“Doings” Unto Others: A Social Ecological Framework on Personality and Volunteering

By

Jennifer C. Hunt, B.A. (Hons.)

A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Psychology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August 28, 2002
© 2002, Jennifer C. Hunt

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-79635-3

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

""Doings" Unto Others: A Social Ecological Framework on Personality and
Volunteering"

submitted by

Jennifer Hunt

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
September, 2002

Abstract

This study examined volunteerism among university students by utilizing a social ecological framework. A total of 144 undergraduate students completed a battery of questionnaires for course credit. The sample consisted of 102 women and 42 men, the mean age was 20.06 years, and there were 85 volunteers and 59 non-volunteers. Major findings revealed that volunteers are higher on openness to experience, have project systems that are well-structured and sources of passion, and report higher levels of meaning in their lives than non-volunteers. Future intentions to volunteer were predicted by past volunteer activity, openness to experience, agreeableness, neuroticism, and the levels of passion and structure in one's project system. In comparing active volunteers to inactive volunteers moderate effect sizes were obtained for: conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, project structure, community life passion, positive affect and community well-being. The motivations of active volunteers were also explored. Implications and priorities for future research are addressed.

Acknowledgments

Though the completion of this thesis marks the end of one era and the beginning of another in my academic career, it coincides with the closure of The Social Ecology Lab within the Department of Psychology at Carleton. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Brian Little who supported me and mentored me both here in Ottawa and from across the border during these last two years in the SEL. Dr. Little, your loyalty and commitment to me as your student and to this project were unwavering; I truly appreciate it.

This experience was also enriched by the support and insight of wonderful colleagues: Dr. Chambers, Dr. Goodine, and Dr. Phillips. Thank you all so much for lending me your ears, your time, and your assistance each and every time I was in need. To my wonderful friends – I was always able to count on each of you during this process and I want you to know that I treasure your support, friendship, and love.

Finally, to my biggest supporters, Mom and Dad; thank you for the late night chats, to looking for high stress or low stress, and for all of the big and small ways that you have shown me your love and support.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Volunteerism in Canada.....	2
Defining volunteerism.....	5
Situating the research literature on volunteerism.....	6
The present research.....	14
Methods.....	15
Participants.....	15
Procedure.....	16
Description of measures.....	17
Results.....	22
Preliminary analyses.....	22
Data reduction strategies.....	22
How do volunteers differ from non-volunteers?	27
Predicting future voluntary participation	32
Active volunteers.....	33
Discussion.....	37
Data reduction: Exploratory principal components analyses.....	37
How do volunteers differ from non-volunteers?	40
Predicting future voluntary participation	50
Active volunteers	51
Implications and priorities for future research.....	55
References.....	59
Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics for N = 144	67
Appendix B: Descriptive Statistics by Volunteer Status.....	70

Appendix C: Descriptive Statistics for Active Volunteers73

Appendix D: Portrait of a volunteer: A case study 75

Appendix E: Sample Assessment Package 78

List of Tables

Table 1: Principal Components Analysis of Personal Project Dimensions.....	23
Table 2: Principal Components Analysis of Community Life Dimensions.....	25
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics on Community Life Factor Components for Volunteers	26
Table 4: Principal Components Analysis of Quality of Life Measures.....	27
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Traits for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers.....	28
Table 6: Descriptive Statistics on PPA Factor Components for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers.....	30
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics on QOL Factor Components for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers.....	31
Table 8: T-tests and Effect Sizes for the Personality Traits	34
Table 9: T-tests and Effect Sizes for the PPA Factors	35
Table 10: T-tests and Effect Sizes for the CLM Factors	35
Table 11: T-tests and Effect Sizes for the QOL Factors	36
Table 12: Percentages of Volunteer Motives for Active Volunteers	36

List of Figures

Figure 1: A Social Ecological Framework for the Study of Person-Environment
Interaction (Little, 1999)..... 4

“Doings” Unto Others: A Social Ecological Framework on Personality and Volunteering

Many university students are occupied with day-to-day activities such as “Study for my Psych 101 midterm,” “Go to the gym more often,” “Figure out this month’s budget,” and “Get along with my roommate.” These activities, or personal projects (Little, 1983) have been the focus of a long standing and comprehensive body of research on personality and subjective well-being (Dowden, Chambers, Hunt, Richardson-Taylor, K., Hargrave, A., & Little, B.R., 2001; Hunt, 1999; Little, 1989; McGregor and Little, 1998; Omodei & Wearing, 1990; Pychyl, 1995; Richardson, 1999, 2001). Personal projects are defined as “extended sets of personally salient action” (Little, 2000, p. 4) and can include anything and everything that an individual is planning on undertaking or is engaged in at the present time.

PPA research has been conducted in many contexts and with diverse populations both locally and internationally (Richardson, 1999, 2001; Salmelo-Aro & Nurmi, 1992, 1996; Goodine, 1999), and a large number of studies have examined the personal projects of university students. The projects listed above are typical examples of the everyday activities and concerns that constitute student’s lives, yet some students are involved in more ‘atypical’ personal projects. “Volunteer at seniors’ home,” “Giving patients menus and drinks at hospital,” “Make blankets for CHEO,” and “Coach soccer” are examples of projects that are of a voluntary nature. This study examines the psychological underpinnings that lead to: the predisposition, facilitation, and motivation of becoming engaged in volunteer activities; and the willingness to pursue voluntary activities in the

future. It will also explore the relationships between voluntary projects and subjective well-being.

Volunteerism in Canada

The designation of 2001 as the International Year of the Volunteer reflects the growing awareness among governments, agencies and organizations of the value of volunteerism for our communities and society at large. Consequently, numerous studies have been conducted throughout North America and abroad that have examined the incidence of volunteerism among citizens, the demographic characteristics of volunteers, where individuals are volunteering, and the extent to which they are volunteering.

One such study, The National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (hereafter, NSGVP) (2001), a household survey conducted every 3 years, reported an overall decline in Canada of one million volunteers from 1997 to 2000. Considering this decline, there is growing concern among nonprofit agencies and organizations that there may not be a sufficient number of new volunteers to fill vacant positions. Despite the decrease, the NSGVP also reported that in the last 10 years the largest increase in volunteerism rates has been amongst 15 to 24 year olds who are volunteering at a rate of 33%; this is roughly equivalent to the rates for individuals in their mid thirties and forties (37%) (Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (CCP), Kahanoff Non-Profit Sector Research Initiative, Volunteer Canada, Canadian Heritage, Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, & Statistics Canada, 1998). However, very recent evidence indicates that this rate has dropped off during the last 2 years (Pickering, 2002).

Therefore, from an applied perspective, an examination of the youth volunteer experience may provide organizations with requisite information in order to recruit and retain the next critical group of volunteers, our youth. Likely related to the NSGVP's finding that until recently the percentage of youth who were volunteering was small relative to other age groups, the preponderance of volunteerism research to date does not adequately address questions pertaining to youth who volunteer. Although providing organizations with vital information on youth volunteer experiences is integral to the sustainability of volunteerism in general, the exploration of volunteerism among youth will contribute to the theoretical and empirical foundations of the psychosocial factors involved in voluntary activity.

Such an exploration demands the utilization of an integrative framework. The assessment of stable and dynamic individual and personal contextual features has been described by Little (1999, 2000) as a social ecological lens to the study of human behavior. The social ecological framework (Figure 1) is comprised of several blocks of variables. Block A represents stable personal features such as traits (e.g. Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism) and demographic variables such as age and gender. Stable contextual features comprise Block B and include the current social climate, economic climate and cultural environment. Although this block of variables is not directly assessed in the current study, the strong need for more volunteers is a reflection of the current state of our society. Block C is comprised of personal action constructs (hereafter PAC units) (Little,

1989). PAC units include current concerns (Klinger, 1975), personal projects (Little, 1983, 1999, 2000), life tasks (Cantor, 1990) and personal strivings (Emmons, 1986). In this study the PAC units of Block C will be represented by personal projects and voluntary projects. Block D of the social ecological framework is comprised of outcome variables that are related to subjective well-being, life satisfaction, or more generally, quality of life. Most researchers investigating volunteerism have examined only subsets of variables, focusing mainly on demographics. Since voluntary activity is jointly influenced by personal and contextual features, it is necessary to assess variables from both of these elements in order to provide the most comprehensive understanding of volunteerism among youth.

Figure 1

A Social Ecological Framework for the Study of Person-Environment Interaction

The present research contributes to the volunteerism literature by not only adopting this research framework but also by utilizing it in the understudied yet important group of youth volunteers.

Defining Volunteerism

Volunteerism has been defined as behaviors that are directed at helping or supporting various causes, collectives, persons, and organizations (Nunn, 2000; Wilson, 2000). Within the realm of volunteerism there are distinctions among categories of helping behaviors. Differences between spontaneous, episodic and planned helping have been discussed (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998; Nunn, 2000). Spontaneous helping behaviors are evident in situations where unexpected help is needed, an immediate need for action is required, and that within the specific context, only one altruistic act is provided by the helper. Episodic volunteerism or flexible volunteerism differs from spontaneous helping behaviors in that the individual plans to become involved in the voluntary activity. These individuals engage in activities that have a fixed timeline and often they donate their time to these activities rather intermittently (Nunn, 2000). Lastly, planned helping behaviors require “considerably more planning, sorting out of priorities, and matching of personal capabilities and interests with type of intervention” (Benson, Dohority, Garman, Hanson, Hochschwender, Lebold, Rohr, & Sullivan, 1980). Planned helpfulness requires that individuals evaluate their own dispositions, attitudes, abilities and motives as a means of

determining whether to become a volunteer, what type of activity to volunteer for, and in sustaining the voluntary behavior (Clary et al., 1998).

Voluntary activity can also be classified as formal or informal. Formal voluntary activities include those that are carried out within organizations and/or agencies such as schools, community centers, religious institutions, hospitals, government funded agencies, and non profit agencies (e.g. Meals on Wheels, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the United Church). Informal voluntary activities are those for which organizations or agencies are not involved (e.g. shoveling a neighbour's walk). In the present study volunteerism is operationalized as involving: a) episodic and/or planned helping behaviors, and b) formal and/or informal voluntary activities.

Situating the research literature on volunteerism

Volunteerism research has predominantly examined the traits, dispositions, and demographic characteristics of volunteers, corresponding to Block A of the social ecological framework. The motivational and action oriented approaches to the study of volunteerism, represented by Block C, have received greater attention throughout the last ten years (Clary et al., 1998; Omoto & Snyder, 1990, 1995). Research examining the effects of volunteerism upon individual well-being or quality of life is situated in Block D.

Demographics & Traits

Demographics

Research on volunteerism is laden with descriptive statistics about the percentage of females and males who volunteer, the average age of volunteers or the percentages of

Voluntary Projects

certain age groups that are engaged in voluntary activities, and information pertaining to the marital, educational, and socioeconomic statuses of volunteers. Some studies have used these variables to predict volunteerism and to see if differences exist between volunteers and non-volunteers on these indices. In North America researchers have found that: females are slightly more likely to volunteer than males; the prevalence of volunteering is higher among married people than among single people; volunteers are more likely to have higher levels of education than non-volunteers; and socioeconomic status as measured by income and occupational status is predictive of volunteer status (Clary and Snyder, 1991).

Individuals between the ages of 15 and 24 years are considered to be youth, as stated in the NSGVP, and because of their ages some of the demographic variables as outlined above are not relevant for measurement with these groups. For example, the majority of youth will report their marital status as single and will report having no children. Therefore, among youth who volunteer the most appropriate demographic variables to measure are gender, age, and employment status.

Traits

Personality characteristics are important factors to examine when assessing the willingness of some individuals but not others, to volunteer. One of the most studied personality characteristics in the volunteerism literature is the extraversion-introversion continuum. Dollinger and Leong (1993) found that extraversion predicted volunteering for psychological research, yet a study examining student volunteers working with mental patients found that these students were more introverted than the general student

Voluntary Projects

population (Knapp & Holzberg, 1964). These mixed findings have been discussed within the context of the need for affiliation. It has been suggested that introverts may be more likely to fulfill their need for affiliation in the safe setting of structured volunteer work (Trudeau & Devlin, 1996) and extraverts may engage in voluntary activities which offer opportunities for group activities and social stimulation.

Although the aforementioned studies did offer interesting findings, one must be sure to consider the limitations of the research. These studies examined specific types of volunteer activities: participation in psychological research and volunteering to work with mental patients, neither of which is representative of the multitude of contexts within which one could volunteer. Considering the mixed findings and limitations of the research, it is clear that further investigation of the relationships between extraversion-introversion and volunteer status is required as is an examination of the remaining Big Five traits (Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience) as proposed by Costa and McCrae (1999). It is hypothesized that extraversion and agreeableness will predict volunteer status among youth. Students who thrive on social stimulation may be more likely to engage in voluntary activities because they may view these activities as offering opportunities for interacting with a variety of people. It is also anticipated that agreeableness will predict volunteer status (Omoto & Snyder, 1995). People may approach agreeable individuals to become volunteers because they know that these individuals will not likely refuse their request.

Motives and Personal Projects

Motives

Clary et al. (1998) have proposed what they term a functional approach to the study of volunteerism. “The core propositions of a functional analysis of volunteerism are that acts of volunteerism that appear to be quite similar on the surface may reflect markedly different underlying motivational processes and that the functions served by volunteerism manifest themselves in the unfolding dynamics of this form of helpfulness...” (Clary et al., 1998, p.1517). Six different categories of motives comprise the functional approach: Values (“the individual volunteers in order to express or act on important values like humanitarianism”), Enhancement (“one can grow and develop psychologically through volunteer activities”), Protective (“the individual uses volunteering to reduce negative feelings, such as guilt, or to address personal problems”), Understanding (“the volunteer is seeking to learn more about the world or exercise skills that are often unused”), Career (“the volunteer has the goal of gaining career-related experience through volunteering”), and Social (“volunteering allows an individual to strengthen his or her social relationships”).

Most of this research has examined these motives as they pertain to AIDS volunteers in the United States, however, some research with older and younger volunteers has also been conducted. Overall, Clary et al. (1998) found that the most important motivations for volunteers are Values, Understanding, and Enhancement, while Career, Social, and Protective are less important functions; however there is some

Voluntary Projects

variability of this ranking depending upon the age of the volunteers. The Career function is more important to younger volunteers but it is less integral to older volunteers.

Congruent with the latter finding, the NSGVP (which did not utilize Clary et al's (1998) Volunteer Functions Inventory) reported that the predominant reason why younger people are engaged in volunteer work is to improve their career opportunities. It is of theoretical interest to determine whether the six motives of the functional approach are relevant and exhaustive to a group of Canadian youth volunteers, and based on the findings outlined above, it is anticipated that the Career function will emerge as the most important function for volunteering youth. The present research utilizes content analysis to categorize narrative responses given by student volunteers as to why they became engaged in their respective voluntary activities.

Personal Projects

As discussed earlier, some researchers have been interested in 'the who' of volunteering, some are interested in 'the why' of volunteering, and yet others are interested in 'the what' of volunteering (i.e. what happens to the well-being of volunteers) which is addressed in the next section. Although all of these approaches contribute to the understanding of volunteers and the effects of volunteerism on volunteers, they do not address the relationship(s) between individuals' daily activities and their voluntary activities.

Personal Projects Analysis (Little, 1983) offers an additional form of measurement that incorporates the social ecological contexts in which people live their daily lives. These middle level units of analysis focus on personal action or the doing

Voluntary Projects

side of personality (Little, 1998). Personal projects are defined as “extended sets of personally salient action that are influenced jointly by personal and contextual variables in dynamic interaction” (Little, 2000). Projects may be carried out in solitude or in the company of others, may be routine such as ‘take out the garbage’ or may be uplifting - ‘live a deeply spiritual life.’ In past PPA research (Little, 1989, 1999) five theoretical project factors have emerged: project Meaning, Structure, Community, Efficacy, and Stress. Findings demonstrate that the extent to which one’s projects are meaningful, well-defined, supported by others, likely to be achieved/completed, and unstressful, one’s subjective well-being will be enhanced (Little, 1999). The utilization of PPA in research pertaining to well-being is well established, demonstrating that project appraisals account for 20 to 25% of the variance in well-being and depression (Little, 1989; Hunt, 1999). However, PPA has not been utilized in research pertaining to volunteerism. Since volunteerism is affected by both personal and contextual features, it is of theoretical interest to explore whether personal projects that individuals are engaged in affect: a) their perceptions of their voluntary activities, and b) the likelihood of engaging in and disengaging from voluntary pursuits.

