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ABSTRACT

In recent years, more and more organizations are being held responsible for the social impact of their organizational priorities, commonly referred to as corporate social responsibility. As a result, there has been an increased implementation of employee volunteering initiatives. However, research on volunteering has largely remained separate from the context of work. As the prevalence of employee volunteering initiatives continues to grow, the need to integrate the theoretical and practical findings from the volunteering literature with that of the extensively studied and related discretionary prosocial work behavior (i.e., organizational citizenship behavior) research has become increasingly apparent. This dissertation examines how commonly used motivational theories found within the volunteering literature can be leveraged to aid the prediction of important work-related outcomes. More specifically, a person-centered perspective is applied using a latent profile approach, where the relationship between an employee’s combination of motives for pursuing volunteer opportunities and their subsequent discretionary behaviors at work, including organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive work behaviors, are tested with vigor and depletion as respective mediating mechanisms. A sample of employed individuals who participated in a volunteer activity within the past year responded to a series of survey items related to their volunteering experience, motivations for participating, and their behaviors at work following the activity. Results demonstrated the most support for a three-profile solution, and profile membership was revealed to be significantly related to levels of vigor, and ultimately, subsequent engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors.

iii
Findings did not support the hypothesized relationship between the profiles and depletion (nor counterproductive work behaviors). However, a supplemental mediation analysis using multiple regression with each volunteer motive as a predictor did demonstrate support for the indirect effects of the career and protective motives on counterproductive work behaviors through depletion. Theoretical and practical implications of this dissertation's findings are also discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years, more and more organizations are being held responsible for the social impact of their organizational priorities (Basil et al., 2009). This notion is commonly referred to as corporate social responsibility (CSR), which concerns all prosocial organizational activities and outcomes that are not strictly pursued for the maximization of shareholders’ wealth (Houghton et al., 2009). Prominent organizations such as Google, IBM, and JP Morgan Chase have all implemented their own CSR practices (Bode & Singh, 2018), recognizing that their commitment to socially responsible practices is particularly influential on an organization’s reputation, employee retention, and competitive advantage (Henning & Jones, 2013). One response to the call for CSR is the implementation of employee volunteering initiatives, in which employed individuals volunteer their time for nonprofit or charitable groups (Rodell et al., 2016).

While organizational support for employee volunteering provides a solution to stakeholders’ demands for more corporate involvement in social issues, it also serves as a strategic asset to organizations. Research has demonstrated that job seekers are more attracted to organizations that support employee volunteering and giving behavior (Deloitte, 2016; Jones & Willness, 2013; Jones et al., 2014). Moreover, organizations that have implemented their own corporate volunteering programs (CVPs)—a form of employee volunteering—have experienced an increase in employee retention and employee engagement (Caligiuri et al., 2013; Rodell et al., 2016). In fact, one particular study even found that employees who do not participate in the CVP still feel that they
gain benefits from it (Rodell et al., 2017). As such, organizations have found that demonstrating support for employee volunteering has the potential to result in a “win-win-win” scenario, such that by investing their resources into these initiatives, they are also maximizing the benefits for the employee, the organization, and the community (Caligiuri et al., 2013).

Despite the fact that a majority of the literature has focused on the positive outcomes of employee volunteering, empirical evidence has recently emerged suggesting that CSR initiatives, such as CVPs, may also lead to negative outcomes. Findings have illustrated that the implementation of employee volunteering initiatives have the potential to result in increased engagement in deviant workplace behavior, employee skepticism, and unfavorable word of mouth (Loi et al., 2020; Skarmeas & Leonidou, 2013). As such, the argument can be made that employee volunteering has the potential to lead to both positive and negative outcomes. However, the conditions in which employee volunteering elicits positive or negative consequences are unclear.

The conflicting results found in the employee volunteerism research are not unlike the also conflicting results found in the interpersonal helping research. Interpersonal help is considered a subdimension of the broader organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) construct, referring to employee extra-role behaviors that enhance the organization’s functioning (Organ, 1977). Given that corporate volunteering and interpersonal helping are both forms of workplace discretionary prosocial behaviors, findings from the more extensively studied interpersonal helping literature make for an ideal source from which to draw upon for better understanding employee
volunteering. For example, on the one hand, studies examining the effects of helping behaviors have found support for the enrichment-based perspective on helping, which suggests that following a helping event, the helper is likely to experience enhanced positive affect, energy, and meaningfulness (Harrison et al., 2006; Lam et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2020). On the other hand, studies have also found support for the depletion-based perspective on helping, suggesting helping others is a depleting act that is likely to result in increased feelings of exhaustion and job stress for the helper (Gabriel et al., 2018; Koopman et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2020). Such consequences of providing help have the potential to influence a number of employee outcomes (e.g., personal well-being, organizational commitment, job performance), ultimately carrying serious implications for organizations.

One potential explanation for the conflicting conclusions found within the interpersonal helping literature has been provided by theories of motivation. More precisely, theory on autonomous and controlled motivation suggests that an individual’s behavior is motivated by factors that are either inherent to the individual or to some attribution of the external environment, respectively. Early empirical findings demonstrated that when successful performance was motivated by autonomous conditions, individuals experienced resource accumulation, as evidenced by reports of enhanced levels of subjective energy, vitality, and positive affect (Lin et al., 2020; Nix et al., 1999; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Conversely, when successful performance was attributed to controlled motives, individuals experienced resource depletion and were more likely to report lower levels of positive affect and well-being, in addition to
decreased helping intentions (Lin et al., 2020; Nix et al., 1999; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Given that resource replenishment and resource depletion have been identified as consequences of motivation and predictors of important work outcomes such as OCBs and CWBs, it is possible that an individual’s unique combination of motives for participating in employee volunteering opportunities may influence one’s level of resources following such participation and is ultimately responsible for the employee’s subsequent engagement in discretionary prosocial and deviant behaviors.

Theories of motivation tend to dominate the research on employee volunteering, and volunteerism more broadly, with empirical evidence supporting the influential effects of one’s motives for volunteering on outcomes important to the coordinating non-profit organization, like volunteer retention and commitment (e.g., Caligiuri et al., 2013; Clary & Snyder, 1999). According to the functional approach to volunteering framework (Clary et al., 1998), the same volunteering activity can serve different motives for different individuals. Likewise, the functional approach also explains that volunteering is likely not a result of one single motive, but rather a combination of different motives. Referring specifically to CVPs, Peloza and colleagues (2009) echo the complex nature of volunteering motives proposed by the functional approach, suggesting that employee volunteerism is likely a result of the various combinations of coexisting and opposing motives (e.g., egoistic motives, altruistic motives, and organizational citizenship motives). Interestingly, despite the literature's consensus that an individual’s competing motivations for volunteering can simultaneously coexist and
are predictive of one’s volunteer behavior (Rodell et al., 2016), such theory remains largely misaligned with the way in which volunteer motives are empirically evaluated.

The goal of this dissertation is two-fold. First, this dissertation applies a person-centered approach to the volunteerism literature through the utilization of latent profile modeling to create a series of profiles reflective of an individual’s motives to volunteer. The use of profiles provides insight to the way in which volunteer motives tend to manifest in unique combinations across multiple groups of volunteers, allowing the influence of multiple volunteer motives acting in concert to be examined. Second, drawing from conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and theory on autonomous and controlled motivation, this dissertation utilizes the profiles of volunteer motives as predictors of an employed volunteer’s psychological resource availability following participation in a volunteer activity. Third, utilizing self-regulatory theory (Bandura, 1977; Carver & Scheier, 1982; Vohs & Baumeister, 2016) and moral licensing theory (Loi et al., 2020; Miller & Effron, 2010), the availability of an employed volunteer’s psychological resources, as evidenced by vigor and depletion, are examined as parallel mediators of the relationship between each profile of motives and their participation in OCBs and CWBs. Collectively, such an understanding of how each motivation profile experiences resource gain (i.e., vigor) or loss (i.e., depletion) following their volunteer participation and how that relates to their later engagement in extra-role (i.e., OCBs) or deviant (i.e., CWBs) behaviors serves to further integrate the theoretical and empirical findings of the volunteerism and organizational behavior literatures.
This dissertation makes several theoretical and practical contributions to the literature. First, indicators of behavioral engagement, such as OCB and withdrawal (an example of CWB), have been studied within the context of employee volunteering, but they tend to be examined as predictors of participation in employee volunteering initiatives (e.g., Caligiuri et al., 2013; Clary & Snyder, 1999). In this dissertation, such indicators are instead examined as distal consequences of employee volunteering participation, expanding our understanding of how volunteering has implications for what occurs at work. Second, research on volunteerism has largely ignored the possibility that volunteering has the potential to lead to unfavorable outcomes, like depletion, as opposed to favorable outcomes, like positive affect. Current research also fails to acknowledge the role of volunteerism on performance-related outcomes beyond task performance (e.g., Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Hu et al., 2016). Given that organizations consider an employee’s discretionary organizational behaviors (i.e., OCB and CWB) when assessing performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002), empirical findings from the volunteering literature are difficult to apply to practice as the range of performance outcomes are typically restricted to that of an employee’s core task responsibilities. The exploration of alternative outcomes to volunteering, such as depletion, OCB, and CWB, is intended to broaden the current scope of the relatively limited volunteerism literature. More specifically, depletion and vigor serve as mediating mechanisms linking the volunteer motives profiles to OCB and CWB. Third, through the application of latent profile modeling, this dissertation also advances the way in which the literature currently approaches the measurement of volunteering
motives. Such an approach to measurement allows for greater alignment between theory and measurement that is currently missing from the study of volunteerism.

Perhaps the most apparent practical implication of this dissertation is that it provides an improved understanding of the process in which a volunteer’s commitment and dedication that is fostered through one’s volunteering experience can also be applied within the context of an organization’s support for employee volunteering. Previous findings have suggested that organizations should tailor their volunteering recruitment strategies to be more aligned with volunteers’ motivation needs, as it is likely to produce more favorable outcomes in terms of employee participation and retention (Kim et al., 2019). Through the identification of which volunteering motives are more or less likely to lead to depletion, organizations can work toward actively promoting particular volunteer activities that are more likely to replenish an employee’s resources (i.e., lead to vigor), and subsequently their participation in OCBs rather than CWBs.

In sum, this dissertation extends the current understanding of employee volunteering through the integration of theory and empirical evidence found in the interpersonal helping research. As such, the primary goals of this dissertation are (1) to use latent profile modeling to realign the disjointed theory and assessment of volunteer motives, and (2) to identify how an employed individual’s motives for participating in a volunteer activity are related to their subsequent engagement in OCB and CWB. This dissertation begins with a brief introduction to the more general volunteering construct and will be followed with a discussion of volunteering within the context of work.
Theories commonly found within the more general volunteerism literature will subsequently be introduced, as well as how such theories can be applied to better understand workplace behaviors. The primary motives for volunteering will also be featured, including the disconnect between the theoretical conceptualization of a volunteer’s motives and the way in which motives are measured. The second chapter will explore the primary commonalities and distinguishing features between the volunteering and interpersonal helping constructs. Consequently, hypotheses will be presented in which findings from the research on interpersonal help can be applied to the research on employee volunteerism. Additionally, the third chapter will explore the OCB and CWB constructs in greater depth, and subsequently, hypothesize how engagement in OCB and CWB can be linked to the profiles of volunteer motives via feelings of vigor and depletion.
VOLUNTEERING

Conceptual Clarification

Volunteering is best defined as “any activity intended to help others that is provided without obligation and for which the volunteer does not receive pay or material compensation” (Harootyan, 1996, p. 613). This definition provides resolution to two ongoing debates within the literature regarding how to best conceptualize volunteering (Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Wilson, 2000). First, the literature has seen conflict over whether or not volunteering for self-oriented motives (as opposed to other-oriented motives) actually constitutes as volunteering, given that volunteering is meant to benefit others and not oneself. Drawing from the functionalist approach to volunteering, Clary and Snyder (1999) explain that it is inappropriate to attribute an individual’s motives for volunteering as solely altruistic or egoistic, given that individuals are likely to have many motives for engaging in volunteer activities. As such, the definition provided above does not take into account one’s motive for volunteering.

Second, the literature has also grappled with whether a particular activity that provides a volunteer with some benefit or reward, whether tangible (e.g., money, gift cards) or intangible (e.g., personal well-being, recognition from supervisor and/or peers), should be considered as an act of volunteering. Drawing from the social exchange literature, and more specifically equity theory (Adams, 1965), tangible rewards and benefits serve as means of compensation or “material effects of social exchange,” which implies some sort of obligation to reestablish inequity (in which the recipient of
the favor is no longer indebted; Peng et al., 2018, p. 761). For example, an employee goes to work for an organization in return for monetary compensation (i.e., salary). In other words, the employee has an obligation to complete their work responsibilities for the organization, and the organization has an obligation to pay the employee for their work. Alternatively, intangible benefits and rewards are considered “symbolic effects of social exchange,” (p. 761) in which feelings of gratitude (rather than indebtedness) are elicited and are reciprocated through relationship growth (Peng et al., 2018). As such, although a definitive consensus has yet to be reached (Wilson, 2000), for purposes of this dissertation, the above definition excludes tangible rewards and benefits.

**Employee Volunteering**

Employee volunteering can be considered a specific type of volunteering, defined as “employed individuals giving time during a planned activity for an external nonprofit or charitable group or organization” (Rodell et al., 2016, p. 57). Employee volunteering can subsequently be divided into two dimensions: corporate volunteering and personal volunteering. Corporate volunteering refers to employee volunteering conducted through a company initiative, such as a corporate volunteer program (CVP). Corporate volunteer programs (CVPs) are defined as the formal and informal practices, policies, and programs created by an organization to coordinate and encourage community service among their paid employees (Henning & Jones, 2013). Approximately 77.34 million adults reported that they had volunteered through their work organization in 2017 (The Corporation for National and Community Service, 2018). In fact, according to
Deloitte’s 2017 Volunteerism Survey, 38% of respondents identified that their employer provides access to company-sponsored or coordinated volunteer programs (Deloitte, 2017). There is no single model employers utilize when supporting CVPs and other employee volunteering initiatives within their organization; thus, the extent of employer support for employee volunteering varies from organization to organization. For example, an employer may provide financial or logistic support for volunteering, such that the organization donates monetary and physical assets to support employee volunteering (e.g., reimbursing entry fees, donating prizes, using company facilities; Rodell et al., 2016). Alternatively, employers may provide time-based support for volunteering, such that an organization provides employees with time off in order to volunteer or allows employees to adjust their work schedule to accommodate volunteering (Booth et al., 2009).

Personal volunteering, on the other hand, refers to employee volunteering conducted on one’s own personal time (Rodell et al., 2016). Although these two subdimensions of employee volunteerism differ in terms of how the employee becomes involved in a particular volunteering initiative, both reflect employed individuals giving time during a planned activity for an external nonprofit or charitable group or organization (as the employee volunteering definition suggests). For purposes of this dissertation, both forms of employee volunteering are of interest. The following section reviews theory commonly used in the general volunteerism literature and how their application to a work context can provide additional insight to the research on corporate volunteering.
Theories of Volunteerism

Within the literature on volunteerism, there are three commonly used theoretical frameworks used to explain why an individual volunteers: the motivation-based theory of volunteerism, the functionalist approach to volunteering, and volunteer role identity.

Motivation for Volunteering

In 1991, Clary and Snyder proposed a motivation-based theory of volunteerism in which volunteering can serve to: (1) fulfill prosocial, altruistic, or empathetic humanitarian concerns; (2) adhere to socially developed norms and acquire a positive self-image, as well as acceptance by important others; and (3) acquire learning through new experiences for career benefits. Several years later, Clary and colleagues (1998) assigned labels to these motives, and included three additional motives, to create a total of six primary motives (values, understanding, social, career, protective, enhancement) for engaging in volunteerism.

