than those who did non-mandatory activities to agree that being forced to volunteer would impact their performance on volunteer tasks, *t*(72)=-2.54, *p*<.05.

A hierarchical regression analysis examined whether the importance placed on feeling free to choose the types of volunteer activities one engages in can be predicted by greater volunteer behavior over time and enjoyment of volunteer experiences. As recommended by Baron and Kenney (1986), measures were centered and the multiplicative interaction term was created. Key demographic variables were entered in Step 1: age, gender, income, and ethnicity. However, none of these variables were significant predictors. The key predictors, lifetime volunteer activities and enjoyment of volunteer activities, were entered in Step 2. The addition of these variables significantly contributed to the prediction of importance to choose volunteer activities, ΔR^2 = .09, *p* < .001. Greater lifetime involvement in volunteer activities (β = .15, *t* = 2.52, *p* = .01) and enjoyment of volunteer activities (β = .21, *t* = 3.45, *p* = .001) predicted greater importance of choosing volunteer activities. The two-way interaction, entered in Step 3, was not significant. Overall, the regression equation was significant, *R* = .34, R^2 = .12, R^2_{adj} = .10, *F*(1, 305) = 5.71, *p* < .001.

Utilizing participants who had volunteered as part of a class, a second hierarchical regression was run examining whether social responsibility predicts feeling forced to engage in specific volunteer activities. More specifically, does the perception

that one has an obligation to act in ways that benefit society relate to feeling forced to engage in particular volunteer activities as a course requirement? That is, does the felt obligation to give back to society impact the perception that one was forced to volunteer? The internal desire to contribute to society may conflict with the requirement to volunteer and create the perception that one is forced to engage in these activities. As with the first analysis, demographic variables were entered in Step 1 and the regression equation was not significant, $R = .25$, $R^2 = .06$, $F(4, 60) = 99$, $p = ns$. Social responsibility was entered in Step 2 and significantly contributed to the prediction of feeling forced to volunteer, $\Delta R^2 = .10$, $F(1, 59) = 6.70$, $p = .01$. That is, feeling one has a responsibility to improve the lives of people around them was associated with feeling forced to engage in volunteer activities, $\beta = .34$, $t = 2.59$, $p = .01$.   In other words, the more internally motivated people are to engage in volunteerism via their sense of social responsibility, the more they report feeling forced to engage in volunteer activities as part of a class. Paradoxically, perhaps, the internal factor that encourages people to volunteer their time for the benefit of society also is related to a heightened need to be able to be in control of that effort rather than mandated to comply with it.

Volunteering Typologies

We were interested in determining if there were ways to distinguish between student volunteers by creating classifications that would be useful to those developing classes or programming for them. In other words, do different characteristics of student volunteers, such as importance of being able to freely choose one's volunteer activities and enjoyment of volunteer activities, hang together in such a way as to form useful groupings of student volunteers? It would then be possible to ascertain how these different classifications of volunteers perceived being forced to volunteer as part of a class.

A hierarchical cluster analysis utilizing Ward's method was performed for the purpose of developing a "typology" of volunteers from the current data. A two-cluster solution was sought, with a Euclidean Distance measure. The standardized variables used for the clustering were age, enjoyment of volunteering, importance of freedom to choose volunteer activities, and willingness to participate in volunteer activities in the future. The analysis resolved into two similar-sized clusters (Cluster 1=196 and Cluster 2=154), which differed significantly on the main variables [age: $t(348)=4.49$, $p<.001$; enjoyment: $t(348)=-11.49$, $p<.001$; free to choose: $t(348)=-8.34$, $p<.001$; and future volunteerism: $t(348)=-19.47$, $p<.001$] and also distinguished significantly on other key variables that allowed us to form a "typology" for each cluster. We termed Cluster 1 the "Resolute Volunteers" and Cluster 2 the "Ambivalent Volunteers."

