

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNDERGRADUATE MOTIVATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT IN PHILANTHROPY

DANIEL LEVY
Spring 2011

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Marketing and Psychology
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Rick Jacobs
Professor of Psychology
Thesis Supervisor

Jeanette Cleveland
Professor of Psychology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

Abstract

With decades of research and growing interest in Public Service Motivation (PSM), how can philanthropic organizations benefit from understanding the motivations of their volunteers? Previous studies have focused on various populations, as well as how Public Service Motivation relates to philanthropic involvement, but fail to incorporate personality traits or biographical data. Drawing on measures and frameworks from previous research, this study attempts to identify the antecedents of philanthropic involvement among undergraduate students by relating the Big Five personality traits, biographical data, and Public Service Motivation to philanthropic involvement at the undergraduate level. Positive associations between total Public Service Motivation and philanthropic involvement were found. Additionally, Public Service Motivation subscales were positively associated with several Big Five personality factors as well as philanthropic involvement. Demographic data were shown to be related to philanthropic involvement. Using the findings in this study, philanthropic organizations can more effectively recruit undergraduate volunteers by creating recruitment strategies focused on the factors that relate to more involvement in philanthropic organizations by undergraduates.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Operationalizing the Constructs	2
<i>Public Service Motivation</i>	2
<i>Big Five Personality Factors</i>	7
<i>Biographical Data (Biodata)</i>	10
Study Overview	11
Hypotheses.....	12
Methods	13
Procedure	13
Instruments	13
Results	14
Participants	14
Hypothesis 1	15
Hypothesis 2	16
Hypothesis 3	17
Hypothesis 4	18
Hypothesis 5	19
Discussion.....	23
Hypothesis 1	23
Hypothesis 2	23
Hypothesis 3	27
Hypothesis 4	29
Limitations.....	31
References.....	33
Appendices	37
Undergraduate Motivations for Philanthropy Survey	37
Academic Vita	47

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Rick Jacobs for his assistance in helping me conduct this study and analyze its results, as well as for his helpful comments in the several drafts of this paper. I am also grateful to all the students who participated in the study and have helped philanthropic organizations and the students who volunteer for them.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The notion of motivation to perform public service has long intrigued both psychologists and lay people. Knowing what motivates individuals to get involved in organizations that serve others is both interesting and essential to the success of such groups. Immense possibilities become available if an organization understands the motivations of its volunteers. For instance, the organization can provide more of the specific types of incentives its volunteers desire if involvement needs to be increased. Additionally, a philanthropic organization can recruit volunteers more effectively if it knows what messages to stress when recruiting.

In this study, the research question of interest is, “what are the antecedents of undergraduate involvement in philanthropic organizations”? In other words, what drives undergraduates to join charitable organizations? Additionally, do certain types of personalities have a greater likelihood of involvement in philanthropy? Before addressing these questions directly, it is essential to first analyze the research findings of several distinct but adjacently connected studies linking specific traits and motivating forces (known as “public service motivation” or PSM) to involvement in public service and philanthropy. It is equally important to address undergraduates’ personalities as precursors, so measures of personality must be thoroughly discussed as well. This study, using past research, linked these different measures of an individual and related them to undergraduate involvement in philanthropy.

Through analyzing past research concerning PSM and individuals’ personality factors I developed a survey for undergraduates comprised of a public service motivation scale, a personality scale, and biographical data (biodata) questions. By analyzing the data collected from

the survey, I was able to draw conclusions regarding undergraduate motivations for involvement in philanthropic organizations.

Operationalizing the Constructs

Public Service Motivation

Let us first look at the construct of Public Service Motivation (PSM), which is defined as, “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry & Wise, 1990). Measuring PSM is difficult because motivation is an unobservable variable and therefore cannot be easily measured. Fortunately, Perry (1996) developed the construct further, and argued that the motives are grounded in three distinct categories. The first includes rational motives, which involve “actions grounded in individual utility maximization” (Perry, 1996, p.6) such as *attraction to public policy making* (Kelman, 1987). The second category includes norm-based motives or “actions generated by efforts to conform to norms” (Perry, 1996, p.6) such as a desire and *commitment to serve public interest* (e.g. an affinity towards helping society in a specific way); (Downs, 1967). Other normative motives include *civic duty* (Buchanon, 1975), and *social justice*, or the desire to enhance the well-being of minorities (Frederickson, 1971). The final category includes affective motives, or “those triggers of behavior that are grounded in emotional responses to various social contexts” (Perry, 1996, p.6). One facet of affective motives is *compassion*, or the “extensive love of all people within our political boundaries and the imperative that they must be protected in all of the basic rights granted to them . . .” (Frederickson and Hart, 1985). The other is *self-sacrifice*, or giving up personal gains for service to others. The more of these motives an individual possesses, according to Perry (1996), the more PSM the individual has and the more likely that individual will be to be involved in public service. Together these facets comprise the

six dimensions of Perry's Public Service Motivation Scale (see Methods for further explanation of scale).

Measuring Public Service Motivation

Perry's scale originally consisted of a 35 item survey, each with a Likert scale ranging from one, "Strongly Disagree", to five, "Strongly Agree". After doing a confirmatory factor analysis on the scale and correlating items to each other to see if they had discriminant validity, Perry rearranged the items and removed the dimensions of Social Justice and Civic Duty. Several items were also removed because they correlated too strongly (at least .90 for each item that was removed) to other items. Ultimately Perry came up with a final scale, which includes the remaining four dimensions and 24 items in the survey. The 24-item scale had very strong internal consistency as well, $\alpha = .90$. Additionally, the reliabilities of each of the subscales was strong as well, ranging from $\alpha = .69$ to $\alpha = .74$. However, both the full version and shorter version of the measure has been used in PSM studies since the scale's inception in 1996. (Perry, 1996, p.13-19)

PSM in Different Contexts

The construct of PSM has been researched within many different contexts, although it originally was meant to describe individuals' motivation to get involved in government (Perry & Wise, 1990). Studies have used Perry's scale and other measurement tools to try to replicate Perry's results in other settings, including governmental entities, volunteer organizations, and college universities. While each study is unique, at their core the studies are attempting to find the essence of the motivating forces behind certain individuals' involvement in public service or volunteer organizations.

While most studies on PSM focus on governmental or business contexts, Clerkin, Paynter and Taylor (2009) examined charitable decisions among undergraduates, the same population as the population used for the current study. More specifically, Clerkin et al. (2009) had 316 students complete part of Perry's (1996) PSM survey, in addition to other questions. In addition, students under several conditions were asked to decide whether they would donate money or volunteer in a philanthropic organization or in the following week.

One intriguing finding of the Clerkin et al. (2009) study was a high positive correlation between an individual's PSM and their willingness to donate or volunteer in the next week. Additionally, the dimensions of compassion and civic duty had positive correlations with volunteering and donating, while self-sacrifice had no significant relationship. Surprisingly, the rational dimension of attraction to public policy had a negative relationship with volunteering and donating. In other words, people were not motivated by rational reasons to donate or volunteer. For non-profits, this means that appealing to individuals' rational interests would not be as effective as appealing to their affective motivations. In general, this study connected Perry's (1996) measure of PSM to the undergraduate population. Knowing that Perry's measurement scale is valid and reliable in the undergraduate setting allows for further research of PSM at universities, including the research question of interest in this study.

