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ABSTRACT

In this chapter, we introduce the idea that volunteers (an increasingly important type of worker), like employees, choose the level of citizenship behavior that they contribute to the organization. First, we draw on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior literature to suggest that volunteers engage in different types of helping (directed at clients and/or directed at the organization). Second, we draw on the Volunteer literature to suggest that role identity is a key causal mechanism that predicts volunteer helping behavior. Third, we propose, based on the Psychological Contracts literature, that the relationship between role identity and OCB is moderated by fulfillment of functional motives for volunteering. We hope this integration of concepts from three different literatures stimulates future theory development on identity, citizenship, and volunteers. We also hope the chapter stimulates future research on identity and the target of helping done by volunteers in organizational contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Individual-organizational relationships are changing rapidly and dramatically as organizations increase their use of non-traditional (e.g., part-time, temporary, contract, outsourced, networked, and foreign) work relationships (Ellingson, Gruys, and Sackett, 1998; Howard, 1995; Rousseau, 1997; Van Dyne and Ang, 1998; West and Bogumil, 2000). In many cases, work that was formerly done by employees (who had ongoing and embedded relationships with the organization) is now being done by individuals in a variety of non-traditional roles which do not involve formal employment status (Cappelli, 1997; Kalleberg, 2000). For example, contract workers are not employees of the organization, even though they often work side-by-side with regular employees. Similarly, when work is outsourced, it is typically performed by non-employees who work off premises. Volunteer or unpaid work is also becoming more prevalent and important. In the late 1990’s, over half of all American
adults volunteered their time to nonprofit organizations (Independent Sector, 1999), giving an average of 3.5 hours per week. Financially, non-profits are a growing part of the national economy, receiving over $120 billion in donations in 1995 alone (U.S. News and World Report, 1995).

Another major change in organizations is increased emphasis on individual initiative (Campbell, 2000; Crant, 2000; Frese and Fay, 2001; Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks, 1995). Current competitive demands do not allow organizations to specify all desired behaviors in advance and instead, require individuals to use their good judgment in determining the best way to make contributions that help the organization and serve its long-term objectives (Organ, 1988). Simultaneously, many individuals emphasize their personal role identities (Burke, 1991; Stryker, 1980) and adjust their contributions to the organization based on the extent inducements provided by the organization serve their personal motives (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2002).

This chapter combines these themes and develops a theoretical model (see Figure 1) of two types of helping organizational citizenship behavior initiated by those in volunteer positions. Responding to contemporary trends toward non-traditional relationships, we argue that volunteers, like employees, choose the level of citizenship behavior they will contribute to the organization. We have three primary objectives. First, based on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) literature, we propose that volunteers engage in different types of helping (directed at clients and/or directed at the organization). Second, based on the Volunteer literature, we describe role identity as a key causal mechanism that predicts volunteer helping behavior. Third, based on the literature on fulfillment of psychological contracts, we argue that helping citizenship behavior of volunteers, like OCB of employees, is influenced by perceptions of psychological contract fulfillment. In the case of volunteers, this is tied to the functional motives that cause them to engage in unpaid work. In sum, our model emphasizes role identity and fulfillment of the psychological contract as key factors that predict the helping of volunteers in organizational contexts.
Figure 1: Volunteer Role Identity and Citizenship Behavior
Since we integrate concepts from the literatures on organizational citizenship, role identity, psychological contracts, and volunteers, our framework is distinctive and has the potential to contribute separately and jointly to each of these literatures. Two specific aspects of our approach differ from that of most prior research. First, prior research on citizenship behavior emphasizes employee-organizational linkages and less often recognizes citizenship performed by non-employees (for exceptions, see the literature on customer citizenship behavior (Bettencourt, 1997; Groth, 2002). We focus on volunteers as members of the organization and as members of the community (Seiling, 1997) and suggest this provides a unique perspective on citizenship behavior because we explicitly acknowledge that citizenship can be performed by those without formal employment relationships. Second, and in contrast to most psychological contract research, we focus on volunteer perceptions of fulfillment (Lambert, Edwards, and Cable, 2002; Turnley, Bolino, Lester, and Bloodgood, 2003) instead of on employee perceptions of violation and breach (Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Robinson, 1996; Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Robinson and Morrison, 2000; Thompson and Bunderson, 2003; Turnley and Feldman, 2000). In sum, this theoretical model should advance our thinking about factors that influence helping citizenship behavior within the context of organizations.