Being that this is the first time that such a methodology has been used in researching volunteerism, the nature of these analyses are exploratory. However, it is anticipated that individuals who have projects systems that are well-defined, progressing well, unstressful, but low on meaning will be more likely to engage in voluntary activity. It is plausible to assume that if people are engaged in projects that are low on stress, likely to be achieved, and well structured, they will feel as though they

Voluntary Projects

have the time and energy to give to volunteering. Furthermore, it is also reasonable to hypothesize that when people feel that their personal projects do not provide them with a strong sense of meaning, the possibility exists that they will look to other types of activities to gain a sense of meaning and purpose, namely voluntary activities.

Volunteering and Subjective Well-Being

Well-being can be operationalized in multiple ways; as researchers we can assess the emotional well-being of individuals, their physical well-being, and their satisfaction with life and with specific life domains (e.g., academic life, social life, and home life). Current and previous literature on the implications of volunteerism on well-being has traditionally assumed well-being to include indices of emotional and physical health.

Research has demonstrated that among adults and seniors who volunteer, their self-reported physical health and emotional well-being are significantly higher than that of adult and senior individuals who do not volunteer (Putnam, 2000). In a study of American adults aged 25 and older, Thoits and Hewitt (2001) found that volunteer work augments six aspects of well-being: happiness, life satisfaction, self-esteem, sense of control over life, physical health, and depression; similarly, Harlow & Cantor (1996) found that volunteerism increases life satisfaction.

Studies of elderly volunteers demonstrated that they experienced higher levels of life satisfaction and lower levels of anxiety and depression when compared to elderly non-volunteers (Hunter & Linn, 1981). Wheeler, Gorey, & Greenblatt (1998) conducted a meta-analysis of the positive effects of volunteerism for older adults and found that there was a positive linear relationship between volunteering and life satisfaction.

Voluntary Projects

These findings in and of themselves are interesting; however, there are three main areas that have been unaddressed in the literature and will be examined in this study.

First, there is a paucity of literature that similarly explores volunteer experiences among youth and the potential benefits to one's subjective well-being. Second, although well-being appears to be enhanced by voluntary activities it is not clear which aspects of these activities are accounting for this relationship. The present study will examine volunteer status as it is related to well-being, and will also explore the characteristics of voluntary activities that may contribute to improved well-being. Finally, in addition to analyzing the aspects of voluntary activities that may contribute to the traditional indices of well-being outlined above, this study will include meaning/purpose in life, satisfaction with community life, and satisfaction with degree of participation in community life as additional aspects of subjective well-being.

McGregor & Little (1998) acknowledge that "the more meaningful aspects of well-being have recently been regaining some credibility in mainstream personality and social psychology" (p.495). The inclusion of meaning and purpose in life as an outcome measure may reveal whether this aspect of well-being is affected by participating in voluntary activities. Little (1998) reports that community projects are rated high by respondents on dimensions of personal meaning. In addition, "adolescents engaging in community volunteer projects appraised these as exceptionally self-expressive" (Little, 1998, p.200). Therefore, it is hypothesized that youth who volunteer will report higher scores on meaning/purpose in life as compared to youth who do not volunteer.

Voluntary Projects

Furthermore, higher scores on satisfaction scales pertaining to one's community life and to one's degree of participation in community life are expected for youth who are engaged in voluntary activities compared to those who are not.

The Present Research

Given the growing need for volunteers and the decline in volunteerism rates among youth, it is important to examine the relationships among potentially critical variables related to youth volunteerism. Therefore, this study examines: (a) demographic and personality differences between youth volunteers and non-volunteers; (b) the personal projects of youth volunteers and non-volunteers, and the motives underlying the involvement in current voluntary activities, and (c) whether students who volunteer differ on various indices of well-being as compared to a group of non-volunteering students.

Although exploratory in nature, it is anticipated that extraverted and agreeable students and those whose personal project systems afford the opportunities to engage in projects for others will be more likely to engage in voluntary pursuits. Furthermore, it is anticipated that volunteers will experience higher levels of meaning and community satisfaction than non-volunteers.

Methods

Participants

A sample of 144 undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology courses served as the participant pool for this study. One hundred and two women and 42 men completed a battery of questionnaires for course credit. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 29 years with a mean age of 20.06 years.

Respondents were categorized as volunteers or non-volunteers based on their levels of current and previous voluntary participation, and whether they had a strong intention to engage in further voluntary activities over the next year. Current participation was assessed by the following question: “Over the past six months, have you been involved in any formal or informal voluntary activities?” to which the respondents selected ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ Previous voluntary participation was assessed by asking “Are there any voluntary activities that in the past you were engaged in that you have now stopped doing?” and the respondents selected either ‘yes’ or ‘no’. To determine their level of intention to volunteer in the future, the participants circled a number between 0 and 10 (0 meaning not all likely to volunteer in the future and 10 meaning extremely likely to volunteer in the future).

Participants who were currently volunteering, had volunteered over the last 6 months, or had strong intentions to volunteer in the future were categorized as volunteers. Fourteen participants who had volunteered only once and did not have any intention to volunteer in the future were subsequently deleted from the analyses. Based on the

Voluntary Projects

responses to the questions outlined above, 85 students were categorized as volunteers and 59 were categorized as non-volunteers.

Procedure

During the month of October, scheduled announcements, which briefly described the study, were given to students in first year psychology classes. A total of 250 questionnaire packages were distributed to students who were interested in participating. In the weeks following the announcements, the packages were collected before the start of class; alternatively, students were able to return their packages to the Social Ecology Lab. Each participant was provided with a debriefing form and received two experimental credits for their involvement.

One hundred and forty-seven packages were returned resulting in a response rate of 59%. Fifteen packages were omitted because of incomplete measures and 3 packages were omitted because the respondents were not youth. The N from this data collection was 129.

As an additional means of participant recruitment, a student sign-up sheet was posted on a Psychology experimental credits announcement board. Testing occurred within a span of several months, October 2001 through April 2002. Each participant was provided with a debriefing form and received two experimental credits for their involvement.

Thirty-seven packages were handed out and 35 were returned, yielding a return rate of 94%. Four packages were omitted because of incomplete data, and two

packages were omitted because the participants were not youth¹. The N for this round of data collection was 29.

Description of Measures

The assessment package consisted of several components: the Community Life Matrix (Phillips, Little, & Goodine, 1997), Personal Projects Analysis (Little, 1983), Big Five Factor Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999), Life Attitude Profile-Revised (LAP-R) (Reker, 2001), Life Satisfaction Scales, Affect Scale and Affect Scale (after September 11th) (Diener & Emmons, 1985), Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale (CES-D) (Radloff, 1977), and general background information².

Community Life Matrix

Phillips et al. (1997) developed the Community Life Matrix (hereafter, CLM). The CLM affords researchers the opportunity to probe the finer details of individuals' activities within various contexts, such as the workplace or in voluntary activities. The present study utilized the CLM in order to determine how volunteers feel about their voluntary experiences. The type of data that is elicited is both qualitative and quantitative, thereby providing rich details about volunteer experiences and enabling the use of content analysis, while also allowing for normative, quantitative analyses.

The respondent is asked to write down the voluntary projects that they have been engaged in over the last 6 months, and for each project to indicate with which organization they volunteered, the reasons they engage(d) in the activity, the hours per

¹ A total of 11 students who were older than 24 years (to a maximum age of 29 years) were retained in the study as they did not emerge as influential outliers.

² As this study was part of a larger program of research, additional measures were included in the assessment packages that were not germane to the present research and were therefore omitted.

Voluntary Projects

month they engage in it, and when they started the activity (month/year). There are 13 other dimensions based on a 0 to 10 scale that each voluntary activity is to be rated on; these dimensions are: enjoyment, commitment, self benefit, others' benefit, satisfaction, passionate engagement, sameness to work, difference from work, supportiveness of agency/organization, hindrance of agency/organization, support by family/close friends, future plans, and pressure. One final dimension is 'Sameness/Difference Further Explanation' for which the respondent is asked to describe how they view their voluntary activities as being similar to and/or different from their current employment or paid work that they have done in their lives.

Personal Projects Analysis (PPA)

Participants are asked to provide at least 10 personal projects that they are currently engaged in. In the event that they list more than ten, the respondents are instructed to choose the ten projects that they feel would be of interest to explore in greater detail and to then rate these projects on 18 dimensions, along an 11- point scale with appropriate descriptives (e.g. Not at all important to very important, not difficult to very difficult). The PPA component of the package includes the following dimensions: importance, enjoyment, difficulty, visibility, stress, control, passionate engagement, time adequacy, outcome, self identity, support, and value congruency, stage (how far along the project is from inception to completion), challenge, commitment, competence, other's benefit, and self-benefit³.

³ Detailed descriptions of the PPA dimensions are provided in Appendix E.

Voluntary Projects

Within PPA, the unit of analysis may be a personal project, or, numerous projects can be aggregated to elicit average scores per respondent on a number of project dimensions. The latter approach was utilized in the present study to allow for normative analyses. Based on this approach, each individual is said to have a project system, that is, their individual projects are viewed as one entity.

Big Five Factor Inventory

John & Srivastava (1999) developed a relatively short measure of the five factor model. This measure contains 44 statements each of which are prefaced by the general comment “I see myself as someone who...” Each of the statements are to be rated by the respondents along a 5-point, Likert scale where 1 indicates strong disagreement, 2 is disagree a little, 3 is neutral (neither disagree nor agree), 4 is agree a little, and 5 reflects strong agreement. Individual subscores for each of the Big Five traits (Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism) are derived from the 44 ratings.

Life Satisfaction Scales

The Life Satisfaction Scales used in this study are adapted from that created by Lecci (1990) and are comprised of 9 items which assess the degree to which individuals are satisfied or dissatisfied with various aspects of their life as it is right now. Satisfaction with a particular domain would be rated as high numbers on a 0 to 10 continuum, 5 would indicate neutrality, and dissatisfaction is represented by low numbers. The following areas of satisfaction are measured: life as a whole, academic life, social life, home life, emotional well-being, sense of community, degree of

participation in community life, and physical health. A measure of the extent to which respondents feel they have a sense of meaning and purpose in their lives is included at the end of the satisfaction items, as it is also rated along a 0 to 10 scale⁴.

Life Attitude Profile-Revised (LAP-R).

The LAP-R is a self-report measure of meaning and purpose in life and the motivation to find meaning and purpose in life (Reker, 2001). It is comprised of 48 statements that are rated on a 7-point Likert scale where 7 indicates strong agreement with the statement and 1 indicates strong disagreement with the statement. The items of the LAP-R are scored such that participants have subscores on six dimensions and on two composite indices. The six dimensions include purpose, coherence, choice/responsibleness, death acceptance, existential vacuum, and goal seeking; the indices include the personal meaning index which is comprised of the sum of the purpose and coherence dimensions; existential transcendence is comprised of the sum of the purpose, coherence, choice/responsibleness and death acceptance dimensions minus the sum of the existential vacuum and goal seeking dimensions. The internal consistency of the LAP-R is highly satisfactory as the alpha coefficients for the dimensions and composite indices range from .77 to .91 (Reker, 2001)⁵.

Diener & Emmons (1985) Affect Scale

This Likert-type scale (0 = not at all, to 7 = extremely) measures the extent to which individuals may have experienced nine emotions during the previous few weeks. There are four positive adjectives (happy, joyful, pleased, and full of fun) and five negative adjectives (frustrated, worried/anxious, angry/hostile, unhappy, and depressed)

⁴ Satisfaction with academic life and satisfaction with physical health were not included in subsequent analyses as they were not considered to be relevant indices of traditional well-being or quality of life.

⁵ Only the subscales of purpose and coherence were utilized in the present study.

which when summed across their respective poles, yield total scores per subject on positive and negative affect.

Due to the events of September 11th 2001, a duplicate of the affect measure was provided so that respondents could indicate whether these events had impacted their various emotional states. Therefore, two separate measures of affect were obtained; one indicating individuals' responses without taking into consideration the events of September 11th, and a second indicating how their affective ratings may or may not have changed after September 11th⁶.

Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression scale (CES-D).

The CES-D (Radloff, 1977, 1991) is a 20-item scale designed to measure current ("this week") symptoms of depression in the general public. It has demonstrated high internal consistency (Radloff, 1977) and has proven appropriate for the assessment of young adults (Radloff, 1991).

General Background Information

This component elicits demographic information such as gender, age, marital status, employment status, academic status (full time, part time or special student), and what year of studies the participants are in (first, second, third or fourth).

⁶ Only Pre-September 11th affect scale scores were utilized in this study because the pre and post scores demonstrated multicollinearity. Furthermore, it was of interest to use affect scores that reflected how a person might typically feel, not how they feel given the events of September 11th, 2001.

Preliminary Analyses

Analytic Strategy

In order to understand the demographic, personality, and social ecological differences among volunteers and non-volunteers, analyses were conducted at three different levels. First, analyses were conducted on the total sample of volunteers and non-volunteers ($N = 144$); second, analyses were performed on the sample of currently active volunteers ($n = 25$); and finally, an active volunteer was profiled as a case study and is presented in Appendix D.

Separating Voluntary Projects from Personal Projects.

To ensure that the personal projects and voluntary projects that respondents elicited and rated were not mixed amongst one another, each personal project was examined as a means of determining whether any of the projects were voluntary in nature. A total of 15 voluntary projects were found such as ‘Spend more time volunteering,’ and ‘Volunteer on Mondays’ and were removed from the PPA data file.

Descriptive statistics on the five blocks of variables for $N = 144$ are presented in Tables A1 through A5 in Appendix A.

Data Reduction Strategies

In the interest of reducing the number of variables in the PPA, CLM, and QOL blocks for use in subsequent analyses, three principal components analyses with varimax rotation were performed.

PPA Principal Components Analysis.

A principal components extraction with varimax rotation was performed on the 18 project dimensions for the sample of 144 participants. Five factors were extracted and the loadings of variables on the factors are shown in Table 1⁷. Loadings of .49 and higher in absolute value were included in the interpretation of the factors⁸.

Table 1

Principal Components Analysis of Personal Project Dimensions

Project Dimension	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Agency	Stress	Structure	Passion	Community
Competence	.83				
Value Congruency	.65				
Self Benefit	.62				
Control	.55				
Outcome	.52		.52		
Commitment	.49		.49		
Challenge		.85			
Difficulty		.83			
Stress		.76			
Time Adequacy			.87		
Stage			.71		
Enjoyment				.83	
Passionate Engagement				.78	
Visibility				.59	
Others' Benefit					.77
Support					.64
Importance					

⁷ Although multiple loading items and dimensions can pose interpretive problems when their vectors are used conjointly, as long as the overlap is minimal (as in the present case) precedent exists for their use in test psychometrics (e.g. Gough, 1987).

⁸ See Stevens (2002) for a detailed explanation of determining the critical value that should be utilized for testing the significance of loadings.

Voluntary Projects

Factor 1 was labelled Agency as was evident by the high loadings of competence, value congruency, self benefit, control, outcome, and commitment. Stress emerged as Factor 2 with loadings from the dimensions of challenge, difficulty, and stress. The third factor, Structure, is comprised of time adequacy, stage (how far along the project is from inception to completion), outcome, and commitment. Factor 4 was considered to be Passion in that enjoyment, passionate engagement, and visibility were its significant loadings. The fifth and final factor is Community for which others' benefit and support loaded highly.

CLM Principal Components Analysis

A principal components analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 11 of the 19 community life matrix dimensions. The dimensions that were included in the analysis are: enjoyment, commitment, self benefit, other's benefit, satisfaction, passionate engagement, support (organization), hindrance (organization), support (family/friends), future plans, and pressure. The remaining 8 dimensions (volunteer activity, organization, reasons for volunteering, number of hours per month spent volunteering, start date, sameness to work, difference to work and same/different further explanation) were not included in the analysis because some of the variables were qualitative in nature (voluntary activity, organization, reasons for volunteering, sameness/difference further explanation), others were quantitative variables (number of hours per month, start date) which were not comparable to the other Likert type dimensions that were utilized, and finally because two were not germane to the student population (sameness to work, difference to work).

Voluntary Projects

Four components emerged and to achieve greater clarity of the factors, the analysis was re-run with the specification to extract 2 factors. Factor 1 was labeled Passion and is comprised of four dimensions, passionate engagement, satisfaction, future plans, and enjoyment. The second component is Pressure for which pressure, others' benefit, and self benefit loaded significantly⁹. Table 2 presents the loadings of variables on the factors¹⁰.