Wright and Pandey (2008) conducted a similar study and focused on a business context, specifically governmental organizations. Surveys covering three of Perry's dimensions—commitment to public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice—were distributed to employees of seven governmental organizations and 206 surveys were completed. The study analyzed the mediating effects of person-organization value congruence (i.e. how much an employee's values

coincide with the organization's values) on the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction (Naff and Crum, 1999).

By using validated measures to assess person-organization value congruence and job satisfaction, Wright and Pandey (2008) were able to show that person-organization value congruence does, in fact, mediate the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction. There was a moderate correlation between PSM and person-organization value congruence, $r=.37$, as well as a strong correlation between person-organization value congruence and job satisfaction, $r=.66$. The more a person feels that their values coincide with the organization's values, the more satisfied they will feel. This is important to note when studying the reasons why undergraduates become involved in philanthropic organizations. If this study's results are transferrable to undergraduate students, it would help better understand undergraduates' motivations. Ultimately, what may keep them involved over time may include value congruence.

A third quantitative study involving Perry's PSM measurement scale came from a survey of award-winning volunteers across America (Coursey, Perry, Brudney, & Littlepage, 2008). The sample represented roughly the demographics of the general body of volunteers across the country, according to the 2003 Bureau of Labor Statistics database. The 516 respondents completed three subscales of Perry's (1996) PSM measure. These included the self-sacrifice, compassion, and commitment to public interest subscales.

Overall, Perry's instrument proved useful and valid within the volunteer sample. Specifically, reliability scores for commitment were relatively equal to that of Perry's original study (1996) and reliability scores for self-sacrifice were actually higher than in Perry's original study. What this means is that Perry's results are transferrable to a context of volunteers, not just government and business employees. Again, this is vital to the research question of interest

because for Perry's PSM measure to be used effectively, it must be certain that it is valid and reliable in the philanthropic context.

Qualitative Research

While most studies focused on the quantitative aspects of PSM and tried to operationalize and measure the construct, Seider (2007) took a qualitative approach. He interviewed twenty undergraduate students for an hour and a half each, using a structured interview. All students interviewed came from mid- to upper-class families, but the students varied in many things such as geography, age, gender, and religion. This was done to get a wide variety of backgrounds. All students were involved in at least one philanthropic or public service organization as well. The interview consisted of questions about the students' current volunteer work and potential future work.

Seider's (2007) most important finding was that fifteen of the twenty students attributed their involvement in philanthropy to a single academic experience (e.g. a class, orientation program, reading, lecture). These experiences were classified by Seider into three distinct categories: (1) Replacement of Worldview, in which one's view of community service is changed by their experience; (2) Modification of Worldview, in which one's idea of community service does not change, but their ideas for how to go about carrying it out changes; or (3) Specification of Worldview, in which one's worldview and idea of community service are focused or clarified by an experience. These categories are essential aspects of the motivating forces behind undergraduates' involvement in philanthropic organizations because they offer information about individuals' backgrounds. If more qualitative studies are conducted, the findings of this study could be shown to be more reliable and valid.

Big Five Personality Factors

Another vital aspect of undergraduate motivations, and the second factor used in our study after PSM, is personality. Personality is a construct that has been conceptualized in a multitude of ways, through multiple perspectives and through a variety of methods.

Psychologists have long debated what factors truly capture all aspects of personality and have come up with many different models of personality over the years. However, a model that has integrated almost all other personality factors models is known as the Big Five taxonomy (John & Srivastava, 1999 p.2-3). The Big Five personality dimensions – Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (or Emotional Stability) – incorporate the personality factors included in prior models and are generally described as broad, inclusive categories (hence the name “Big Five”). While some would argue that although they are broad dimensions they do not incorporate all aspects of an individual’s personality, the taxonomy is the culmination of decades of psychological research.

One of the first personality taxonomies ever created included 18,000 factors and came from the belief that relevant personality characteristics come from the language (and therefore the dictionaries) of a country (Allport and Odbert, 1936). This idea, known as the “lexical approach”, fueled psychologists into coming up with a finite list of personality factors an individual can possess. The original list of 18,000 was divided into four categories, but later three more were added to create a total of seven mutually-exclusive personality dimensions (Norman, 1967).

While Allport and Odbert’s (1936) classifications did begin the process of creating a theoretical personality taxonomy, a stronger and more structured system was necessary. In one of the most important advancements in personality psychology history, Raymond Cattell (1943)

created a more sophisticated taxonomy based on 4,500 subfactors from Allport and Odbert's model. The 4,500 subfactors came from the personality trait category, which was later shown to be quite stable and long-lasting (Chaplin et al., 1988 p.541-557). Through various procedures and testing, Cattell came up with 35 variables grouped into 12 personality factors from the original 4,500 factor list.

Inspired by Cattell's ability to condense the list so effectively, several researchers began attempting to reduce the list further. Fiske (1949) found strong correlations between self-ratings, peer-ratings, and psychological staff members and created a structure of five dimensions that would later become the Big Five. Others such as Norman (1963), Borgatta (1964), and Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1981) all found similar results after using several personality tests – five distinct dimensions from Cattell's original 35 and nothing else, which gives the five dimension model both validity and reliability. The factors were also tested for generalizability by many researchers and were shown to be fairly stable across several factors, including cultures and time (Digman, 1989).

The "Big Five" taxonomy of personality has since been used as a tool to describe individuals' personalities, predict job performance (Barrick and Mount, 1991), and predict potential personality disorders (Saulsman and Page, 2004), among others. It is part of the core of personality psychology and continues to be studied and developed by psychologists and researchers alike.

Big Five Measurement

While the Big Five are theoretically sound, the framework is not useful to assess personality without a valid and reliable measurement tool. Several measures of varying methodologies have been developed as a result. Some measures use adjectives that describe an

individual's traits (Wiggins, 1995); (Goldberg, 1992). For instance, Goldberg's (1992) instrument groups the trait descriptive adjectives in pairs in a bipolar manner (e.g. talkative – quiet). The measure is referred to as the TDA for the trait descriptive adjectives that it uses and has shown high internal consistency.

Another measure developed by Costa and McCrae (1985) used a Likert scale ranging from one (“Strongly Disagree”) to five (“Strongly Agree”) and included several subfactors within each personality dimension and 100 statements in total. The tool was known as the NEO Personality Inventory because it was used for the dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience. It was revised later and eventually included the dimensions of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Costa and McCrae, 1992). The measure's scales have shown strong validity, temporal stability, and internal consistency as well.

Although both scales differ in their methodology, both were long and included “fuzzy categories” (John and Srivastava, 1999) that differed in the number of subfactors and labels of the Big Five. To create a more brief measure with factors and subfactors common across researchers (John, 1989,1990), John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991) created the Big Five Inventory (BFI). It includes 44 short phrases based on adjectives that were found to be ideal indicators of the Big Five personality factors (John 1989,1990). Thus, it builds off of older measures and is more concise in length. Each of the Big Five includes eight to ten items, and most of the subfactors are identical to past measures, such as Costa and McCrae's NEO Personality Inventory (1992). The BFI has been shown to have strong convergent and divergent validity, as well as alpha reliabilities averaging above .80. Currently, this measure may be the most useful when collecting data from undergraduates because of its brevity while maintaining such strong validity and reliability.