The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows. We start with a brief overview of the organizational citizenship literature (Organ, 1988) and emphasizing the multidimensionality of OCB (LePine, Erez, and Johnson, 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach, 2000), argue that volunteers most likely differentiate two primary targets of their helping citizenship: clients (e.g., those who benefit from the services provided by the organization) and the organization and its employees. Second, we describe volunteers and the role identity literature which has been a key factor in recent research on volunteers (Callero, 1985; Callero, Howard, and Piliavin, 1987; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene, 1998; Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Omoto and Snyder, 1995; Penner and Finkelstein, 1998; Piliavin and Callero, 1991) but much less central in the organizational citizenship literature (for an exception, see Penner, Midili, and Kegelmeyer, 1997). Third, we provide a brief overview of the psychological contracts literature, emphasizing the link to citizenship behaviors when personal motives and goals are fulfilled. Finally, we present our theoretical model and propositions based on an integration of the above literatures. We conclude by discussing theoretical and practical implications as well as directions for future research.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship as discretionary behavior that contributes to the effective functioning of organizations. Recently, two integrative reviews of the OCB research examined the multidimensionality of citizenship behavior (LePine et al., 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2000). These reviews noted that we know most about helping or altruism types of citizenship because these affiliative behaviors have been the focus of most OCB research. In addition, both reviews emphasized the voluminous and at times inconsistent literature on the nature of citizenship and stressed the importance of clear distinctions between types of OCB, based on differences in nomological networks of antecedents and consequences across dimensions. In other words, current trends position OCB as an aggregate
construct where at least some of the dimensions are conceptually distinct and do not share the same nomological networks, rather than assuming OCB is a latent construct where dimensions are comparable substitutes with common antecedents and consequences.

Building on these observations, we focus our attention on helping as the dominant form of citizenship and we also differentiate two types of helping citizenship behavior: helping directed at clients (beneficiaries of organizational services) versus more traditional forms of helping such as that directed at the organization and at other employees of the organization. We selected these two forms of helping for two reasons. First, we wanted to build on knowledge gained from prior research on helping that is directed at the organization and organizational employees. Second, we wanted to identify a specific form of helping that would be especially salient to volunteers. As we describe in the later sections on volunteers and fulfillment of personal motives, the desire to help or serve a useful purpose (Jenner, 1984) is a major factor in motivating volunteers to contribute their services to a specific cause. Accordingly, helping directed at clients of the organization should be an important form of volunteer citizenship behavior. Consistent with the recent literature reviews, we make differential predictions for the combined effects of role identity and fulfillment of motives for these two types of helping.

**Volunteers**

Volunteering is defined as sustained, nonspontaneous prosocial behaviors that benefit strangers and usually occur in an organizational setting (Clary and Snyder, 1991; Penner, 2002). As such, volunteering involves helping citizenship behaviors. To date, most research on OCB has focused on the voluntary (discretionary) behaviors of for-pay employees. Since much volunteer work involves ongoing, organizationally-embedded helping, it is important to consider the link between volunteerism and OCB. OCB usually focuses on behavior directed toward the organization or to individuals and groups within the organization. Just as some OCB research has expanded to consider customer citizenship and externally-oriented citizenship (Bettencourt, 1997; Bettencourt, Gwinner, and Meuter, 2001), it also can include citizenship of volunteers. In addition, consistent with the missions of most nonprofits (societal social benefits), it makes sense to include OCB of volunteers directed at clients of the organization. Thus, we differentiate helping the organization (“inside” OCB) and helping the client (“outside” OCB) and use this distinction in our later propositions.

Table 1 summarizes some of the most important distinctions between employees and volunteers that may be relevant to helping citizenship behaviors. The examples under “volunteer” and “paid” headings represent archetypes that establish the ends of the spectrum; thus, actual situations of individuals in volunteer and for-profit organizations will fit these descriptions to varying degrees. Nevertheless, employee and volunteer differences fall into three general categories: structure/role; attitudes, values, and motivations; and human resource management practices.

As the table shows, unpaid workers have different reasons for joining the organization, show different patterns of attitudinal, calculative, and affective involvement, often experience confusion in exactly what their role in the organization is, and are not usually subject to the same performance standards to which paid workers are held. Volunteers may choose to limit their activities, being only occasional contributors, or may choose to make themselves “more
useful and informed" (Pearce, 1993, p. 48). This is a major factor contributing to the "reliability" problem that is one of the most distinguishing (and problematic) characteristics of volunteer management (Pearce, 1993).