The Resolute Volunteers cluster consists of volunteers who are older ($M= 27$ years) than the Ambivalent Volunteers, strongly enjoy volunteering, find it more important than the Ambivalent Volunteers to be free to choose volunteer activities, and are very certain they will volunteer again in the future. The Resolute Volunteers are more likely to be female, married or divorced, have children, and have incomes over $70,000. The Resolute Volunteers also feature a significantly higher Social Responsibility score, and they consist of the greatest proportion of those who volunteer on a regular basis.

The Ambivalent Volunteer cluster consists of younger volunteers (M=23.5 years), more neutral-positive about volunteering in general, feel it is less important to be free to choose (although still important overall), and are less certain they will volunteer again in the future. The Ambivalent Volunteers contains a greater proportion of the male and Black respondents (although other ethnicities are represented), and all but two respondents had an income less than $70,000. Interestingly, one of the few variables that the Resolute versus Ambivalent Volunteers did not differ on was, "if you volunteered as part of a class, did you feel forced?" In other words, when they actually volunteered (instead of just thinking about it), they did not differ in the extent to which they "felt" forced to do it. It is instructive to note that important aspects of student volunteers, including age, experience with volunteerism, enjoyment of volunteerism, and future volunteer intentions did hang together in such a way as to present a useful profile of volunteerism categories in students.

Discussion

Volunteerism that is less than purely "voluntary" in nature is a growing aspect of American life; indeed, the prestigious Carnegie Community Engagement Classification seeks, in part, to institutionalize community engagement in the higher education curriculum, as it has already been integrated into many high schools' curriculum (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, n.d.). The result is to put more students in positions where they are engaged in community activities in order to meet learning objectives for individual courses or programs. Within this context, it is important to know the effects of such requirements, as one of the prosocial consequences of volunteerism requirements should be continued community engagement.

When respondents "think" about being forced to volunteer in general, they view it more negatively. Specifically, they think not being free to choose would result in less enjoyment, lower propensity to volunteer again, and less relevant volunteer activities. However, when they actually engage in mandatory volunteering behavior, they are more likely to say they will volunteer in the future. There appears to be a cognitive component at work in this instance in that there is a cognitive bias against being forced to do things. In the US, "freedom" in all aspects of life is a cultural theme that persists across situations. Cognitively, this is probably a reflection of a framing bias, wherein "freedom to choose" is more salient than other aspects of the question and the risk of being "forced" to do something outweighs the benefits. It could also be a form of the anchoring effect, whereby we ground our assumptions on a focal part of the issue (in this case, freedom to choose), and thereby the assessment of the rest of the matter is a foregone conclusion. Overall, the words "freedom to choose" and voluntary are probably seen synonymously and interchangeably, so to introduce a mandatory component violates the cognitive connection between the two.

Another key finding is that even though more than 50% said they would be less likely to volunteer again if they felt "forced" to do the activity, when students actually participated in 'forced' volunteerism as part of a class, they said they would perform the activity again. The mere exposure effect would assume that the act of participating in volunteerism could produce a preference, even if it was involuntary (Zajonc, 1980). Mere exposure negates the necessity for participants to cognitively process or consider the implications of voluntary versus involuntary action; the behavior and the preference

are concurrent. In other words, it doesn't really matter if it is truly voluntary as much as it is that they do it, which opens the door to future volunteerism intentions. This further implies that it is not wholly enjoyment—or the conscious understanding of enjoyment—that matters. In fact, in the present study enjoyment of the activity does not differ between mandatory and voluntary participants, which does imply that it is likely not just a "halo effect" around prosocial behavior that produces future volunteerism intentions; exposure produces the propensity to view future volunteerism favorably.

This study found that the higher the sense of social responsibility, the more respondents felt forced to do specific volunteer activities. Goal achievement may explain this finding. Those with a high level of social responsibility may volunteer with the goal of helping others and have a well-defined sense of what types of prosocial behaviors will bring about the most good. These feelings of responsibility may be strong enough for some to feel forced to volunteer or be engaged to meet the internal drive to give back to society. More specifically, the internal motivation to give back to society may drive people to be engaged. Not fulfilling these motivations, due to being forced into a specific activity, could bring about feelings of discomfort.