The method of measurement for the Big Five has undergone a great deal of changes over time, as has the development of the Big Five taxonomy itself. There are currently many measures that claim to accurately and reliably assess an individual's personality among the Big Five, but no current measure seems to stand out like the Big Five Inventory. It was developed using the strongest measures that preceded it and standardized the terminology of the Big Five taxonomy. For the present question at hand, the BFI is the strongest, most current measurement tool that can be used to assess an undergraduate's personality.

Biographical Data (Biodata)

While there is no definition for biodata, short for Biographical Data, biodata in essence is information about a person's background, including life experiences, values, beliefs, and other factors that influence their life. Biodata questionnaires are designed to collect information from the person taking the questionnaire that provides insight into the person's past. Therefore, the use of biodata stems from the belief that one's past can help predict one's future.

First used in 1894 in Chicago to help improve selection of life insurance agents (Owens 1976), biodata questionnaires have been used in a variety of settings to predict performance. They have helped predict military performance (cited in Farmer, 2007) as well as performance in a variety of other domains, such as sales, science, office positions, and management (McKillip & Clark, 1974); (England, 1971). As a result, biodata questionnaires have been used predominantly in personnel selection.

For the purposes of this research, a series of biodata questions was used to learn about participants' background, particularly those hypothesized to be related to philanthropy. The answers to the biodata questions were used in an effort to find additional antecedents of undergraduate involvement in philanthropy.

Study Overview

Perry's (1996) model and the subsequent research that examined that model within different contexts suggest a standard set of motivators that have been proven reliable and valid. Furthermore, because the measure transferred well to the undergraduate, business, and volunteer populations it can effectively be used for the present research question. To examine the factors that motivate undergraduates to become involved in philanthropic organizations, it will be necessary to use an instrument that has been proven reliable and valid in its intended setting – among undergraduates that may or may not be involved in philanthropic organizations. The three studies described have collectively accomplished this goal.

Likewise, in the study of personality great advancements have been made by several researchers. With the advent of the Big Five by several studies and the development of various measuring tools designed to assess individuals' personality on the Big Five, psychologists have made great strides in personality assessment. Although the aforementioned assess personality on the Big Five in different ways (e.g. different lengths, use of adjectives vs. phrases), the measures are reliable and valid. In particular, John, Donahue, and Kentle's (1991) Big Five Inventory provides the best tool for measuring the personalities of undergraduate students. Its 44 short-phrases provide a brief, accurate Big Five measure that is effective in the undergraduate setting.

The present research question sought to find the antecedents of undergraduate involvement in philanthropy. To apply fully adequate measurement, however, both Perry's (1996) scale and the Big Five Inventory must be used in conjunction with biographical questions. Perry's six dimensions of PSM as well as the Big Five can help indicate what types of students are more likely and less likely to be involved in philanthropy. Furthermore, by finding out undergraduates' current involvement (or lack thereof) in philanthropy and comparing these data

to scores on Perry's PSM scale and the BFI, we can potentially predict the types of students that are more or less likely to be involved in philanthropic organizations. Similarly, we can compare a plethora of biographical data to undergraduates' current involvement in philanthropy and make predictions. Ultimately, the goal of this research is to make such predictions so that future philanthropic organizations recruiting from universities can more effectively and efficiently use their resources to increase undergraduate involvement.

Hypotheses

Based on the research literature the following hypotheses are advanced:

H₁: Public Service Motivation is positively correlated with involvement in philanthropy.

H₂: Subscales of PSM will have varying relationships with involvement in philanthropy.

H₃: Various aspects of personality will be related to PSM scores and to involvement in philanthropy.

H₄: A set of demographic variables will add to the prediction of philanthropic involvement.

H₅: A set of demographic variables will add to the prediction of philanthropic involvement above and beyond Public Service Motivation and personality.

Chapter 2

Methods

Procedure

Undergraduate students were recruited to complete an online survey lasting approximately 30 minutes through a social networking website (i.e. Facebook), through a recruitment letter sent to classes, and through word of mouth. Because the study took place at the participants' own convenience and on a computer of their choosing, every participant was required to verify that they were at least 18 years of age and an undergraduate student. After clicking the link to the online survey on Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com), participants were guided through the survey and upon completion, participants were thanked for their participation and their responses were recorded.

Instruments

The questionnaire consisted of three surveys – (1) Perry's (1996) full PSM measure, (2) John, Donahue, and Kentle's (1991) Big Five Inventory, and (3) a set of biographical data questions. The PSM measure evaluated the amount of Public Service Motivation in general, as well as specific dimensions including Attraction to Policy Making, Commitment to Serve Public Interest, Social Justice, Compassion, Civic Duty, and Self-Sacrifice.. The Big Five Inventory assessed the undergraduates' personality on the Big Five through its 44 item, Likert scale questions. The biographical data provided information about each participant's background. Finally, participants' self reported on their philanthropic activities (see Appendix A for full questionnaire).

Chapter 3

Results

Participants

One hundred eighty-six undergraduate students from universities in the United States participated in the survey. The response rate for the survey (i.e. number of students who completed the survey divided by the number who opened the survey link but did not complete the survey) was 48.7%. Male respondents constituted 36.1% of all participants and females constituted the remaining 63.9%. A majority of the participants, 92.4%, were Caucasian. Participants' family income levels varied, with the highest number of participants reporting their household income as \$100,000 to \$149,000. The sample also included students of every academic year from freshman to fifth-year senior and beyond.

Participants' levels of involvement in philanthropy were varied, although most reported some philanthropic involvement. One hundred seventy-three (93.0%) participants were currently or have been involved in philanthropic organizations (i.e. at least one hour per week on average) during their collegiate careers with only thirteen students (7.0% of participants) in the sample reporting no philanthropic involvement during their collegiate careers. Of the 93% involved in philanthropy, various amounts of involvement (i.e. less than three months through four or more years) were represented. Participants' involvement ranged from less than one hour per week to over 30 hours per week. Since 88.1% of participating students currently attend Penn State University, a university with a large philanthropic presence, obtaining data from students not involved in philanthropy was difficult.

H₁: Public Service Motivation is positively correlated with involvement in philanthropy.

Table 1: Correlations Between Independent Variables and Philanthropic Involvement

	TotalInvolvement	WeeklyInvolvement
AttractiontoPolicyMaking $\mu=17.26, \sigma=2.411$.071	-.023
CommitmentToPublicInterest $\mu=25.60, \sigma=3.232$.321**	.343**
SocialJustice $\mu=18.67, \sigma=2.494$.068	.140
CivicDuty $\mu=24.94, \sigma=3.844$.231**	.244**
Compassion $\mu=28.95, \sigma=4.343$.224**	.275**
SelfSacrifice $\mu=30.11, \sigma=4.501$.263**	.318**
PSMTtotal $\mu=145.4247, \sigma=15.78734$.280**	.314**
Extraversion $\mu=29.05, \sigma=6.099$.079	.171*
Agreeableness $\mu=34.75, \sigma=4.698$.028	.049
Conscientiousness $\mu=33.18, \sigma=5.290$.124	.047
Neuroticism $\mu=21.66, \sigma=5.433$	-.124	-.069
OpennesstoExperience $\mu=37.30, \sigma=5.813$.007	.066
HHIncome $\mu=10.12, \sigma=2.796$.100	.094
Religiosity $\mu=2.80, \sigma=1.059$.074	-.020
Class $\mu=2.86, \sigma=1.234$.383**	.199*
TotalInvolvement $\mu=5.59, \sigma=2.146$.667**
WeeklyInvolvement $\mu=4.59, \sigma=1.863$		
**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)		
*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)		

Table 1 shows the correlations between the predictor variables and involvement in philanthropy both throughout college and per week. Public Service Motivation as measured as a single variable across all subscales is positively correlated with philanthropic involvement in college, $r=.28$, and with philanthropic involvement per week, $r=.31$. The more Public Service

Motivation an undergraduate has, the longer they are likely to be involved in philanthropy in college. Additionally, the more Public Service Motivation a student has, the more time they are likely to spend on philanthropy each week.