Table 1. Work-Related Similarities and Differences between Volunteers and Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure and Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role uncertainty</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to enforce role expectations</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role behavior</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-role behavior</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of labor in task allocation</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status distinctions</td>
<td>Weaker</td>
<td>Stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary basis of control/compliance</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Utilitarian/calculative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal social influence</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizationally-controlled social influence</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of face-to-face contact</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status as a member of the organization</td>
<td>Few clear indications</td>
<td>Clear (e.g., paycheck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes, Values, and Motivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for affiliation</td>
<td>Primarily symbolic (service or social)</td>
<td>Primarily material (calculative or instrumental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective involvement</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculative involvement</td>
<td>Little, often none</td>
<td>Some, possibly high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resource Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Primarily personal contact</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigor of selection process</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job analysis and descriptions</td>
<td>Less frequent</td>
<td>Prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and training</td>
<td>Less common</td>
<td>More common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and incentives</td>
<td>Primarily symbolic</td>
<td>Primarily tangible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance standards</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>Prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination for poor performance</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Occasional to frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Role Identity

Role identity theory asserts that the self consists largely of the various social roles in which an individual engages (Stryker, 1980). Role identity is the extent to which a role is part of a person's self-concept. It is the self-conception or set of meanings that people apply to themselves as a consequence of their structural role positions. For instance, when asked the seemingly simple but open-ended question "Who are you?" an individual with a strong volunteer role identity may respond "I am a volunteer." Volunteers, like employees, differ in the degree to which they internalize their organizational roles. When role identity is strong, individuals are motivated to maintain the role by exhibiting ongoing behavior that is consistent with the role (Grube and Piliavin, 2000). This has important implications for
research on OCB because those who engage in OCB may come to see helping as part of their role (Penner et al., 1997).

The theory is based on the idea that personal identity is emergent from social structure in society (Stryker, 1980), insofar as roles represent a stable and recurring pattern of social relationships that is recognized as a legitimate or real aspect of community. Since the self is multidimensional (Markus and Wurf, 1987), a person can have as many role identities as roles played in distinct sets of social relationships (Stryker, 1980; 1987). These identities reflect themselves as internalized sets of role expectations (a set for each identity), where the importance of a given identity is a function of commitment to the associated role. This level of commitment is determined by the social and personal costs involved in no longer fulfilling a role based on a given identity (Stryker, 1980). These costs are calculated within an interpretative process of sense making in which relevant inputs from others and the self are reconciled in attempts to verify, support, and validate the identity (Riley and Burke, 1995). This process is self regulatory, insofar as validated role performances create a role identity that is central to the core sense of self (Burke, 1991; McCall and Simmons, 1978). Initially, individuals have no particular self-concept implications for performing activities associated with a given role, but over time role identity is created by the positive reactions of others to role performances (Burke, 1991).

A number of researchers have suggested that continued volunteer activity causes the volunteer role to become a central part of personal identity (Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Penner and Finkelstein, 1998; Piliavin and Callero, 1991; Piliavin, Grube, and Callero, 2002). In addition, empirical research demonstrates that volunteer role identity predicts a variety of helping behaviors directed at individuals and organizations, including blood donations (Callero, 1985; Chang, Piliavin, and Callero, 1988; Piliavin and Callero, 1991), hours donated, money contributed, intent to leave (Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Lee, Piliavin, and Call, 1999), and task leadership (Riley and Burke, 1995). Since citizenship behaviors are a fundamental part of the volunteering role, an internalized “citizenship” role may be a core component of ongoing volunteer role identity.

**Volunteer Motives**

A great deal of research suggests that volunteer motives for joining the organization are key determinants of their contributions to the organization. Although much attention has been directed toward identifying voluntary action as reflective of altruistic impulses (Murnighan, Kim, and Metzger, 1993), volunteer descriptions of their own motives also include instrumental goals, such as meeting new people, gaining work-relevant experience, self-enhancement, ego protection, or overall personal development (Anderson and Moore, 1978; Clary et al., 1998; Knoke and Wright-Isak, 1982; Miller, 1985; Zakour, 1994). Recent research suggests that volunteer motives are functional—they serve a psychological purpose for the individual—and thus have implications for attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Clary et al., 1998; Omoto and Snyder, 1995).