Table 2

Principal Components Analysis of Community Life Matrix Dimensions

Dimension	Factor	
	1	2
	Passion	Pressure
Passionate Engagement	.75	
Satisfaction	.74	
Future Plans	.69	
Enjoyment	.57	
Pressure		.70
Others' Benefit		.66
Self Benefit		.61
Commitment		
Family/Friend Support		
Organizational Support		
Organizational Hindrance		

Note. N = 51¹¹.

Descriptive statistics on the CLM factors are presented in Table 3.

⁹ Though not a major focus of this study, voluntary projects are in part, a response to pressures in the stable context (Block B of the social ecological framework) for volunteers.

¹⁰ See Stevens (2002) for a detailed explanation of determining the critical value that should be utilized for testing the significance of loadings.

¹¹ Of the 85 participants categorized as volunteers, some did not complete the CLM because they had not been volunteering over the last six months (their voluntary activity had occurred in the more distant past). Therefore, the principal components analysis on the CLM dimensions was performed using the data from the 51 participants who were either actively volunteering or had volunteered during the last six months.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics on CLM Factor Components for Volunteers			
CLM Factor	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Passion	7.83	1.42	7.17
Pressure	6.23	1.87	9.67

QOL Principal Components Analysis

A principal components analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the 11 outcome measures¹². Three readily interpretable components emerged. The first component is Positive Affect due to the significant loadings of CES-D (negative), negative affect (pre-Sept.11, negative), emotional well-being satisfaction, positive affect (pre-Sept.11), global life satisfaction, and social life satisfaction. The second factor labelled Personal Meaning is comprised of coherence, purpose, satisfaction with meaning/purpose in life, and global life satisfaction. Community Well-Being is the third factor and is comprised of satisfaction with degree of participation in community life, satisfaction with community life, and social life satisfaction. These results are presented in Table 4.

¹² In the interest of clarifying the QOL factor structures, the QOL items were standardized and the alpha coefficient was calculated by selecting the option allowing for the examination of the impact on Cronbach's coefficient of the potential deletion of each item. Based on subsequent analyses using these modified QOL factors, it was decided that the original QOL factors would be retained as they were more robust and interpretable.

Table 4

Principal Components Analysis of QOL Measures

Outcome Measure	1 Positive Affect	2 Personal Meaning	3 Community Well-Being
CES-D	-.88		
Negative Affect (Pre-Sept.11)	-.85		
Emotional well-being satisfaction	.77		
Positive Affect (Pre-Sept.11)	.74		
Global life satisfaction	.58	.59	
Social life satisfaction	.53		.50
Coherence		.89	
Purpose		.88	
Satisfaction with meaning/purpose in life		.75	
Satisfaction with degree of participation in community life			.89
Community life satisfaction			.78
Home life satisfaction			

Note. N = 144.

How Do Volunteers Differ From Non-Volunteers?Do Demographic Variables Predict Volunteer Status?

In the volunteer group there were 63 women and 22 men, and in the non-volunteer group there were 39 women and 20 men. The majorities of participants in each group were single, in their first year of study and were attending university on a full-time basis. Of the volunteers, 52% were currently employed as were 56% of the non-volunteers. See Table B1 in Appendix B for means and frequencies.

To determine whether gender, age, and employment status were predictive of voluntary status, a logistic regression was performed with volunteer status as the dependent variable and gender, age, and employment status as the predictors.

A test of the full model with all three predictors against a constant-only model was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 144) = 2.60, p = .63$, indicating that the predictors, as a set, did not reliably distinguish volunteers from non-volunteers.

Do They Differ in Personality?

Descriptive statistics for volunteers and non-volunteers on the 5 traits are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics on Traits for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers

Trait	Volunteers			Non-Volunteers		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Openness to Experience	30.03	4.66	24.00	28.17	4.09	18.00
Conscientiousness	33.67	5.62	27.00	32.00	5.14	22.00
Extraversion	26.69	6.43	25.00	26.71	5.70	22.00
Agreeableness	35.81	5.39	25.00	33.29	6.07	24.00
Neuroticism	23.96	6.72	28.00	23.00	6.14	25.00

To determine whether personality traits were predictive of volunteer status, a logistic regression was performed with volunteer status as the dependent variable and the traits of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism as the predictors.

Voluntary Projects

A test of the full model with all five predictors against a constant-only model was statistically significant, $\chi^2(5, N = 144) = 20.46, p < .005$, indicating that the predictors, as a set, reliably distinguished volunteers from non-volunteers.

According to the Wald criterion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience reliably predicted volunteer status¹³. For Agreeableness, $wald = 7.32, p < .01$. Volunteers were more likely to have higher scores on Agreeableness than non-volunteers (for volunteers $M = 35.81, SD = 5.39$ and for non-volunteers $M = 33.29, SD = 6.07$). For Neuroticism, $wald = 4.93, p < .05$ indicating that volunteers were more likely to have slightly higher scores on Neuroticism than non-volunteers (for volunteers $M = 23.96, SD = 6.72$ and for non-volunteers $M = 23.00, SD = 6.14$). For Openness to experience, $wald = 7.45, p < .01$, indicating that volunteers were more likely to report higher scores on this trait than non-volunteers (for volunteers $M = 30.03, SD = 4.66$, and for non-volunteers, $M = 28.17, SD = 4.09$).

Are Their Personal Project Systems Different?

Descriptive statistics on the PPA factors for volunteers and non-volunteers are presented in Table 6.

¹³ Although Conscientiousness is higher for the volunteers, it does not emerge as a significant predictor in the logistic regression. This is likely attributable to Conscientiousness sharing variance with the other unique predictors, and therefore it is relegated to a lower entry status in the regression.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics on PPA Factor Components for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers¹⁴

PPA Factor	Volunteers			Non-Volunteers		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Agency	7.72	.96	5.82	7.34	1.03	3.70
Stress	5.70	1.45	7.37	5.58	1.30	6.86
Structure	6.57	1.11	5.23	5.92	1.09	5.45
Passion	6.21	1.28	5.97	5.54	1.38	7.47
Community	5.42	1.93	8.50	5.20	1.71	7.46

To determine whether the 5 PPA factors were predictive of volunteer status, a logistic regression was performed with volunteer status as the dependent variable and the PPA factors of Agency, Stress, Structure, Passion, and Community as the predictors.

A test of the full model with all five predictors against a constant-only model was statistically significant, $\chi^2(5, N = 130) = 16.86, p < .01$, indicating that the predictors, as a set, reliably distinguished volunteers from non-volunteers.

According to the Wald criterion, Structure and Passion reliably predicted volunteer status. For Structure, $wald = 7.89, p < .01$, indicating that volunteers were more likely to have higher scores on Structure than non-volunteers (for volunteers $\underline{M} = 6.57, \underline{SD} = 1.11$ and for non-volunteers $\underline{M} = 5.92, \underline{SD} = 1.09$). For Passion, $wald = 8.45, p < .005$, indicating that volunteers were more likely to have higher scores on Passion than non-volunteers (for volunteers $\underline{M} = 6.21, \underline{SD} = 1.28$ and for non-volunteers $\underline{M} = 5.54, \underline{SD} = 1.38$).

Do They Experience Different Quality of Life?

Table 7 presents descriptive statistics on the QOL factors.

¹⁴ Factor components means were calculated from the sum of the aggregate scores on dimensions with significant loadings for a particular factor. This applies to all tables that present descriptive statistics for factors components.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics on QOL Factor Components for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers

QOL Factor	Volunteers			Non-Volunteers		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Positive Affect	40.37	15.19	74.17	39.87	13.22	53.00
Meaning	23.95	4.03	21.25	21.89	4.25	19.50
Community Well-Being	6.36	1.82	8.33	5.99	1.67	7.67

Note. Positive Affect: min.value = -98, max. value = 70. Meaning: min.value = 16, max.

value = 132.

To determine if volunteers differed from non-volunteers on the QOL factors, a MANOVA was conducted with volunteer status as the fixed factor. The multivariate test revealed that there were significant differences among volunteers and non-volunteers on the linear combination of the QOL factors, $F(3,134) = 3.58, p < .05$. The between-subjects tests revealed that there was a significant difference among the groups on Meaning, $F(1, 136) = 7.67, p < .01$; Meaning was higher for volunteers ($M = 23.95, SD = 4.03$) than for non-volunteers ($M = 21.89, SD = 4.25$).

Regression Analyses on Outcome Factors

To examine whether or not volunteer ratings on the Community Life Matrix dimensions significantly predicted quality of life, three regressions were performed, once with each of the outcome factors. First, Positive Affect was utilized as the dependent variable, with the CLM factors as Block 1, the PPA factors comprising Block 2, and the traits comprising Block 3. This was repeated for the Meaning and Community Well-Being outcome factors as the dependent variable (using the F to enter criterion).

With Positive Affect as the dependent variable, the CLM factors did not account for a significant proportion of the variance, $F(2,36) = .79, p = .46, R^2 = 0.04$. The PPA

factors did demonstrate incremental validity, $F(5,31) = 2.78$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.30$. Of the PPA factors, Stress (negatively) was the significant predictor of positive affect, $t(31) = -3.42$, $p < .01$. The traits also accounted for a significant proportion of the variance, $F(5, 26) = 7.09$, $p < .01$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.38$. Of the traits, Neuroticism (negatively) was the significant predictor of positive affect, $t(26) = -2.74$, $p < .05$.

The second regression was performed with the outcome factor, Meaning. The CLM factors did not account for a significant proportion of the variance, $F(2,36) = 1.06$, $p = .36$, $R^2 = 0.05$. The PPA factors did account for a unique proportion of variance in meaning, $F(5,31) = 3.12$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.32$. Of the PPA factors, Structure was the significant predictor, $t(31) = 2.92$, $p < .01$. The traits did not account for a unique proportion of the variance in meaning, $F(5,26) = 1.25$, $p = .31$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.12$.

For the third regression, the dependent variable was the Community Well-Being outcome factor. The CLM factors did not account for a significant proportion of variance, $F(2,36) = .22$, $p = .70$, $R^2 = 0.02$, nor did the PPA factors, $F(5,31) = 1.37$, $p = .26$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.18$. The traits did account for a unique proportion of variance, $F(5,26) = 2.74$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.28$. Of the traits, Extraversion was the significant predictor, $t(26) = 2.56$, $p < .05$.

Predicting Future Intentions to Volunteer¹⁵

To examine whether or not the PPA factors and the traits significantly predicted individuals' intentions to volunteer in the future (over the next year), a regression was performed with the PPA factors as Block 1 and the traits as Block 2. The PPA factors

¹⁵ It should be noted that past volunteering is significantly correlated with future intentions to volunteer over the next year, $r = .67^{**}$, $p < .01$.

Voluntary Projects

did account for a significant proportion of the variance, $F(5,117) = 3.17, p < .05, R^2 = 12\%$. PPA Passion, $t(117) = 2.58, p < .05$, and PPA Structure, $t(117) = 2.36, p < .05$ emerged as significant predictors. The traits also accounted for a significant proportion of the variance, $F_{change}(5, 112) = 2.92, p < .05, R^2 = 10.2\%$. Openness to experience, $t(112) = 2.62, p < .05$, Agreeableness, $t(112) = 2.33, p < .05$, and Neuroticism, $t(112) = 2.15, p < .05$, emerged as significant predictors.

Active Volunteers

It was of interest to examine the potential differences among volunteers who were actively engaged in voluntary projects from volunteers who were not actively engaged in voluntary projects on the traits, PPA factors, CLM factors and QOL factors.

The second set of analyses was performed on a subset of 25 volunteers from the larger volunteer group ($n = 85$). These 25 individuals were identified as active volunteers and this designation was determined by examining the phrasing and content of their voluntary projects. For example, the voluntary project of “donated blood” implies that it was a one time occurrence and has been completed, whereas “volunteer at the Womyn’s Centre” is phrased in the present tense. As an additional means of determining if these voluntary projects were on-going, scores on the CLM dimension of future plans were examined; scores of 7 or higher were considered to be indicative of the participant continuing in their volunteer work over the next year, or remaining active.

Voluntary Projects

To compare these 25 active volunteers to the remaining volunteers ($n = 60$) on the traits, PPA factors, CLM factors, and QOL factors, t tests were obtained and the corresponding effect sizes were computed¹⁶.

Descriptive statistics on each of the 5 blocks of variables are presented in Tables C1 through C5 in Appendix C.

Do They Differ in Personality?

The active volunteers were higher on Conscientiousness, Openness to experience, and Extraversion, and lower on Agreeableness and Neuroticism as compared to the other volunteers. The largest effect sizes obtained were for Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Agreeableness. See Table 8 for the results.

Table 8

T-tests and Effect Sizes for the Personality Traits

Trait	t	df	p	d
Openness to Experience	0.26	83	.80	0.06
Conscientiousness	1.72	83	.09	0.41
Extraversion	0.91	83	.36	0.22
Agreeableness	-1.25	83	.21	0.30
Neuroticism	-1.50	83	.14	0.36

Are Their Personal Project Systems Different?

Relative to the larger group of volunteers, the active volunteers had project systems that were higher in Agency, Structure, Passion, and Community, and lower in Stress. The computed effect sizes were largest for Structure and Agency, $d = .44$ and $d = .25$, respectively. See Table 9 for the results.

¹⁶ See Cohen (1988) for conventions specifying effect sizes as weak, moderate, and strong.

Table 9

T-tests and Effect Sizes for the PPA Factors

PPA Factor	t	df	p	d
Agency	1.03	77	.31	0.25
Stress	-0.72	77	.48	0.18
Structure	1.79	77	.08	0.44
Passion	0.46	77	.96	0.01
Community	0.48	77	.63	0.12

Are Their Community Life Ratings Different?

The active volunteers had voluntary projects that were on average higher in Passion and lower in Pressure compared to the larger group of volunteers; the effect size for Passion was strong, $d = .84$. See Table 10 for the results.

Table 10

T-tests and Effect Sizes for the CLM Factors

CLM Factor	t	df	p	d
Passion	2.66	40	.01	0.84
Pressure	0.84	40	.41	0.26

Do They Experience Different Quality of Life?

The active volunteers demonstrated higher levels of Positive Affect, Meaning, and Community Well-Being as compared to the larger group of volunteers. Two moderate effect sizes were obtained for Community Well-Being and Positive Affect. See Table 11 for the results.

Table 11

T-tests and Effect Sizes for the QOL Factors

<u>QOL Factor</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>d</u>
Positive Affect	1.87	80	.06	0.45
Meaning	0.27	80	.78	0.06
Community Well-Being	2.04	80	.04	0.49

What are the Motives of Active Volunteers for Volunteering?

A content analysis was performed on the primary reasons given for engaging in voluntary activity. The 6 motive categories (Values, Understanding, Social, Career, Protective, and Enhancement) proposed by Clary & Snyder (1999) were utilized as a means of coding the narrative responses. The categorization process revealed that the addition of 1 category, 'Enjoyment/Fun' was necessary in order to accurately account for the variety of reasons cited. See Table 12 for the frequencies of the 7 motives.

Table 12

Percentages of Volunteer Motives for Active Volunteers

<u>Motive</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Values	28%
Understanding	20%
Social	16%
Career	4%
Protective	4%
Enhancement	8%
Enjoyment/Fun	20%

Data Reduction: Exploratory Principal Components AnalysesPersonal Project Factors

Within PPA, project dimensions can be aligned into five theoretical factors: Meaning, Structure, Community, Efficacy, and Stress (Little, 1989, 1998). In this study, five factors emerged from the principal components analysis of the PPA dimensions: Agency, Structure, Community, Passion, and Stress. The theoretical factors of Structure, Community, and Stress were replicated in this study, however, the Meaning and Efficacy factors were not replicated. Instead, an Agency factor and a Passion factor were obtained. Little and Chambers (in press) note that “although the five factors frequently appear in factor analyses, their emergence is entirely contingent on whether there is a roughly equivalent number of dimensions sampled from each of the five domains” (p.9). Furthermore, the use of ad hoc dimensions and the omission of some standard dimensions may also alter the structure and composition of PPA factors¹⁷. This is evident from the utilization of one of the ad hoc dimensions (passionate engagement) and how it contributed to the emergence of Passion, while the ad hoc dimensions of commitment and self benefit contributed to the emergence of Agency.

¹⁷ The five theoretical factors are comprised of the following standard PPA dimensions: *meaning*: enjoyment, importance, self-identity, value congruency, absorption; *structure*: initiation, control, time adequacy, positive impact, negative impact; *community*: visibility, other’s view, support; *efficacy*: progress, outcome, competency; *stress*: stress, difficulty, challenge.