The dependent variables – total involvement in philanthropy (“Total Involvement”) and weekly involvement in philanthropy (“Weekly Involvement”) – were highly intercorrelated, $r=.67$ and can be seen as redundant. As a result, only Total Involvement was used in analyzing the remaining results of the study.

H₂: Subscales of PSM will have varying relationships with involvement in philanthropy.

Table 2: Intercorrelations Among Independent Variables

	AttractiontoPolicyMaking	CommitmentToPublicInterest	SocialJustice	CivicDuty	Compassion	SelfSacrifice	PSMTotals	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	OpennesstoExperience	HHIncome	Religiosity	Class
AttractiontoPolicyMaking $\mu=17.26, \sigma=2.411$.245**	.182	.276**	.209*	.232*	.423**	.081	.211*	.249**	-.105	.082	-.016	.115	-.066
CommitmentToPublicInterest $\mu=25.60, \sigma=3.232$.460**	.570**	.615**	.647**	.807**	.103	.330**	.143	-.149	.143	.171*	.208**	-.047
SocialJustice $\mu=18.67, \sigma=2.494$.541**	.568**	.579**	.733**	.204**	.238**	.056	-.171*	.274**	.034	.012	-.049
CivicDuty $\mu=24.94, \sigma=3.844$.430**	.617**	.782**	.038	-.147	.062	-.081	.130	.153	.211**	-.063
Compassion $\mu=28.95, \sigma=4.343$.594**	.797**	.200**	.331**	-.057	-.055	.205**	.173	.120	-.110
SelfSacrifice $\mu=30.11, \sigma=4.501$.858**	.116	.404**	.103	-.142	.178	.023	.138	-.072
PSMTotals $\mu=145.4247, \sigma=15.78734$.164	.381**	.107	-.150	.225**	.130	.187**	-.094
Extraversion $\mu=29.05, \sigma=6.099$.230**	.055	-.194*	.231**	-.122	-.008	.056
Agreeableness $\mu=34.75, \sigma=4.698$.368**	-.353**	.157	-.111	.099	-.062
Conscientiousness $\mu=33.18, \sigma=5.290$											-.096	.044	-.133	.103	.124
Neuroticism $\mu=21.66, \sigma=5.433$												-.219*	-.023	.033	-.026
OpennesstoExperience $\mu=37.30, \sigma=5.813$													-.084	-.003	.144
HHIncome $\mu=10.12, \sigma=2.796$														-.058	-.226**
Religiosity $\mu=2.80, \sigma=1.059$.019
Class $\mu=2.86, \sigma=1.234$															

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Table 2 depicts the intercorrelations among the predictor variables. While two subscales of Public Service Motivation were shown to have no significant relationship with involvement in philanthropy (Policy Making and Social Justice), there were four subscales positively correlated with philanthropic involvement in college. Commitment to Public Interest ($r=.32$), Civic Duty

($r=.23$), Compassion ($r=.22$), and Self Sacrifice ($r=.26$) all demonstrated positive correlations with total philanthropic involvement, $p<.01$. With the exception of policy making, these subscales demonstrated high to very high intercorrelations.

H₃: Various aspects of personality will be related to PSM scores and to involvement in philanthropy.

Table 2 also presents the correlations between Big Five subscales and total Public Service Motivation. Three of the Big Five – Extraversion ($r=.16$), Agreeableness ($r=.38$), and Openness ($r=.23$) to Experience – all have significant positive relationships with total PSM.

Table 2 also shows the correlations between Big Five and PSM subscales. While not all of the PSM subscales were correlated with philanthropic involvement among undergraduates, it is useful to know what personality traits are related to PSM factors because several PSM factors are correlated with involvement in philanthropy. Thus, it may be of use to philanthropic organizations to recruit those undergraduates who have personality factors that correlate with various aspects of PSM.

Extraversion was related to both Social Justice and Compassion ($r=.20$) significant at the .01 level. Agreeableness was related to ALL but one of the PSM subscales, Civic Duty, at the .01 level. Conscientiousness was related to Attraction to Public Policy Making, $r=.25$ and Neuroticism was negatively related to Social Justice, $r=-.17$, at the .01 level of significance. Finally, Openness to Experience was related to three of the subscales – Social Justice, $r=.27$; Compassion, $r=.21$; and Self-Sacrifice, $r=.18$.

H₄: A set of demographic variables will predict philanthropic involvement.

A multiple regression analysis was also completed to determine whether specific demographics could predict total philanthropic involvement. Table 3 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 3: Demographics vs. Total Philanthropic Involvement Regression Output

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.447 ^a	.200	.178	1.969

Model		Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	143.481	4	35.870	9.248	.000 ^a
	Residual	574.048	148	3.879		
	Total	717.529	152			

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.227	.958		1.280	.202
	HHIncome	.155	.060	.196	2.584	.011 **
	Religiosity	.167	.152	.082	1.100	.273
	Class	.772	.133	.441	5.792	.000 ***

*** = significant at the 0.01 level

** = significant at the 0.05 level

* = significant at .10 level

The independent variables of household income, religiosity, and class standing together accounted for 17.8% of all variance of total philanthropic involvement. Individually, two of the three independent variables significantly predicted total philanthropic involvement. Household income is a statistically significant predictor at the .05 level and was positively correlated with total philanthropic involvement, $r=.10$. Likewise, class standing was positively correlated with total philanthropic involvement at the .01 level, $r=.38$.

Finally, a t-test was conducted between male participants (n=60) and female participants (n=106), with Total Philanthropic Involvement as the dependent variable. The t-test concluded

that there were no significant differences between male and female total involvement in philanthropy. Table 4 shows the results of the t-test between genders.

Table 4: Differences in Total Philanthropic Involvement Between Genders

		Independent Samples Test									
		Levene's Test for Equality of		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
VolunteerTotal	Equal variances assumed	.254	.615	.275	164	.784	.096	.347	-.590	.782	
	Equal variances not assumed			.270	115.558	.788	.096	.354	-.606	.797	

H₅: A set of demographic variables will predict philanthropic involvement above and beyond what is predicted by both PSM and Personality.

A multiple stepwise regression analysis was used to create a predictive model for philanthropic involvement using all of the predictor variables (i.e. PSM subscales, Big Five dimensions, and demographics). The goal was to add to what we already know above and beyond PSM and Big 5 Personality. Table 5 provides information regarding the demographic variables while Table 6 shows the results of this analysis.