In our model, we differentiate two general types of functional motives. Expressive motives are related to the expression of role identity and instrumental motives are generally based on economic or cost-benefit considerations. Expressive motives include altruism, ego-protection, self-enhancement, and social motives reflecting the normative expectations of
others. Instrumental motives include career-related experience, learning about the world, exercising and enhancing skills and social motives, such as networking and meeting new people (not tied to identity). Although some approaches to motives are more fine-grained and differentiate four (Clary and Snyder, 1991) or six motives (Clary et al., 1998), we use the expressive-instrumental distinction as an initial heuristic for our theory building. We suggest that more complex approaches would be interesting material for future research. In addition, and in contrast to prior research, we suggest that mere presence of expressive or instrumental motives is not adequate to explain identity development or volunteer helping behavior. Instead, the functional approach emphasizes satisfaction or fulfillment of motives as more likely to influence attitudes, cognitions, and behavior. In the following section, we frame this issue from the perspective of the psychological contracts held by volunteers.

**FULFILLMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACTS**

Psychological contracts are individual beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement with another party (Rousseau, 1995). These beliefs include what they are obligated to provide, what the other party is obligated to provide, and evaluative standards for assessing how well the other party has fulfilled its obligation. Psychological contracts apply to a variety of work contexts, work roles, and working relationships (Ellingson et al., 1998; Howard, 1995; McLean Parks, Kidder, and Gallagher, 1998; Rousseau, 1997; Van Dyne and Ang, 1998; West and Bogumil, 2000) and also have been linked to unpaid or volunteer work (Farmer and Fedor, 1999; Liao-Troth, 2001).

Since motives to volunteer are not purely altruistic or other-oriented, volunteer contracts may range from relatively transactional cost-benefit considerations to highly relational or even covenental bonds (Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch, 1994), where organizational values are accepted and internalized. Volunteers thus enter their working relationships with specific expectations of what tangible and intangible inducements the organization is obliged to provide them. Volunteer motives predict willingness to volunteer for a particular organization (Simon, Sturmer, and Steffens, 2000), which is consistent with recommendations for voluntary organizations to match recruitment messages (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, and Haugen, 1994) and incentives (Knoke and Wright-Isak, 1982) with volunteer motives. This suggests that volunteer motives play an important role in determining perceived obligations for inducements and contributions, judgments whether the relationship fulfills these expectations, and volunteer reactions based on their assessment of motive fulfillment (Omoto and Snyder, 1995; Stevens, 1991).

In the next section, we integrate these concepts and develop the causal logic for the propositions in our theoretical model. Overall, based on social exchange (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960), we propose that functional motives will interact with role identity to influence volunteer helping.
A PRELIMINARY MODEL OF VOLUNTEER HELPING BEHAVIOR

General Role Identity and Organization-Specific Role Identity

Earlier, we discussed the importance of role identity. We now differential general role identity (GRI) and organizational-specific role identity (OSRI). When a given role is well-recognized and legitimated by social structures, its meaning is likely to be socially shared (Stryker, 1980; Wiley and Alexander, 1987). Thus, “general” role identities can span groups and organizations. A general role identity as a volunteer is generic—it’s meaning is widely shared and most agree who is a volunteer and what a volunteer does. General role identity does not depend on membership in or service to a particular organization. At the same time, any specific case of volunteering is embedded in an organizational context. Thus, recent research on volunteerism acknowledges organizational characteristics and organizational-specific role identity as predictors of volunteer helping, often in conjunction with general volunteer role identity (Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Penner, 2002; Penner and Finkelstein, 1998; Piliavin et al., 2002).

This raises questions about organizationally embedded or situated identities and the organizational identification literature (Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, 1994; Schlenker, 1985; Scott and Lane, 2000). Organizational identification is a cognition of the self in relationship to the organization (Rousseau, 1998), whereas role identity is a cognition of the self in relation to a role (e.g., as a volunteer). Thus, the constructs differ but are not incompatible. One may have an identity that is tied to an organization (OI), to a role regardless of context (GRI), and to a particular role within a particular organization (OSRI) such as being a volunteer for the local March of Dimes chapter. Thus, our focus is on role-within-organization and not just on identification with the organization as the psychological referent for self-identity.