Community Life Factors

Passion and Pressure were the 2 factors obtained from a principal components analysis of the CLM dimensions. The emergence of separate internal (Passion) and external (Pressure) factors is incongruent with self-determination theory which situates internal and external regulation as opposite ends on a continuum of self regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2001). For some volunteers, voluntary projects may be self-determined, or internally regulated which is represented by Passion. These individuals volunteer because of their internal motivation to do so which is enforced by the passion and enjoyment that they derive from their voluntary projects. This factor exhibits how the extent of the positive nature of voluntary activities is likely internalized by the volunteer and may be related to the decision to remain involved in the activity.

In comparison to Passion, the Pressure factor is somewhat less intuitive. The highest significant loading on pressure is the dimension, pressure, and self benefit and others' benefit complete the factor structure. The nature of the self benefit and others' benefit dimensions could generally be considered positive but perhaps the degree or amount of self and others' benefit leads to a certain feeling of pressure on behalf of the volunteer. In the CLM, pressure is defined as "how much pressure do you feel to give more to this activity?" This is similar to the external regulation component of self-determination theory. The pressure of volunteering may arise from the external demands of knowing that the activity is beneficial to other people, or it may arise due to pressure that is perceived as coming from the voluntary organizations.

QOL Factors

Positive Affect, Meaning, and Community Well-Being emerged as the three outcome factors. Some theorists argue that negative affect and positive affect are independent constructs (Baumeister, 1991) and others suggest that they are bipolar (Russell & Carroll, 1999). The structure of affect in this study demonstrates bipolarity; however, this is due to the larger number of positive affect variables that were included in the outcome measures. The only negative affect variables that were included in the principal components analysis were the composite measure of negative affect from the Diener & Emmons (1985) affect scale and the CES-D. Therefore, these variables loaded negatively with the positive affect variables to create a bipolar factor that is predominantly one of positive affect. A negative affect factor might be expected to emerge given an equal number of positive and negative affect variables.

The Meaning factor is comprised of satisfaction with meaning/purpose in life, purpose, coherence, and satisfaction with life as a whole. Satisfaction with life as a whole loaded on this factor rather than on the positive affect factor suggesting that for this sample, overall life satisfaction is tapping into aspects of personal meaning. Reker, Peacock, & Wong (1987) define personal meaning as “having a purpose and striving toward a goal or goals” (p.44). In this sample, general life satisfaction may very well be reflecting the extent to which individuals feel they are engaging in purposeful action.

Finally, the Community Well-Being factor represents satisfaction with aspects of one’s life that is concerned with other people. The emergence of this factor indicates the

importance of considering individuals' social environments in assessing their perceived quality of life as separate from personal satisfaction and meaning.

How Do Volunteers Differ From Non-Volunteers?

Demographics

Demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and employment status were not found to be significant predictors of volunteer status. The lack of predictive utility of these variables may be reflecting the relative homogeneity of the larger population that these participants were sampled from. The majority of students in first year psychology classes are women, are in their late teens or early twenties, and are working on a part time basis. Because of the lack of variability in age among this sample, it is not surprising that age does not differentiate volunteers from non-volunteers.

With roughly equivalent percentages of women in both the volunteer and non-volunteer groups (74% and 66%, respectively) and men in both groups (34% and 26%, respectively) there was greater similarity than there was difference in the gender composition of the two groups; therefore, the non-significant prediction of volunteer status by gender is plausible. As with gender, there were roughly equivalent percentages of employed students in the volunteer and non-volunteer groups (52% and 56%, respectively). The homogeneity of the groups on this demographic variable likely accounts for the non-significant prediction of volunteer status by employment status.

Personality Traits

Much of the literature examining the relationships among the Big Five personality traits and volunteerism has focussed on Extraversion (Knapp & Holzberg, 1964) and the

research findings are mixed (Trudeau & Devlin, 1996). Although it was hypothesized that volunteers would be significantly different from non-volunteers on the traits of Extraversion and Agreeableness, only the latter was confirmed. In addition to Agreeableness, Openness to experience, and Neuroticism emerged as significant predictors of voluntary status.

The non-significance of extraversion in predicting volunteer status among students is likely a result of the types of projects that extraverts find stimulating¹⁸. Furthermore, perhaps the structure of many voluntary activities (such as time commitments) and the more administrative or one-on-one nature of many volunteer opportunities (fundraising, preparing meals for homeless shelters, and tutoring) may not appeal to extraverted individuals.

The findings that volunteers in this sample were more likely to be open to experience, agreeable, and somewhat neurotic are informative. It may be the case that being open to new experiences serves as an impetus to being agreeable and that being neurotic may lead to agreeableness. For example, individuals who are open to experiences are typically characterized as having a preference for variety in that they like to try to do new things and are intellectually curious about the things and people around them; this outlook may naturally lead to being more agreeable to engage in novel activities. Therefore, individuals higher on openness to experience may become volunteers in either one of two ways: a) they have a keen interest in learning and doing something new so they seek out volunteer opportunities, or b) people who know such

¹⁸ A more detailed explanation is provided on pg.49.

Voluntary Projects

individuals may be more apt to ask them to become volunteers because of the awareness that the individual is one who likes to try new things. In sum, being open to experience may lead to simply being more agreeable to take on volunteer projects.

In contrast to the rather proactive nature of the openness-agreeableness route to volunteering, the neuroticism-agreeableness route could be viewed as more reactive. Take for example an individual who is overly concerned with what others think of him or tends to feel guilty. This person may engage in volunteering as a means of ‘saving face’ or to alleviate their guilty feelings. Additionally, if someone asks this type of individual to become involved in volunteering, the somewhat neurotic individual will likely agree so as to avoid looking bad or to avoid feeling guilty about turning that person down.

Personal Projects

The project factors of structure and passion emerged as significant predictors of volunteer status indicating that the project systems of volunteers were higher in structure and passion than the project systems of non-volunteers. The contrast between the external nature of project structure and the internal nature of project passion speaks to the importance of considering both external and internal forces involved in engaging in voluntary activities.

Little & Chambers (in press) discuss the primary sources of sustainability in project pursuit as comprised of a) external ecological factors and b) inner, regulatory functions. If the ecosystem resources are sufficient and there are few constraints, individuals will likely be able to sustain most if not all of their current projects and would perhaps be willing to undertake new ones. Similarly, if individuals possess

Voluntary Projects

positive internal appraisals of their projects, they are likely to successfully complete their current projects and perhaps engage in new ones.

Volunteers had personal projects for which they had an adequate amount of time, were at an advanced stage of completion, and were likely to be completed. These external project characteristics afford these individuals the opportunity to become involved in voluntary projects. If individuals feel as though their projects are not too time consuming, are progressing well and are likely to be achieved, then they are more likely to feel that they have the time and energy to devote to other endeavours, such as voluntary projects.

Volunteers were also passionately engaged in their personal projects, derived enjoyment from their projects, and talked with family and friends about what they were up to. If someone is passionate about their projects and derives a great deal of enjoyment from them, then it is likely that they would be excited and eager to talk about these projects with family and friends. Given these positive internal influences on projects, it is plausible that these positive feelings lead individuals to undertake other projects such as voluntary pursuits.

Quality of Life

The notion that volunteerism can lead to an increased sense of subjective well-being or quality of life has been discussed by various researchers, however this research is often conducted with elderly volunteers (Hunter & Linn, 1981; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001). In this study, there were no significant differences among volunteers and non-volunteers

on the QOL factors of positive affect and community well-being, however, volunteers scored higher on meaning than non-volunteers.

The finding that volunteers were not experiencing higher levels of positive affect than non-volunteers may be attributable to the following reasons. As outlined in a previous section, this group of volunteers was represented by a number of differing voluntary orientations. Some were active volunteers, some were sporadic volunteer with strong intentions to become involved in future voluntary activities and some were individuals who expressed a strong interest in volunteering. If volunteering were to enhance positive affect among student volunteers, then it would be expected that the greatest impact would be for currently active volunteers and not the other types. This is suggested because it is possible that the length of time that one feels good after volunteering may be more temporary and subside shortly after disengaging from the activity; in a sense volunteering may provide a 'high of feeling good' for the moment but in order to maintain that high the activity would need to be sustained. For many of these volunteers, they were no longer actively volunteering and therefore any positive feelings that they derived from volunteering would have dissipated. As Myers & Diener (1995) state "the more recent an event, the greater its emotional affect...the affect system is most attuned to the information value of new events" (p.17).

A possible explanation why volunteers and non-volunteers did not differ significantly on community well-being may have to do with the indices that comprised this QOL factor. Three items comprised the community well-being factor: satisfaction with one's social life, satisfaction with one's community life, and satisfaction with one's

Voluntary Projects

degree of participation in community life. It is plausible that volunteer work is not a primary means of improving an individual's satisfaction with his/her social life because it may not be considered to be in the same category as other interpersonal activities such as spending time with friends, going to the movies with my boyfriend etc. Though volunteering typically involves interacting with other people, student volunteers may not perceive these other people as belonging to part of their social network and hence, would not feel that volunteering contributes to their social life satisfaction.

A second reason why community well-being did not differ among volunteers and non-volunteers could be because volunteers are not particularly in tune with their immediate communities. Community life satisfaction implies that an individual is content with their surrounding neighbourhood, that is having neighbours with whom you are neighbourly and community organizations that serve the neighbourhood well. Students may not accord the same level of importance to these qualities or be as aware of these community aspects because they are primarily focussed on academics and interpersonal relationships (Little & Chambers, in press). Furthermore, it is possible that some student volunteers have not been residents of one particular community for an extended period of time, and therefore do not feel a strong sense of being connected to or satisfied with their communities.

The finding that volunteers experience greater meaning in their lives than non-volunteers justifies recent attempts to expand conceptions of well-being to include meaning as well as affective states (McGregor & Little, 1998; Reker et al., 1987; Ryff, 1989). This result suggests that the pathways that lead from volunteering to an increased

Voluntary Projects

sense of quality of life are operating not through an affective (emotions based) pathway but rather through a cognitive appraisal pathway whereby volunteer work either develops or enhances the degree of meaning and purpose in life that volunteers feel they possess. Reker et al. (1987) state that “meaning is created in commitments, achievements, and relationships” (p.223). Perhaps it is through the commitment to voluntary projects and the knowledge that such activity is beneficial to someone else that volunteers develop meaning and purpose in their lives. Students may be committed to more mundane projects such as ‘calculate this month’s budget’ or those that pervade their project systems such as ‘study for my exam’ and ‘finish my readings for class,’ and these pursuits may not lead to the same feeling of achievement or offer the same opportunities to develop relationships that voluntary projects afford.

Little (1987) found that among adolescents’ personal projects, the highly meaningful projects were ones that provided feelings of intimacy or connectedness. Furthermore, voluntary projects “were rated especially high on dimensions of personal meaning” (p.200). Adolescents who were engaged in community volunteer projects perceived these activities as highly self-expressive (Little, 1987; Snyder, 1993). As Little (1998) states “it is in engagement with others that individuals may discover their own identity” (p.200). Therefore, the roles and corresponding projects that students engage in on a daily basis (son/daughter, student, brother/sister, friend, boyfriend/girlfriend) may not be avenues through which self discovery and meaning making are encouraged; voluntary projects and the people and contexts within which they are carried out may be

offering students alternative platforms through which they can develop and enhance their sense of identity and meaning in life.

Predicting Quality of Life from Voluntary Projects, Personal Projects, and Traits

The CLM factors were not significant predictors of positive affect, meaning, and community well-being. The PPA factors predicted positive affect and meaning, and the personality traits accounted for significant proportions of unique variance in positive affect and community well-being.

The potential reasons that the CLM factors did not predict positive affect likely the same reasons that volunteers did not significantly differ from non-volunteers on positive affect as discussed in the previous section. Furthermore, the nature of the CLM dimensions should be considered; only three dimensions (enjoyment, satisfaction, and passionate engagement) were included that were of a positive affect or discrete emotion category. As Little & Chambers (in press) note with respect to personal projects "...the addition of more affective dimensions to the PPA matrix increases our ability to predict outcome measures that are themselves, affectively toned such as, affect balance and happiness" (p.11). It is suggested that the same theorizing applies to the CLM dimensions; if a larger number of affect dimensions had been included in the CLM matrix perhaps a significant prediction of positive affect would have emerged.

With respect to meaning and community well-being, it is also plausible that the CLM dimensions were not tapping into these types of quality of life factors. There were no specific dimensions addressing how meaningful or purposeful the volunteers felt there voluntary activities to be, and as previously discussed, the nature of the community well-

Voluntary Projects

being was more to do with social life satisfaction and community satisfaction which are not assessed by the CLM.

In PPA research, project factors typically account for approximately 25% of the variance in well-being (Hunt, 1999; Little, 1989). In this study PPA Stress (negatively) was a significant predictor of positive affect. To the extent that the students had project systems that were low on Stress, the more likely they were to report higher levels of positive affect. This suggests that the absence of negative attributes (stress, difficulty, challenge) of projects has a more pervasive effect on one's general sense of feeling good than the presence of positive attributes (enjoyment, passionate engagement) of projects. Perhaps students are all too familiar with being 'stressed out' and therefore, when stress is relatively low for them in their daily projects, they feel happier and more satisfied with their lives.

PPA Structure emerged as a significant predictor of meaning. This finding suggests that if a project is personally meaningful then PPA Structure would also be high because the individual would want to ensure that the particular project is regulated both internally (being committed to the project) and externally (making sure enough time is spent on the project).

Finally, the potential reasons for the PPA factors not predicting community well-being are examined. It is hypothesized that the nature of the projects that students were engaged in were typical of the average student (i.e. academic projects and interpersonal projects). However, these projects are not necessarily intertwined with the goings on in

one's community, nor are they relevant to the satisfaction that one has with their degree of participation in community life.

The five traits accounted for a unique proportion of variance in positive affect, and community well-being, but not with meaning. The literature relating the Big Five to subjective well-being demonstrates that extraverted people generally experience positive affect and neurotic people are prone to experience greater levels of negative affect (Costa & McCrae, 1980; Costa, McCrae, & Zonderman, 1987). In the present study neuroticism (negatively) significantly predicted positive affect. So, for this group of students, lower levels of neuroticism are related to positive affect. This suggests that students with a relatively high degree of stability are able to experience higher levels of positive affect than those who are more neurotic. Extraversion approached significance in the prediction of positive affect but its lack of predictive power may be attributable to the fact that it shared common variance with one or more of the other traits rather than accounting for unique variance.

The traits were not significant predictors of meaning. Within this student sample, extraverts may find their attention to be diverted from one project to another depending on the levels of social stimulation and integration that are provided; it is likely that extraverted students are particularly concerned with their social lives such as finding the next great party or getting into Oliver's, the campus bar, on its notorious Wednesday nights. Although such projects may satisfy extraverts' need for stimulation, they are not likely to result in the development of great meaning in one's life.

With community well-being, extraversion emerged as a significant predictor.

Voluntary Projects

The extraverted nature of some students is likely expressed in ever-changing contexts where the diversity of people is salient and the opportunities for interaction are great. It is possible that extraversion is most strongly related to the social life satisfaction component of community well-being; as described above, these students are engaged in social happenings on and off campus and likely spend a lot of time working on their social lives.

Predicting Future Voluntary Participation

Personality Traits

Just as Openness to experience, agreeableness, and neuroticism predicted voluntary status, these same traits predicted students' intentions to volunteer in the future. The discussion that was provided for the former result is also applicable for the latter result. The pathways to volunteering, that is, openness leading to agreeableness, and neuroticism leading to agreeableness, seem to be in effect for whether one is likely to volunteer in the future. Some students are operating on (as described earlier) a proactive pathway to volunteering in that they are intrinsically interested in new experiences and either actively seek them out, or are intrinsically interested in new experiences and if asked to volunteer, will be likely to agree. In contrast, some students are operating on the reactive pathway to volunteering in which they either volunteer to alleviate some concern/worry or to avoid looking bad in the eyes of others.

Personal Projects

Just as Passion and Structure emerged as significant predictors of voluntary status, they are also significant predictors of students' intentions to volunteer in the future. The

Voluntary Projects

notion of internal and external regulation of projects is viable for this latter finding; those students who are deriving passion and enjoyment from their projects, yet are also organizing their time and efforts to achieve their projects, are most likely to volunteer in the future. This reinforces the relevance of internal sustainability (via feeling passion and enjoyment in one's projects) and external sustainability (via ecological affordances) in understanding why some people may continue to volunteer into the future and others may not (Little & Chambers, in press). Although the relative lack of social ecological constraints makes it easier to undertake new projects (eg. voluntary projects), the passion that is derived from one's daily projects may in a sense lead one to view voluntary projects as additional sources of positive, internal regulation; therefore individuals may decide to engage in voluntary projects in the future.