Table 5: Means for Biodata Variables - Gender, Class Standing

VolunteerTotal * Gender				VolunteerTotal * Class			
VolunteerTotal				VolunteerTotal			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Class	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	5.63	60	2.247	Freshman	3.83	36	1.612
Female	5.54	106	2.094	Sophomore	5.50	22	.913
Total	5.57	166	2.144	Junior	6.12	51	1.728
				Senior	6.35	48	2.462
				Fifth year or more	5.70	10	2.751
				Total	5.59	167	2.146

Table 6: Stepwise Multiple Regression for Total Philanthropic Involvement

Variables Entered/Removed ^a			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	CommitmentToPublicInterest	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Class	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
a. Dependent Variable: VolunteerTotal			

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.362 ^a	.131	.125	2.032
2	.551 ^b	.304	.295	1.824
a. Predictors: (Constant), CommitmentToPublicInterest				
b. Predictors: (Constant), CommitmentToPublicInterest, Class				

ANOVA ^c						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	94.123	1	94.123	22.798	.000 ^a
	Residual	623.407	151	4.129		
	Total	717.529	152			
2	Regression	218.228	2	109.114	32.780	.000 ^b
	Residual	499.301	150	3.329		
	Total	717.529	152			

a. Predictors: (Constant), CommitmentToPublicInterest

b. Predictors: (Constant), CommitmentToPublicInterest, Class

c. Dependent Variable: VolunteerTotal

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.897	1.364		-.658	.512
	CommitmentToPublicInterest	.252	.053	.362	4.775	.000
2	(Constant)	-3.350	1.289		-2.599	.010
	CommitmentToPublicInterest	.267	.048	.383	5.612	.000
	Class	.729	.119	.416	6.106	.000

a. Dependent Variable: VolunteerTotal

Excluded Variables^c

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial	Collinearity
					Correlation	Statistics
						Tolerance
1	AttractiontoPolicyMaking	-.021 ^a	-.268	.789	-.022	.925
	SocialJustice	-.046 ^a	-.551	.583	-.045	.820
	CivicDuty	.061 ^a	.673	.502	.055	.706
	Compassion	.074 ^a	.788	.432	.064	.655
	SelfSacrifice	.129 ^a	1.345	.181	.109	.624
	Extraversion	.065 ^a	.846	.399	.069	.989
	Agreeableness	-.067 ^a	-.832	.407	-.068	.890
	Conscientiousness	.062 ^a	.796	.427	.065	.958
	Neuroticism	-.077 ^a	-.987	.325	-.080	.955
	OpennesstoExperience	.008 ^a	.101	.919	.008	.991
	Gender	-.054 ^a	-.712	.478	-.058	.998
	HHIncome	.024 ^a	.306	.760	.025	.957
	Religiosity	.005 ^a	.063	.950	.005	.957
	Class	.416 ^a	6.106	.000	.446	.998

2	AttractiontoPolicyMaking	-.010 ^b	-.141	.888	-.012	.924
	SocialJustice	-.039 ^b	-.512	.609	-.042	.819
	CivicDuty	.084 ^b	1.030	.305	.084	.704
	Compassion	.130 ^b	1.539	.126	.125	.648
	SelfSacrifice	.151 ^b	1.762	.080	.143	.623
	Extraversion	.026 ^b	.384	.702	.031	.981
	Agreeableness	-.039 ^b	-.536	.593	-.044	.886
	Conscientiousness	.014 ^b	.197	.844	.016	.946
	Neuroticism	-.053 ^b	-.756	.451	-.062	.952
	OpennesstoExperience	-.070 ^b	-1.001	.318	-.082	.959
	Gender	.003 ^b	.045	.964	.004	.979
	HHIncome	.113 ^b	1.597	.112	.130	.919
	Religiosity	-.004 ^b	-.052	.959	-.004	.957

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), CommitmentToPublicInterest

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), CommitmentToPublicInterest, Class

c. Dependent Variable: VolunteerTotal

The stepwise regression revealed a predictive model for philanthropic involvement. Two variables – Commitment to Serve Public Interest and Class Standing – were demonstrated to significantly predict philanthropic involvement at the .05 level and thus can be used together as a predictive model for philanthropic involvement. This was the only demographic variable that added to the prediction of philanthropic involvement.

Chapter 4

Discussion

All five hypotheses in this study were supported in part or in whole and as a result the findings can provide useful information both to researchers of philanthropic motivations and to philanthropic organizations looking to recruit undergraduates. While some hypotheses were supported more than others, results gathered from testing each of the hypotheses demonstrated that there are some relationships between personality, public service motivation, biographical data, and involvement in philanthropy.

H₁: Public Service Motivation is positively correlated with involvement in philanthropy.

Our significant positive correlations between total PSM and involvement in philanthropy by week and throughout college indicate that Perry's (1996) measure does transfer to the undergraduate population. Furthermore, the measure transfers to the philanthropic setting within the undergraduate population. Ultimately, this furthers PSM research and opens up a new population for PSM researchers to study.

H₂: Subscales of PSM will have varying relationships with involvement in philanthropy.

As expected, the subscales of Perry's (1996) measure have varying relationships with involvement in philanthropy. What is important to discuss is which of the dimensions had significant relationships and how those correlations can help improve philanthropies.

First, it is worth noting that of the three categories of motives (rational, norm-based, and emotional) the rational category did not demonstrate significant relationships with philanthropic

involvement. This finding makes sense, since rational motives are based on the idea that individuals want to get involved in public service to benefit themselves. For example, someone may have an increased image of self-importance after creating new public policies (Perry, 1990, p.3). In other words, undergraduate students do not get involved in philanthropic organizations solely to benefit themselves (e.g. to boost their resume). For a philanthropic organization recruiting undergraduate students, our results indicate that appealing to students' rational motives will be less effective than appealing to emotional and norm-based motives.

Two of the three norm-based motives saw significant positive correlations in our study. "Commitment to serve public interest" and "civic duty" were positively correlated with involvement in philanthropy throughout college. These norm-based motives are based on the idea that people would be motivated by a desire to meet standards and conform to norms.

"Commitment to serve public interest" was the most positively correlated with involvement in philanthropy, which means that undergraduates may be most motivated by the ability to help society through helping those in need. This sounds obvious, but with survey items such as, "People may talk about the public interest, but they are really concerned only about their self-interest" the main idea behind this subscale is the contrast between self-serving individuals and other-serving individuals. Our findings show that those undergraduates who genuinely are motivated by serving society by serving others are more likely to be involved in philanthropy.

Similarly, "civic duty" is a norm-based motive that showed a positive relationship with philanthropic involvement. "Civic duty" involves a sense or feeling of responsibility to one's community and/or society as a whole. With survey items such as, "Public service is one of the highest forms of citizenship" and "I have an obligation to look after those less well off", it is clear that this subscale very practically measures one's feeling of responsibility to help others.

Undergraduates involved in philanthropy, according to our findings, are more likely to feel this responsibility to help their country by helping those less well off. The more responsibility an undergraduate feels, the more likely they are to be involved in philanthropy.

Norm-based motives, then, are prevalent in the undergraduate population and influence the amount that undergraduates get involved in philanthropy. Those who are legitimately interested in helping society as a whole by helping a specific group in need, as well as those who feel a sense of responsibility for helping others, are more likely to put in more time to fulfill their responsibility and serve the community.

Affective motives, based on emotion, were also shown to be positively correlated with involvement in philanthropy. “Compassion” involves the belief that everyone should be supported, regardless of their situation. Some survey items for this subscale include, “It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in need” and the reverse-scored “I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves.” Whereas “commitment to the public interest” focused on the desire to serve the public, this subscale is focused on helping *individuals* in need. The results of our study demonstrate that the more an undergraduate cares about the welfare of individuals less fortunate, the more likely they are to become involved in philanthropy.