Consistent with research that shows relationships between more abstract or general constructs (such as global self-esteem) and more proximal or situation-specific constructs (such as organizational-based self-esteem), we expect that general role identity will be related to organization specific role identity (Pierce, Gardner, Dunham, and Cummings, 1989). In other words, OSRI is a facet of GRI. Both stem from reification of social structures and thus share the essential form or content of role identity. Organizations are embedded in broader social structures and draw their legitimacy from these contexts. Thus, identification with context-free role in general (GRI) should enhance the development of a context-specific or situated role identity (GRI). Consistent with this, Grube and Piliavin (2000) demonstrated that strength of general role identity as a volunteer positively predicted strength of role identity as a volunteer for the American Cancer Society. Accordingly, we predict that

P1: The stronger a volunteer’s general role identity, the stronger the organization-specific role identity.

Initial Fulfillment of Functional Motives

We also propose, consistent with the psychological contracts literature, that initial fulfillment of functional motives (expressive and instrumental) will moderate the
relationships in proposition 1. When volunteers join an organization, their specific experiences in the organization and the extent to which the organization fulfills obligations will influence the extent to which GRI is transformed into OSRI. Shore and Tetrick (1994) note that people have goal-oriented motivations for seeking information relevant to their psychological contracts, and so volunteers ought to be vigilant about contract fulfillment of motives that are especially meaningful to them (Morrison and Robinson, 1997). Thus, perceived fulfillment of salient motives for volunteering influences the effect of GRI on organization-specific role identity as a volunteer. When new volunteers judge that the organization enables them to fulfill their functional needs, they are more likely to internalize the specific role as part of their identity. They are more likely to adopt a collective ("us") interest (McLean Parks and Kidder, 1994). Although Grube and Piliavin (2000) found that general role identity predicted organization-specific role identity, they did not investigate whether motive fulfillment influenced the relationship between the two identities. In the next two sections, we extend their work and propose that motive fulfillment moderates the relationship between GRI and OSRI. In addition, we argue that the form of these interactions differs for expressive and instrumental motives. We first discuss the case of expressive motives.

The Moderating Role of Fulfillment of Expressive Motives

Expressive motives are fulfilled when role enactment is consistent with an individual’s self-identity. For example, if a volunteer sees the self as altruistic, helping others is consistent with self-concept, reinforces a positive sense of self, and is intrinsically satisfying. From this perspective, volunteering enhances self-image.

In proposition 1, we proposed that GRI would be positively related to OSRI. Here we refine that prediction and suggest that the relationship between GRI and OSRI will be weaker when there is high fulfillment of expressive motives and stronger when there is low fulfillment of expressive motives (see Figure 2). In other words, we argue that high fulfillment of expressive motives leads to high OSRI, regardless of GRI. This is because the role enactment (role taking or role making) satisfies personal needs for consistency between self-concept and behavior and thus is intrinsically satisfying to the volunteer (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Korman, 1976). Even if a relatively new volunteer had a weak general role identity as a volunteer, this is less salient because it is less proximal to the immediate situation. For example, individuals could find themselves in volunteer roles without previously including ‘volunteer’ as part of their self-identity. In this case, an OSRI would form as a result of specific experiences in the particular organization (most likely as a result of newcomer socialization) and fulfillment of identity-relevant expressive motives would cause a strong volunteer role identity that is organization-specific. In sum, we suggest that general role identity has little effect on OSRI of newcomers when expressive motives are fulfilled because a strong organization-specific volunteer role identity will develop in either case.
Figure 2: Predictions for Moderated Relationships (bold line indicates steeper slope).
In contrast, however, we argue that general role identity makes an important difference when expressive motives are not fulfilled. In other words, the relationship between GRI and OSRI is stronger when there is low fulfillment of expressive motives. If general role identity and expressive motive fulfillment are both low, enactment of the role does not provide intrinsic satisfaction and does not reinforce a positive sense of self. As such, the individual may report for work and may perform volunteer duties, but it is unlikely that the volunteer will feel a strong sense of identification with the role, their contributions, or with the organization. In this type of situation, it may be that an individual is volunteering for instrumental motives and has no personal identity as a volunteer (either generally or in the context of this particular organization).

If, however, a volunteer enters the organization with a strong volunteer role identity and subsequently perceives that the role does not allow fulfillment of identity-expressive motives, this is a more complex situation. Self-schemas affect the formation of role identity (Stryker, 1987; Wiley and Alexander, 1987). Thus, if an individual with a strong general role identity as a volunteer joins a new organization, their reflexive self-views (McCall and Simmons, 1978) can allow them to sustain and verify their identity in the new situation (Riley and Burke, 1995). This is because failing to enact the role triggers social and personal costs that threaten general role identity (Stryker, 1980) and causes them, at least initially, to continue enacting the role (Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Penner and Finkelstein, 1998). Therefore, when a new volunteer holds a strong general role identity, moderate organization-specific identity development should develop based on role self-support (McCall and Simmons, 1978) even if external role support (i.e., fulfillment of expressive motives) is not present.