One concern regarding forced volunteerism, is that the experience may 'backfire' and cause less engagement in the future. As suggested by the overjustification effect, among those students highly motivated to be socially engaged, extrinsically rewarding them for volunteering may diminish this internal motivation. Prior research has found that intrinsic motivations can be attenuated if the behavior is needed to obtain some external reward (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973). In the classroom setting, students volunteering as a course requirement are engaging in the behavior as a means to obtain an external reward – here, a good grade. Theoretically, concern regarding the negative impact of the over-justification effect on future intentions to volunteer seems warranted. The results, however, do not support this concern. Among those highly motivated to be social engaged, forced volunteerism did *not* negatively impact future intentions to be engaged. Furthermore, if we consider the Resolute Volunteers, they score higher on social responsibility, enjoy volunteering, find it important to choose the volunteer activities they are engage in, and are very certain they will volunteer again in the future. The experience of forced volunteerism did not have a negative impact on future volunteer intentions. This result in combination with the other positive findings from this study should alleviate concerns about the negative impact of forced volunteerism.

Of the respondents who had engaged in volunteerism as part of a college class, most agree or strongly agree (80.6%) that they are in favor of having college students volunteer as part of a class. This finding suggests that although they were forced to engage in volunteerism for course credit, participants found the experience beneficial. So much so, in fact, that the majority of participants endorsed having students volunteer as part of the college experience. While social responsibility may serve as a strong antecedent for engaging in prosocial behaviors, it may be that actual engagement in these behaviors generates positive benefits as well. Certainly, the respondents seem to think that the benefits are strong enough that they would require *others* to do what they were required to do.

Finally, the results suggest that greater involvement in volunteerism and more enjoyment of it predicts that people will want to be free to choose their own volunteer

activities. It is clear from both regression and cluster analyses that those who are experienced volunteers place a high value on freedom to choose. This makes sense, as they have reality-based expectations and prior experience with what does and does not fit for them in terms of volunteering. Previous research into person-environment fit and volunteerism supports the conclusion; a good match between volunteer activity and participant needs/personality increases enjoyment and future participation (Clary et al., 1998; VanVianen, Nijstad, & Voskuijl, 2008). Limiting one's freedom to choose reduces the chances, in the participant's perception, that the volunteer activity will be as personally compatible as previous experiences and thus yield fewer benefits and less enjoyment. The current results could also be related to the functional value of volunteerism in the participants' lives. That is, volunteers engage in specific behaviors that satisfy important goals. These goals can include anything from career enhancement to obtaining a sense of competency. When thinking about the freedom to choose, the view is that it is unlikely that the forced volunteer behavior will aide them in reaching these goals. For Resolute Volunteers performing an act that has been chosen for them takes time and resources away from volunteer behavior they view as more important. This could be a critical reason why these experienced volunteers place a high premium on the freedom to choose their behavior. Moreover, freedom to choose may be key to sustaining volunteer behaviors by allowing volunteers to "match" their motivations and reasons for volunteering with specific volunteer activities (Clary et al., 1998).

Limitations and Future Directions

There are limitations to the study that should be mentioned. The data were collected through cross-sectional and self-report surveys, and as a result, the causal direction between variables and the possible influences of self-presentational concerns are unclear. The data utilized in this sample focused on involuntary volunteerism experienced by college students. As such, the pattern of results may be limited to this type of experience. A different series of results could be found amongst other types of forced volunteerism (i.e., Boy and Girl Scout activities, court-ordered community service, etc.). These limitations notwithstanding, the strengths of this study and the results obtained are noteworthy.