The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) was subsequently developed as a way to measure each of the six primary volunteering motives (Clary et al., 1998). First, the values motive refers to a person’s desire to express personal principles related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others. The second motive, understanding, involves the opportunity for volunteerism to provide new learning experiences and the chance to utilize knowledge, skills, and abilities that might otherwise go unused. The social motive concerns one’s desire to develop and maintain relationships with others. Career, the fourth motive, refers to the career-related benefits that may be acquired
from volunteerism. The protective motive involves protecting one’s ego from negative features of the self through volunteerism. Examples of the protective motive include volunteering to mitigate one’s guilt over being more fortunate than others, as well as to address an individual’s own personal problems. The sixth and final motive, enhancement, refers to an individual’s desire to grow and develop psychologically and increase self-esteem.

When applied to the context of corporate volunteering, Clary and colleagues’ (1998) motives for volunteering are evidenced in the volunteering work design model (Grant, 2012). More specifically, when an employee perceives a lack of meaningfulness in their work, which has been shown to enhance employee intrinsic motivation (and ultimately employee engagement; Sonnentag, 2003), they will seek out other opportunities that can compensate for this deficiency. According to the volunteering work design model, each of the three core dimensions of work (i.e., task, social, knowledge) correspond to two of the six volunteering motives identified by Clary and colleagues (1998). A lack of meaningfulness in any of the three work dimensions can be compensated for by satisfying the volunteering motives associated with it. For instance, deficiencies in the enrichment of the task dimension, referring to the lack of work characteristics (i.e., task variety, task significance, task identity, task autonomy, task feedback) specified by job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) to be meaningful, can be compensated for by volunteering in activities that satisfy one’s values and enhancement motives. Deficiencies in the enrichment of the social dimension, such as a lack in opportunity to interact with people both inside and outside
of the organization, can be compensated for by volunteering activities that satisfy one’s social and protective motives. Finally, deficiencies in the enrichment of the knowledge dimension, or the failure of the work to facilitate one’s acquisition, application, and proficiency in a variety of skills, can be compensated for by volunteering activities that satisfy one’s understanding and career motives. Thus, an employee may be motivated to participate in their employer’s CVP due to compensatory motives that are unfulfilled by their work.

Functional Approach to Volunteering

In general, the functional approach assumes human behavior is a result of one’s personal goals and needs, and that by identifying a person’s purpose for engaging in such behaviors allows for an improved understanding of why the person performed it (Rioux & Penner, 2001; Snyder, 1993). When applied more specifically within the context of volunteering, the functional approach to volunteering assumes that volunteering serves certain functions for individuals, which ultimately motivates volunteering behavior. More precisely, the approach suggests that the same act of volunteering has the potential to serve different motives for different individuals and has been used to explain the significant relationships found between an individual’s motives and the quantity/quality of volunteer activities (Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998).

Applications of the principles of the functional approach to volunteering can be found in an occupational context via moral licensing theory. Essentially, moral licensing
theory suggests that employees may be motivated to volunteer because they consider their participation to be a way of accruing “moral credits,” which can later be used to justify morally questionable or socially undesirable behaviors (Loi et al., 2020). In other words, by engaging in morally impressive behaviors through their participation in an employee volunteering initiative, the morally inappropriate behaviors performed later are deemed less immoral than if they had not previously accumulated “moral credits.”

Volunteer Role Identity

Role identity (McCall & Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1980; Turner, 1978) refers to the extent to which an individual internalizes a particular social role they play (e.g., mother, business-owner), such that it becomes of component of their self-concept (Grube & Piliavin, 2000). As such, volunteer role identity refers to the internalization of a volunteer role and guides the individual’s future behaviors (Finkelstein, 2008; Grant, 2012). Volunteer role identity has been used as an explanation for one’s consistent involvement in volunteering. For example, the more an individual continues to participate in volunteering activities, the more likely they are to internalize their role as a volunteer, eventually becoming a part of their self-concept. As a result, now that their volunteering role has become a feature of their self-concept, they will continue their involvement as a volunteer because it is now a defining part of them.

Volunteer role identity is positively related to outcomes such as commitment to volunteering and time spent volunteering (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Finkelstein et al., 2005). Applying these findings to the workplace, an individual who continues to
participate in their organization’s CVP, for instance, will gradually begin to feel more committed to their organization, as there is a perceived alignment between one’s own values and the values of the organization (Grant, 2012; Grant et al., 2008; Jones, 2010). The alignment of values helps to foster the internalization of one’s role as an employee of the organization and, therefore, becoming a part of their self-concept. Commonly defined as the “perception of oneness with or belongingness to [the organization]” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 34), organizational identification is considered the internalization of an individual’s role as an employee of their organization (Riketta, 2005; Rousseau, 1998). Organizational identification has repeatedly been supported as a result of factors such as organizational prestige and reputation and has been shown to predict outcomes beneficial to the organization’s functioning, such as employee engagement in OCBs and high levels of job involvement (Riketta, 2005; Smidts et al., 2001).

**Empirical Findings on Volunteering**

**Antecedents of Volunteering**

Commonly studied antecedents of volunteering include volunteer demographics, personality, and motivation. For example, findings have suggested that women are more likely than men to volunteer (Rodell et al., 2016; Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1997), and individuals who are older are more likely to volunteer than those who are younger (Peterson, 2004; Rodell et al., 2016). Ethnicity has also been identified as an antecedent
of participation in volunteer initiatives. Findings from Wilson and Musick (1997) indicate that Whites tend to volunteer more than Blacks, which has been suggested is due to socioeconomic factors, such that Blacks tend to be poorer, experience more illness, and are less able to provide help. However, in a study examining the relationship between military service and community service, a positive relationship was found between military service and volunteering among Blacks and Hispanics (Nesbit & Reingold, 2011). Education and socioeconomic status are also positively related to volunteer participation, a finding in which Penner and colleagues (2005) suggest may be a result of individuals with high levels of education having more awareness of the problems faced by others. Alternatively, Wilson and Musick (1997) purport that the positive association may be a result of those high in socioeconomic status having more verbal, writing, and social skills (due to their easier accessibility to resources), making them both more confident and more desirable as volunteers. The last most commonly studied demographic predictor of volunteering is the number of children in a particular household. For example, findings indicated parents with young children at home are more likely to volunteer, but volunteer for fewer hours than those with older children (Rodell et al., 2016; Wilson, 2000).

Another commonly studied antecedent of volunteering involves an individual’s personality. Perhaps unsurprisingly, prosocial personality—the enduring tendency to think about the welfare of others, feel concern and empathy for them, and engage in behaviors that benefit them—is positively related to participation in volunteering initiatives (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). In a review of the literature, it was found that
extraversion and agreeableness were more commonly found in volunteers than non-volunteers, in which Rodell and colleagues (2016) suggest may be explained by the fact that both traits are considered to be other-oriented. Moreover, one’s motivation for participating in volunteer activities has been repeatedly identified as an antecedent of actual acts of volunteering. Motivation has been suggested to be positively associated with volunteer intensity (i.e., extent of volunteer effort; Rodell et al., 2016), commitment to volunteering (Clary & Snyder, 1999), and length of service (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998).

Within the context of work, several job-level and organizational-level antecedents have been identified as predictors of participation in employee volunteering initiatives, including job characteristics, employer-sponsored benefits, organizational-based self-esteem, corporate volunteering climate, and attributions of the organization’s public relations motives. First, Grant (2012) explained that when employees perceive a lack of task significance, identity, autonomy, and feedback in their jobs, they are more likely to seek out activities, such as corporate volunteering, that can provide them with those opportunities for self-enhancement. Interestingly, in their review of the employee volunteering literature, Rodell and colleagues (2016) suggested there is evidence that employees participate in their organization’s CVP because they are searching for meaningfulness not provided by their job, but that they also participate because they are happy with their job. For example, drawing from social exchange theory, employees may be more likely to participate in their employer’s CVP because they see their participation
as a way to reciprocate their appreciation to the organization for providing them with a job that they find to be meaningful and rewarding.

Second, employer-sponsored benefits, which refer to instances of the organization’s support for volunteering, has been shown to be positively related to the number of hours volunteered by employees (Booth et al., 2009; Peterson, 2004; Rodell et al., 2016). Two types of employer support have been identified: time-based support and logistic/financial support. Time-based support is evidenced by an organization providing its employees with time off in order to volunteer or allowing employees to adjust their work schedules so that it can accommodate volunteer activities. Logistic/financial support is provided by organizations when they donate monetary or physical assets in an effort to support employee volunteering initiatives, such as using company facilities or providing prizes of t-shirts.

Third, organizational-based self-esteem is best defined as the perception an individual has of themselves as important, meaningful, and worthwhile within their employing organization. Findings from Mayer and colleagues (2007) found that high organizational-based self-esteem was associated with both more days spent volunteering per year and a longer length of time spent volunteering compared to individuals who had lower levels of organizational-based self-esteem.

Fourth, an organization’s corporate volunteering climate refers to employees’ shared perceptions about the degree to which there is involvement in the organization’s CVP, is fostered through employees’ belief in the cause and corporate policies. Such a climate has been suggested to foster a feeling of collective pride among employees and is
ultimately responsible for employees’ affective organizational commitment and personal volunteering intentions (Rodell et al., 2017). Moreover, corporate volunteering climate has been demonstrated to enhance employees’ feelings of positive emotions, resulting in an increases level of employee work engagement (Zhang et al., 2021). For example, one study found that high levels of intrinsic satisfaction and affective organizational commitment preceded employee participation in organization-initiated volunteer activities (Schaubroeck & Ganster, 1991).

Lastly, participation in employee volunteering initiatives tends to be preceded by attributions the employees make about an organization’s motivation for implementing a CVP. Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac (2015), for instance, found that when employee’s attribute their organization to be motivated by public relations, the traditionally positive attitudes held by employees regarding their organization, such as affective organizational commitment and the company’s prosocial identity, tend to be undermined. Alternatively, findings have illustrated that when employees have positive perceptions of the organization’s motives for engaging in corporate social responsibility practices, levels of organizational cynicism are relatively low (Sheel & Vohra, 2016).

Outcomes of Volunteering

Several commonly studied consequences of volunteering include need satisfaction, interpersonal helping, well-being, and volunteer role identity. It has been suggested that volunteering serves as an opportunity to fulfill the certain needs of individuals, such as the need for accomplishment, the chance to connect with others and
feel a sense of belonging, and providing a sense of purpose (Rodell et al., 2016). Volunteering has also been demonstrated to have a positive effect on interpersonal helping at work (the differences between these two constructs will be discussed in a later chapter). Furthermore, enhanced well-being is another commonly studied outcomes of volunteering, including an increase in positive affect and internal satisfaction (Rodell et al., 2016; Schaubroeck & Ganster, 1991). Lastly, research has identified that individuals are more likely to internalize a volunteer identity if they have the ability to choose the cause they will help and when they perceive the projects they are involved with to be meaningful (van Schie et al., 2019). In fact, volunteer role identity was even identified in a study by Finkelstein and colleagues (2005) to be the strongest predictor of both time spent volunteering and length of service.

Within the context of work, job-related and organizational-related outcomes associated with employee volunteering include employee attitudes toward the organization and company reputation/attractiveness. Employees who participate in their organization’s CVP, for example, tend to identify more strongly with their organization and feel more committed to their employer (Grant, 2012; Grant, 2008; Houghton et al., 2009; Jones, 2010). Company reputation and attractiveness have also been identified as outcomes of employee participation in their organization’s employee volunteering initiatives. For instance, multiple studies have found that employer support for employee volunteering is positively associated with perceptions of the organization’s image and reputation (Basil et al., 2009; Jones & Willness, 2013; Rodell et al., 2016). Company attractiveness has also been supported as a beneficial outcome of
employer initiatives to encourage employee volunteering, as prospective applicants are more likely to apply to organizations that show public support for employee volunteering and giving behavior (Jones & Willness, 2013; Rodell et al., 2016).

Interestingly, the impact of employee volunteering on employee job performance has been mixed. For example, several studies have illustrated that employee engagement in their employer’s CVP tends to result in enhanced task performance, productivity, and OCBs, as well as decreased levels of engagement in CWBs (Caligiuri et al., 2013; Rodell et al., 2016). On the other hand, in line with moral licensing theory, Loi and colleagues (2020) found that employee volunteering was positively related to workplace deviance via the accumulation of moral credits and psychological entitlement. Additionally, by employee’s spending their time participating in volunteer activities, they are spending less time directing their attention toward their formal job responsibilities. As such, participation in employee volunteering activities has the potential to hinder an employee’s job performance.

In sum, given the evidence presented, the consequences of employee volunteering seem to be mixed. The seemingly contradictory findings may be best explained by the employed volunteer’s complex motives. For instance, it has been suggested that employee volunteerism is a result of the combination of egoistic, altruistic, and organizational citizenship motives (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Peloza et al., 2009). Thus, it is possible that an employee’s participation in volunteer activities is determined by a unique combination of their underlying motivations, and that
combination of motives also has implications for the outcomes associated with the volunteering experience.

**Misalignment in Theory and Measurement of Volunteer Motives**

Despite the general agreement among researchers regarding the role one's motives have on both general volunteering outcomes and those specific to employee volunteering, the way in which volunteering motives have been measured in previous studies seems to be inconsistent with the way in which an individual’s motives are theoretically conceptualized. Research in the social sciences has traditionally taken a variable-centered approach, which attempts to provide an explain for the relationships between variables of interest to the researcher in a general population (Howard & Hoffman, 2018). Variable-centered analyses tend to underscore the linear relationships among variables, while largely ignoring the possibility of such variables combining to form structurally unique factors that have the potential to influence relevant outcomes of interest (Gabriel et al., 2015). A quick search for studies that have utilized the VFI demonstrates that an individual’s motives for volunteering are typically examined independently of one another (e.g., Bode & Singh, 2018; Kim et al., 2019; Peloza & Hassay, 2006). In other words, the relationship between each motive and subsequent behaviors and outcomes is examined separately, despite one tenet of the functionalist perspective being that multiple motives may simultaneously coexist. For example, Kim and colleagues (2019) examined how altruistic volunteer motivation (i.e., values motive) and egoistic volunteer motivation (i.e., enhancement motive) differentially predict
volunteer retention. This conceptualization of volunteer motives as either altruistic or egoistic is not practical, as it is possible for both to exist simultaneously. An individual may engage in volunteer activities because they have genuine humanitarian concerns for others but are also interested in seeking out opportunities that may enhance their own self-perception. Essentially, the presence of one motive does not negate the presence of another motive (Clary & Snyder, 1999).

In this dissertation, a person-centered approach is applied to address this shortcoming in the literature posed by the misalignment of theory and measurement. Compared to the variable-centered approach, the person-centered approach identifies “dynamics of emergent subpopulations in a sample based on a set of chosen variables” (Howard & Hoffman, 2018, p. 848). Compared to the variable-centered approach, the person-centered approach does not assume all individuals in the data make up a single population; rather, it takes into account the possibility that subpopulations may exist, in which unique parameters can be estimated (as opposed to averaged; Howard & Hoffman, 2018; Morin et al., 2017). Latent profile analysis (LPA; a type of person-centered approach in which people are grouped into clusters that are indicative of an underlying subpopulation; Lubke & Muthén, 2005) is utilized to create a set of latent profiles that each contain unique constellations of volunteer motives identified by Clary and colleagues (1998). Results from this dissertation are intended to extend the current volunteering literature through the identification of multiple latent profiles that reflect commonalities shared among groups of individuals within the sample. General
hypotheses for possible profiles will be discussed at a later point; for now, the following research question is proposed:

Research Question 1: Do volunteer motives (values, understanding, social, career, protective, enhancement) quantitatively and qualitatively differentiate profiles of volunteer motives?
DISCRETIONARY PROSOCIAL BEHAVIORS AT WORK

Employee volunteering and interpersonal helping (a subdimension of the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) construct) are both considered discretionary prosocial behaviors (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Based on this similarity, this dissertation draws from the OCB literature on helping as part of the theoretical development. This chapter begins with a brief introduction to the interpersonal helping construct, followed by a discussion of the parallels that exist between employee volunteering and interpersonal helping with respect to their conceptualizations, theoretical frameworks, and empirical findings. The final section of this chapter applies findings from the interpersonal helping research to the current corporate volunteering research, with the intention to extend the way in which volunteerism motives are examined.