Active Volunteers

Personality Traits

Of the computed effect sizes for the traits, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Agreeableness had the highest effect sizes (moderate). In comparison to the larger group of volunteers, active volunteers are more conscientious, less neurotic, and less agreeable.

The higher levels of conscientiousness found among active volunteers suggests that once a conscientious individual decides to become involved in volunteer work, they may remain active because of their predisposition to be responsible, ambitious, and persevering (Costa et al., 1987).

The lower levels of Neuroticism among active volunteers suggest that these students are slightly more stable than students with a voluntary orientation. This greater

Voluntary Projects

stability may enable these students to stick with or remain active in their voluntary projects.

Scores on agreeableness were slightly lower for active volunteers than for the larger group of volunteers. Omoto & Snyder (1995) found that volunteers who were less agreeable were more likely to avoid volunteer 'burn out' and therefore remained active in their volunteer activities longer than volunteers who were highly agreeable. In a sense, knowing when to say no to further requests for participation in volunteer work or being able to refrain from taking on too many responsibilities in one's role as a volunteer, may protect volunteers from becoming tired, stressed, and overworked. It would appear that this finding may be the case among the active volunteers in this study.

In addition, perhaps being agreeable is not a prerequisite to sustaining volunteer work. Active volunteers may be more likely than sporadic volunteers to engage in voluntary projects because of their own volition and not because they were asked to as might be the case with sporadic volunteers. Therefore, agreeableness would not necessarily figure prominently for active volunteers in their decisions to engage in the activity.

Personal Projects

Moderate effect sizes were obtained for Structure and Agency. This suggests that the social ecologies of active volunteers may facilitate the engagement in and sustainability of volunteer projects both because of the lack of external constraints and the presence of internal affordances. Again the importance of having a well-structured project system emphasizes the point that students need to feel that their current projects

Voluntary Projects

are not in disarray in order to feel that they have the time to give to voluntary projects. This finding may be particularly informative to voluntary organizations because it suggests that the reported decline of volunteerism among youth may be related in part to constraints in these individuals' project systems.

The moderate effect size obtained with Agency suggests that volunteers may be more likely to remain active in their voluntary projects to the extent that their daily personal projects are ones that they feel competent to carry out, and are self beneficial. Perhaps feeling a sense of competence in one's project system may lead to feeling competent in voluntary activities which results in sustained volunteering; moreover, deriving self benefit from one's projects may lead an individual to pursue activities that are beneficial to others because they feel that since they have reaped benefits in their own lives, it is their turn to 'give something back.'

Community Life/Voluntary Projects

For the CLM factor, Passion, a strong effect size was obtained, indicating that the active volunteers were involved in volunteer projects which gave them a stronger sense of passion than did the volunteer projects of the larger group of volunteers. It is plausible then that the more passion that volunteers derive from their volunteer work, the more likely they are to remain active in those activities. It is also possible that aspects of their project systems contribute to their higher levels of passion in their volunteer projects. For example, having well-structured project systems may lead to a sort of 'carryover' effect to voluntary projects. If the personal projects in one's life are in order then the

Voluntary Projects

accessibility of resources needed to create or find passion in voluntary projects may be increased.

Quality of Life

The moderate effect sizes obtained for positive affect and community well-being are consistent with Putnam's work (2000). Among active volunteers, positive affect may likely be enhanced because they have project systems that are working well and because they are deriving a strong sense of passion from their voluntary projects. As was discussed in an earlier section, positive feelings that may result from volunteering are likely to dissipate if the activity that gave rise to them is over. Therefore, by the very nature of being active volunteers, the positive feelings associated with volunteering are likely to be maintained given that the volunteer activity is sustained.

Finally, it is hypothesized that the reasons why community well-being is higher for active volunteers are because: a) they are more satisfied with their degree of participation in their community lives since they are actively involved in volunteering; b) as a result of being active volunteers they may be more aware of the state and happenings in their own community, and c) they may consider the relationships that they form in their volunteer contexts to be part of their social lives, and hence their social life satisfaction would be higher.

Motives of Active Volunteers

Even though the number of active volunteers in this study was small, their motives for volunteering were examined. Although it was hypothesized that students

Voluntary Projects

would be engaged in volunteering primarily for career related motives, this was not confirmed. The most often cited motive for volunteering was Values; students were interested in expressing values related to altruism and the concern for others. The second most frequent motives were Understanding and Enjoyment/Fun, indicating that students were motivated to “receive benefits related to self-development, learning, and variety in life” (Clary et al., 1998, p.1518), and to simply engage in activities that were enjoyable and fun. These findings suggest that perhaps the roles that youth fulfill on a daily basis (e.g. son/daughter, brother/sister, friend, student, boyfriend/girlfriend, etc.) are not offering them the opportunities to express their humanitarianism to the extent that they want, nor are they providing the type of self development that they are seeking, nor are they fulfilling their need for enjoyment and fun.

Implications and Priorities for Future Research

This study reveals that both stable personal features such as traits and personal action constructs such as personal projects are related to: engaging in volunteer work; future intentions to volunteer; and the degree to which students remain active in their voluntary pursuits. The implications of these findings on a theoretical level suggest that an integrative approach to the study of volunteerism among youth is warranted; personality traits may predispose students to become involved in voluntary activities, their personal projects may facilitate or impede such voluntary action and students who volunteer may report an increased level of meaning in their lives.

On an applied level, voluntary organizations are eager to attract and retain younger volunteers. This research may offer organizations and agencies information

Voluntary Projects

about the personality and social ecologies of students that should be considered in matching students to appropriate voluntary projects. Some preliminary analyses revealed that students who had disengaged from volunteering did so because they were moving away from home to attend university. Voluntary organizations may benefit from being aware of where their younger volunteers are moving to so that they can inform them of locations of the organization or of similar organizations in the student's new city.

The major limitation to this study is that very few students were active volunteers and this is consistent with the latest finding that the rate of volunteerism among youth has declined since 1997 (Pickering, 2002). Therefore, replication of the results that were found among this group is recommended. In future research this limitation could be overcome by recruiting volunteers from campus volunteer centres (which match the volunteer interests of student to local volunteer organizations). Furthermore, recruitment notices for younger volunteers could be posted in a multitude of volunteer contexts such as hospitals, schools, community centres, seniors' homes, and sports clubs to ensure that students are sampled from environments outside of the university.

A priority for future research includes the utilization of a longitudinal research design of volunteerism among students. This would allow researchers to examine how students' perceptions of their voluntary activities may change over time (i.e. do they maintain the same level of passion and pressure) and whether changes in one's project system affect the likelihood of sustaining or disengaging from voluntary pursuits. Furthermore, the motivations underlying volunteerism could be assessed at intervals

Voluntary Projects

throughout the study as a means of identifying whether students' motives remain consistent or vary depending on their current situation. Little (1983) developed a laddering technique which was later modified by Chambers (1997) that would be useful in identifying peripheral motives from core motives for volunteering. Volunteers would be asked why they are engaged in volunteering as a means of identifying possible higher order projects and motives. For example, if a student is asked why the volunteer at a local hospital, they may say that they want to learn about medicine. When 'learn about medicine' is queried, the project may be because they want to become a doctor. 'Become a doctor' is queried and the response is to please my family, and so on. This laddering technique may reveal the higher order nature of some voluntary projects. Finally, a longitudinal study may offer insight into the long term effects of voluntary participation on the quality of life of student volunteers.

Future studies could also examine the finer details of the relationships between the traits of Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism and volunteerism. An exploration of the facet levels of these traits may reveal more subtle yet intriguing information about which are the most or least conducive to engaging in and sustaining volunteer projects. Furthermore, causal path analysis could be employed to investigate the relationships among these traits as they pertain to volunteering.

Another potentially interesting line of research involves the utilization of PPA cross-impact matrices. In this extension of the traditional PPA assessment, students would rate how much their voluntary projects impact upon each of their personal projects

Voluntary Projects

(positive, negative, or ambivalent) or vice versa. This would allow for greater clarity of the specific features of both personal and voluntary projects that are most facilitating and most frustrating.

It should be noted that this study is part of a larger program of research examining volunteerism across the lifespan. Student volunteers are at a very different stage in the life cycle than adult and elderly volunteers and therefore the nature and number of voluntary projects that they are involved in are likely to differ. The competing demands of the age related tasks of academic and interpersonal projects in the lives of youth are critical to understanding the state of volunteerism among this group. The utilization of the social ecological framework allows researchers to gain insight into the personalities and daily lives of students as a means of understanding volunteerism among youth.

In short, the present study has served to identify some promising lines of inquiry about the nature of students' volunteer projects. If replicated and expanded, particularly through examining the developmental and motivational underpinnings of "doings unto others", both the scientific understanding of volunteering and its enhancement will be advanced.

References

- Baumeister, R.F. (1991). Meanings of life. New York: Guilford.
- Benson, P., Dohority, J., Garman, L., Hanson, E., Hochschwender, M., Lebold, C., Rohr, R., & Sullivan, J. (1980). Intrapersonal correlates of nonspontaneous helping behaviour. Journal of Social Psychology, 110, 87-95.
- Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, Kahanoff Non-Profit Sector Research Initiative, Volunteer Canada, Canadian Heritage, Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, & Statistics Canada. (1998). Caring Canadians, involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry.
- Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behaviour. "Having" and "doing" in the study of individual personality and cognition. American Psychologist, 45, 735-750.
- Chambers, N. (1997). Onwards and upwards: From ladders and lattices to nests and trees in project pursuit. Unpublished paper, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- Clary, E.G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behaviour: The case of volunteerism. In M. Clark (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Clary, E.G., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8 (5), 156-159.

- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A.A., Haugen, J., et al. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74 (6), 1516-1530.
- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 668-678.
- Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin and O. P. John (Eds.). Handbook of personality: Theory and research. (2nd Ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Costa, P.T., McCrae, R.R., & Zonderman, A.B. (1987). Environmental and dispositional influences on well-being: Longitudinal follow-up of an American national sample. British Journal of Psychology, 78, 299-306.
- Diener, E., & Emmons, R.A. (1985). The independence of positive and negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47 (5), 1105-1117.
- Dollinger, S.J. & Leong, F.T.L. (1993). Volunteer bias and the five-factor model. The Journal of Psychology, 127, 29-36.
- Dowden, C., Chambers, N., Hunt, J., Richardson-Taylor, K., Hargrave, A., & Little, B.R. (2001). Personal projects appraisals and depressive affect: A meta-analysis. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Voluntary Projects

- Emmons, R.A. (1986). Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1058-1068.
- Goodine, L.A. (1999). A personal projects analysis of commitment. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Gough, H.G. (1987). The California Psychological Inventory administrator's guide. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Harlow, R., & Cantor, N. (1996). Still participating after all these years. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 1235-1249.
- Hunt, J.C. (1999). Personal projects, idio-tapes and well-being: An exploratory study on incremental validity. Unpublished B.A. thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Hunter, K.I., & Linn, M.W. (1981). Psychosocial differences between volunteers and non-volunteers. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 12, 205-213.
- John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Klinger, E. (1975). Consequences of commitment to and disengagement from incentives. Psychological Review, 82, 1-25.
- Knapp, R.H., & Holzberg, J.D. (1964). Characteristics of college students volunteering for service to mental patients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 28, 82-85.
- Lecci, L. (1990). Personality, personal projects, and adaptation to university. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

- Little, B.R. (1983). Personal projects: A rationale and method for investigation. Environment and Behaviour, 15 (3), 273-309.
- Little, B.R. (1987). Personal projects and fuzzy selves: Aspects of self-identity in adolescence. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the life span (pp.230-245). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Little, B.R. (1989). Personal projects analysis: Trivial pursuits, magnificent obsessions, and the search for coherence. In D.M. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.), Personality psychology: Recent trends and emerging issues (pp. 15-31). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Little, B.R. (1998). Personal project pursuit: Dimensions and dynamics of personal meaning. In P.T.P. Wong & P.S. Fry (Eds.), The human quest for meaning: A handbook of research and clinical applications. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Little, B.R. (1999). Personality and motivation: Personal action and the conative evolution. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.). Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd Ed.) New York: Guilford.
- Little, B.R. (2000). Free traits and personal contexts: Expanding a social ecological model of well-being. In W.B. Walsh, K.H. Craik, & R. Price (Eds.). Person environment psychology (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Little, B.R., & Chambers, N. (in press). Personal project pursuit: On human doings and well beings. In M. Cox & E. Klinger (Eds.). Handbook of Motivational Counseling. Chichester, England: Wiley.

- McGregor, I. & Little, B.R. (1998). Personal projects, happiness, and meaning: On doing well and being yourself. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 494-512.
- Myers, D.G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? Psychological Science, 6, 10-19.
- Nunn, M. (2000). Building the bridge from episodic volunteerism to social capital. The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, 24 (2), 115-127.
- Omodei, M.M., & Wearing, A.J. (1990). Need satisfaction and involvement in personal projects: Toward an integrative model of subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59 (4), 762-769.
- Omoto, A.M., & Snyder, M. (1990). Basic research in action: Volunteerism and society's response to AIDS. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16, 152-166.
- Omoto, A.M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 671-687.
- Phillips, S.D., Little, B.R., & Goodine, L.A. (1997). Reconsidering gender and public administration: Five steps beyond conventional research. Canadian Public Administration, 40, 563-581.
- Pickering, D. (2002). Youth giving and volunteering. Retrieved August 20, 2002, from <http://www.givingandvolunteering.ca/factsheets.asp>.

- Putnam, R.D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Pychyl, T.A. (1995). Personal projects and the lives of doctoral students. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Radloff, L.S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1, 385-401.
- Radloff, L.S. (1991). The use of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale in adolescents and young adults. Journal of Young Adolescence, 20, 149-166.
- Reker, G.T. (2001). The Life Attitude Profile-Revised (LAP-R) Procedures Manual: Research Edition. Peterborough: Student Psychologists Press.
- Reker, G.T., Peacock, E.J., & Wong, P.T.P. (1987). Meaning and purpose in life and well-being: A life-span perspective. Journal of Gerontology, 42, 44-49.
- Richardson, K. (1999). Personal projects analysis and well-being: A cross-national comparison. Unpublished B.A. Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Richardson, K. (2001). Personal projects and well-being: Cultural explorations. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Russell, J.A., & Carroll, J.M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. Psychological Bulletin, 125, 3-30.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 141-166.

- Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 1069-1081.
- Salmela-Aro, K., & Nurmi, J.-E. (1992). Struggling with self: The personal projects of students seeking psychological counselling. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 33, 330-338.
- Salmela-Aro, K., & Nurmi, J.-E. (1996). Depressive symptoms and personal project appraisals: A cross-lagged longitudinal study. Personality and Individual Differences, 21, 373-381.
- Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a “functional” personality and social psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19, 251-264.
- Stevens, J.P. (2002). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thoits, P.A., & Hewitt, L.N. (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 42, 115-131.
- Trudeau, K.J., & Devlin, A.S. (1996). College students and community service: Who, with whom, and why? Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26 (21): 1867-1888.
- Wheeler, J., Gorey, K., & Greenblatt, B. (1998). The beneficial effects of volunteering for older adults and the people they serve. International Journal of Aging Human Development, 47, 69-80.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. Annual Review of Sociology, 26, 215-240.

Appendix A

Descriptive Statistics for N = 144

Table A1

Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	Frequency	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Men	42			
Women	102			
Single	129			
Married	9			
First year status ^a	107			
Second year status	25			
Third year status	3			
Fourth year status	2			
Full time student	125			
Part time student	5			
Special student	14			
Currently employed	77			
Number of hours per week working	--	18.50	9.86	56.00
Age	--	20.05	2.08	11.00

Note. ^a7 participants did not report what year of university they were in

Table A2

Descriptive Statistics on Traits

Trait	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Openness to Experience	29.27	4.52	24.00
Conscientiousness	32.99	5.47	27.00
Extraversion	26.70	6.12	25.00
Agreeableness	34.78	5.79	25.00
Neuroticism	23.57	6.48	29.00

Table A3

Descriptive Statistics on PPA Dimensions

PPA Dimension	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Importance	7.55	1.26	5.60
Enjoyment	6.17	1.54	7.40
Difficulty	5.73	1.56	8.78
Visibility	5.68	1.86	9.80
Stress	4.88	1.84	9.80
Control	7.16	1.54	6.90
Passionate Engagement	6.00	1.78	9.00
Time Adequacy	5.33	1.85	8.88
Outcome	7.49	1.44	7.67
Self Identity	6.47	1.69	8.50
Support	5.87	2.43	9.80
Value Congruency	7.32	1.66	8.20
Stage	5.29	1.35	8.70
Challenge	6.34	1.63	8.20
Commitment	7.14	1.51	7.70
Competence	7.65	1.72	8.33
Other's Benefit	4.80	2.16	10.00
Self Benefit	8.60	1.19	6.10

Note. Alpha reliability coefficient = .83.