This study provides insight into the benefits of 'forced' volunteerism. Participants found the experiences important enough to endorse the belief that others should volunteer as part of college courses. Future research could examine the long-term impact of forced college-based volunteerism. There could be meaningful effects that extend further into adulthood. There may be interesting effects for forced volunteerism on future civic engagement for individuals high in social responsibility. It may be that creating dissonance encourages future behavior corresponding to the internal motivations to be involved. As a result, there may be greater engagement after forced volunteerism. Longitudinal research projects may begin to uncover how volunteering as part of a course could generate greater civic and social engagement.

References

Barber, C., Mueller, C. T., & Ogata, S. (2013). Volunteerism as purpose: Examining the long-term predictors of continued community engagement. *Education Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 33(3),* 314-333. doi:10.1080/01443410.2013.772775

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6),* 1173-1182. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

Barraza, J. A. (2011). Positive emotional expectations predict volunteer outcomes for new volunteers. *Motivation and Emotion*, 35(2), 211-219. doi:10.1007/s11031-011-9210-4

Batson, C., Ahmad, N., & Tsang, J. (2002). Four motives for community involvement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 429-445. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.00269

Beehr, T. A., LeGro, K., Porter, K., Bowling, N. A., & Swader, W. M. (2010). Required volunteers: Community volunteerism among students in college classes. *Teaching of Psychology, 37(4),* 276-280. doi:10.1080/00986283.2010.510965

Bekkers, R. (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 439-454. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00425.x

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations to volunteer: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(6),* 1516-1530. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516

Finkelstein, M. A., Penner, L. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2005). Motive, role identity, and prosocial personality as predictors of volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *33(4)*, 403-418. doi:10.2224/sbp.2005.33.4.403

Finkelstein, M. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2007). Applying theories of institutional helping to informal volunteering: Motives, role identity, and prosocial personality. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *35*(1), 101-114. doi:10.2224/sbp.2007.35.1.101

Finkelstein, M. A. (2010). Individualism/collectivism: Implications for the volunteer process. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *38(4)*, 445-452. doi:10.2224/sbp.2010.38.4.445

Flewelling, R. L., Paschall, M. J., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1993). *Supporting adolescents with guidance and employment (SAGE) baseline survey*. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC.

Hart, D., Donnelly, T. M., Youniss, J., & Atkins, R. (2007). High school community service as a predictor of adult voting and volunteering. *American EducationResearch Journal, 44(1)*, 197-219. doi:10.3102/002831206298173

Helms, S. (2013). Involuntary Volunteering: The impact of mandated service in public schools. *Economics of Education Review, 36,* 295-310. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.06.003

Matsuba, K., Hart, D., & Atkins, R. (2007). Psychological and social-structural influences on commitment to volunteering. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41(4)*, 889-907. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.11.001

Nedwek, B. P. (1987). Political socialization and policy evaluation: The case of youth employment and training program. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 1035-42. doi:10.1016/0149-7189(87)90020-6

New England Resource Center for Higher Education (n.d.). Community Engagement Classification. Retrieved from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92

Omoto, A., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J. D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality, 78(6)*, 1703-1734. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00667.x

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1),* 54-67. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Sukas, A. A., Synder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of 'Mandatory Volunteerism' on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10(1),* 59-64. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00107

Van Vianen, A. M., Nijstad, B. A., & Voskuijl, O. F. (2008). A person-environment fit approach to volunteerism: Volunteer personality fit and culture fit as predictors of affective outcomes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *30(2)*, 153-166. doi:10.1080/01973530802209194

Volunteer Canada (2006). *Volunteering and mandatory community service: Choice-Incentive-Coercion-Obligation: A discussion paper*. Retrieved from http://volunteer.ca/content/volunteering-and-mandatory-community-service-discussion-paper

Zajonc, R.B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist, 35*(2), 151–175. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.35.2.151

Corresponding author: Susan M. Henney, PhD, University of Houston-Downtown, Department of Social Sciences, Houston, TX 77002; henneys@uhd.edu