Interpersonal Helping Behaviors

Since Organ’s (1988) original conceptualization of “altruism” as a dimension of the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) construct, interpersonal helping has been an area of keen interest for both researchers and practitioners, Organ (1997) later relabeled the dimension from “altruism” to “helping,” because it was suggested the former label implied that one’s motive for helping was completed devoid of any self-interest. Consequently, by using the term “helping,” any potential for bias of one’s intent would be mitigated, as the revised term provides no connotation or implication of a person’s true motivation for providing aid. As such, helping behavior is best defined as
“voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems” (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 516).

Prior to highlighting the commonalities shared between the volunteering and interpersonal helping constructs, it is important to point out the key differences between the two discretionary prosocial acts. Volunteering and interpersonal helping can be differentiated from one another based on three factors: (1) the recipient of the help, (2) the duration or period of time in which the helping event occurs, and (3) whether or not the helping event was planned in advance. First, Omoto and Snyder (1995) explain that interpersonal help generally occurs because of a sense of personal obligation to a particular person; on the other hand, most volunteering activities are orchestrated through some organization or third-party, suggesting that it is unlikely the volunteer has had any prior interactions or personal relationship with the person or group they are providing help to. In other words, because the recipients of a volunteer’s service are either strangers or an organization that serves such individuals, it is unlikely that the volunteer is motivated by a sense of personal obligation to the person (Omoto & Snyder, 1995). Second, interpersonal helping tends to be episodic and largely nonroutine, while volunteering is considered to be prosocial action “that continues for an extended period of time” (Penner et al., 2005, p. 375). Lastly, given that providing help is typically sporadic and not generally expected to occur on a regular, routine basis, it can be implied that instances of interpersonal help are largely not planned in advance. Alternatively, as most volunteer activities are prearranged or organized in advanced, it is
fair to assume that volunteering tends to be planned or follow some sort of regular schedule.

When examining these three differentiating factors in unison, it is possible that the level of commitment required up front by volunteering may lend itself to the perception of volunteering seeming more formal than interpersonal helping. Commitment implies that an individual is making a conscious decision to be available at a particular time and place to do a particular activity, likely requiring the restructuring of one’s typical schedule. As such, the commitment needed prior to a helping event within a volunteering context may subsequently appear more intentional or effortful than spur-of-the-moment acts of interpersonal help, which has implications for employees’ perceptions of workload, recognition from leaders, and even the organization’s reputation. The formality or commitment involved in volunteering provides one possible explanation as to why formal volunteering has a positive effect on helping yet helping does not have a positive effect on formal volunteering (Mojza et al., 2011; Rodell et al., 2016).

Relating Volunteerism and Interpersonal Help Behaviors

Despite the differences mentioned above, employee volunteering and interpersonal helping do share several commonalities in terms of their conceptualization, theoretical frameworks, and empirical findings.
Conceptual Similarities

Volunteering is considered, by definition, to be an activity that is intended to help others (Harootyan, 1996). Therefore, it is fair to assume that volunteering can be thought of as a specific type of interpersonal help, as they are both instances of discretionary prosocial behavior (Rioux & Pennner, 2001). Moreover, both behaviors have been purported to be a result of an individual’s motivation to satisfy their specific needs. For example, according to Clary and colleagues (1998), individuals are motivated to participate in volunteering activities as a way of satisfying particular needs (i.e., values, understanding, social, career, protective, enhancement). Helping behaviors, and other OCBs, have also been suggested to be outcomes of one’s motivation(s) to satisfy their needs. For instance, providing help to others satisfies an individual’s need for belongingness and competence, two basic needs outlined by self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). In sum, volunteering and interpersonal help are both examples of discretionary prosocial behaviors and are suggested to be motivated by the desire for needs satisfaction.

Theoretical Similarities

Volunteering and interpersonal helping are both instances of prosocial behavior that can be explained by the functional approach and role identity theory. As referenced in the previous chapter, the functional approach assumes humans are motivated to engage in certain behaviors as a way of satisfying their own personal goals and needs (Rioux & Pennner, 2001; Snyder, 1993). With respect to volunteerism, the functional
approach suggests that an individual’s participation in a volunteering activity can be attributed to the function that particular activity serves to satisfy the volunteer’s needs. Although less commonly used when studying helping, and OCBs more generally (e.g., Lavelle, 2010), findings have suggested that prosocial motives and organizational concern to be significant predictors of interpersonal helping behaviors (Klotz et al., 2018; Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Furthermore, role identity theory can also be utilized to explain instances of volunteering and helping. More specifically, moral identity (the extent to which “being moral is a central or defining characteristic of a person’s sense of self,” Aquino et al., 2011, p. 704) has been identified as an antecedent of both types of prosocial behaviors. Examples of moral traits include helpfulness, fairness, and friendliness (Aquino & Reed, 2002). Specific to volunteering, moral identity has been demonstrated to be positively and significantly related to participating in prosocial cause initiatives on one’s own time (Reed et al., 2007; Reed at et al., 2016). Moreover, evidence has provided support for moral identity as a significant positive predictor of an individual’s engagement in citizenship behaviors, like helping, and a significant negative predictor of an individual’s engagement in deviant behaviors (Matherne & Farmer, 2018).

Empirical Similarities

Given the conceptual and theoretical overlap between volunteering and interpersonal helping, the empirical overlap between the constructs can also be considered.
Antecedents

Several common individual-level predictors of both volunteering and interpersonal helping include personality and job attitudes. For example, prosocial personality—the tendency to think about the welfare of others, express empathy for them, and to act in a way that benefits them—is composed of two dimensions: other-oriented empathy and helpfulness (Penner, 2002; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). The other-oriented dimension of prosocial personality, which refers to one’s prosocial cognitions and feelings, is closely aligned with volunteerism because these are factors inherent to an individual and are not caused by some external circumstance. In other words, individuals who inherently have prosocial thoughts and feelings without being prompted are more likely to seek out and plan time for volunteering activities.

Alternatively, the helpfulness dimension refers to observable prosocial actions, which is more closely aligned with the interpersonal help construct. As previously mentioned earlier in this chapter, helping is more likely to be prompted by feelings of personal obligation, which can be considered an external circumstance, such that helping behaviors occur when prompted. Additionally, evidence has demonstrated that job satisfaction and organizational commitment, both of which are considered positive job attitudes, are significant positive predictors of interpersonal helping and employee volunteering (LePine et al., 2002; Ng & Feldman, 2011; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Schaubroeck & Ganster, 1991).

Although the antecedents mentioned above are all considered to be positive constructs, it is important to acknowledge that both volunteering and interpersonal
helping have the potential to be preceded by more negative circumstances. For example, an employed individual may be motivated to participate in a particular volunteer activity or provide help to coworkers as a result of their self-serving motives (Loi et al., 2020). More precisely, impression management is a commonly cited motive for engaging in prosocial behaviors to enhance their reputation among colleagues and supervisors (Rodell & Lynch, 2016). It is also possible that low levels of job satisfaction may precede involvement in employee volunteering initiatives or instances of helping. Employees may be motivated to seek out opportunities to help others or participate in volunteer initiatives because they perceive a lack of meaningfulness in their job, and thus, are hoping to compensate their job’s perceived lack of meaningfulness with meaningfulness from the engagement in prosocial behaviors (Grant, 2012).

**Consequences**

Volunteering has been demonstrated to enhance an individual’s well-being and task performance (Rodell et al., 2016). For example, one study found that engagement in volunteering activities provided employees with the opportunity to initiate the recovery process, as it serves as a means by which employees can psychologically detach from their work (Mojza et al., 2011). Similarly, helping behaviors have been linked to positive outcomes such as enhanced helper well-being, positive affect, and enhanced task performance (Koopman et al., 2016; Podsakoff et al., 2009). At the organizational level, both instances of prosocial behaviors have been associated with outcomes
considered to beneficial to the organization, including increased unit efficiency and productivity (Caligiuri et al., 2013; Podsakoff et al., 2009).

Volunteering and interpersonal helping also have the potential to result in more negative consequences. According to moral licensing theory, for instance, employees may engage socially desirable activities, such as volunteering or opportunities to help their coworkers, as a way to justify subsequent engagement in deviant behaviors (Loi et al., 2020). As such, deviant behaviors are a possible consequence following employee participation in volunteering activities. Moreover, providing help to others has been demonstrated to result in increased feelings of emotional exhaustion, poor job performance, and reduced personal perceptions of work goal progress (Baumeister et al., 1998; Koopman et al., 2016). Similarly, within the employee volunteering literature, it has also been suggested that engaging in an employer’s CVP distracts the employee from their formal work tasks, ultimately hindering their goal progress (Rodell et al., 2016).

**Integrating Corporate Volunteerism and Interpersonal Help Behaviors**

Based on the evidence provided above, it is evident that the volunteering and interpersonal helping behaviors constructs are closely aligned. While the constructs do differ in terms of the recipient of the help, the duration of the help, and the planning of the help, there is enough overlap with respect to their conceptualizations, theories, and empirical findings that suggest integration of the two literatures is warranted. As such, the following section will discuss the theoretical frameworks used to clarify the
circumstances in which helping leads to positive or negative outcomes. This theory will subsequently be applied to the volunteerism literature, and more specifically, the employee volunteering literature.

The Role of Resources in Providing Interpersonal Help

Resources refer to any “objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued by the individual or that serve as a means for attainment of these objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies” (Hobfoll, 1989, p. 516). Money, energy, interpersonal relationships, and knowledge are all examples of resources. According to the conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989), individuals are motivated to minimize the extent to which they lose their resources. In other words, individuals strive to maintain their resources or to accumulate a surplus of resources, as a means of offsetting the threat of resource loss in the future. For example, an employee who feels sick with a minor cold may choose to not use any of their allotted “sick days,” as they want to save that time off so that can use it later, in the event they become seriously ill. This employee is choosing to retain their level of resources (i.e., “sick days”) in order to compensate for the possible future loss of resources (i.e., using their “sick days” due to serious illness).

The tenet that the accumulation and surplus of resources is beneficial for the individual’s well-being has been well supported by empirical findings. For example, Glomb and colleagues (2011) found that helping others was beneficial in regulating the helper’s mood. This finding was also supported by another study in which providing
help was positively related to an individual’s self-evaluations and mood (Williamson & Clark, 1989). Moreover, as mentioned in the previous chapter, helping behaviors have been linked to positive outcomes such as enhanced helper well-being, positive affect, and enhanced task performance (Koopman et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2020; Podsakoff et al., 2009).

Alternatively, when an individual experiences a loss of resources—even if the loss is only perceived—they are considered to be in a state of depletion (Vohs & Baumeister, 2016). According to depletion theory, an individual’s resources are limited, suggesting that the utilization of one’s resources leaves the individual with fewer resources in the future. Without replenishing one’s resources, the individual will feel increasingly depleted as they continue to use their resources. However, it is important to acknowledge that depletion does not refer to a total loss of resources, and rather, significant resources remain but are being conserved (Vohs & Baumeister, 2016). For instance, runners that exert effort during a race will undoubtedly have less energy compared to before the race. While their energy level has been reduced, their body is still able to exert enough energy to perform necessary biological functions, such as breathing and reducing their heartrate. As such, energy can be considered a significant resource. Because runners’ bodies are conserving the remaining limited energy (i.e., resources) physically needed for vitality, less energy is available for other functions (e.g., critical thinking, problem-solving).

The tenet that the threat of loss or actual loss of resources is harmful to an individual’s well-being has also been well supported by empirical findings. For instance,
findings from Gabriel and colleagues (2018) suggest that providing help depletes the helper of their resources, making them less likely to provide future help and more likely to participate in self-serving acts (e.g., deviant work behaviors). Another study found that when leaders are requested by their subordinates for help, leaders tended to experience enhanced levels of negative affect (Lanaj & Jennings, 2020). It has also been suggested that when an individual provides help, and therefore expends their resources, they are left with fewer resources to devote to regulatory resources, which are important for facilitating focus and resisting impulses to act against some formal or informal standard (Lanaj et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2020).

While COR theory can be used to explain the mixed findings surrounding the outcomes of providing help, it fails to explain the circumstances in which the helper is more likely to feel as if they gained resources from helping or lost resources from helping. However, there is reason to suspect that one’s motivation for helping, such as whether it was due to autonomous or controlled motives, may be able to predict when help results in enrichment or depletion. Autonomous motivation (i.e., intrinsic motivation) refers to behaviors an individual engages in because they genuinely want to, find it interesting, or enjoy it (Kanfer et al., 2017). In other words, there is no external circumstance, such as compensation, that is driving or responsible for one’s behavior. Alternatively, controlled motivation (i.e., extrinsic motivation) is best defined as behaviors an individual engages in for reasons other than inherent enjoyment or interest, such as receiving praise or avoiding punishment (Kanfer et al., 2017).
When successful performance is autonomously motivated, individuals report experiencing enhanced levels of subjective energy and vitality compared to when successful performance is attributed to controlled motives (Nix et al., 1999). More recently, autonomous helping (i.e., aid that is provided because of one’s own internal motivations) has been illustrated to result in greater levels of helper positive affect and well-being, increased helping intentions, and more instances of providing subsequent help to coworkers; alternatively, controlled helping, or aid that is provided because of external motivations, was shown to result in lower levels of helper positive affect and well-being, decreased helping intentions, and fewer instances of providing subsequent help to coworkers (Lin et al., 2020; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Moreover, meta-analytic evidence has demonstrated autonomous motivation to be positively related to personal well-being, and controlled motivation to be positively related to an individual’s level of distress (Slep et al., 2020). Taken together, when autonomously motivated, individuals are more likely to experience renewed vigor, greater positive affect, and enhanced well-being compared to when motivation is controlled. When these findings are examined from the perspective of resources, it seems that the replenishment of resources is plausibly associated with autonomously motivated behaviors. On the other hand, it seems that controlled motivation is plausibly associated with either a loss of resources or conservation of resources.
Application to Employee Volunteerism

According to the functional approach to volunteering (Rioux & Penner, 2001; Snyder, 1993), it is an individual’s desire for need satisfaction that motivates them to volunteer. As noted previously, the following six motives have been identified as antecedents of volunteering participation: values, understanding, social, career, protective, and enhancement (Clary et al., 1998). While the volunteerism literature typically categorizes the six motives as egoistic (i.e., self-interested) or altruistic (i.e., other-interested), this approach (Batson & Shaw, 1991) presents a limited dichotomy that makes the application of findings difficult. The following section details three particular issues with respect to the egoistic and altruistic motives labels.

Altruism and Egoism

First, theorists and researchers across various disciplines tend to examine egoistic motives and altruistic motives as two ends of the same bipolar scale, assuming that high altruistic motivation means low egoistic motivation and vice versa (De Dre & Nauta, 2009). However, according to the cost-reward model (Dovidio et al., 1991), humans instinctively evaluate the costs and benefits associated with performing certain behaviors, like providing help. Such consideration of the self, even if the behavior is performed despite being more costly than beneficial to the helper, suggests that it is unlikely for behavior to be attributed to solely altruistic motive. For example, an employee who identifies as having a strong prosocial orientation may be motivated to provide help to a worker because of their prosocial values; however, they are also likely
to consider the benefits to the self that accompany such behavior, like being seen by others in the department as a helpful or dependable coworker.