We note, however, that this applies only in the context of initial fulfillment of motives. Over time, low fulfillment of expressive motives has identity threatening implications that can change identity cognitions and behavior (Farmer, Tierney, and Kung-McIntyre, in press), leading to reduced volunteer participation (Farmer and Fedor, 1999). We return to this later in the chapter. In summary, for relatively new volunteers, we propose the following

P2: Fulfillment of expressive motives will moderate the relationship between volunteer general role identity and organization-specific role identity, such that the relationship will be stronger when fulfillment of expressive motives is low and weaker when fulfillment is high.

The Moderating Role of Fulfillment of Instrumental Motives

Instrumental motives are fulfilled when the benefits of role enactment exceed the costs. In contrast to expressive motives, instrumental motives have fewer identity implications. Instead, they are based on economic or transactional types of exchange (Murnighan et al., 1993). For example, if volunteering enables skill development, learning, and career development, this can satisfy instrumental motives of the volunteer (Kim and Murnighan, 1997; Pearce, 1993; Zakour, 1994). From this perspective, volunteering provides tangible and/or intangible personal benefits.

Continuing to refine our predictions in P1 and P2, we now propose that the positive relationship between GRI and OSRI will be stronger when there is high fulfillment of instrumental motives and weaker when there is low fulfillment of instrumental motives (see
Figure 2). In other words, when volunteers feel that their volunteering provides them with personal benefits, this will enhance the positive relationship between their general role identity as a volunteer and their organizational-specific role identity. This is because the benefits of role enactment are greater than the costs and volunteers feel they are making progress toward their instrumental goals (Mael and Ashforth, 1992).

As with expressive motives, when a new volunteer with a strong general role identity as a volunteer judges that their instrumental motives are fulfilled, they will develop a relatively strong organization-specific role identity. In contrast, however, to fulfillment of instrumental motives, we suggest that the effect of satisfaction with achieving goals (instrumental fulfillment) will not lead to as high a level of organization-specific role identity strength as when expressive motive fulfillment is high. This is because self-verification (the basis for role identity development) is highest when identity-related external feedback is consistent with role self-support (McCall and Simmons, 1978).

For those with a weak GRI as a volunteer, fulfillment of instrumental motives is not particularly relevant to formation of organization-specific volunteer role identity. Instead, the relationship between the volunteer and the organization is relatively transactional and based on specific or explicit exchange. Overall, a weak general role identity as a volunteer will cause low levels of organization-specific role identity, regardless of fulfillment of instrumental motives. In sum, we propose that fulfillment of instrumental motives will enhance the positive effects of GRI on OSRI. When instrumental motives are not fulfilled, even when paired with a strong general role identity, OSRI will be lower. Thus,

**P3:** Fulfillment of instrumental functional motives will moderate the relationship between volunteer general role identity and organization-specific role identity, such that the relationship will be *stronger* when fulfillment of instrumental motives is *high* and *weaker* when fulfillment is *low*.

**Organization-Specific Role Identity and Volunteer Helping**

Volunteering is fundamentally helping behavior. While paid workers sometimes “volunteer” to help their employer in discretionary ways (OCB), volunteerism is most often directed toward a shared social benefit, such as improving public health, conserving the environment, contributing to the arts, or enhancing public education. Being a volunteer may mean that an individual is working in (not necessarily “for”) organizations such as the March of Dimes, the Sierra Club, a parent-teacher association, a hospital, a mental health center, a crisis hot line, a local church, a museum, or a professional association. In each of these cases, individuals volunteer to serve their expressive and instrumental motives. When these motives are fulfilled, OSRI is higher and volunteers have stronger links to the specific organization.

Helping serves these motives and reinforces identity, provides instrument benefits, and/or serves the client or the cause. Helping the organization, when it occurs, may simply be a means to that end. For example, the volunteer “reliability” problem suggests that while general role identity as a volunteer may focus on the organizational mission, it does not necessarily focus on citizenship directed toward the organization (e.g., conscientiousness, civic virtue, etc.). This is consistent with research that demonstrates organizationally-directed
helping and its antecedents are different from helping behaviors directed at individuals (e.g., Coleman and Borman, 2000; McNeely and Meglino, 1994).