“Self-Sacrifice” involves the sacrifice of personal gains to help others benefit. The main point of difference between this and other subscales is that “self-sacrifice” involves helping others and society while losing potential personal benefits. For example, one survey item is, “Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.” Another is, “I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.” These are direct representations of the notion of sacrificing personal gains to help others benefit. Our findings show that the more

an undergraduate is willing to give up personal gains in order to benefit others, the more likely they are to be involved in philanthropy.

In general, our results show that it is undergraduates' norm-based and affective motives that drive their involvement in philanthropy. Students are involved in philanthropy out of a desire to help society, a sense of responsibility to help society, a desire to help individuals less fortunate, and a willingness to sacrifice personal gains in order to help others. On the other hand, undergraduate students are not motivated by the opportunity to enhance their sense of self-importance by creating the policies that affect those less fortunate.

Our research can ultimately help a philanthropic organization recruiting undergraduate volunteers. Such organizations now know not to focus on the fact that involvement in philanthropy will help the volunteer and that telling students about the impact that the philanthropy is having on individuals and on society is more likely to attract people that will stay involved for longer. Additionally, since students who will commit to involvement are more likely to be willing to sacrifice their time and efforts to help others, philanthropic organizations can worry less about deterring students from getting involved due to of the time commitment. Instead, they can focus on what the philanthropy does and how it impacts others and society, which will help recruit undergraduate volunteers who are already willing to make sacrifices to help others. All in all, our findings on the relationships between Perry's (1996) subscales of Public Service Motivation and involvement in philanthropy can help philanthropic organizations recruiting undergraduates modify and enhance their recruitment strategies and create a longer lasting, more involved volunteer base at the undergraduate level.

H₃: Various aspects of personality will be related to PSM scores and to involvement in philanthropy.

A number of correlations were statistically significant in our results between aspects of personality and aspects of PSM. Related to an individual undergraduate's total PSM were extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience. Additionally, each of the Big Five factors was related to at least one aspect of PSM, which means that the more of a given personality factor one has (or the less for neuroticism), the stronger their motivation to serve the public.

First, extraversion was related specifically to Social Justice and Compassion as well as total PSM. This means that outgoing, social undergraduates are more likely both to try to advance the equality of all people (the Social Justice component) as well as to help people in need out of genuine care for them (the Compassion component).

Agreeableness was the most strongly related personality factor both to total PSM and to the individual elements. Agreeableness involves a tendency towards cooperativeness and a yearning for social harmony, and those strong in Agreeableness tend to be compromising, helpful, and calm rather than quarrelsome and argumentative. It makes sense, then, that this dimension of personality is strongly related to involvement in philanthropy.

Someone high in conscientiousness is strong in organization, meets deadlines, and is a diligent worker. This aspect of personality was related to Attraction to Policy Making, which means that people stronger in Conscientiousness are more likely to be rationally motivated. In other words, things like paying attention to detail, being prepared, and meeting deadlines may be motivated by one's desire for achievement or to maximize their benefit in general.

The personality dimension of Neuroticism was negatively related to Social Justice, the aspect of PSM associated with the desire to help the well-being of minorities. According to our results, the more neurotic and emotionally unstable an undergraduate is, the less likely they are to want to increase the welfare of those less fortunate.

Finally, Openness to Experience was related to three dimensions of PSM – Social Justice, Compassion, and Self-Sacrifice. Undergraduates who are inquisitive, inventive, and generally enjoy new experiences are more likely to want to help minorities, help others out of a genuine love for all people, and be willing to sacrifice personal benefits to do so.

While it may seem a bit odd to consider the relationships between personality and Public Service Motivation, the connections to philanthropic involvement are clear. Philanthropic organizations can use these relationships when segmenting their recruiting efforts to certain types of undergraduates. Besides knowing which personality factors are related to subscales of PSM (especially subscales related to philanthropic involvement), understanding the direct relationships between the Big Five personality factors and involvement in philanthropy is beneficial to philanthropic organizations.

Ultimately, we hoped to find that certain personality characteristics correlated to more involvement in philanthropy. It appears that the direct relationships are non-existent and by finding only one significant correlation we showed that perhaps there really is no specific type of personality that is more likely to be involved in philanthropies. However, while only Extraversion was correlated directly with philanthropic involvement, two of the other Big Five dimensions – Agreeableness and Openness to Experience – were correlated with several aspects of PSM that have been shown in this study to be related to philanthropic involvement. Therefore, it may be of benefit to a philanthropic organization to recruit undergraduates high in these

dimensions even though they do are not directly related to involvement in philanthropy among undergraduates. This finding opens the door for speculation of a mediated model between personality-PSM-philanthropic activity but the analysis of this hypothesis is well beyond the scope of this study and is suggested for future research.

H₄: A set of demographic variables will predict philanthropic involvement and

H₅: A set of demographic variables will predict philanthropic involvement and above and beyond that which is predicted using PSM and Personality.

Through several analyses we gathered valuable information that can help philanthropic organizations recruit and retain undergraduate volunteers. One important finding was the predictive model for philanthropic involvement, which included the variables of Commitment to Serve Public Interest and Class Standing. The former, to reiterate, reflects one's desire to help society by helping people in the community. An undergraduate's level of this variable, in conjunction with their class standing, can help organizations predict that student's level of involvement in philanthropy.

Another key finding was the trend that consecutive class standing tends to have students that have been involved in philanthropy for a longer period of time than those with lower classes standing (e.g. seniors tend to have been involved in philanthropy for more years than juniors, juniors more than sophomores, etc.). While this finding seems like common sense, a deeper look reveals information that is valuable to philanthropic organizations recruiting student volunteers.

Philanthropic organizations recruiting undergraduate volunteers, especially those just starting out, may want to focus their recruiting efforts on freshmen or younger students in general rather than all undergraduates. While it would be typical to want to recruit older students to act as leaders, it may be more beneficial in the long term to focus on recruiting freshmen, who

will put in more and more time each consecutive year and build the philanthropy. Juniors and seniors may also have more time for philanthropic activities as well, so the earlier on in their college career a philanthropic organization recruits an undergraduate, the more involvement they may obtain from the student in the long run.

Furthermore, depending on the types of roles that volunteers will be involved in, considering Path-Goal Theory is of utmost importance to philanthropic organizations. Path-Goal Theory, developed by House (1971), states that the satisfaction, motivation, and performance of a subordinate depend on the leadership style of their leader. In other words, the degree to which a leader imposes structure, is supportive, allows subordinates to make decisions, and engages in other similar leadership behaviors has a direct role in their subordinates' behavior. One of the key findings in House's (1971) article was that subordinates with habitual jobs are more satisfied when their leader does not impose much structure, whereas employees with ambiguous jobs are more satisfied with more structure by the leader. Additionally, when subordinates are new to their roles, it is important to be more directive and "show" the subordinate precisely what to do. Philanthropic organizations can benefit from these findings in that they can encourage older volunteers to really "show" the freshmen and sophomores how to get involved. Furthermore, depending on the types of roles that volunteers have, the leaders of the organization can initiate more or less structure to increase satisfaction among volunteers.