Second, the functional approach suggests that volunteering is likely a result of multiple motives that exist simultaneously. Given that the only truly altruistic motive identified by Clary and colleagues (1998) is the values motive, the functional approach seems to imply that it would be relatively rare for a volunteer to be motivated solely due to their prosocial values. Empirical evidence has provided support for the notion that self-concern and other-orientation are two independent constructs, and therefore, are not mutually exclusive (De Dreu & Nauta, 2009).

Lastly, the terms altruistic and egoistic carry connotations and assumptions that have the potential to muddy findings, ultimately leading to problems like misinterpretation. For example, Organ (1997) relabeled the initial “altruism” dimension of OCB to “helping,” as the former label had implications that the helper’s motive was wholly without any self-interest. Moreover, labeling one’s motives for volunteering as egoistic is misleading, as it assumes that if someone is acting out of self-interest, they are unlikely to devote the same level of resources (e.g., compassion, care, concern, effort) to those that the volunteer initiative is intended to benefit compared to those acting out of other-interest. For instance, the career motive identified by Clary and colleagues (1998) refers to the volunteer’s desire to gain career-related experience. The implication that a volunteer is motivated to gain experience relevant to their own career would warrant the career motive to be egoistic. However, by gaining career-related experience, the volunteer is acquiring knowledge and skills that are intended to enhance
their performance at work, ultimately contributing to the organization’s productivity and effectiveness. It is plausible that a highly committed employee would want to also benefit their organization. This also highlights how the altruism label is problematic. If altruistic motives are intended to be other-oriented, then the example previously mentioned would be considered altruistic, even though the “other” is the employing organization and not even the intended beneficiaries of the volunteering effort.

In sum, the classification of volunteer motives as either egoistic or altruistic has limitations based on both theory and empirical evidence. The following section explores how examining volunteering motives as autonomous or controlled—as is commonly done in the interpersonal help research—can provide insight as to which of the volunteer profiles are likely to result in vigor or depletion following employee participation in a volunteer activity.

**Autonomous and Controlled**

Autonomous motivation can be characterized as behavior that is performed because of one’s own interest or enjoyment (Kanfer et al., 2017). In contrast, controlled motivation can be conceptualized as behavior that is performed because of some external circumstance, such as avoiding punishment or receiving rewards (Kanfer et al., 2017). While the autonomous-controlled labels provide an advanced theoretical understanding of the motivation construct, it is unlikely for an individual's motivation to be attributed to solely autonomous or solely controlled origins. Drawing on the six motives for volunteering identified by Clary and colleagues (1998), it is evident that each
motive consists of unique combination of both autonomous and controlled factors. If placed on a continuum from most autonomous/least controlled to least autonomous/most controlled, the following order is expected to emerge: values, understanding, enhancement, protective, career, and social.

The values motive refers to instances in which an individual is compelled to help others as a result of their own internalized values, and thus, is proposed to be the most autonomous and least controlled of the six motives. While it is likely that the values motive can be attributed to some controlled factors, such as societal pressures to be morally upstanding, it is largely a motive that is derived from one’s innate desire and humanitarian concern. Moreover, when the items in the VFI are examined, those that refer to the values motive make no reference to the benefits gained from volunteering, suggesting the lack of outside influence on one’s decision to volunteer.

The understanding motive refers to one’s need for new knowledge and acquiring additional insight, and has been commonly associated with outcomes such as learning and self-development (Clary et al., 1998). An individual’s internal drive for improving their understanding of themselves and others is inherently less autonomous and more controlled than the values motive because of its focus on the benefits that volunteering can provide to the self, such as exploring one’s own strengths and the opportunity to “learn how to deal with a variety of people” (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1520). However, the understanding motive emphasizes how the self-benefits received from volunteering are inherently beneficial to others, such as increased tolerance and acceptance.
The enhancement motive suggests individuals participate in volunteering initiatives as a way to improve their self-esteem. Given that one's self-esteem is fundamentally grounded in one’s own evaluation of the self (Baumeister et al., 2003), the enhancement motive suggests that an individual participates in an organization’s volunteering opportunities to benefit their own self-interest. Moreover, a quick glance at the VFI items for the enhancement motive indicate that its focus is on how one’s participation in volunteering activities is beneficial to the self and one’s self-concept (e.g., “makes me feel important”). As such, the enhancement motive is considered more controlled than the understanding motive because of the increased awareness of the “rewards” to the self that volunteering can provide.

The protective motive implies that an individual will participate in volunteering initiatives because they want to reduce their own feelings of guilt for being more fortunate than others or to “protect the ego from negative features of the self” (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1518). When compared to the enhancement motive, the protective motive can be classified as more controlled because of its desire to subvert unpleasant feelings caused by comparisons with others. Drawing from cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), inconsistent perceptions and psychological discomfort tend to motivate an individual’s behaviors in an attempt to rectify such a state of unpleasantness. Therefore, the protective motive is driven less by one’s own willingness and more by one’s need to be alleviated of displeasure, which can be considered a reward offered by volunteering.
Individuals who identify with the career motive are driven to participate in volunteer activities because they view their involvement as an opportunity to gain career-related skills. For example, a volunteer activity that requires coordinating and allocating resources to various groups may help improve an individual's understanding of departmental budgeting at work. Career-related benefits, such as the sense of attainment and advancement, are at least partially influenced by external standards, like how others view or evaluate the individual. For example, when successful at work, it is likely that one will receive social approval as evidenced through praise from one's supervisor and coworkers or receiving a promotion (Shacter, 1945). Based on motivation theories, social approval is considered valuable to an individual as it can satisfy one's inherent need for belonging, and ultimately contribute to the individual's optimal functioning (Deci & Ryan, 2000). While it is possible that a volunteer may value their career and consider their work to be a central part of their identity, the career motive is more likely to be driven by controlled needs than more autonomous needs, like the protective motive, due to its relevance to adhere to societal standards.

The social motive for volunteering explains that volunteer participation is driven by an individual's need for meaningful relationships with others. Examples of the social motive include volunteering to spend time with friends or to be favorably viewed by others. When comparing the social motive and career motive for volunteering, the career motive can be considered more autonomous due to the fact that one may consider their career to be a central part of their identity and self-concept, and therefore, more intrinsically motivating. For instance, as described by Shacter (1945), an
individual can obtain a sense of accomplishment, even when others are not present, because the self is aware of the accomplishment. Within the context of volunteer motives, this would suggest that career motives can fulfill one’s need for accomplishment, even without recognition or rewards from others. In contrast, a closer examination of the VFI items related to the social motive (e.g., “People I’m close to want me to volunteer”) reveals that none of the items acknowledge one’s own internal desire to volunteer; rather, the items illustrate that an individual’s decision to volunteer is derived from either trying to please others or impression management. As such, the social motive is postulated as the most controlled of all six motives for volunteering.

Based on the earlier discussion regarding the role autonomous and controlled motivation play in predicting future helping intentions and helper affect, autonomous motivation appears to be closely aligned with resource replenishment while controlled motivation appears to be closely aligned with resource depletion and/or conservation. Intrinsic (i.e., autonomous) motivation has been shown to positively and significantly predict job attitudes, such as affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Eby et al., 2010). Such findings suggest that those inherently motivated by their work are more involved in their organization because they want to be there. In other words, employees that are intrinsically motivated are likely to exert more of their resources into their efforts because they find the work to be personally meaningful; thus, the employee anticipates resource replenishment from the work itself. Previous research, for example, has found that those who participated in formal volunteer activities arranged by an organization due to altruistic concerns (i.e., values motive) were shown to also provide
more assistance than their non-altruistically motivated counterparts in more informal settings, such as helping a neighbor or family member (Wilson & Musick, 1997). As such, the following relationships are hypothesized:

**Hypothesis 1a:** Profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives will be more likely to experience vigor following their volunteer participation compared to their less autonomous counterparts.

**Hypothesis 1b:** Profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives will be less likely to experience depletion following their volunteer participation compared to their less autonomous counterparts.

Employee volunteers who have controlled motivations are driven by extrinsic forces to volunteer in their organization’s CVP. Findings (e.g., Stukas et al., 1999) suggest that those who are externally motivated are less likely to exert their resources into their efforts because they do not have genuine interest or enjoy their work; rather, they are volunteering because they feel like it is expected of them or as a way to impress others. Thus, they do not anticipate resource replenishment from the work itself and must prioritize the conservation of their available resources.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Profiles with greater levels of more controlled motives will be less likely to experience vigor following their volunteer participation compared to their less controlled counterparts.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Profiles with greater levels of more controlled motives will be more likely to experience depletion following their volunteer participation compared to their less controlled counterparts.
It is also possible that certain profiles may not depict extreme levels of autonomous or controlled motives, and instead, may reflect low, moderate, or high levels across both autonomous and controlled motives. For example, a profile with relatively low levels across all six motives may be reflective of a situation in which an employee participates in a volunteer activity for reasons that do not fall within the six motives classified by Clary and colleagues (1998). In fact, despite the fact that altruistic motives have routinely been cited as one of the primary sources of motivation for personal volunteering, findings have demonstrated that the values motive is considered less prevalent a motive when examined within the context of employee volunteering (Peloza et al., 2009).

Alternatively, it is also possible that profiles may emerge in which moderate or high levels across both autonomous and controlled motives are identified. For example, a profile with moderate levels or high levels across motives may be reflective of a situation in which an employee's participation in a volunteer activity is driven equally by both more autonomous and controlled motives. This suggests that the employed volunteer considers the more autonomous motives to be of similar importance to the more controlled motives. It is expected that such profiles are less likely to experience strong relationships with either vigor or depletion, as the opposing effects of the motives serve to cancel one another, ultimately rendering both effects null.

There are multiple other profiles that could possibly emerge. As such, other possible profiles, including if profiles emerge in which neither more autonomous nor more controlled motives are dominant or if there are mixed autonomous and controlled
motives, and the relationship between such profiles and vigor/depletion will be examined in an exploratory manner.
The conceptualization of job performance has greatly evolved over the past 40 years. At the core of job performance is what is commonly referred to as task performance, or the effectiveness in which an individual performs the duties required of their job (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997). Yet, it has since been demonstrated that when supervisors rate employee performance, they tend to consider factors beyond that of just task performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). The model of job performance was initially expanded to include the contextual performance (i.e., organizational citizenship behaviors; OCB) dimension, which is described as an employee’s extra-role behaviors, or behaviors performed by an employee that are not formally rewarded and outside of their job description that contribute to the organization’s functioning (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Organ, 1997). A third dimension was also later added to the performance model called counterproductive work behaviors (CWB), which are considered to be any intentional behavior performed by an employee that violates, inflicts harm, or defies the interests of the organization or its stakeholders (Sackett, 2002). Previous theory and empirical evidence have suggested that an employee’s participation in extra-role behaviors (i.e., OCB) and deviant work behaviors (i.e., CWB) is, at least partially, determined by the level of self-regulatory resources an employee possesses (Vohs & Baumeister, 2016).
Self-Regulatory Resources

Self-regulation is the process in which an individual engages to exert control over oneself and, more specifically, to bring the self into accordance with socially desirable standards (e.g., organization policies and procedures; Bandura, 1977; Carver & Scheier, 1982; Vohs & Baumeister, 2016). Essentially, any attempt to adjust or control one’s own thoughts, feelings, or behaviors is considered a form of self-regulation. For instance, an individual who is focusing their attention on a specific work task is considered to be engaging in self-regulation, because they must put forth effort to ignore potential distractions. Given that one's ability to self-regulate provides an individual with the opportunity to obtain resources of value (e.g., job promotion), self-regulation itself can also be considered a resource. Like other resources, self-regulatory resources also have the potential to be depleted. As briefly described at the beginning of this chapter, the depletion of self-regulatory resources causes a cycle in which additional resources must be allocated to self-regulatory processes, thereby further reducing an individual’s available resources. As such, the following sections explore how an individual’s level of resources can be used to subsequently predict employee engagement in OCBs and CWBs.

Resources and Participation in Discretionary Organizational Behaviors

While cognitive ability has consistently been shown to be the best predictor of task performance (Chernyshenko et al., 2011; Ree et al., 1994; Schmidt & Hunter, 2004), factors such as personality, affect, and job attitudes are more predictive of discretionary
organizational behaviors, like OCB and CWB (Judge et al., 2006; Lee & Allen, 2002; Smith et al., 1983). Given the importance supervisors and organizations place on an employee’s discretionary behaviors, it is evident that a better understanding of the predictors resulting in such outcomes are of keen interest to both researchers and practitioners. The following paragraphs explore the OCB and CWB constructs in greater detail, in which antecedents, such as an individual’s level of resources, and consequences of both types of discretionary work behaviors are highlighted. The hypothesized effects an employee’s motivation profile has on predicting their subsequent engagement in OCB and CWB are also considered.

Motivation Profiles and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

OCB refers to any employee behavior that supports the functioning of the social and psychological environment in which core task performance occurs (Organ, 1997). The OCB construct is made up of five dimensions: helping, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue (Organ, 1988). First, helping, as earlier described, is best defined as providing assistance to others. Second, courtesy refers to the behaviors engaged in that demonstrate consideration for others, such as when an individual provides a presenter with their full attention instead of engaging in other distractions (e.g., conversations, web surfing). Third, sportsmanship is defined as one’s willingness to refrain from complaining when in circumstances that are less than ideal and abstains from making “mountains out of molehills.” For example, an employee is demonstrating sportsmanship when they refrain from complaining about the extra workload they had
to take on because a coworker was out sick. Fourth, conscientiousness (i.e., compliance) is reflected in employee behavior that shows they accept and respect the rules and procedures of the organization, such as arriving to work on time. Lastly, civic virtue refers to instances in which the employee takes an active interest in the activities of the organization, such as attending a local fundraiser sponsored by the organization.

Meta-analytic evidence supports positive job attitudes, including job satisfaction, perceived fairness, organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness, as significant antecedents of OCB (Lee & Allen, 2002; LePine et al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995). In fact, analogous to the general factor of cognitive ability being the best predictor of task performance, Organ and Ryan (1995) suggest that an underlying general morale factor may be the best predictor of extra-role performance. Such findings would imply that an individual’s morale, which is a collective of positive attitudes (e.g., enthusiasm, confidence, loyalty), is a particularly significant antecedent of an employee’s citizenship behaviors.

When considered through the lens of resource-based theories, employees who are autonomously motivated to volunteer are likely to put forth effort, thereby utilizing some of their resources. However, because they find the work to be purposeful or enjoyable, these employees experience resource replenishment (i.e., vigor) rather than depletion as a result of their inherent interest in the volunteer work or the motive it fulfills. Empirical evidence supports that a surplus of resources tends to result in common antecedents of OCB, including increased levels of vigor, positive job attitudes
(e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment), and enhanced well-being (Lin et al., 2020; Nix et al., 1999; Slemp et al., 2020).

Resource replenishment suggests a greater level of self-regulatory resources, implying that fewer resources must be devoted to self-regulation processes, like remaining focused. As such, fewer resources must be conserved, and more resources can be devoted to behaviors beyond simply task performance. As such, it is expected that vigor will be positively related to OCB. On the other hand, resource depletion via controlled motivation suggests that more resources must be conserved, and therefore, fewer resources can be devoted to behaviors beyond task performance. As such, it is expected that depletion will be negatively related to OCB. Thus, the following hypothesis is presented (see Figure 1):

Hypothesis 3a: Profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives will be more likely to experience vigor following their volunteering participation, subsequently leading to greater engagement in OCBs than their less autonomous counterparts.