Instead, volunteers may be motivated to acquire personal benefits, help the organization, or help the clients of the organization. For example, if volunteers are motivated primarily by instrumental motives (e.g., gaining experience and skills or network contacts), they may perform minimal volunteer tasks and may not do anything extra to help the organization or clients of the organization. Alternatively, volunteers may be strongly attached to the goals of the organization (e.g., enhancing community access to nature, art, or music) and may go beyond typical volunteer roles to contribute to the organization’s mission. Still yet, volunteer role identity may be strongly linked to the well-being of the organization’s clients (e.g., empathetic concern for hospital or nursing home patients, those with AIDS, multiple sclerosis, or birth defects).

Although the motivations in these three cases differ, we propose that higher levels of OSRI lead to higher levels of helping by volunteers. Consistent with this, Katz and Kahn (1978) proposed that motivation associated with self-identification has great potential for internalizing system goals. Accordingly, volunteer identification with the organization should be related to their reciprocal efforts on behalf of the organization, directed at client and organization-centered helping (Robinson and Morrison, 1995; Turnley et al., 2003). This follows directly from role identity theory, in that role identities imply action (Callero, 1985). According to Penner and Finkelstein (1998, p. 526), “it is this role identity that directly drives the volunteer’s behavior, because the person strives to make his or her behavior consonant with a volunteer role identity.” Accordingly, we predict that volunteer behavior will be consistent with OSRI such that

P4: The stronger the volunteer’s organization-specific role identity, the higher the helping.

The Moderating Role of Ongoing Fulfillment and OCB

Volunteers’ psychological contracts, tending toward the relational, may be open-ended or long-term in time frame (McLean Parks and Kidder, 1994). Thus volunteer assessment of expressive and instrumental fulfillment of perceived obligations continues over time and judgments can change. Past research demonstrates that contract fulfillment perceptions of employees are related to citizenship behaviors (e.g., Robinson and Morrison, 1995; Van Dyne and Ang, 1998). Extending this, we make a similar claim here for volunteers. More specifically, we predict that ongoing fulfillment of functional motives influences the general relationship between organization-specific volunteer role identity and helping behaviors, whether directed toward clients or toward the organization and its members. Because we expect that fulfillment moderates this relationship somewhat differently for client-centered and organizational helping, we discuss each in turn (see Figure 2).

Given that the societal role of volunteer is tightly bound to the idea of other-oriented benefits (Wilson and Musick, 1997), helping directed at clients of the organization is a core outcome of role identity as a volunteer. Consistent with this, our definition of volunteering includes benefits to strangers (i.e., clients). Thus, volunteer helping is embedded in (but not necessarily directed toward) the organization. Overall, the discretionary nature of volunteer
work and the normative/value-based control systems that influence volunteering (Etzioni, 1975; Knoke and Wright-Isak, 1982; Pearce, 1993) often direct volunteer attention, energy, and efforts toward clients, such that their focus on clients may be stronger and more enduring than their efforts to help the organization, even though the organization will also benefit.

In this section, we propose that ongoing fulfillment of functional motives (both expressive and instrumental) will enhance the positive effect of OSRI on helping directed at clients of the organization (P5). As described in our earlier section on OCB, we differentiate helping directed at the organization and helping directly at clients of the organization. We also argue that client helping will be particularly salient to volunteers. In the following two sections, we develop the logic for predicting that fulfillment of functional motives will differentially influence the relationship between OSRI and helping. Thus we further specify the relationship proposed in P4, based on target of the helping.

Ongoing Fulfillment and Helping Clients

Client-centered helping is a critical consequence of organization-specific role identity as a volunteer. When a volunteer has a strong OSRI, this should enhance client-focused helping behavior and strengthen the relationship between OSRI and help directed at the clients of the organization. Accordingly, when fulfillment of motives is high, client helping ought to be highest due to generally positive affect based on fulfillment of volunteer instrumental motives. Although we expect some reduction in client helping when perceived motive fulfillment is low, the core effects of the volunteer-identity ought to ensure that helping clients is still higher when OSRI is high than when organization-specific identity is low. Thus,

**P5:** Ongoing fulfillment of motives (both expressive and instrumental) will moderate the positive relationship between volunteer organization-specific role identity and helping directed at clients, such that the relationship will be *stronger* when fulfillment of motives is *high* and *weaker* when fulfillment is *low*.