Table A4

Descriptive Statistics on CLM Dimensions

CLM Dimension	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Enjoyment	8.42	1.32	6.00
Commitment	8.41	1.62	7.00
Self Benefit	6.80	2.65	10.00
Other's Benefit	7.97	2.16	10.00
Satisfaction	8.70	1.43	8.00
Passionate Engagement	7.56	1.99	8.00
Organizational Support	8.53	2.33	10.00
Organizational Hindrance	1.64	2.11	8.00
Family/Friend Support	8.14	2.47	9.33
Future Plans	6.63	2.56	10.00
Pressure	3.98	2.88	9.00

Note. Alpha reliability coefficient = .58.

Table A5

Descriptive Statistics on QOL variables

QOL variable	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Positive Affect (pre-Sept.11)	26.05	7.88	36.00
Negative Affect (pre-Sept.11)	22.61	9.88	42.00
CES-D	17.26	10.20	49.00
Global life satisfaction	7.21	1.69	10.00
Social life satisfaction	6.64	2.36	10.00
Home life satisfaction	7.12	2.32	10.00
Emotional well-being satisfaction	6.87	2.17	8.00
Community life satisfaction	6.20	1.98	10.00
Satisfaction with degree of participation in community life	5.78	2.15	10.00
Meaning/purpose in life satisfaction	7.44	1.78	9.00
Purpose in life	39.83	7.68	39.00
Coherence in life	37.73	8.12	40.00

Note. Alpha reliability coefficient = .72.

Appendix B

Descriptive Statistics by Volunteer Status

Table B1

Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Variables for Volunteers and Non-

Volunteers

Demographic Variable	Volunteers			Non-Volunteers		
	Frequency	<u>M</u>	Range	Frequency	<u>M</u>	Range
Men	22			20		
Women	63			39		
Single ^{a,b}	75			54		
Married	6			3		
First year status ^{c,d}	58			49		
Second year status	18			7		
Third year status	2			1		
Fourth year status	2			0		
Full time student	74			51		
Part time student	2			3		
Special student	9			5		
Currently employed	44			33		
Number of hours per week working		19.67	54.00		16.91	40.00
Age		20.19	9.00		19.86	11.00

^aFour volunteers did not report their marital status. ^bTwo non-volunteers did notreport their marital status. ^cFive volunteers did not report what year of universitythey are in. ^dTwo non-volunteers did not report what year of university they are in.

Table B2

Descriptive Statistics on PPA Dimensions for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers

PPA Dimension	Volunteers			Non-Volunteers		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Importance	7.71	1.24	5.60	7.32	1.27	5.30
Enjoyment	6.41	1.45	7.10	5.82	1.60	7.30
Difficulty	5.67	1.66	8.00	5.81	1.42	7.98
Visibility	5.96	1.79	8.60	5.28	1.90	9.80
Stress	5.01	1.91	9.20	4.71	1.74	7.80
Control	7.32	1.48	6.50	6.92	1.60	6.90
Passionate Engagement	6.31	1.67	7.22	5.55	1.86	9.00
Time Adequacy	5.65	1.82	8.88	4.86	1.81	7.72
Outcome	7.63	1.43	6.33	7.29	1.45	7.67
Self Identity	6.55	1.62	7.08	6.36	1.80	8.50
Support	6.02	2.34	9.20	5.64	2.56	9.80
Value	7.52	1.58	8.20	7.04	1.73	7.20
Congruency	5.62	1.35	6.60	4.81	1.22	6.80
Stage	6.42	1.65	7.90	6.23	1.60	7.40
Challenge	7.42	1.38	6.50	6.73	1.59	7.70
Commitment	7.77	1.62	8.00	7.47	1.85	8.33
Competence	4.86	2.32	10.00	4.71	1.92	8.60
Others' Benefit	8.66	1.15	6.10	8.51	1.27	4.50
Self Benefit						

Table B3

Descriptive Statistics of the Outcome Measures for Volunteer Status

Outcome Measures	Volunteers			Non-Volunteers		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Positive Affect (pre-Sept.11)	26.29	8.29	36.00	25.69	7.31	30.00
Negative Affect (pre-Sept.11)	22.88	9.98	42.00	22.22	9.79	38.00
CES-D	17.65	10.33	49.00	16.71	10.07	42.00
Global life satisfaction	7.45	1.59	10.00	6.86	1.78	9.00
Social life satisfaction	6.62	2.40	10.00	6.66	2.32	9.00
Home life satisfaction	7.49	2.11	9.00	6.59	2.52	10.00
Emotional well-being satisfaction	7.01	2.10	8.00	6.66	2.28	8.00
Community life satisfaction	6.39	1.98	10.00	5.93	1.97	8.00
Degree of participation in community life satisfaction	6.06	2.07	10.00	5.39	2.22	9.00
Meaning/purpose in life satisfaction	7.70	1.70	9.00	7.07	1.83	8.00
Purpose in life	41.38	7.45	39.00	37.63	7.53	38.00
Coherence in life	38.87	8.31	40.00	36.05	7.61	33.00

Appendix C

Descriptive Statistics for Active Volunteers

Table C1

Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Variables for Active Volunteers

Demographic Variable	Frequency	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Men	7			
Women	18			
Single ^a	21			
Married	3			
First year status ^d	16			
Second year status	6			
Third year status	1			
Fourth year status	0			
Full time student	21			
Part time student	1			
Special student	3			
Currently employed	15			
Number of hours per week working	--	17.57	9.77	38.00
Age	--	20.28	2.57	9.00

Note. ^aOne volunteer did not report marital status. ^dTwo volunteers did not report their year of study.

Table C2

Descriptive Statistics on Traits for Active Volunteers

Trait	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Openness to Experience	30.24	4.04	16.00
Conscientiousness	35.28	5.00	19.00
Extraversion	27.68	6.53	23.00
Agreeableness	34.68	6.57	23.00
Neuroticism	22.28	7.14	25.00

Table C3

Descriptive Statistics on PPA Factor Components for Active Volunteers

PPA Factor	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Agency	7.97	.78	3.05
Stress	5.53	1.37	5.63
Structure	6.93	.95	3.70
Passion	6.45	1.61	5.97
Community	5.63	2.06	7.75

Table C4

Descriptives on CLM Factor Components for Active Volunteers

CLM Factor	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Passion	8.43	.90	3.42
Pressure	6.08	1.57	5.67

Table C5

Descriptives on QOL Factor Components for Active Volunteers

QOL Factor	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
Positive Affect	46.69	14.68	50.50
Meaning	24.88	4.15	14.25
Community Well-Being	7.12	1.51	6.67

Note. Min. value for Positive Affect = -98, max. value for Positive Affect = 70.

Min. value for Meaning = 16, max. value for Meaning = 132.

Appendix D

Case Study

As a means of offering greater insight into the social ecologies of active volunteers, a representative volunteer was chosen as the subject of the following case study.

Our active volunteer, let's call her Patty, is a 21 year old, single female who is currently unemployed. She is a full time student at Carleton, in her second year of the Child Studies program. In comparison to other active volunteers on the personality traits, Patty scores lower on openness to experience (approximately 2.0 standard deviations from the mean), slightly lower on extraversion (less than 1 standard deviation from the mean), and neuroticism (less than one standard deviation from the mean), however she scores higher on agreeableness and conscientiousness (approximately 1 standard deviation from the mean on each).

Now that Patty's stable personal features have been examined, we turn to her personal projects. In the elicitation phase of PPA, she provided 15 personal projects and subsequently chose 10 that she felt were of interest to explore in further detail. In order, her 10 projects are as follows:

"Giving time to God everyday & attending church on Sundays"

"Preparing notes for mid-term exams"

"Staying ahead of my homework"

"Going to all classes and watching ITV classes"

"Exercise on a regular basis (5 times a week)"

"Ace-it-cd questions on each chapter for psychology"

“Reading books for English literature”

“Attending PASS classes for psychology”

“Social work paper”

“Taking time for myself to do something fun”

Personal projects can be classified as belonging to one of seven categories:

Academic, Occupational, Health/Body, Interpersonal, Intrapersonal, Leisure, and Maintenance. Patty has 7 academic projects, 1 health/body project, 1 intrapersonal project, and 1 leisure project.

In terms of the 5 project factors (Agency, Stress, Structure, Passion, and Community) Patty's scores are all within 1 standard deviation of the average scores of the active volunteers, with the exception of structure for which she scores approximately 1.25 standard deviations higher. Based on the large number of academic projects that she is engaged in, it is evident that she is a dedicated student and that pursuing her university degree is important to her. Her project system is well structured and unstressful which is likely related to the fact that Patty is highly conscientiousness.

Patty is actively involved as a soccer coach for a local soccer league. She became involved in this voluntary project because she enjoys teaching children and wanted to help out a friend. Her high score on agreeableness would support the notion that agreeable people may volunteer because they are asked to. Though this does apply to Patty, she also became a soccer coach because it is a source of enjoyment for her. Considering that she does not have any interpersonal projects and only one leisure project in her project system, perhaps being a volunteer coach is a means for Patty to bring some fun into her life.

Overall, Patty's ratings of her voluntary project are glowing. She is committed to coaching and feels that it is self beneficial (ratings of 8 on these dimensions). Patty is passionately engaged in this activity and derives a great deal of enjoyment from it (ratings of 9). She derives complete satisfaction from coaching, believes that her coaching activities are highly beneficial to others, and feels that she is highly supported in this activity by both the soccer league and her family and friends (ratings of 10). Patty feels very little pressure to give more to this activity (rating of 2) and does not feel that there is any indication of organizational hindrance to her voluntary work (rating of 0). Finally, Patty reports that she is extremely likely to continue with this voluntary activity in the future (rating of 10). Patty's scores on the 2 CLM factors, Passion and Pressure, were higher than the averages for the active volunteers but were within 1 standard deviation from the mean on each.

Lastly, we turn to Patty's quality of life. Her scores on positive affect and meaning are within 1 standard deviation from the means of the active volunteers, and her score on community well-being is approximately 1.5 standard deviations lower. The latter finding is likely indicative of the fact that she is actively engaged in only one volunteer project which may make her feel dissatisfied with her degree of participation in community life.

This social ecological portrait of Patty provides a more detailed description of the psychological underpinnings of a typical active volunteer.

Students' Lives and their "Thinkings, Doings and Feelings"

Dear Participant:

This study focuses on your everyday activities and concerns and how this relates to your well-being. Ours is not a usual "test" where you tick off items which may or may not be relevant to you. Rather it explores in a more interesting way the everyday activities ("take the dog for a walk," "find a new roommate") in which people are engaged. Many of those who have already participated in our research have given us very positive feedback that they found this exercise to be useful in reflecting on different aspects of their life. Similarly, we hope that you will find it a worthwhile exercise.

There is no deception involved in this study, nor does it involve anything likely to be threatening or embarrassing to you. For participation in this study of approximately 1 1/2 hours, you will receive two experimental credits. These are the instructions:

1. Please complete the Informed consent form. This must be handed in with the package.
2. Please answer questions in the order given rather than skipping ahead.
3. Choose a pseudonym or nick name which you think is particularly descriptive of yourself (e.g., 'Rose Garden') and write it in the corner of the next page where indicated. Don't worry about the subject ID# as this is for our information only.
4. Don't forget to take a break if you find yourself getting a bit tired.
5. If you have any questions regarding the study, feel free to contact our Research Associate, Dr. Laura Goodine or our Research Assistant, Jennifer Hunt at 520-2600, ext. 2697.
7. If you should have any ethical concerns about the research you may contact Dr. M. Gick, Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research (520-2600, ext. 2664). If you have any other concerns about the study, you may contact Dr. K. Matheson, Chair of the Department of Psychology (520-2600, ext. 2648).
8. Thank you again for your participation.

Brian R. Little, Ph.D.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Phillips, Ph.D.

Informed Consent Form

Carleton University
Social Ecology Laboratory
Psychology Department
School of Public Policy and Administration

This form is intended to ensure that you are aware of your rights concerning participation in this study and to ensure you are adequately informed to be able to decide whether you wish to participate. Please read the following carefully and sign below to indicate that you understand your rights as a voluntary participant in this research.

Title of Study: **Students' Lives and their "Thinkings, Feelings, and Doings"**

The purpose of this study is to examine the kinds of activities and concerns that people currently have in their daily lives, with a particular emphasis on community activities. The more specific focus is on how activities may affect well-being. In addition, we will be asking you to complete a measure concerning the September 11th terrorist incident as well as to write in your own words how or if it has affected your life

The study will involve the completion of questionnaires in the attached package. It will take approximately ninety minutes to complete. Some of the measures in the study may ask questions of a personal and sensitive nature. You may choose not to answer specific questions or withdraw at any point in the process for any reason without penalty.

I understand that the data collected is confidential. The data, once collected, will be coded in such a way that my name is not associated with the data. This anonymous data may also become part of an archival data set for use in future research. Further, it is kept strictly confidential and will not be used in any way other than for the research purposes outlined above. Only research personnel will have access to these data.

I understand that if I should have any questions about this research, I may report them to Dr. Laura Goodine, the research coordinator (520-2600, ext. 2697), Dr. Brian Little, the principal investigator (520-2600, ext. 2697) or Dr. Susan Phillips, the co-investigator (520-2600, ext. 2633). If I should have any ethical concerns about the research I may contact Dr. M. Gick, Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research (520-2600, ext. 2664). If I have any other concerns about the study, I may contact Dr. K. Matheson, Chair of the Department of Psychology (520-2600, ext. 2648).

Date: _____ 2001

Name of Participant _____

Signature of Participant _____

Signature of Researcher _____

Pseudonym_____

PERSONAL PROJECTS ANALYSIS

Part 1: Project Elicitation

We are interested in studying the kinds of activities and concerns that people have at different stages of their lives. We call these personal projects. All of us have a number of personal projects at any given time that we think about, plan for, carry out and sometimes (though not always) complete. In this sense, projects may be ongoing tasks as well as finite ones; they may be things we choose to do or things we have to do. Please think of projects in this broad way. We are interested in the projects that you are involved in at work, at home, in leisure and in the community.

Here are some examples of projects:

- Work things out with Anna
- Finish organizing the bazaar for Big Sisters
- Try to balance my budget
- Try not to make Peter angry
- Clarify my religious beliefs
- Exercise more often
- Visit Ireland next summer
- Be a better person
- Look into publishing my poetry
- Study for my Psychology 100 exam
- Practice my presentation for my seminar class

We are also interested in finding out how people feel about these personal projects, how enjoyable they are, and so on. We would appreciate it if you could begin by just writing down in the next few minutes as many personal projects as you can that you are engaged in or considering at the present time--remember these are not necessarily formal projects, or important ones--we would prefer you to give us more of the everyday kinds of activity or concerns that characterize your life at present.

List of Projects

Now please go ahead and write down as many projects as you can think of in the next few minutes. Include some detail so we know what you are up to in each project.

[illegible]

Part 2: Project Rating

Now select 10 projects/activities from your list that you feel you would like to explore in more detail in order to better understand your life. These may not necessarily be the most important or demanding projects, but rather ones that are representative of your life at the present time.

Next, recopy these 10 projects in a brief yet clear and descriptive form onto the Personal Projects matrix on the next page.

In the following columns, please rate each of your projects using any number from 0-10 on the following dimensions – remember that the numbers 0 and 10 can also be used. If you feel a dimension is not relevant to a project, you may put an X in the space instead of a numerical rating, but please try to rate each project on all dimensions wherever possible. Please read the definition of the various dimensions as you go along.

Personal Projects Rating Matrix: What do you think about what you are doing?

<i>Projects</i>	1. Importance	2. Enjoyment	3. Difficulty	4. Visibility	5. Stress	6. Control	7. Passionate Engagement	8. Time Adequacy	9. Outcome	10. Self Identity	11. Support	12. Value Congruency	13. Stage	14. Challenge	15. Commitment	16. Competence	17. Other's Benefit	18. Self Benefit
	1																	
	2																	
	3																	
	4																	
	5																	
	6																	
	7																	
	8																	
	9																	
	10																	

Project Dimension Definitions.

1. Importance

how important each project is to you (use 10 if you consider it to be very important and 0 if it is not at all important).