Hypothesis 3b: Profiles with greater levels of more controlled motives will be less likely to experience vigor following their volunteering participation, subsequently leading to less engagement in OCBs than their less controlled counterparts.
CWB refers to any behavior intentionally performed by an employee that has the potential to harm the organization or its stakeholders (Sackett, 2002). The CWB construct is suggested to be made up of five dimensions: production deviance, sabotage, theft, withdrawal, and abuse. First, production deviance is best defined as an employee’s intentional failure to perform their job tasks effectively the way in which they should be performed. For instance, an employee may engage in production deviance when they purposely work slower than they are capable of because they know they will not get compensated for surpassing the daily production quota. Second, sabotage is the defacing or destroying the employer’s physical property, such as intentionally breaking an
organization-owned computer. Third, theft refers to any instance in which an employee takes property that does not belong to them, such as taking home a printer without permission when one’s personal printer at home breaks. Fourth, withdrawal is considered any attempt by an employee to disengage from the workplace. Withdrawal can be exhibited in a number of ways, but the most commonly studied include absenteeism (i.e., lack of physical presence at work) and lateness. Fifth, abuse is defined as harmful behaviors directed toward others that elicits physical and/or psychological harm. Examples of abuse can vary widely, ranging anywhere from making unkind comments to workplace violence (e.g., physical fighting).

Empirical findings have illustrated common antecedents of CWB include frustration, person-environment (PE) misfit, environmental stressors, negative emotions, and organizational constraints (Harold et al., 2016; Meier & Spector, 2013; Spector & Fox, 2005). More specifically, acts of CWB targeted at the organization (CWB-O; i.e., production deviance, sabotage, theft, withdrawal) tend to be motivated by feelings of fatigue, hostility, boredom, and feelings of depression (Spector et al., 2006). On the other hand, acts of CWB targeted at individual stakeholders (CWB-I; i.e., abuse and incivility), like coworkers, supervisors, clients, and customers, tend to occur as a result of more intense emotions and preceding circumstances than acts of CWB-O (e.g., anger, furiousness, perceptions of injustice, experienced incivility, and interpersonal conflict; Krischer et al., 2010; Rosen et al., 2016; Spector et al., 2006).

The outcomes of CWB have the potential to harm the organization’s functioning. For example, one study found that experienced incivility is associated with a reduced
sense of self-control, which then spurs retaliatory incivility, as a way of regaining the self-control the individual felt was previously threatened (Rosen et al., 2016). Incivility has also been shown to hinder task performance and employee engagement by depleting the victim of their cognitive processing resources (Cortina et al., 2017). Interestingly, research has also suggested that employee engagement in CWBs has the potential to result in positive outcomes for the employee (Klotz et al., 2013). For instance, findings from Krischer and colleagues (2010) demonstrated that the relationship between perceptions of low distributive justice and emotional exhaustion was actually buffered by the employee’s engagement in production deviance and withdrawal behaviors.

When considered through the lens of resource-based theories, providing help has the potential to be viewed as a depleting act. Based on COR theory, depletion triggers the employee’s need to restore their resources and eliminate the deficiency. Gabriel and colleagues (2018) found that an employee’s depleted resources from providing help made them more likely to engage in self-serving acts and less likely to provide future help. For instance, when an employee feels they are being underpaid by their employer may retaliate against the organization by stealing a computer from the office. In that particular instance, the employee has stolen the computer as a way to “even the score” with their employer. Acts of CWB also have the potential to serve as a coping mechanism for some employees, and in some cases, even result in positive consequences for the perpetrator. For example, an employee who is feeling stressed at work might take a 10-minute break during the day to surf the internet. While this is considered off-task behavior, by taking the time to replenish their resources by detaching from their work
for a brief period of time, the employee can subsequently apply more resources to their work following the break, helping to facilitate improved levels of job performance (Klotz et al., 2013).

Employees who identify their motivation for volunteering as controlled are less likely to put forth as much effort as their autonomously motivated counterparts. More specifically, they are less willing to utilize their resources, because they are driven by external rather than internal factors, leading to resource depletion rather than resource replenishment. For example, an employee who participates in a volunteer activity because they see their coworkers doing so (i.e., social motives) is not inherently motivated by the volunteer opportunity. As the employee is choosing to volunteer for a reason other than their own inherent interest, their lack of genuine desire to participate in the volunteer activity reflects that they do not view their participation as a function for motive satisfaction. Thus, when an employed volunteer participates in an activity largely driven by controlled motives, the employee is expending their resources yet not gaining any in return, making it more likely they experience resource depletion rather than replenishment. Empirical evidence supports that a deficiency of resources tends to result in common antecedents of CWB, including decreased levels of vigor, negative affect, and feelings of distress (Lin et al., 2020; Nix et al., 1999; Slemp et al., 2020). Resource depletion suggests a lower level of self-regulatory resources, such that more resources must be devoted to self-regulation processes, such as remaining focused and resisting impulses to act against socially desirable standards. As such, it is expected that depletion will be positively related to CWB. On the other hand, resource replenishment
via autonomous motivation suggests that more resources can be devoted to self-regulation processes, and therefore, the individual will be less likely to engage in deviant acts, such as CWB. As such, it is expected that vigor will be negatively related to CWB. Thus, the following hypothesis is presented (see Figure 2):

*Hypothesis 4a*: Profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives will be less likely to experience depletion following their volunteering participation, subsequently leading to less engagement in CWBs than their less autonomous counterparts.

*Hypothesis 4b*: Profiles with greater levels of more controlled motives will be more likely to experience depletion following their volunteering participation, subsequently leading to greater engagement in CWBs than their less controlled counterparts.
As previously mentioned, it is also possible that certain profiles may not depict extreme levels of autonomous or controlled motives, and instead, may reflect low, moderate, or high levels across both autonomous and controlled motives. Given that these profiles and their relationships with both vigor and depletion will be examined in an exploratory manner, their distal effects on employee engagement in OCBs and CWBs will also be examined in such a manner.
METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited from several different sources. Regardless of source, in order to participate in this study, participants were required to be employed full-time (approximately 40 hours per week), be at least 18 years old, and had volunteered at some point within the past year. 332 participants were initially sourced through Prolific, an online large-scale data collection platform that connects researchers with eligible participants. A total of four incomplete responses were excluded, as were an additional 33 responses for failing to correctly answer at least one of two attention check items. The final sample from Prolific ($n = 295$) consisted of approximately 52% males, was made up 79% of individuals who self-identified as White, and reported working, on average, 42.87 hours a week ($SD = 5.74$).

Participants were also recruited from a corporate volunteer program offered to employees of a multi-site healthcare system in the southeast region of the United States. Leveraging the same criteria mentioned above, 261 participants were initially sourced from the employer-sponsored program. A total of 13 incomplete responses were excluded, as well as 74 responses for incorrectly answering at least one of two attention check items. The final sample from the multi-site healthcare system ($n = 174$) consisted of approximately 50% males, was 49% White, and worked an average of 41.67 hours per week ($SD = 9.48$).
Lastly, participants were recruited from a local chapter of a national non-profit organization. Applying the same eligibility requirements mentioned previously, a total of 15 participants were recruited. Four responses were excluded for incorrectly responding to more than one of two attention check items. As such, a final sample of 11 participants was retained that consisted of approximately 27% males, was 73% White, and worked, on average, 45.91 hours per week ($SD = 7.35$).

The final collective sample across all three sources resulted in a total of 480 participants and consisted of approximately 40% males, was 68% White, and worked an average of 42.47 hours per week ($SD = 7.37$). Corporate volunteers made up 54.00% of the sample, and personal volunteers accounted for the remaining 46.00%. Differences between the corporate and personal volunteers on variables of interest to this dissertation can be found in Table 1.
Table 1: Comparison of Corporate and Personal Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Corporate Volunteers</th>
<th>Personal Volunteers</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>3.69 (1.64)</td>
<td>3.99 (1.60)</td>
<td>-2.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>6.01 (1.00)</td>
<td>5.73 (1.16)</td>
<td>2.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>2.81 (1.59)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.42)</td>
<td>3.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.03 (1.63)</td>
<td>3.70 (1.62)</td>
<td>2.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>4.92 (1.49)</td>
<td>4.61 (1.53)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>4.46 (1.62)</td>
<td>4.44 (1.49)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous motivation</td>
<td>5.34 (1.11)</td>
<td>5.21 (1.08)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled motivation</td>
<td>2.17 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.04 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>3.54 (0.76)</td>
<td>3.55 (0.79)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>1.66 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.83 (0.79)</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>5.29 (1.09)</td>
<td>4.29 (1.20)</td>
<td>9.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>1.10 (0.32)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.30)</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (*) indicates a t-value significant at p < .05. (**) indicates a correlation significant at p < .01. OCB= organizational citizenship behaviors; CWB = counterproductive work behaviors.

At the time of completing the survey, 64.38% of respondents reported having most recently volunteered within the past month. Over half of the sample (59.76%) reported having previous experience volunteering with the particular external nonprofit or charitable group, and most volunteer activities (70.42%) consisted of 30 volunteers or less. Table 2 provides additional volunteer activity-related information reported by the sample.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Volunteer Experience Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Employee Volunteers n = 480</th>
<th>Corporate Volunteers n = 259</th>
<th>Personal Volunteers n = 221</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How physically demanding was the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How mentally demanding was the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How emotionally demanding was the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours did you spend volunteering on this particular occasion?</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* First three items were measured using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all demanding*) to 5 (*extremely demanding*). The fourth item asked participants to type the number into a text box.

Procedure

All respondents were asked to complete an online survey in which they would be asked about their most recent volunteer experience. The survey consisted of two primary components. The first included items related to the volunteer's most recent volunteer experience, such as their motives for volunteering, the type of volunteering (i.e., corporate or personal), how many hours they spent volunteering, and the extent to
which they felt invigorated and/or depleted following the activity. The second component of the survey referred to the employee’s behavior upon their return to work following their experience volunteering. More specifically, participants were asked to self-report their engagement in prosocial and/or deviant work behaviors.

Participants recruited via Prolific were initially compensated $0.50 for their time spent completing an initial screening questionnaire to ensure they satisfied the eligibility criteria for this study. Upon their completion of the screening questionnaire, eligible respondents were invited to participate in the study’s online survey and received $4.00 as compensation for their time upon completion. Participants recruited via other sources were not provided with compensation for their participation in this study.

**Measures**

A full list of items for each measure is provided in Appendix A.

**Volunteer Experience**

Participants were asked to recall their most recent volunteer experience and were subsequently presented with a series of items related to that experience. Sample items include “How many hours did you spend volunteering on this particular occasion?” and “Had you volunteered with that specific external nonprofit or charitable group before participating in the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?” Respondents were also asked to select whether their most recent experience was employer- or self-initiated
(i.e., personal volunteering), or if unsure, could provide additional details in a text box. Responses provided via the text box feature were individually inspected and recoded to align with either corporate or personal volunteering where appropriate. A full list of items and corresponding response scales are provided in Appendix A.

Volunteering Motives

To measure an individual’s motives for volunteering, the 30-item Volunteering Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary et al., 1998) was utilized. Each motive for volunteering (values ($\alpha = .85$), understanding ($\alpha = .89$), social ($\alpha = .89$), career ($\alpha = .65$), protective ($\alpha = .88$), enhancement ($\alpha = .91$)) is assessed using five items. For instance, a sample item for the social motive includes, “My friends volunteer.” Responses were recorded using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from one (not at all important or accurate) to seven (extremely important or accurate).

Autonomous/Controlled Motives

The Volunteer Motivation Scale (VMS; Li et al., 2016; Millette & Gagné, 2008) was used to inspect the validity of the previously described theoretical argument that classified each motive identified by VFI as either more controlled or more autonomous. More specifically, the VMS draws upon self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000), suggesting that autonomous and controlled motivation are each comprised of two subconstructs. According to SDT, autonomous motivation is best represented as a
composite of intrinsic motivation and identified regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2004). Intrinsic motivation, which refers to participating in an activity for the sake of it, was assessed using a three-item scale. An example item includes “Because I enjoy volunteering very much.” Identified regulation refers to participating in an activity because it carries personal meaning or relates to one’s goals. A three-item scale was used to measure identified regulation, including “Because this is a way of developing myself.”

On the other hand, SDT suggests that controlled motivation is best represented as a composite of external regulation and introjected regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2004). External regulation, which refers to participation in an activity to receive a reward or to avoid a punishment, was assessed using a three-item scale. An example item includes “Because I’ll get into trouble if I don’t.” Introjected regulation can be defined as participating in an activity out of guilt or because one perceives that it carries implications for self-worth. A three-item scale was used to measure introjected regulation, including “Because I would feel bad about myself if I didn’t.”

Responses were collected using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to seven (strongly agree). Scores for autonomous motivation (α = .64) were derived by averaging the subscale scores of intrinsic motivation and identified regulation. Alternatively, scores for controlled motivation (α = .65) were derived by averaging the subscale scores of external regulation and introjected regulation.
Vigor

Vigor was assessed using an adapted six-item subscale of the Work and Well-Being Survey (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2006; $\alpha = .86$). A sample item includes, “I felt I was bursting with energy.” Responses were collected using a five-point Likert scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

Depletion

Depletion was measured using a five-item scale (Lanaj et al., 2014; $\alpha = .93$). A sample item includes, “I felt drained.” Responses were collected using a five-point Likert scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

To measure engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), the 16-item scale ($\alpha = .79$) developed by Lee and Allen (2002) was utilized. The measure is divided into two subscales: OCBs in which the organization is the intended target (OCB-O) and OCBs in which other individuals are the intended target (OCB-I). A sample item for the OCB-O subscale includes, “Express loyalty toward the organization.” Responses were recorded using a seven-point frequency scale ranging from one (never) to seven (always).
Counterproductive Work Behaviors

To measure engagement in counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), the 32-item Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C; Spector et al., 2010; $\alpha = .97$) was used. The measure is divided into five subscales, each of which reflect a dimension of CWB (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, withdrawal) identified by Spector and colleagues (2006). A sample item for the sabotage dimension includes, “Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies.” Responses were recorded using a five-point frequency scale ranging from one (never) to five (every day).

Analytic Approach

A latent profile analysis (LPA) approach was used to answer Research Question 1. As previously mentioned, the goal of LPA is to identify the different subpopulations or groups found within a population, where each group represents a construct-based profile with a unique composition of individual attributes (Spurk et al., 2020). One advantage of using a person-centered approach over a variable-centered approach includes the opportunity to observe more nuanced patterns among variables that may be harder to detect when using a variable-centered approach (Bennett et al., 2016; Gabriel et al., 2015). Moreover, while a variable-centered approach tends to assume homogeneity across a sample, a person-centered approach can better capture the heterogeneity across a sample and therefore identify circumstances in which differential outcomes may be explained by subgroup membership.
Per best practice recommended by the literature (Vermunt, 2010; McLarnon & O’Neill, 2018; Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014), a three-step approach of mixture modeling with distal outcomes was conducted using Mplus 8.1 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017) to examine the relationships between the latent profiles and related outcomes of interest. The first step of the three-step approach is commonly referred to as profile enumeration, in which the number of profiles in the model is iteratively specified and estimated with the robust maximum likelihood (MLR). Two latent profiles were initially specified (Nylund et al., 2007), and additional latent profiles were subsequently added to the model until the fit indices indicated that the addition of another latent profile was unwarranted.