Another result of our analyses on biodata from participants revealed that undergraduates with higher household incomes are more likely to be involved in philanthropy for a longer period of time. While the relationship was weak, it may be of use to philanthropic organizations looking to recruit undergraduates to know that areas with higher household income averages may lead to more undergraduate volunteers.

Finally, our results demonstrated that there is no significant difference in philanthropic involvement between genders. Males and females are similarly involved in philanthropic organizations and such organizations, therefore, should generally not try to target one gender when recruiting.

Limitations

For the most part, the limitations of this study lie in the sample that was used to gather data. Most of the participants (over 88%) currently attend Penn State University, where philanthropy among students is extremely prevalent, especially through the Penn State Dance Marathon (THON for short). THON has a 15,000 undergraduate volunteer base at Penn State, and has become a popular way for students to get involved while in school. Thus, its influence will have created some bias among the students participating in this study. In future studies, using a sample from a larger variety of universities would help lower the biases that come from using mostly Penn State undergraduates. While our study allowed students at any university to participate, doing more recruiting at other institutions may be a better method to recruit a variety of participants.

Additionally, the lack of diversity among participants racially and religiously hindered our ability to perform certain analyses. We would have liked to conduct analyses with these two variables specifically, but with over 90% of participants being Caucasian and most participants being Christian, we were unable to do the tests we initially planned. While we were still able to test for religiosity (degree of religious conviction but not the categorical variable of type of religion), in future studies it may be interesting to test differences in philanthropic involvement between religions. Again, a more diverse sample is ultimately necessary in future research of philanthropic motivations at the undergraduate level.

As far as the measures themselves, it may be of benefit in future studies to evaluate whether other measures could be used to assess undergraduates' Big Five personality traits and Public Service Motivation. The Big Five measure used in this study was chosen for its brevity while still being quite reliable and valid (John, 1990). However, other measures such as Johnson's IPIP-NEO (n.d.) offer more items and types of questions that some researchers may prefer. For Public Service Motivation, Perry's (1996) full measure or shorter measure can be used. Researchers may also want to create a new measure to assess individuals' level of PSM. In the end, there are multiple Big Five measures and several variations of Perry's measure that can be used in future studies and it will be up to future researchers to determine which measures are best for their research.

Future studies can also explore new biodata from undergraduates. A few variables were used in this study (some of which were unable to be analyzed) but there are numerous other biographical variables that can be related to philanthropic involvement. For example, undergraduates with a history of philanthropic involvement in their family may be more likely to be involved in philanthropy. With an unlimited amount of options, researchers seeking to relate biodata to philanthropic involvement can help progress undergraduate philanthropic research immensely.

Chapter 5

References

- Allport, G.W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47, No. 211.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology* 44. 1–26.
- Borgatta, E. F. (1964). The structure of personality characteristics. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 8-17.
- Buchanon, Bruce II. (1975). Red tape and the service ethic: Some unexpected differences between public and private managers. *Administration and Society*, 4. 423-44.
- Chaplin, W. F., John, O. P., & Goldberg, L. R. (1988). Conceptions of states and traits: Dimensional attributes with ideals as prototypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 541-557.
- Clerkin, R. M., Paynter, S. R., & Taylor, J.K. (2009). Public service motivation in undergraduate giving and volunteering decisions. *The American Review of Public Administration*. 39(6). 675-698.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Coursey, D. H., Perry, J. L., Brudney, J. L., & Littlepage, L. (2008). Psychometric verification of Perry's public service motivation instrument: Results for volunteer exemplars. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 28(1). 79-90.

- Digman, J. M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. Special Issue: Long-term stability and change in personality. *Journal of Personality*, 57, 195-214.
- Downs, Anthony. (1967). *Inside Bureaucracy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- England, G. W. (1971). *Development and use of weighted application blanks* (Rev. ed.). Minneapolis MN: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Farmer, William L. (2007). A brief review of biodata history, research, and applications. *Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology Division Bureau of Naval Personnel*
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344.
- Frederickson, H. George. (1971). Toward a new public administration. In Frank Marini, ed. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, Pa.: Chandler, 309-31.
- Frederickson, H. George, and Hart, David K. (1985). The public service and the patriotism of benevolence. *Public Administration Review*, 45, 547-53.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26-42.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Leadership Review*, 16, 321-339.
- John, O. P. (1989). Towards a taxonomy of personality descriptors. In D. M. Buss and N. Cantor (Eds.), *Personality psychology: Recent trends and emerging directions* (pp. 261-271). New York: Springer-Verlag.

- John, O. P. (1990). The “Big Five” factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66-100) New York: Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory – Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Johnson, J. (n.d.) *Short Form for the IPIP-NEO (International Personality Item Pool Representation of the NEO PI-R™)*. Retrieved from <http://www.personal.psu.edu/j5j/IPIP/ipipneo120.htm>
- Kelman, Steven. (1987). ‘Public choice’ and public spirit. *Public Interest*, 87. 80-94.
- McKillip, R. H. and Clark, C. L. (1974). *Biographical data and job performance* (Technical Memorandum 74-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Civil Service Commission.
- Naff, K. C., & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19, 5-15.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.
- Norman, W. T. (1967). *2,800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population*. Department of Psychology. University of Michigan.
- Owens, W. A. (1976). Background data. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 609-644). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Perry, James L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1), 5-22.

Perry, James L., and Wise, Lois Recascino. (1990). The motivational bases of public service.

Public Administration Review 50, 367-73.

Saulsman, L. M.; Page, A. C. (2004). "The five-factor model and personality disorder empirical

literature: A meta-analytic review". *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23(8).

Seider, Scott. (2007). Catalyzing a commitment to community service in emerging adults.

Journal of Adolescent Research, 22(6). 612-639.

Wiggins, J. S. (1995). *Interpersonal Adjective Scales: Professional manual*. Odessa, FL:

Psychological Assessment Resources.

Wright, Bradley E. and Sanjay K. Pandey. (2008). "Public service motivation and the assumption of person-organization fit: Testing the mediating effect of value congruence.

Administration & Society, 40(5). 502-521.

Chapter 6

Appendix A

Undergraduate Motivations for Philanthropy Survey

1. Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Undergraduate Motivations for Involvement in Philanthropy

Principle Investigator: Dan Levy
212 West Fairmount Avenue
State College, PA 16801
(215) 518-1637 dgl5020@psu.edu

Advisors: Dr. Rick Jacobs
508C Keller Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-865-4820 rrj@psu.edu

Dr. Jeanette Cleveland
507C Keller Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-1712 jnc10@psu.edu

You are being asked to take part in a research study of college students' involvement in philanthropy. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to take part in the study.

Purpose of the study: The purpose of this study is to learn what motivates undergraduate college students to get involved in philanthropy.

Procedures to be followed: If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to complete three surveys asking you about your personality, your involvement in philanthropic organizations, and your background. The surveys will take approximately 45 minutes to complete in total. You must be at least 18 years of age and an undergraduate student in order to participate.

Your answers will be confidential. The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we make public we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Only the researchers will have access to the records. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally

identifiable information will be shared because your name is in no way linked to your responses. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

Taking part is voluntary: Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time.

If you have questions: If you have questions later, you may contact Dan Levy at dgl5020@psu.edu or at 215-518-1637. You can reach Dr. Rick Jacobs at rick.jacobs@ebjacobs.com.