2. Enjoyment

how much you enjoy working on each project (use 10 if you enjoy it a great deal and 0 if you do not enjoy it at all)

3. Difficulty

how difficult you find it to carry out each project? (use 10 for a project which is extremely difficult to carry out and 0 for one that is not difficult at all).

4. Visibility

how aware are people who are close to you that you are engaged in each project? (use 10 for a project which is very visible to those you are close to and 0 for a project that is not visible to those close to you at all).

5. Stress

how stressful it is for you to carry out each project? (Use 10 if a project is very stressful to carry out and 0 if a project is not stressful at all to carry out).

6. Control

how much you feel you are in control of each project? (use 10 for a project over which you feel in complete control and 0 for a project over which you feel you have no control at all).

7. Passionate Engagement

Some people might say that they are passionate about their projects, others less so or not at all. (Use 10 if you are extremely passionate about a project and 0 if you are not at all passionate about it).

8. Time Adequacy

If you are currently engaged in a project, how much you feel that the amount of time you spend working on each project is adequate? (Use 10 if you feel that the amount of time spent on a project is perfectly adequate, and 0 if you feel that the amount of time you spend working on a project is not at all adequate).

9. Outcome (Anticipated Success)

what you anticipate the outcome of each project to be (use 10 if you think that a project will be extremely successful and 0 if you think a project will turn out to be not at all successful)

10. Self-Identity

All of us have things we do that are truly expressive of us. These things can be thought of as our "trade marks." For example, some people engage in sports every chance they get, others prefer to read, others prefer to socialize. Think of what your own personal "trade marks" are, and then rate each project on the extent to which it is expressive of you (use 10 if a project is very self expressive and 0 if it is not at all self expressive).

11. Support

To what extent you feel each project is supported by other people? (use 10 if you feel other people support the project a lot and 0 if there is no support at all). Note that support can be emotional or practical or both.

12. Value Congruency

To what extent each project is consistent with the values that guide your life? (Use 10 if a project is totally consistent with your values and 0 if a project is not consistent with your values at all).

13. Stage

Projects often go through several stages, which can be visualized along a time-line...

(...such as: 0.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7.....8.....9.....10).

Think of each project as moving through stages on such a time-line. Using the following scale, rate each project's stage:

0 to 2:	Inception	The idea for the project has just come to you. You may have some thoughts on how to approach it or are deciding whether or not the project can actually be carried out.
3 to 5:	Planning	You have decided to proceed with the project. You may be planning it and obtaining whatever personal and material support it may require or you have the project planned out and you are beginning to actively start the project.
6 to 8:	Action	You are actively working on the project. You may be trying to balance it with your other projects, resources and time commitments.
9 to 10:	Completion	The project is coming to a close or has actually been completed or terminated.

[Note: You may consider your project as something that is always ongoing without any stages. In this case, just mark a '5' as it is somewhere in between on this scale]

14. Challenge

to what extent each project is demanding and challenging to you (use 10 if a project is most challenging and 0 if it is not challenging at all).

15. Commitment

to what extent are you committed to the project (use 10 if you are totally committed to this project and 0 if you are not at all committed).

16. Competence

to what extent do you feel competent to carry out this project? (use 10 if you feel completely competent to carry out the project and 0 if you do not feel competent at all to carry it out).

17. Other's Benefit

to what extent are you engaged in each project for the benefit and well-being of other people? (Use 10 if enhancing the well-being of others is very much a purpose of the project, and 0 if the project is not at all for the well-being of others.)

18. Self Benefit

to what extent are you engaged in each project for your own benefit and well-being? (use 10 if enhancing your own well-being is very much a purpose of the project, and 0 if it is not at all for your own benefit.)

Big Five Factor Inventory

John & Srivastava (1999).

I see myself as someone who...

Instructions: For each of the 44 characteristics listed below, rate how descriptive each characteristic is of you using a 1-5 scale as shown below.

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree a little 2	Neither agree or disagree 3	Agree a little 4	Strongly Agree 5
1	Is talkative _____				
2	Tends to find fault with others _____				
3	Does a thorough job _____				
4	Is depressed, blue _____				
5	Is original, comes up with new ideas _____				
6	Is reserved _____				
7	Is helpful and unselfish with others _____				
8	Can be somewhat careless _____				
9	Is relaxed, handles stress well _____				
10	Is curious about many different things _____				
11	Is full of energy _____				
12	Starts quarrels with others _____				
13	Is a reliable worker _____				
14	Can be tense _____				
15	Is ingenious, a deep thinker _____				
16	Generates a lot of enthusiasm _____				
17	Has a forgiving nature _____				
18	Tends to be disorganized _____				
19	Worries a lot _____				
20	Has an active imagination _____				
21	Tends to be quiet _____				
22	Is generally trusting _____				
23	Tends to be lazy _____				
24	Is emotionally stable, not easily upset _____				
25	Is inventive _____				
26	Has an assertive personality _____				
27	Can be cold and aloof _____				
28	Perseveres until the task is finished _____				
29	Can be moody _____				
30	Values artistic, aesthetic experiences _____				
31	Is sometimes shy, inhibited _____				
32	Is considerate and kind to almost everyone _____				
33	Does things efficiently _____				
34	Remains calm in tense situations _____				
35	Prefers work that is routine _____				
36	Is outgoing, sociable _____				
37	Is sometimes rude to others _____				
38	Makes plans and follows through with them _____				
39	Gets nervous easily _____				
40	Likes to reflect, play with ideas _____				
41	Has few artistic interests _____				
42	Likes to cooperate with others _____				
43	Is easily distracted _____				
44	Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature _____				

Trust Scale

1. Generally speaking, would you say that **most people** can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? Use 10 if you think most people can be completely trusted and 0 if you think that they cannot be trusted at all.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not Trusted					Neutral					Completely
at all/ Can't be too careful with people										Trusted

2. Generally speaking, would you say that you have confidence and trust in **government** (federal, provincial, municipal)? Use 10 if you have a great deal of confidence and trust in government and 0 if you have no confidence and trust at all.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
No Confidence					Neutral				A great deal of	And
Trust At All									Confidence and Trust	

PPSRS

Consider the different pursuits, activities, commitments and projects in which you are currently involved. we call this your "personal project system" **On the whole**, how would you evaluate your current project system on the following dimensions? Please circle the appropriate number.

On the whole, my current activities, commitments, pursuits and projects are:

meaningful (eg. enjoyable, valuable)	10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0	meaningless (eg. worthless, unenjoyable)
chaotic (eg. out of control, not enough time)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	well-organized (eg. under control adequate time)
supported (eg. lots of help and affection from others)	10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0	totally lacking support (eg. others don't care at all)
unstressful (eg. no hassle or conflict)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	very stressful (eg. lots of hassle and conflict)
progressing well (eg. likely to be very successful)	10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0	progressing poorly (eg. very likely to fail)

LIFE ATTITUDE PROFILE-REVISED (LAP-R)

(c) Gary T. Reker

This questionnaire contains a number of statements related to opinions and feelings about yourself and life in general. Read each statement carefully, then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling one of the alternative categories provided. For example, if you STRONGLY AGREE, circle SA following the statement. If you MODERATELY DISAGREE, circle MD. If you are UNDECIDED, circle U. Try to use the undecided category sparingly.

	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
	STRONGLY	AGREE	MODERATELY	UNDECIDED	MODERATELY	DISAGREE	STRONGLY
	AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		DISAGREE
1. My past achievements have given my life meaning and purpose.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
2. In my life I have very clear goals and aims.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
3. I regard the opportunity to direct my life as very important.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
4. I seem to change my <u>main</u> objectives in life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
5. I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
6. I feel that some element which I can't quite define is missing from my life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
7. The meaning of life is evident in the world around us.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
8. I think I am generally much less concerned about death than those around me.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
9. I feel the lack of and a need to find a real meaning and purpose in my life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
10. New and different things appeal to me.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD

	SA STRONGLY AGREE	A AGREE	MA MODERATELY AGREE	U UNDECIDED	MD MODERATELY DISAGREE	D DISAGREE	SD STRONGLY DISAGREE
11. My accomplishments in life are largely determined by my own efforts.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
12. I have been aware of an all powerful and consuming purpose towards which my life has been directed.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
13. I try new activities or areas of interest and then these soon lose their attractiveness.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
14. I would enjoy breaking loose from the routine of life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
15. Death makes little difference to me one way or another.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
16. I have a philosophy of life that gives my existence significance.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
17. I determine what happens in my life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
18. Basically, I am living the kind of life I want to live.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
19. Concerning my freedom to make my choice, I believe I am absolutely free to make all life choices.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
20. I have experienced the feeling that while I am destined to accomplish something important, I cannot put my finger on just what it is.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
21. I am restless.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
22. Even though death awaits me, I am not concerned about it.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
23. It is possible for me to live my life in terms of what I want to do.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD

	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	UNDECIDED	MODERATELY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
24. I feel the need for adventure and "new worlds to conquer".	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
25. I would neither fear death nor welcome it.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
26. I know where my life is going in the future.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
27. In thinking of my life, I see a reason for my being here.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
28. Since death is a natural aspect of life, there is no sense worrying about it.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
29. I have a framework that allows me to understand or make sense of my life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
30. My life is in my hands and I am in control of it.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
31. In achieving life's goals, I have felt completely fulfilled.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
32. Some people are very frightened of death, but I am not.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
33. I daydream of finding a new place for my life and a new identity.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
34. A new challenge in my life would appeal to me now.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
35. I have the sense that parts of my life fit together into a unified pattern.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
36. I hope for something exciting in the future.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
37. I have a mission in life that gives me a sense of direction.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD

	SA STRONGLY AGREE	A AGREE	MA MODERATELY AGREE	U UNDECIDED	MD MODERATELY DISAGREE	D DISAGREE	SD STRONGLY DISAGREE
38. I have a clear understanding of the ultimate meaning of life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
39. When it comes to important life matters, I make my own decisions.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
40. I find myself withdrawing from life with an "I don't care" attitude.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
41. I am eager to get more out of life than I have so far.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
42. Life to me seems boring and uneventful.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
43. I am determined to achieve new goals in the future.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
44. The thought of death seldom enters my mind.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
45. I accept personal responsibility for the choices I have made in my life.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
46. My personal existence is orderly and coherent.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
47. I accept death as another life experience.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD
48. My life is running over with exciting good things.	SA	A	MA	U	MD	D	SD

Affect Scale

This questionnaire consists of nine adjectives which may describe the way you have felt lately. Using the scale beside each item, please indicate how much each adjective describes how you have felt in the past few weeks. Indicate your choice by circling the appropriate number.

Now, please rate how you have felt over the past few weeks:

Happy	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Frustrated	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Worried or Anxious	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Joyful	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Pleased	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Angry or Hostile	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Unhappy	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Depressed	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely
Full of Fun	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Extremely

Affect Scale (after September 11th)

We realize that a lot of people have been greatly affected as a result of the events on September 11th. We are interested in how this event may change or may not change your ratings on the previous scale. As before, this questionnaire consists of nine adjectives which may describe the way you have felt in the past few weeks. Using the scale beside each item, please indicate how much each adjective describes how you have felt taking into consideration the events of September 11th and its aftermath. Remember, it is possible to stay the same, increase or decrease each item. Indicate your choice by circling the appropriate number. **Now, please rate how you have felt over the past few weeks (considering the events of September 11th):**

Happy Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Frustrated Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Worried or Anxious Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Joyful Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Pleased Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Angry or Hostile Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Unhappy Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Depressed Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

Full of Fun Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely

In your own words, how would you say the events of September 11th (the terrorist strike in the US) and its aftermath have affected your projects, your emotions or other aspects of your life?

Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved. Please indicate **how often you have felt this way during the past week** by **rating each item on the following scale**:

- 0 = rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)
1 = some or little of the time (1 – 2 days)
2 = occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3 – 4 days)
3 = most or all of the time (5-7 days)

During the past week:

- _____ 1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.
- _____ 2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.
- _____ 3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with the help from my family or friends.
- _____ 4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.
- _____ 5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.
- _____ 6. I felt depressed.
- _____ 7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.
- _____ 8. I felt hopeful about the future.
- _____ 9. I thought my life had been a failure.
- _____ 10. I felt fearful.
- _____ 11. My sleep was restless.
- _____ 12. I was happy.
- _____ 13. I talked less than usual.
- _____ 14. I felt lonely.
- _____ 15. People were unfriendly.
- _____ 16. I enjoyed life.
- _____ 17. I had crying spells.
- _____ 18. I felt sad.
- _____ 19. I felt that people dislike me.
- _____ 20. I could not get "going".

COMMUNITY LIFE

Now, we would like to turn the focus to volunteer, community and civic activities. When we say "volunteer" we mean both more formal voluntary activities that are done through organizations and more informal activities such as "shovelling my elderly neighbour's walk" that are not associated with an organization. We realize that your volunteer activities may have come up in the earlier section on personal projects that you have already completed. We have just a few more questions to ask you about these activities.

Over the past six months, have you been involved in any formal or informal voluntary activities? Yes ☐ No ☐ (Please ✓)

If you answered Yes to the question on voluntary activities, please turn to the Community Life Matrix (attached to the end of the package) and start with Part A. Then continue with Part B. You can pull this page off of the package to more easily follow the instructions below.

If you answered No, then turn to the Community Life (cont'd) page and start with Part B. (Note that there are four more pages of Part A until you get to Part B.)

Part A

Community Life Matrix

This matrix is a more focussed version of the project one you completed earlier. In the far left column (Activity), please write down the nature of any volunteer, community or civic activities (e.g. fundraising, shovelling the walk, volunteering in the local community centre, campaigning for a political candidate) that you have been engaged in over the past six months. Of course, you may not need to fill in all of the rows -- it depends on how many different activities you have been involved in.

If this activity was done through an organization please indicate [in the second column from the left] (Organization), the name of the organization involved (e.g., Big Brothers, Meals-on-Wheels, the United Church). [If no organization was involved, please put N/A (not applicable)].

Now we'd like to hear what you think about various aspects of your own volunteer activities. In the remaining columns of your community life matrix, please rate (0 to 10) each volunteer activity on the following dimensions:

1. Reason	We recognize that there are many different reasons that people are engaged in volunteer activities. For instance, one might say, "I volunteer because it fits with personal values and convictions. Others might say, "I volunteer because it helps me gain understanding of certain issues," or because "it allows me to gain experience and develop personally and socially." Yet others might say "Volunteering helps me stabilize my life, escape from other stresses, feel needed, and feel better about myself." Could you tell us the primary reasons that you are engaged in this activity?
2. Enjoyment:	How much you enjoy working on each project? Use 10 if you enjoy it a great deal and 0 if you do not enjoy it at all.
3. Commitment:	To what extent are you committed to this activity? Use 10 if you are totally committed and 0 if you are not at all committed.

4. **Self Benefit:** Many people are involved in voluntary activities because it helps them develop new skills, meet new friends, or network with other people to help career opportunities. We might call these kinds of reasons "personally oriented" ones. Please rate from 0 to 10 the extent to which you engage in the activity for personally oriented reasons. Use 10 if these kinds of reasons are very important and use 0 if they are not at all important.
5. **Other Benefit:** Many people are involved in voluntary activity because they want to have an influence in community affairs, help other people or further a political cause. We might call these kinds of reasons "other oriented." Please rate from 0 to 10 the extent to which you engage in the activity for other oriented reasons. Use 10 if these kinds of reasons are very important and 0 if they are not at all important. [Note: Please do this independently of how you rated the activity in the last column. An activity might be rated as high (or low) on both Self Benefit and Other Benefit.]
6. **Satisfaction:** How satisfying and rewarding do you find being involved in the activity? Use 10 if the activity is very satisfying to you and 0 if it is not at all satisfying.
7. **Passionate Engagement:** Beyond mere satisfaction, some people might say that they are passionate about their voluntary pursuits, others less so or not at all. Please rate from 0 to 10 the extent to which you feel passionate about the activity. Use 10 if you are extremely passionate about it and 0 if you are not at all passionate about it.
8. **#Hours:** Approximately how many hours per month are you engaged in this activity?
9. **Start Date:** In what year did you start doing this activity? Please also indicate the approximate month.