After the optimal number of profiles had been specified, the BCH (Bakk & Vermunt, 2016) approach was applied. When including auxiliary variables in the analysis, the traditional three-step approach runs the risk of confounding the latent profiles with the auxiliary variables, such that profile membership is influenced by the effects of the auxiliary variable as opposed to just the indicator variables (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2021). The weights produced by the BCH approach are subsequently applied to the sample along with the auxiliary variables, and the profiles are estimated again to ensure there are no shifts in profiles. Numerous studies including field samples and simulated samples (e.g., Asparouhov & Muthén, 2018; McLarnon & O’Neill, 2018; Spurk et al., 2020) have identified the BCH approach as advantageous when estimating continuous distal outcomes. Lastly, mediation analyses were conducted to estimate the indirect effect of each profile on OCB and CWB via vigor and depletion.
RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

To investigate the credibility of the theorized order in which this dissertation’s hypotheses were based on, correlation analyses were performed for each of the subdimensions identified by the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary et al., 1998) with autonomous and controlled motivation. The correlations and reliabilities for each form of motivation, as well as the other hypothesized variables, are reported in Table 3.

Figure 3 illustrates the hypothesized order of the VFI motives and the actual order of the VFI motives based on the correlation analyses. More specifically, the correlations demonstrated that the six VFI motives, from most autonomous to least autonomous, are as follows: understanding (r = .62, p < .01), enhancement (r = .57, p < .01), values (r = .47, p < .01), protective (r = .46, p < .01), career (r = .36, p < .01), and social (r = .25, p < .01). Such findings are generally aligned with the originally hypothesized order, with the exception that the values motive was expected to have strongest positive correlation with autonomous motivation. Correlations also revealed that the six VFI motives, from most controlled to least controlled, are as follows: career (r = .37, p < .01), social (r = .25, p < .01), protective (r = .19, p < .01), enhancement (r = .18, p < .01), understanding (r = -.06, n.s.), and values (r = -.15, p < .01). Results were generally consistent with the originally hypothesized order, with the exception that the social motive was expected to have the strongest positive correlation with controlled motivation.
Interestingly, while the values, understanding, and enhancement motives were expected to be more strongly related to autonomous motivation as opposed to controlled motivation, such a relationship between the protective motive and autonomous motivation was unexpected. It should also be noted that the career motive demonstrated nearly equal relationships in terms of strength, direction, and significance with both autonomous and controlled motivation. Moreover, the social motive exhibited the exact same correlation with both autonomous and controlled motivation. Implications of these findings are discussed in a later section; however, the general agreement between the hypothesized order of the VFI motives and the order demonstrated by the correlation analyses offers preliminary support for the theoretical argument from which this study’s hypotheses were derived.

**Figure 3: Volunteer Motives on Autonomous/Controlled C**
### Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlation (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protective motive</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Values motive</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.33** (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Career motive</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.45** .10* (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social motive</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.31** .06 .47** (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understanding motive</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.48** .39** .48** .35** (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhancement motive</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.60** .24** .47** .39** .63** (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Autonomous motivation</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.46** .47** .36** .25** .62** .57** (.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.29** .45** .17** .16** .41** .39** .83** (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Identified regulation</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.49** .37** .39** .27** .63** .57** .89** .48** (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Controlled motivation</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.19** -.15** .37** .25** .06 .18** -.11* -.27** .05 (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. External regulation</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.07 -.16** .32** .20** .03 .70 -.13** -.22** -.03 .83** (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Introjected regulation</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.24** -.11* .32** .23** .07 .22** -.06 -.24** .10* .89** .49** (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vigor</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-.35** -.27** .24** .21** -.35** -.37** -.43** .39** -.36** .02 -.03 .06 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Depletion</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-.20** -.15** .03 -.06 -.03 -.23** -.35** -.26** .44** .37** .39** -.26** (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. OCB</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.15** .37** .18** .16** .34** .18** .34** .37** .23** -.08 -.03 -.09* .31** -.23** (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. CWB</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.10* -.10* .10** .14** .00 .07 -.12* -.14** -.07 .39** .34** .33** -.01 .32** -.07 (.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Reliabilities are reported in parentheses along the diagonal. (**) indicates a correlation significant at p < .01. (*) indicates a correlation significant at p < .05. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors; CWB = counterproductive work behaviors. n = 480.
Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted using the lavaan package in R (vo.6-7; Rosseel, 2012). Best practices outlined in the literature (e.g., Graves et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2017) recommend performing a CFA prior to utilizing the latent profile analysis (LPA) approach to verify that the expected factor structure informed by theory is empirically represented (Spurk et al., 2020). The following recommendations provided by Bandalos and Finney (2010) were used as heuristics for evaluating model fit: $\chi^2$, n.s.; standardized root mean squared error (SRMR) < .08; Tucker-Lewis index/comparative fit index (TLI/CFI) $\geq$ .95; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) $\leq$ .05.

To ensure that the six-factor model identified by the VFI scale (Clary et al., 1998) was the most appropriate structure from which to estimate profiles, a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted using the lavaan package (vo.6-7; Rosseel, 2012) in R. Fit statistics were compared across all variants of the model, including a one-factor model (all scale items loaded onto one factor), two-factor model (the three more autonomous/less controlled motives onto one factor and the three less autonomous/more controlled motives onto another factor), and the hypothesized 6-factor model. Model fit indices for each model variant can be found in Table 4. CFA results demonstrated that the 6-factor model had the best fit and was the most appropriate structure from which to create profiles compared to the one-factor model and the two-factor models. While considered the best fit of the three models, several of
the fit indices did not meet the recommended criteria offered by Bandalos and Finney (2010); this limitation is discussed in more detail in the Discussion section.

*Table 4: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Model Fit Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(M1) General factor model</td>
<td>2301.99</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M2) Two correlated factors</td>
<td>2088.31</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M3) Six correlated factors</td>
<td>877.77</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 480. df = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; SRMR = standardized root mean squared error.*

**Primary Analyses**

To identify the optimal number of profiles for the model, several iterations were performed and compared. Table 5 includes the fit statistics provided from each iteration. Previous research (e.g., Bennett et al., 2016; Nylund et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2017) has found that, in addition to theoretical consideration, the following heuristics can be leveraged to identify the ideal profile solution: smaller Akaike information criterion (AIC), Bayesian information criterion (BIC), and sample-size- adjusted BIC (SSA-BIC) statistics in comparison to other solutions; an entropy value greater than or equal to .80; a significant ($p < .05$) Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio Test (LMRT), indicating that the addition of one more profile significantly improves model fit; and verifying that there is no redundancy in the profile solution, as evidenced by profiles that are comprised of less than 5% of the sample or contain fewer than 25 individuals from the sample.
Analyses revealed that the three-profile model fit the data significantly better than the two- and four-profile solutions. The decreasing AIC, BIC, and SSA-BIC and profiles with no less than 5% of the data all supported the addition of another profile. However, the non-significant \( p = .07 \) LMRT value indicated that the addition of a fourth profile to the model would not improve model fit enough to warrant the decrease in model parsimony. As such, the three-profile solution indicated a sufficient entropy value of .80, smaller AIC, BIC, and SSA-BIC values compared to the two-profile solution, and a significant LMRT value indicating that the addition of a third profile significantly improved model fit.

The means and standard deviations for each of the profiles across the six VFI motives can be found in Table 6 and are represented graphically in Figure 4. Prior to discussing each profile individually, several trends across the profiles are discussed. First, it should be noted that all three profiles identified the values motive to be most important when making their decision to volunteer, and the career motives was consistently rated as the least important VFI factor when making their decision to volunteer. Moreover, all three profiles consistently rated the understanding motive as a more important factor in making their decision to volunteer compared to the
enhancement motive, and the enhancement motive was reported as more important than the protective motive. Each profile is described in greater detail below.

Table 6: Profile Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Protective (SD)</th>
<th>Values (SD)</th>
<th>Career (SD)</th>
<th>Social (SD)</th>
<th>Understanding (SD)</th>
<th>Enhancement (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Only</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.00 (0.93)</td>
<td>5.14 (1.52)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.06)</td>
<td>2.68 (1.44)</td>
<td>2.54 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Except Career</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.82 (1.36)</td>
<td>5.98 (0.94)</td>
<td>1.96 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.66 (1.52)</td>
<td>4.97 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.55 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49.58%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.93 (1.30)</td>
<td>6.16 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.32 (1.07)</td>
<td>4.93 (1.63)</td>
<td>5.81 (0.78)</td>
<td>5.54 (0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31.57%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All variables were measured on a 7-point scale.

Figure 4: Means for Three-Profile Solution
Profile 1: “Values Only”

The first profile identified by the analysis exhibited the lowest average importance scores across all three profiles on all six of the VFI factors. However, unlike the other two profiles, this group showed the greatest disparity between the average importance ratings of the values motive ($M = 5.14, SD = 1.52$) compared to the other five motives (protective $M = 2.00, SD = 0.93$; career $M = 1.33, SE = 0.06$; social $M = 2.68, SE = 1.44$; understanding $M = 2.54, SE = 1.04$; enhancement $M = 2.33, SE = 1.08$). As such, this group is referred to as the “Values Only” profile. In fact, when the values motive is excluded, the means reported for the remaining five VFI motives were all rated as less than “slightly important” on the response scale. This pattern suggests that, when compared to the other two profiles, the Values Only group may have had the fewest number of motives competing simultaneously. As the Values Only profile is the smallest of the three profiles identified (18.75% of the sample), such a finding is aligned with the functionalist approach to volunteering (Rioux & Penner, 2001; Snyder, 1993), suggesting that most individuals are compelled to volunteer due to a number of motives acting in concert. Therefore, it is expected that few individuals are inclined to volunteer for almost exclusively one reason. Another unique pattern exhibited by this group that was not exhibited by the other groups is that the social motive had the second highest average following the values motive, indicating that social reasons were the second most important VFI factor for the Values Only group. This finding is of particular interest given that the correlations previously reported indicated the values motive as being the
least controlled \( (r = -0.15, p < .01) \) and the social motive to be the least autonomous \( (r = 0.25, p < .01) \).

Profile Two: “All Motives”

A second profile identified by the three-profile solution demonstrated the highest average values across all three profiles for all six of the VFI motives (protective: \( M = 4.93, SD = 1.30 \); values: \( M = 6.16, SD = 0.74 \); career: \( M = 4.32, SD = 1.07 \); social: \( M = 4.93, SD = 1.63 \); understanding: \( M = 5.81, SD = 0.78 \); enhancement: \( M = 5.54, SD = 0.99 \) ), and thus, is referred to as the All Motives profile. Unlike the Values Only group, means associated with the All Motives group appear to be more consistent across the VFI motives, potentially suggesting that this group had the most motives competing simultaneously. Interestingly, means associated with the All Motives profile suggest that the understanding and enhancement motives were considered to be the second and third most important motives. Therefore, while this profile may have had more motives competing at once, correlation analyses demonstrated that these three motives were the most autonomous (understanding: \( r = .62, p < .01 \); enhancement: \( r = .57, p < .01 \); values: \( r = .47, p < .01 \) ) and least controlled (protective: \( r = .19, p < .01 \); enhancement: \( r = .18, p < .01 \); understanding: \( r = -.06, n.s. \) ).
Profile Three: “All Except Career”

The final profile identified by the three-profile solution demonstrated relatively high levels of each of the VFI motives (protective: $M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.36$; values: $M = 5.98$, $SD = 0.94$; social: $M = 3.66$, $SE = 0.52$; understanding: $M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.02$; enhancement: $M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.19$), with the exception of the career motive ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 0.85$). Hence, this group is labeled as the All Except Career profile and shares several characteristics with the other two profiles. For example, while this group did not exhibit the same disparity as the Values Only group in terms of one particular factor being arguably more important to one’s decision to volunteer, the average mean score for the career motive was similar to that of the Values Only group. The five remaining motives were all relatively high, which exhibited patterns aligned with that of the All Motives profile. As such, the All Except Career profile can be thought of as a middle ground between the Values Only and All Motives profiles.

In sum, the profiles identified by the three-profile solution generally follow a similar pattern, such that the three most autonomous/least controlled motives (i.e., values, enhancement, and understanding) are typically rated as most important across all three profiles. Moreover, the three least autonomous/most controlled motives (i.e., social, career, and protective) tend to be rated as the least important across all three profiles. Within the context of a person-centered approach, it can be said that the profiles that emerged in this study lack qualitative differences, or the “hierarchical ordering” of the motives variables remain consistent across groups (Meyer et al., 2013, p. 194). On the other hand, the profiles that emerged from the latent profile analysis
demonstrated quantitative differences across profiles, which is observed when a particular set of variables vary in strength across the different groups (e.g., low, moderate, high scores; Meyer et al., 2013). Hence, to answer Research Question 1, results of the latent profile analysis indicate that profiles of volunteer motives can be differentiated quantitatively, but the evidence does not suggest support for qualitative differences among the profiles. A lack of qualitative differences between profiles suggests that the person-centered approach of leveraging a person-centered analysis may not be the most appropriate method of analysis. However, person-centered approach was still leveraged in order to test this dissertation’s hypotheses. A supplemental multiple regression mediation model is included following the discussion of the results from hypothesis testing.

In order to quantify the extent to which each of the three profiles is more/less autonomous/controlled, the relative autonomy index (RAI) was (Ryan & Connell, 1989; Milette & Gagne, 2008) was examined. The RAI for each profile was calculated using the following equation from Milette & Gagne (2008):

\[
\text{RAI} = 2(\text{intrinsic motivation}) + 1(\text{identified regulation}) - 1(\text{introjected regulation}) - 2(\text{external regulation})
\]

(1)

Each form of motivation is assigned a weight to account for the degree of autonomy that is associated with each. More positive RAI values are generally indicative of more autonomous motivation while negative scores are generally indicative of more controlled motives. To calculate the RAI for each group, the means for each dimension of motivation were obtained and subsequently entered into the formula above. The
means for the three profiles on all four dimensions can be found in Table 7. Values indicated that the most autonomous/least controlled of the three profiles was the All Motives group (RAI = 11.74), followed by the All Except Career profile (RAI = 10.89), and subsequently the Values Only profile (RAI = 7.97).

Table 7: Profile Means for Calculating the Relative Autonomy Index (RAI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation M (SD)</th>
<th>Identified Regulation M (SD)</th>
<th>Introjected Regulation M (SD)</th>
<th>External Regulation M (SD)</th>
<th>RAI Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values Only</td>
<td>4.70 (1.58)</td>
<td>3.52 (1.63)</td>
<td>2.03 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.46 (0.90)</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Except Career</td>
<td>5.61 (1.00)</td>
<td>5.12 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.45 (1.20)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.92)</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives</td>
<td>5.89 (0.82)</td>
<td>5.83 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.57 (1.38)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.11)</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All variables were measured on a 7-point scale. RAI = Relative Autonomy Index (Ryan & Connell, 1989).

Hypothesis Testing

This dissertation’s hypotheses were generally proposed based on the logic that profiles with more autonomous motives would exhibit different relationships with the mediators and dependent variables compared to profiles with more controlled motives. However, all three profiles that emerged from the latent profile approach were generally more autonomous than controlled; therefore, the hypotheses for this dissertation were combined, and more autonomous profiles are analogous to less controlled profiles and vice versa.