Completion and submission of the survey is considered your implied consent to participate in this study. Please print this form for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study. I am an undergraduate student and am at least 18 years of age.
I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I do not consent to take part in the study.

2. Please use the rating scale next to each statement to describe how much you agree or disagree. A one (1) means “strongly disagree” and a five (5) means “strongly agree”.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.

There are few public programs that I wholeheartedly support.

I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.

I am willing to use every ounce of my energy to make the world a more just place.

I consider public service my civic duty.

I am not afraid to go to bat for the rights of others even if it means I will be ridiculed.

People may talk about the public interest, but they are really concerned only about their self-interest.

Much of what I do is for a cause bigger than myself.

It is hard for me to get intensely interested in what is going on in my community.

Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.

I believe in putting duty before self.

Ethical behavior of public officials is as important as competence.

Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.

The give and take of public policy making doesn't appeal to me.

It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.

I unselfishly contribute to

my community.

It is my responsibility to help solve problems arising from interdependencies among people.

I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another.

When public officials take an oath of office, I believe they accept obligations not expected of other citizens.

If any group does not share in the prosperity of our society, then we are all worse off.

I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves.

Politics is a dirty word.

I am one of those rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else.

I do not believe that government can do much to make society fairer.

Public service is one of the highest forms of citizenship.

To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others.

To me, the phrase "duty,

honor, and country" stirs
deeply felt emotions.

I am rarely moved by the
plight of the
underprivileged.

I respect public officials
who can turn a good idea
into law.

Doing well financially is
definitely more important
to me than doing good
deeds.

An official's obligation to
the public should always
come before loyalty to
superiors.

I believe that there are
many public causes worth
championing.

I believe everyone has a
moral commitment to civic
affairs no matter how busy
they are.

I have an obligation to look
after those less well off.

I don't care much for politicians.
Most social programs are
too vital to do without.

Meaningful public service
is very important to me.

I am willing to go great
lengths to fulfill my
obligations to my country.

I seldom think about the
welfare of people whom I

don't know personally.

I feel people should give
back to society more than
they get from it.

The following statements concern your perception about yourself in a variety of situations. Your task is to indicate the strength of your agreement with each statement, utilizing a scale in which 1 denotes strong disagreement, 5 denotes strong agreement, and 2, 3, and 4 represent intermediate judgments. In the boxes after each statement, click a number from 1 to 5 from the following scale:

1. *Strongly disagree*
2. *Disagree*
3. *Neither disagree nor agree*
4. *Agree*
5. *Strongly agree*

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, so select the number that most closely reflects you on each statement. Take your time and consider each statement carefully.

*3. *I see myself as someone who...*

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

...Generates a lot of enthusiasm

...Values artistic, aesthetic experiences

...Is curious about many different things

...Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

...Gets nervous easily

...Can be cold and aloof

...Tends to be disorganized

...Is considerate and kind to almost everyone

...Has an active imagination

...Is relaxed, handles stress well

...Remains calm in tense situations

- ...Does things efficiently
- ...Is ingenious, a deep thinker
- ...Has few artistic interests
- ...Worries a lot
- ...Likes to cooperate with others
- ...Is inventive
- ...Can be moody
- ...Can be somewhat careless
- ...Does a thorough job
- ...Prefers work that is routine
- ...Likes to reflect, play with ideas
- ...Is helpful and unselfish with others
- ...Is sometimes rude to others
- ...Is talkative
- ...Perseveres until the task is finished
- ...Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
- ...Makes plans and follows through with them
- ...Is sometimes shy, inhibited
- ...Tends to find fault with others
- ...Is reserved
- ...Is original, comes up with new ideas
- ...Is a reliable worker
- ...Has an assertive personality

...Tends to be quiet

...Has a forgiving nature

...Starts quarrels with others

...Can be tense

...Is outgoing, sociable

...Is easily distracted

...Is depressed, blue

...Is generally trusting

...Is full of energy

...Tends to be lazy

4. *What is your gender?*

- Male
- Female
- Transgendered

5. *What is your race?*

- Caucasian
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- African American
- Hispanic
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Asian
- Other (please specify)

6. *What is your household income (i.e. your family's income)?*

- Less than \$10,000
- \$10,000 to \$19,999
- \$20,000 to \$29,999
- \$30,000 to \$39,999
- \$40,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$59,999
- \$60,000 to \$69,999
- \$70,000 to \$79,999
- \$80,000 to \$89,999
- \$90,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$149,999

- \$150,000 or more
- Unsure/Prefer not to answer

7. *What is your religion?*

- Agnostic
- Judaism
- Islam
- Christianity
- Buddhism
- Hinduism
- None
- Other (please specify)

8. *How religious do you consider yourself on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being “Not religious at all” and 5 being “Extremely religious”?*

- I am...

*9. *What is your class standing?*

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Fifth year or more

*10. *What college or university do you attend?*

- Penn State
- Other (please specify)

11. *What are your parents' professions?*

- Mother:
- Father:

12. *Have you been a volunteer for a philanthropic organization during your undergraduate career? If so, please specify how long you were/have been actively involved in philanthropy in your undergraduate career.*

- Never involved as a volunteer for philanthropic organization
- Yes, less than 3 months
- Yes, three to six months
- Yes, six to nine months
- Yes, nine months to one year
- Yes, one to two years
- Yes, two to three years
- Yes, four years or more

13. *In what capacity are you/have you been involved in philanthropic organization(s) in your undergraduate career? (You can choose more than one option)*

- Volunteer time
- Donate money
- Other (please specify)

14. Approximately how many hours per week do you volunteer/have you volunteered in a philanthropic organization?

- Donated money, did not volunteer time (Choose this option if you only selected "Donate money" in the previous question. If you chose "Volunteer time", do not choose this option)
- Less than one hour per week
- One to five hours per week
- Five to ten hours per week
- Ten to fifteen hours per week
- Fifteen to twenty hours per week
- Twenty to twenty-five hours per week
- Twenty-five to thirty hours per week
- Thirty or more hours per week

15. To what degree do you feel that your values relate to the values of the philanthropic organization in general?

- My values are...

Thank you for your time and participation. Your responses will help the researcher better understand what motivates undergraduate students to get involved in philanthropic organizations.

Take care and thanks again,

Dan Levy

Chapter 7

ACADEMIC VITA of Daniel Levy

Daniel Levy
619 Sweetwater Drive
Langhorne, PA 19053
dgl5020@psu.edu

Education

The Pennsylvania State University Schreyer Honors College

Smeal College of Business

Major: Marketing

Expected Degree: B.S. in Marketing

Liberal Arts College

Major: Psychology

Expected Degree: B.S. in Psychology with Business Option

Research Experience

PNC Leadership Assessment Center, Undergraduate Research Assistant under Dr. Rick Jacobs
September 2010 – Present

Teams and Decision-Making Research Lab, Research Assistant under Dr. Susan Muhammed
March 2010 – November 2010

Awards

- Schreyer Honors College Academic Excellence Scholarship
- Marty D' Ambrosio Honors Scholarship
- Rick Funk Dance Marathon Leadership Award
- Penn State Student Leader Scholarship
- Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship
- Dean's List every semester
- Member of Skull & Bones Honorary Hat Society

Activities

- Participated in PNC Leadership Assessment Center
- Former President and Donor Relations Co-Chair of Atlas THON
- Former member of Phi Beta Lambda, Professional Business Fraternity
- Special Events Developmental Captain for THON 2011