- 10. Sameness:** To what extent would you say this activity is similar to what you do at school or at paid work. Work can include part-time, full-time work or if you've never worked compare it to your school work. Use 10 if it is very similar and 0 if it is not similar at all. For example, if you are a Business student and you are working as a treasurer of an organization, it is likely that these activities are quite similar. If you are a fine arts student and you are now coaching girls' competitive soccer, then the activities are probably not very similar.
- 11. Difference:** To what extent would you say this activity is different from what you do at school or paid work. Use 10 if it is very different and 0 if it is not different at all. [It is possible that you feel some activities may have quite a bit of similarity AS WELL AS quite a bit of difference.]
- 12. Same/Different-Further Explanation:** In order to help us understand the similarities and differences, please tell us HOW they are similar or different. The similarities or differences might include skills used, structure of work, organizational cultures, your emotional responses to it or anything else that you can identify as same or different.
- 13. Supportiveness of agency/organization:** To what extent you feel that the agency or organization that you volunteer with supports this activity (use 10 if you feel it supports this project a great deal and 0 if it does not support it at all).
- 14. Hindrance of agency/organization:** To what extent you feel that the agency or organization that you volunteer with impedes or frustrates this activity (use 10 if you feel it impedes or frustrates this project a great deal and 0 if it does not frustrate it at all).
- 15. Support by family/close friends:** To what extent you feel each activity is supported by people who are significant to you? (use 10 if you feel other people support this project a lot and 0 if there is no support at all).

- 16. Future Plans:** To what extent do you see yourself doing a lot more of this activity in the future or a lot less? (Use 10 if you definitely see yourself as doing more in the future and 0 if you do not see yourself continuing on with this activity at all) [Note: '5' would mean that the level of activity would stay the same.]
- 17. Pressure** To what extent do you feel pressure to give more to this activity? Use 10 if you feel a great deal of pressure and 0 if you feel no pressure at all.

Part B --For all to answer

COMMUNITY LIFE (cont'd)

Are there any voluntary activities that in the past you were engaged in that you have now stopped doing? Yes ☐ No ☐ (Please circle one)

If you answered Yes, please indicate what these activities were and the reason that you have stopped.

<u>Activity/Organization</u>	<u>Reason Stopped</u>

To what extent do you think that you will get involved in more voluntary activities over the next year (next 12 months from now)? (Circle the corresponding number on the scale below.)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all likely			Somewhat likely				Extremely likely			

[If answered 5 or above on previous question:]

Could you tell us about the kinds of volunteer activities or organizations that you are thinking about getting involved in and why you're interested?

<u>Activity/Organization</u>	<u>Reason Interested</u>

HEALTH BEHAVIOURS

Please indicate approximately **how often you currently engage in the behaviours listed below** by circling for each behaviour a number from 1 to 5 as defined on the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
less than once /week	one day/week	2-3 days/week	4-5 days/week	6 or 7 days/week

- I eat healthy, well-balanced meals.....1 2 3 4 5
- I eat at least 3 meals a day--including breakfast.....1 2 3 4 5
- I exercise for 20 continuous minutes or more, to the point of perspiration.....1 2 3 4 5
- I walk as much as possible (e.g., I take the stairs not the elevator, etc.).....1 2 3 4 5
- I smoke.....1 2 3 4 5
- I drink alcohol (3 drinks or more/sitting).....1 2 3 4 5
- I use recreational drugs.....1 2 3 4 5
- I get a good night's sleep (e.g., uninterrupted, restful sleep).....1 2 3 4 5

BREAK TIME!!!!!!!

We appreciate the time that you have put in on this study so far. Why don't you take a quick break before continuing through to the end? The next part mostly involves number circling although there is a bit of writing at the end where you can tell us what you thought of the study!

Thing Person Idea Scale

People differ in their basic interests and orientations. Three major areas of basic interest are described below. Please rate yourself on a scale from 0 to 100 for each type of orientation, with zero meaning **no interest** and 100 the **highest possible interest** in the domain. It is possible that you may score high (or low) on all three domains. (Note: You do not need to circle a score – this time please **write out your score in the blanks provided.**)

Person-orientation: A **person-oriented individual** is interested in other people, social and interpersonal matters and simply why people are the way they are. On this scale from 0 to 100, *0 means not at all person-oriented and 100 means extremely person-oriented.*

In the following blank, please write a number from 0 to 100 to describe where you would fall on this person-orientation scale: _____

Thing orientation: A **thing oriented person** is interested in physical objects, material and in how things work. On this scale from 0 to 100, *0 means not at all thing-oriented and 100 means extremely thing-oriented.*

In the following blank, please write a number from 0 to 100 to describe where you would fall on this thing-orientation scale: _____

Idea orientation: Someone with an **idea orientation** is interested in the world of ideas, abstract thought and how different concepts are interrelated. On this scale from 0 to 100, *0 means not at all idea-oriented and 100 means extremely idea-oriented.*

In the following blank, please write a number from 0 to 100 to describe where you would fall on this idea-orientation scale: _____

Life Satisfaction Scales

Below are several scales that we would like you to use to tell us how satisfied you are with your life right now. In the first one, if you are completely satisfied with your life as a whole as it is now, you would circle the number ten (10). If you are completely dissatisfied with your life as a whole as it is now, you would circle zero (0). If you are neither completely satisfied nor completely dissatisfied, you would use one of the numbers from 1 to 9 to indicate your current level of satisfaction. Remember, the higher the number, the more satisfied you feel with your life as it is right now. The other scales work the same way.

A. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **life as a whole** right now? Circle the number on the scale below that comes closest to how you feel:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					Completely
Dissatisfied										Satisfied

B. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are/were you with your **academic life** as it is right now or was just before you retired?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										Satisfied
Dissatisfied										

C. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **social life** as it is right now?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										Satisfied
Dissatisfied										

D. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **home life** as it is right now?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										
Dissatisfied										Satisfied

E. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **emotional well-being** as it is right now?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										
Dissatisfied										Satisfied

F. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality of your **community life** as it is right now?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										
Dissatisfied										Satisfied

G. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your degree of participation in your **community life** as it is right now?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										
Dissatisfied										Satisfied

H. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **physical health** as it is right now?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Completely					Neutral					
Completely										
Dissatisfied										Satisfied

- I. Are there any particular health problems that are of concern to you? (if participant asks for examples: bronchitis, hypertension, chronic fatigue)

- J To what degree do you feel that you have a sense of meaning and purpose in your life as a whole?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
None at all					Neutral					A great deal

SYMPTOM CHECKLIST

We are interested in more fully understanding your current health status. Over the **past 12 months**, have you experienced any of the health problems listed below? Please indicate how **frequently** and how **severely** you have experienced each problem by referring to the scales below and circling a number in each of the corresponding boxes on the same line as the problem.

Frequency of Health Problem

- 1=Never
- 2=Less than 3-4 times per year
- 3=Every month or so
- 4=Every week or so
- 5=More than once per week

Severity of Health Problem

- 1=Not severe at all
- 2=Somewhat severe
- 3=Moderately severe
- 4=Severe
- 5=Extremely Severe

	Frequency					Severity				
Generalized weakness or fatigue	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Weight Problems (e.g., overweight, underweight)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Skin problems (e.g., rashes, acne, severe itching...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Headaches	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Vision problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Other eye problems (e.g., watery, itchy...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Hearing problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Other ear problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Nasal problems (e.g., running, congested, bleeding) and/or sinusitis	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Dental problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Other mouth problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Throat problems and/or problems swallowing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Appetite problems (e.g., very small or very large...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with digestion (e.g., heartburn)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with stomach (e.g., nausea, abdominal pain...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ulcers (e.g., peptic ulcers...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Bowel problems (e.g., diarrhea, constipation...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Breathing problems (e.g., shortness of breath, asthma...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with cough, phlegm	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Heart/cardiovascular problems (e.g., chest pain, racing...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Neck or back problems or pain	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Joint problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Muscle problems (e.g., soreness, stiffness, cramps...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with your arms or hands	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with your legs or feet (e.g., swollen ankles...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Numbness or tingling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Dizziness/faint, shakiness/twitching, cold sweat or chills	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Poor circulation (e.g., cold hands/feet even in hot weather)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
High blood pressure	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with allergies	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with kidneys, urine	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with menstruation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Genital problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Sexual difficulties (e.g., unusually low or absent sex drive...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Problems with drugs, alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Sleep problems (e.g., insomnia)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Colds, flus, or fevers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Other problems or illnesses (e.g., cancer, colitis, diabetes, atherosclerosis, epilepsy, cerebralvascular disease...), Please specify:_____	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

ZTPI (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999.)

1. I believe that getting together with one's friends to party is one of life's important pleasures.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Familiar childhood sights, sounds, smells often bring back a flood of wonderful memories.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Fate determines much in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I often think of what I should have done differently in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My decisions are mostly influence by people and things around me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I believe that a person's day should be planned.	1	2	3	4	5
7. It gives me pleasure to think about the past.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I do things impulsively.	1	2	3	4	5
9. If things don't get done on time, I don't worry about it.	1	2	3	4	5
10. When I want to achieve something, I set goals and consider specific means for reaching those goals.	1	2	3	4	5
11. On balance, there is much more good to recall than bad in my past.	1	2	3	4	5
12. When listening to my favourite music, I often lose track of time.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Meeting tomorrow's deadlines and doing other necessary work comes before tonight's play.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Since whatever will be will be, it doesn't really matter what I do.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I enjoy stories about how things used to be in "the good old days".	1	2	3	4	5
16. Painful past experiences keep being replayed in my mind.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I try to live my life as fully as possible, one day at a time.	1	2	3	4	5
18. It upsets me to be late for appointments.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Ideally, I would live each day as if it were my last	1	2	3	4	5
20. Happy memories of good times spring readily to mind.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I meet my obligations to friends and authorities on time.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I've taken my share of abuse and rejection in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I make decisions on the spur of the moment.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I take each day as it is rather than try to plan it out.	1	2	3	4	5
25. The past has too many unpleasant memories that I prefer not to think about.	1	2	3	4	5
26. It is important to put excitement into my life.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I've made mistakes in my past that I wish I could undo.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I feel that it is more important to enjoy what you are doing than to get work done on time.	1	2	3	4	5

29. I get nostalgic about my childhood.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Before making a decision I weigh the similar past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Taking risks keeps my life from becoming boring.	1	2	3	4	5
32. It is more important for me to enjoy life's journey than to focus only on the destination.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Things rarely work out as I expected.	1	2	3	4	5
34. It's hard for me to forget unpleasant experiences of my youth.	1	2	3	4	5
35. It takes joy out of the process and flow of my activities, if I have to think about goals, outcomes and products.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Even if I'm enjoying the present I'm drawn back to comparisons with similar past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
37. You can't really plan for the future because things change too much.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My life path is controlled by forces I cannot influence.	1	2	3	4	5
39. It doesn't make sense to worry about the future, since there is nothing I can do about it anyway.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I complete projects on time by making steady progress.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I find myself tuning out when family members talk about the way things used to be.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I take risks to put excitement in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I make lists of things to do.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I often follow my heart more than my head.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I am able to resist temptations when I know that there is work to be done.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I find myself getting swept up in the excitement of the moment.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Life today is too complicated; I would prefer the simpler life of the past.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I prefer friends who are spontaneous rather than predictable.	1	2	3	4	5
49. I like family rituals and traditions that are regularly repeated.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I think about the bad things that have happened to me in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
51. I keep working at difficult, uninteresting tasks if they will help me get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Spending what I earn on pleasures today is better than saving for tomorrow's security.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Often luck pays off better than hard work.	1	2	3	4	5
54. I think about the good things I have missed out in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
55. I like my close relationships to be passionate.	1	2	3	4	5
56. There will always be time to catch up on my work.	1	2	3	4	5

We have been trying to understand the joys, problems, hassles, and benefits that people experience in their work as volunteers. We have also been trying to understand the relation between your volunteer work and other aspects of your life.

- 112

- 3. We've talked about your volunteer work over the past 6 months. We're also interested in understanding any past history of volunteering that you may have. When did you first start volunteering and what was the motivation for doing so? In the space below, could you describe any other experiences that you've had?**

- 4. Could you please describe for us some of the positive aspects of your volunteer work?**

- 4. a. Could you tell us about some of the stresses and hassles of your volunteer work?**

- 4b. What are some of the things you do to deal with that stress [to feel less stressed]?**

5. How have your voluntary organizations helped or supported your volunteer work?

6. How have your voluntary organizations hindered or impeded your volunteer work?

7. If you were in charge of a volunteer organization, what would you do to improve recruitment of volunteers? Another way of spinning this might be to think of what would work to recruit YOU to volunteer somewhere.

8. As well, if you were in charge of a volunteer organization, what would you do to improve retention of volunteers? Think of what would work to keep YOU volunteering somewhere.

9. What would you recommend to public policy makers interested in supporting volunteerism?

10. Is there anything else you'd like to add that would help us understand the nature of volunteerism? (Anything we didn't cover?)

11. IF this has not been covered --How could the voluntary organizations you work with make the experiences of their volunteers more satisfying?

FUTURE RESEARCH

It is possible that we may do some follow-up in the future. If you are interested in participating in any follow-up to this research, please leave us your name, address and phone number in the space provided below:

Name _____

Address:

Phone
number: _____

Email:

GENERAL INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions:

1) Male _____ Female _____

2) Age _____

3) Marital Status: Single/Divorced/Widowed _____

Married/Living with a partner _____

4) Do you have children? _____ YES _____ NO

5) Do you live alone or with others?

_____ Alone

_____ With parents _____ with partner _____ with roommates

6) Where were you born? _____

7) What is your native language? _____

8) What language is spoken in the current home? _____

9) What were/are your parents' occupations?

Mother _____

Father _____

10) [If you have a spouse] What is your spouse's occupation?

11) Are you currently employed? _____ YES _____ NO _____ RETIRED
_____ OTHER

[IF YES] What is your occupation? _____

[If work]: # hours per week at your job _____

12) Academic Status: _____ Full Time _____ Part-time _____ Special

The term "special" student means that you are not enrolled in a degree program. If you are a special student, you will not be able to provide information regarding faculty, year of study or current academic major. Depending on the number of courses you have taken at Carleton, you may be able to indicate a grade point average.

13) What is your academic major? _____

Declared _____

Undeclared _____

14) In what year are you in? (e.g., first, second, etc.) _____

15) Please indicate your approximate grade point average so far at Carleton (Circle one):

12 A+ 90-100%

11 A 85-89%

10 A- 80-84%

9 B+ 77-79%

8 B 73-76%

7 B- 70-72%

6 C+ 67-69%

5 C 63-66%

4 C- 60-62%

3 D+ 57-59%

2 D 53-56%

1 D- 50-52%

0 F <50%

**PARTICIPATION IN EXPERIMENT: PLEASE COMPLETE AND WE WILL
HAND IN FOR YOUR PSYCHOLOGY 101 EXPERIMENTAL CREDITS (2)**

NAME _____

STUDENT NUMBER _____

COURSE (INCLUDE SECTION) _____

DEBRIEFING

Carleton University
Social Ecology Laboratory
Psychology Department

Title of Study: Students' Lives and their "Thinkings, Doings and Feelings"

Background and Purpose of Study: Data that are being collected from this study will be used to explore voluntary the incidence of voluntary activities as personal projects in the lives of four critical categories of volunteers. We are hoping to provide a detailed picture of the personal and contextual features that promote voluntary projects and allow them to be sustained. For example, we are looking at how many volunteer projects people list in their everyday project systems, how they appraise these projects (e.g., Are they enjoyable? Are they stressful?) and how these appraisals are related to well-being. Stable personal features (traits and motive dispositions) are likely an influence on type of volunteer activity as well as a direct influence on well-being. For those who are not volunteers, we are still interested in the relation between your personal projects, traits and levels of well-being.

Results: The results of this study will be available in the Social Ecology Lab in the Spring of 2002 (Please see below for our contact information.)

Questions and Comments: If you find this study has raised issues of a personal nature that you might like to discuss with someone, please call Carleton University, Health and Counseling Services: 520-6674.

If you have any questions or comments about this research, please feel free to contact Dr. Laura Goodine, the research coordinator (520-2600, ext. 2697) or Dr. Brian Little, the principal investigator (520-2600, ext. 1097) or Dr. Susan Phillips, the co-director of the study (520-2600, ext. 2633). If you have any concerns about the ethics of this study, please contact Dr. M. Gick, Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research (520-2600, ext. 2664) or Dr. K. Matheson, Chair of the Psychology Department (520-2600, ext. 2648).

Part A - Community Life Matrix

Volunteer Activity	Organization	1. Reasons	2. Enjoyment	3. Commitment	4. Self Benefit	5. Other's Benefit	6. Satisfaction	7. Passionate Engagement	8. # Hours	9. Start Date	10. Sameness	11. Difference	* 12. Same/Different - Further Explanation	13. Support - Organization	14. Hindrance - Organization	15. Support - Family/Friends	16. Future Plans	17. Pressure
1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		

* Please use this space to further explain #12, if you need to.