Hypotheses were tested using two parallel mediation models. The direct and indirect effects provided by the mediation analyses are reported in Table 8. The $a_k$ paths are reflective of the mean differences in vigor across the three profiles, and the and $e_k$ path is reflective of the mean differences in depletion across the three profiles. For
example, a negative $a_k$ or $e_k$ path indicates that the reference profile exhibited greater levels of the mediator when compared to the other profile being examined. Similarly, a positive $a_k$ or $e_k$ path indicates that the reference profile exhibited lower levels of the mediator compared to the profile being examined. It should also be noted that the following analyses were conducted with and without the type of volunteering activity (i.e., corporate or personal volunteering) as a control variable, and the pattern of the results remained unchanged.
### Table 8: Results of Parallel Mediation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>$a_k/e_k\ (SE)$</th>
<th>$b\ (SE)$</th>
<th>$c'_k\ (SE)$</th>
<th>Boot $ab\ (SE)$</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable = OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor ($b$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Except Career vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.46 (.12)**</td>
<td>.28 (.10)**</td>
<td>.31 (.18)</td>
<td>.13 (.06)</td>
<td>[.04, .26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.85 (.12)**</td>
<td>.28 (.10)**</td>
<td>.70 (.20)**</td>
<td>.24 (.09)</td>
<td>[.09, .44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. All Except Career</td>
<td>.40 (.09)**</td>
<td>.28 (.10)**</td>
<td>.39 (.15)*</td>
<td>.11 (.05)</td>
<td>[.04, .23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion ($d$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Except Career vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.05 (.11)</td>
<td>-.33 (.08)**</td>
<td>.31 (.18)</td>
<td>-.02 (.04)</td>
<td>[-.10, .06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.13 (.12)</td>
<td>-.33 (.08)**</td>
<td>.70 (.20)**</td>
<td>-.04 (.04)</td>
<td>[-.13, .03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. All Except Career</td>
<td>.08 (.10)</td>
<td>-.33 (.08)**</td>
<td>.39 (.15)*</td>
<td>-.03 (.03)</td>
<td>[-.11, .03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable = CWB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor ($b$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Except Career vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.46 (.12)**</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.02 (.02)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.85 (.12)**</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.05 (.05)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. AllExcept Career</td>
<td>.34 (.08)**</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.06 (.04)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[.01, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion ($d$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Except Career vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.05 (.11)</td>
<td>.05 (.02)**</td>
<td>.02 (.02)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. Values Only</td>
<td>.13 (.12)</td>
<td>.05 (.02)**</td>
<td>.05 (.05)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motives vs. All Except Career</td>
<td>.07 (.08)</td>
<td>.05 (.02)**</td>
<td>.06 (.04)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.00, .02]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $n = 480$. Boot $ab =$ bootstrapped relative indirect effect. SE = standard error. CI = confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size $= 5,000$. (*) indicates significant estimate at $p < .05$. (**) indicates significant estimate at $p < .01$. 
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Compared to members in the Values Only profile, members in both the All Except Career profile ($b = .46, p < .01$) and All Motives profile ($b = .85, p < .01$) exhibited greater levels of vigor. Results also demonstrated that when compared with the All Except Career profile, the All Motives profile continued to experience greater levels of vigor ($b = .40, p < .01$). Such findings provided support for Hypothesis 1a and 2a, suggesting that profiles with greater levels of autonomous motives, and therefore lower levels of controlled motives, are more likely to experience vigor following their participation in a volunteer activity compared to their less autonomous and more controlled counterparts.

Additionally, volunteers who exhibited greater levels of vigor following their participation in a volunteer activity tended to engage in more OCBs upon their return to work ($b = .28, p < .01$). The confidence intervals for the relative indirect effects of the All Except Career profile ($ab = .13, CI = .04, .26$) and the All Motives profile ($ab = .24, CI = .09, .44$) were significant as neither confidence intervals included zero. This finding is further supported by significant relative indirect effect of the All Motives profile (using the All Except Career profile as the reference group) on OCB via vigor ($ab = .40, CI = .04, .23$). Therefore, Hypothesis 3a and 3b were supported, suggesting that profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives, and thereby lower levels of controlled motives, will be more likely to experience vigor following their volunteering participation, subsequently leading to greater engagement in OCBs than their less autonomous counterparts.
Hypothesis 1b predicted that profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives would be less likely to experience depletion following a volunteer activity compared to profiles with lower levels of autonomous motives. Similarly, Hypothesis 2b predicted that profiles with greater levels of more controlled motives would be more likely to experience depletion following a volunteer activity. Significant mean differences in depletion were not observed for the All Motives profile ($b = .13, n.s.$) nor the All Except Career profile ($b = .05, n.s.$) when compared to the Values Only profile. Significant mean differences were also not exhibited for the All Motives profile when compared to the All Except Careers profile ($b = .07, n.s.$). This finding suggests that profile membership does not significantly impact a volunteer’s level of depletion following a volunteer activity. As such, Hypothesis 1b and 2b were not supported. Table 9 includes the mean values of the mediator variables across each profile. All three profiles exhibited relatively low levels of depletion, ranging from 1.67 to 1.80. Given the minimal variability between the profiles’ depletion ratings, the lack of evidence supporting Hypothesis 1b and 2b are not unexpected.

Table 9: Equality of Means for Distal Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distal Outcomes</th>
<th>Values Only (A)</th>
<th>All Except Career (B)</th>
<th>All Motives (C)</th>
<th>Overall $\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>3.058, c</td>
<td>3.509, c</td>
<td>3.904, b</td>
<td>51.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 480$. All analyses were run using the BCH procedure in Mplus. The values for vigor and depletion are means. Subscripts indicate profiles that are significantly different at $p < .05$. (***) indicates $\chi^2$ values significant at $p < .01$.

Similarly, the confidence intervals for the relative indirect effects of the All Motives profile ($ab = .00, CI = -.01, .02$) and the All Except Career profile ($ab = .00, CI$
= -.00, .06) on CWB when the Values Only profile was held constant included zero. When the All Except Career profile was held constant, the confidence interval for the relative indirect effect of the All Motives profile on CWB through depletion also included zero (ab = .00, CI = -.00, .02). Hence, Hypothesis 4a and 4b, which hypothesized that profiles with greater levels of more controlled motives—and thereby lower levels of autonomous motives—would be more likely to experience depletion and subsequently engage in greater levels of CWB were not supported.

Supplemental Analyses

Multiple Regression

As previously mentioned, it is possible that the person-centered approach may not be the best method for studying the effects of volunteer motives on OCB and CWB via vigor and depletion. Thus, an additional mediation analysis using a bootstrapped sample size of 10,000 was leveraged to examine how the six individual volunteer motives identified by the VFI (Clary et al., 1998) related to OCB and CWB through vigor and depletion. Results can be found in Tables 10 and 11. Unsurprisingly, the values motive was significantly and positively related to vigor (b = .10, p < .01) and significantly and negatively related to depletion (b = -.15, p < .01). The career motive, which was consistently rated as the least important motivating factor for volunteering across all three profiles, had the strongest positive and significant relationship with depletion (b = .10, p < .01).
Unsurprisingly, results indicated significant indirect effects for the values ($ab = .03, CI = .01, .06$) motive on OCB via vigor. Similarly to the mediation analysis in which the profiles were used as predictors, no significant indirect effects were found for the motives on CWB via vigor. Findings revealed a significant indirect effect of the career motive on both OCB ($ab = -.02, CI = -.04, -.01$) and CWB ($ab = .01, CI = .00, .03$) via depletion.

Perhaps the most interesting finding revealed by the supplemental analysis was that the protective motive demonstrated nearly equal positive and significant direct effects on both vigor ($b = .06, p < .05$) and depletion ($b = .07, p < .01$). This would suggest that individuals who considered the protective motive to be very important to their decision to volunteer were likely to experience both vigor and depletion following their participation. Moreover, the protective motive also exhibited significant indirect effects on OCB via both depletion ($ab = -.02, CI = -.03, -.00$) and vigor ($ab = .02, CI = .00, .04$), as well as a significant indirect effect on CWB via depletion ($ab = .01, CI = .00, .02$). Essentially, individuals higher on the protective motive were likely to experience increased feelings of both vigor and depletion. Increased levels of vigor were subsequently associated with increased engagement in OCBs upon the employee’s return to work. On the other hand, increased depletion was associated with decreased engagement in OCBs and increased engagement in CWBs.
### Table 10: Coefficients for Mediation Analysis with Multiple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vigor b (SE)</td>
<td>Depletion b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.06 (.03)*</td>
<td>.07 (.03)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.10 (.04)**</td>
<td>-.15 (.04)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>.10 (.03)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.02 (.03)</td>
<td>-.01 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.05 (.03)</td>
<td>-.03 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>.09 (.04)*</td>
<td>-.06 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>-.21 (.08)**</td>
<td>.12 (.04)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bootstrap sample size = 10,000. (*) indicates significant estimate at $p < .05$. (**) indicates significant estimate at $p < .01$. 
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Table 11: Indirect Effects for Mediation Model with Multiple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boot ab (SE)</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Boot ab (SE)</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator = Vigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
<td>[.00, .04]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.03 (.01)</td>
<td>[.01, .06]</td>
<td>.00 (.02)</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.00, .04]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
<td>[.00, .05]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator = Depletion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>-.02 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.03, -.00]</td>
<td>.01 (.00)</td>
<td>[.00, .02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.03 (.01)</td>
<td>[.01, .06]</td>
<td>-.02 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.04, -.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>-.02 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.04, -.01]</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>[.00, .03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.01, .00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.01, .00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.00, .03]</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.02, .00]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Boot ab = bootstrapped indirect effect. CI = 95% confidence interval. OCB = organizational citizenship indirect behaviors. CWB = counterproductive work behavior. Bootstrap sample size = 10,000.

Volunteer Hours as a Moderator Variable

Given the variability in the number of hours participants reported volunteering, analyses were also conducted using the volunteer hours variable as a moderator. Respondents from the Prolific sample were asked to provide a brief description of their most recent volunteer experience. Descriptions were inspected to verify the validity of the number of hours reported. For example, one participant reported volunteering 120 hours and described performing a number of different activities for a family-run
summer camp, such as finances, hiring personnel, and coordinating resources for the camp. It can be inferred by their response that the 120 hours initially reported is likely referring to the individual’s total experience volunteering for the camp, as opposed to one particular instance, which was the focus of this dissertation. A total of 19 responses were excluded from the sample, resulting in a sample of 461 participants. Findings from the moderated mediation analysis failed to demonstrate a significant conditional indirect effect. Thus, the number of hours involved in the volunteer activity did not impact the relationship between motives and the subsequent mediators/outcomes.

Latent Profile Analysis Using Autonomous and Controlled Motivation

An alternative latent profile analysis was also performed using the subscales of the autonomous and controlled motivation variables. Fit statistics indicated that a two-profile solution was the most appropriate fit. The first profile demonstrated relatively high average levels of intrinsic motivation (M = 5.61) and identified regulation (M = 5.07), and low average levels of introjected (M = 2.38) and extrinsic (M = 1.31) regulation. As such, this profile was referred to as the Autonomous profile. The second profile demonstrated moderate average levels across all four subdimensions (intrinsic motivation = 4.85; identified regulation = 4.84; introjected regulation = 4.10; extrinsic regulation = 4.34). This profile was referred to as the Moderately Autonomous and Controlled profile.

The two profiles were subsequently used as predictors of OCB and CWB via vigor and depletion. Results revealed that individuals in the Moderately Autonomous and
Controlled profile were more likely to experience depletion compared to those in the Autonomous profile, and were therefore, more likely to engage in greater levels of CWB. These results differ from the primary analyses, which supported the relationship between the motives and OCB through vigor.
DISCUSSION

This dissertation leveraged a person-centered approach as way to integrate the motivational underpinnings of the volunteerism literature with the conceptually related discretionary prosocial behaviors employees engage in at work. The Volunteering Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary et al., 1998) was used to create profiles of unique combinations of motives across a sample of employee volunteers. A latent profile analysis identified a three-profile solution as the most appropriate model for the data. The profiles that emerged were classified as Values Only, All Except Career, and All Motives due to their average values on each VFI factor and the extent to which each profile identified more or less motives as influential or important on their decision to volunteer. Significant relative indirect effects from the mediation analyses indicated that levels of vigor—but not depletion—following participation in a volunteer activity were related to profile membership, and ultimately, engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) at work following the volunteer activity. Results did not support a relationship between the profiles and depletion, nor a relative indirect effect on counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) via vigor or depletion.

The three profiles that emerged from the latent profile analysis demonstrated relatively consistent patterns of the extent to which the six VFI motives were important to an employee’s decision to volunteer. However, the profiles did demonstrate several unique characteristics. Most notably, the three profiles differed with respect to the hierarchical order of the social motive. For example, the social motive was considered the second most important motive for the Values Only profile, while the All Except
Career profile rated it as the second least important profile. Interestingly, the social motive and the protective motive demonstrated equal mean scores for the All Motives profile. The All Motives profile was the only profile to have two motives with the same average level of importance. This finding lends additional credence to the functionalist approach to volunteering (Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998), which suggests that an individual may be motivated to volunteer by multiple factors acting simultaneously. The differing order of importance in which the profiles each place the social motive may reflect the extent to which members of each profile consider volunteering to be an opportunity to gain favor with others. The social motive items included in the VFI generally tend to refer to volunteering because people close to the volunteer do so. Perhaps members of the Values Only profile believe that their distinctly altruistic reasons for volunteering will allow them to gain the acceptance from others who they know place a high value on volunteering. Alternatively, members of the All Except Career profile may view volunteering more as an opportunity for self-development, as higher scores on the understanding and enhancement motives would suggest.

It is possible that generally consistent ordering of the motives across profiles can be attributed to the fact that the sample was made up of full-time employed volunteers. For example, part-time employees may be more inclined to participate in volunteer activities, especially those that are employer-initiated, because they view it as an opportunity to network or to demonstrate their commitment to the organization’s community efforts. In addition to full-time employees having arguably fewer hours to
dedicate to volunteering, it is also possible that full-time employees are simply more content in their current positions. Economic and job market conditions, such as when there is a surplus of labor and a deficit of jobs, may also have a contextual effect. Conditions in which there are more workers than jobs available tend to result in more individuals being under-employed, and hence, are likely to be actively seeking opportunities for promotion or advancement.

The consistency in the patterns of motives across the profiles may also be a factor of the nature of employed volunteers. For instance, as mentioned previously, employed volunteers have fewer hours to devote to volunteering. Employees are often faced with trying to balance the demands of their work responsibilities as well as the demands of their responsibilities at home (e.g., childcare, elderly care). When already subjected to time constraints, it seems plausible to suggest that those who make time to volunteer, whether it be on their own or through their employer, are motivated to do so because they genuinely want to. In other words, employed volunteers may be more altruistic compared to other subsamples of volunteers given their willingness to volunteer their already limited time.

The significant mean differences of vigor across the three profiles are aligned with the findings of previous research. More autonomous motivation is often associated with outcomes such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Eby et al., 2010). Essentially, employees who are more autonomously motivated are also generally more willing to expend their resources, whether it be through helping a coworker or attending a corporate-sponsored event, because they anticipate that those resources will
be replenished as they find engaging in those activities to be rewarding. When applied to the context of volunteerism, autonomously motivated volunteers expend their resources on the particular volunteer activity because through their participation, they feel that their resources are replenished. Therefore, the results demonstrating that the All Motives profile, which had the greatest level of autonomous motives, was associated with greater levels of vigor, followed by the All Except Career profile and subsequently the Values Only profile supports the idea that greater levels of autonomy are associated with greater levels of resources through resource replenishment. Further credence to this theory is bolstered by the fact that despite the All Motives and All Except Career profiles exhibiting similar intrinsic motivation averages and nearly the same RAI value, results still demonstrated significantly different levels of vigor and OCB. This suggests the possibility that autonomous motivation could have a robust relationship with vigor.

The results of this dissertation demonstrating significant relative indirect effects across all three profiles and OCB via vigor is also consistent with findings from the literature. Empirical evidence supports that a surplus of resources tends to result in common antecedents of OCB, including increased levels of vigor, positive job attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment), and enhanced well-being (Lin et al., 2020; Nix et al., 1999; Slemp et al., 2020).

The lack of evidence supporting the hypothesized relationship between the VFI profiles and depletion can likely be contributed to the fact that all three profiles reported relatively low levels of engagement in CWB. Measures of CWB tend to have a lower base rate compared to other constructs commonly studied within the occupational literature.
Previous research has suggested a number of reasons for this phenomenon, including that it may be a function of the way in which CWB is conceptualized and measured, or due to employees’ fear of retribution from their employer, or even a result of the fact that individuals who engage in high levels of CWB are simply less likely to respond to surveys (Bowling & Gruys, 2010; Mackey et al., 2021). As such, the effects between other relevant constructs and measures of CWB are often attenuated due to issues of range restriction (Greco et al., 2014). Therefore, it is possible that a relationship does exist between profile membership and CWB, but that the significant relationship could not be detected due to the low mean levels across the three profiles.

Nevertheless, the supplemental analysis did provide support to the theory that more controlled/less autonomous motives—like the career motive—would be more closely related to depletion, and subsequently, increased participation in CWBs upon their return to work. Essentially, when the relationship between the career motive and CWB was examined independent of the other motives, as opposed to in concert with the more autonomous motives, a significant relationship via depletion was realized. Therefore, it is likely that autonomous and controlled motives exist simultaneously, but it is possible that the effects of autonomous motivation (i.e., vigor) are more salient than the effects of controlled motivation (i.e., depletion). However, results from the supplemental latent profile analysis—in which profiles were estimated using the subscales of the autonomous and controlled motivation variables—may suggest otherwise, as the Moderately Autonomous and Controlled profile was significantly related to engagement in CWB via depletion. This would suggest that, when levels of
autonomous and controlled motivation are relatively equal, autonomous motivation is not more salient than controlled motivation.

Findings from the supplemental analysis in which each motive identified by the VFI was regressed onto OCB and CWB via vigor and depletion seemed to support the results of the hypothesis testing. The values motive was, unsurprisingly, related to increased feelings of vigor, which led to increased engagement in OCBs. The values motive was also related to decreased feelings of depletion, ultimately leading to decreased engagement in CWBs. The finding that the protective motive was associated with both vigor and depletion as well as OCB and CWB was not wholly unexpected. As illustrated by the graphic in Figure 3, the protective motive is generally located in the middle of the autonomous/controlled motivation continuum. Employers and future research would be likely to benefit from the identification of instances in which individuals motivated largely by the protective motive feel enhanced vigor as opposed to increased levels of depletion.

Contributions to the Literature

This dissertation offers several contributions to the literature. First, previous research has largely limited the study of behavioral engagement, including OCB and CWB, as predictors of participation in employee volunteering initiatives (e.g., Caligiuri et al., 2013; Clary & Snyder, 1999). However, this dissertation examined OCB and CWB as outcomes of employee volunteerism and expands upon the current understanding of how volunteering has implications for what occurs at work.
More specifically, volunteerism research has generally failed to consider the potential unfavorable outcomes associated with volunteers, such as deviant behaviors captured by CWB. Although this study’s findings did not demonstrate a significant relationship between the motive profiles and depletion nor CWB, results from the supplemental analysis revealed that a relationship between volunteer motives and depletion, and ultimately CWB, does exist. Future researchers may be interested in exploring the circumstances in which this relationship is strengthened, possibly indicating a curvilinear effect for autonomous motives. For instance, perhaps autonomous motives attenuate the effects of more controlled motives, but only up to a certain extent. That point could be when employee volunteers feel that they have utilized all their resources and become more motivated to replenish those resources through acts of CWB.

Similarly, current research has also largely overlooked the role of volunteerism on performance-related outcomes beyond task performance (e.g., Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Hu et al., 2016). When evaluating employee performance, employers tend to look beyond just an employee’s task performance, and instead, also consider an employee’s discretionary organizational behaviors like OCB and CWB (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). As work behaviors are of central concern to organizational researchers, this has made the application of findings from the volunteerism literature difficult to apply. This study demonstrates value in broadening the scope of outcomes associated with employee volunteerism beyond that of just task performance, as results suggest a significant relationship between profiles of volunteer motives and OCB at work.
Lastly, this dissertation leveraged a latent profile approach to study volunteer motives in a way that was more aligned with the commonly discussed theories of motivation within the volunteerism literature, such as the functional approach to volunteering. Future research should consider applying a latent profile approach across a large sample of volunteers beyond that of just employee volunteers. For instance, it is not uncommon for retired individuals to start volunteering their time at a local hospital or school. Volunteering provides these individuals with a sense of purpose but maintains the flexibility in their schedule that would not be possible with a job. Considering the career motives would likely not be applicable to retired individuals, it is likely that a profile for retired volunteers would not even include a career dimension.

**Practical Implications**

Perhaps the most apparent practical implication of this dissertation is that it adds credibility to the argument that an employee’s autonomous motivation for volunteering can lead to increased levels of OCB in the workplace through the vigor experienced after volunteering. Such findings lend support for more organizations to consider implementing either a corporate volunteer program or occasionally sponsoring organization-wide initiatives and opportunities to volunteer. Beyond the benefit of employees participating in increased levels of OCBs, previous research has demonstrated that when organizations who show support for employee involvement in their communities, they are seen by prospective applicants as more attractive (Caligiuri et al., 2013). Thus, the implementation of volunteer initiatives within an organization
can provide employers with a strategy for both retaining current talent and attracting prospective talent.

Results from this study suggest that more autonomous motives tend to result in resource replenishment or vigor (as opposed to depletion), which later leads to increased levels of OCB. Therefore, employers should seek out ways to enhance employees’ perceptions of support from the organization and their commitment to the organization. Employees who feel committed to their organization are more likely to be autonomously motivated to participate in employer-sponsored initiatives. Employees who are committed to the organization are less likely to feel that their participation in employer-sponsored activities is depleting, and are more likely to feel invigorated, leaving them with more resources to expend on OCBs.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

One limitation of this dissertation was the use of cross-sectional data. While the samples used in this study were from multiple sources and attempted to capture a broad spectrum of employee volunteers, the causal inferences that can be drawn are limited due to the lack of longitudinal data. As such, the directionality of the findings from this study cannot be confirmed. Other causal orderings besides what was hypothesized are possible. For instance, it is possible that the performance of OCB could increase individuals’ value of helping others, and thus make them more likely to be motivated to volunteer. Future researchers may consider conducting a daily diary study over the span of two weeks, in which volunteers record their behaviors at work following their
participation in a volunteer activity. A longitudinal research design would bolster the credibility of this study’s findings that employee volunteerism has the potential to result in greater levels of engagement in OCBs at work.

In light of the results produced by using latent profile approach, the lack of qualitative differences between the profiles suggests that such an approach may not be the most appropriate method for examining volunteer motives. Future research may find value in identifying alternative methods of analysis that can provide a new lens from which to study employee volunteerism. As research on employee volunteerism is still a relatively niche area of interest, researchers may find value in leveraging more qualitative approaches. For example, while the distinct motives captured by Clary and colleague’s (1998) VFI measure did not result in qualitative differences between profiles, it is likely that such patterns can be observed in relation to other variables of interest. By taking a more qualitative approach to studying employee volunteerism, more nuanced variables can be identified and applied to larger-scale quantitative studies. Moreover, results from the confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that, despite being the best fitting model, the fit indices of the six-factor model did not meet all the recommended standards offered by the literature. Previous studies have raised some concern over the validity of the VFI scale. For instance, the protective and enhancement motives have been shown to demonstrate poor reliability coefficients (e.g., Wu et al., 2009). In fact, some studies have even found evidence to support a five-factor model in which the enhancement and protective motives are combined into one motive (Teye & Peaslee, 2020). One reason for this finding could be that the VFI scale was originally intended to
be used with general volunteers, as opposed to the more granular subgroup of employed volunteers. It is possible that the motives captured by the VFI are not as applicable to employed volunteers compared to the general population of volunteers. As such, research studying certain subgroups within the volunteering population may benefit from a more qualitative approach to identify motives that are most relevant to the particular subgroup.

A final limitation worth mentioning is that the data collected for this dissertation was obtained using self-report measures. It is possible that despite the confidential nature of the survey, employees may be reluctant to admit they participated in counterproductive behaviors. It is also possible that employees may over-estimate the extent to which they participated in organizational citizenship behaviors. Researchers interested in studying constructs such as CWB, should consider including a measure of social desirability as a control variable in future studies. It would also be worthwhile for future studies to consider data collection methods in which other-report measures are also leveraged following an employee’s return to work after participating in a volunteer activity. Other-reports could come from a coworker or supervisor who interacts with the employee volunteer on a daily and regular basis. This method of collecting data would also provide researchers with the opportunity to examine how the attributions a coworker makes regarding an employee’s motivation for volunteering impact their subsequent rating of the employee’s behavior upon their return to work.
CONCLUSION

In sum, this dissertation utilized a person-centered approach to examine the effects in which employees’ unique combinations of motives for volunteering were related to feelings of vigor and/or depletion following their participation, and subsequently to employee engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) upon their return to work. Results from the latent profile analysis suggested that profiles with greater levels of more autonomous motives—and thereby lower levels of more controlled motives—demonstrated significantly greater levels of vigor following their participation in a volunteer activity than their less autonomous and more controlled counterparts. Findings also revealed that greater levels of vigor were associated with increased employee participation in OCBs upon their return to work. The profiles did not exhibit a significant relationship with depletion nor CWB. However, supplemental analyses suggest that a significant relationship between more controlled/less autonomous volunteer motives—namely career and protective motives—and depletion does exist and are ultimately related to greater levels of employee participation in CWB upon their return to work. Future research should continue to explore ways in which the literature on prosocial discretionary behaviors at work can be applied to the theoretical and empirical findings associated with volunteering in a broader context.
Volunteer Experience
Items were developed specifically for this study.

Instructions: Please respond to the following questions in reference to your most recent volunteer experience.

1. How long ago was the volunteer activity you most recently participated in?
   
   (1 = Within the past week, 2 = Within the past 2 weeks, 3 = Within the past month, 4 = Within the past 3 months, 5 = Within the past 6 months, 6 = Within the past year, 7 = Longer than a year ago)

2. Was the volunteer activity you most recently participated in initiated by your employer (i.e., corporate volunteering) or was it self-initiated (i.e., personal volunteering)?
   
   (1 = Employer initiated (corporate volunteering), 2 = Self-initiated (personal volunteering), 3 = Other (text response required))

3. How many people, including yourself, participated in the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?
   
   (1 = Approximately 10 people or less, 2 = Approximately 11 to 30 people, 3 = Approximately 31 to 50 people, 4 = Approximately 51 to 75 people, 5 = Approximately 76 people or more)

4. Had you volunteered with that specific external nonprofit or charitable group before participating in the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?
   
   (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

5. How physically demanding was the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?
   
   (1 = Not at all physically demanding, 2 = Slightly physically demanding, 3 = Somewhat physically demanding, 4 = Moderately physically demanding, 5 = Extremely physically demanding)

6. How mentally demanding was the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?
   
   (1 = Not at all physically demanding, 2 = Slightly physically demanding, 3 = Somewhat physically demanding, 4 = Moderately physically demanding, 5 = Extremely physically demanding)
7. How emotionally demanding was the volunteer activity on this particular occasion?

(1 = Not at all physically demanding, 2 = Slightly physically demanding, 3 = Somewhat physically demanding, 4 = Moderately physically demanding, 5 = Extremely physically demanding)

8. How many hours did you spend volunteering on this particular occasion? (Numeric response)

Motives for Volunteering
Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI)

Instructions: Please indicate how important or accurate each of the 30 possible reasons for volunteering were for you in reference to the volunteer activity you participated in most recently.

Protective Motive
1. No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
2. By volunteering I feel less lonely.
3. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
4. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
5. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.

Values Motive
6. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
7. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
8. I feel compassion toward people in need.
9. I feel it is important to help others.
10. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.

Career Motive
11. Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.
12. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
13. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
14. Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.
15. Volunteering experience will look good on my resumé.

Social Motive
17. People I’m close to want me to volunteer.
18. People I know share an interest in community service.
19. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
20. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.

Understanding Motive
21. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
22. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
23. Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands-on experience.
24. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
25. I can explore my own strengths.

Enhancement Motive
26. Volunteering makes me feel important.
27. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
28. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
29. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
30. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.

(1 = Not at all important or accurate, 2 = Low importance or accuracy, 3 = Slightly important or accurate, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Moderately important or accurate, 6 = Very important or accurate, 7 = Extremely important or accurate)

Autonomous/Controlled Motives
Volunteer Motivation Scale

Instructions: Please indicate to which extent you agree or disagree with the following possible reasons for volunteering in reference to the volunteer activity you participated in most recently.

I’m participating in volunteer work...

Intrinsic Motivation
1. Because I enjoy volunteering very much.
2. Because being a volunteer is fun.
3. Because it brings me pleasure.

Identified Regulation
4. Because this is a way of developing myself.
5. Because this is a good way of developing aspects of myself that I value.
6. Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.

Introjected Regulation
7. Because I don’t want others to feel that I am not capable of volunteering.
8. Because not volunteering will cause others to look down on me.
9. Because I would feel bad about myself if I didn’t.

External Regulation
10. Because I’ll get into trouble if I don’t.
11. Because that’s a requirement.
12. Because I can get material rewards from it.

(1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Somewhat agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree)

Vigor
Vigor subscale from the Work and Well-Being Survey

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements in reference to how you felt following the volunteer activity you participated in most recently.

1. I felt I was bursting with energy.
2. I felt strong and vigorous.
3. I felt like going to work.
4. I continued working for a very long period of time.
5. I felt very resilient, mentally.
6. I persevered with my work, even when things did not go well.

(1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree)

Depletion

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements in reference to how you felt following the volunteer activity you participated in most recently.
1. I felt drained.
3. Following my participation, it took a lot of effort for me to concentrate on something.
4. Following my participation, my mental energy was running low.
5. Following my participation, I felt like my willpower was gone.

(1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree)

**OCB**

*Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale*


Instructions: *Since participating in your most recent volunteer activity, how often have you done each of the following things on your present job?*

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (targeted at an individual; OCB-I)**

1. Help others who have been absent.
2. Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems.
3. Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off.
4. Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
5. Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
6. Give up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems.
7. Assist others with their duties.
8. Share personal property with others to help their work.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (targeted at the organization; OCB-O)**

9. Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.
10. Keep up with developments in the organization.
11. Defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
12. Show pride when representing the organization in public.
13. Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.
14. Express loyalty toward the organization.
15. Take action to protect the organization from potential problems.
16. Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.

(1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Frequently, 6 = Usually, 7 = Always)
CWB
Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C)

Instructions: *Since participating in your most recent volunteer activity, how often have you done each of the following things on your present job?*

**Abuse**
1. Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work.
2. Was nasty or rude to a client or customer.
3. Insulted someone about their job performance.
4. Made fun of someone’s personal life.
5. Ignored someone at work.
6. Blamed someone at work for an error you made.
7. Started an argument with someone at work.
8. Verbally abused someone at work.
9. Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work.
10. Threatened someone at work with violence.
11. Threatened someone at work, but not physically.
12. Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad.
13. Did something to make someone at work look bad.
14. Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work.
15. Looked at someone at work’s private mail/property without permission.
16. Hit or pushed someone at work.
17. Insulted or made fun of someone at work.

**Production Deviance**
18. Purposely did your work incorrectly.
19. Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done.
20. Purposely failed to follow instructions.

**Sabotage**
21. Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies.
22. Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property.
23. Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work.

**Theft**
24. Stole something belonging to your employer.
25. Took supplies or tools home without permission.
26. Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked.
27. Took money from your employer without permission.
28. Stole something belonging to someone at work.

Withdrawal
29. Came to work late without permission.
30. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t.
31. Took a longer break than you were allowed to take.
32. Left work earlier than you were allowed to take.

(1 = Never, 2 = Once or twice, 3 = Once or twice per month, 4 = Once or twice per week, 5 = Every day)
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