Ongoing Fulfillment and Helping the Organization/Organizational Employees

Although we also propose that ongoing fulfillment will moderate the relationship between OSRI and helping directed at the organization, the form of this prediction differs from that of P5. Instead of expecting fulfillment to strengthen a generally positive relationship, we predict a positive relationship between OSRI and helping directed at the organization and its employees when motives are fulfilled and a negative relationship when volunteers perceive that their motives are *not* fulfilled.

Thus, we suggest that pairing a strong organization-specific volunteer role identity with low motive fulfillment reduces helping directed at organizationally-referenced entities and that lack of contract fulfillment is more likely to affect citizenship behaviors directed toward the organization than toward other foci such as clients since the contract is between the volunteer and the organization (Robinson and Morrison, 1995; Turnley et al., 2003). When
organization-specific identity is weak, fulfillment of motives (whether expressive or instrumental) should have little effect on organization-directed helping, and it will be generally low in either case since the ability to enforce role expectations does not generally exist for volunteers and is rarely implemented for them (Pearce, 1993). When organization-specific role identity is strong, fulfillment of either expressive or instrumental motives should lead to high organization helping based on enhancing identity-consistent behavior (expressive motives) or positive affect and reciprocity for positive benefits (instrumental motives). A perceived lack of fulfillment when OSRI is high, interestingly, should reduce organization-focused helping even below the relatively low level that occurs when organization-specific role identity is weak. This is consistent with suggestions in the contract literature that a violation of trust undermines organizational attachment and related organization-centered helping (Robinson, 1996).

Although we propose similar effects for the two motives, the rationale differs. Recall that volunteers are not overly constrained by role requirements. When volunteers identify with the organization but do not have calculative needs satisfied, they can reduce their contributions toward organizational welfare, in part, because of self-interested cost-benefit considerations (Kim and Muraghan, 1997; Muraghan et al., 1993). When volunteers have strong organization-specific role identity and yet unfulfilled expressive motives, their reasons for avoiding organization-focused helping are less calculative and more intra-psychic based on negative validation of their identity.

Thus, we propose that one of the most interesting outcomes of having a role identity that is not validated (i.e., it is suppressed due to fear of negative validation in an unsupportive environment) is a reduction in positive role-related behaviors even below the level of those who do not have a strong role identity. In this situation, the message to committed volunteers, when they cannot express their valued self is “You will be punished for being yourself here.” Thus, volunteers with high organization-specific role identity should actively avoid role-consistent behavior if they feel that it could expose them to feedback that would demean or potentially punish their sense of “It’s who I am” (Burke, 1991; Riley and Burke, 1995). According to role identity theory, at some point these individuals will seek additional outside venues (other volunteering opportunities for this particular organization) for demonstrating or reasserting this self-salient role behavior. Within a specific and ongoing relationship, however, we propose that

P6: Ongoing fulfillment of motives (both expressive and instrumental) will moderate the relationship of organization-specific role identity with volunteer helping directed at the organization and volunteer helping directed at members of the organization, such that the relationship will be positive when fulfillment of motives is high and negative when fulfillment is low.

To sum up our discussion so far, we have proposed that general role identity as a volunteer (GRI) and initial fulfillment of expressive and instrumental motives for volunteering influence the formation and strength of organization-specific role identity (OSRI) as a volunteer. We have further argued that the expression of this organization-specific role identity, as moderated by ongoing fulfillment of instrumental and expressive motives, influences client- and organization-centered helping citizenship behaviors. Our model suggests several key points. First, volunteer role identity has differential implications
It’s Who I Am

for client and organizationally focused helping OCB. Second, like employees, volunteers have psychological contracts, and fulfillment of these contracts influences OSRI and helping. Third, developing a role identity that enhances attachment to a specific organization is affected by perceived fulfillment of motives. Finally, motive fulfillment remains important throughout the volunteer’s tenure because it affects the target (organization versus client) and amount of helping. In the final section of this chapter, we discuss theoretical and practical implications of our model and suggest extensions for future research.

**DISCUSSION**

This chapter integrates past literature on organizational citizenship, volunteers, role identity, and psychological contracts to develop a framework for predicting two forms of volunteer helping citizenship behavior. We differentiated the effects of general and specific role identity as well as the moderating role of instrumental and expressive motive fulfillment on helping clients and helping the organization/employees of the organization. One key contribution of this chapter is positioning volunteers as a non-traditional form of individual-organizational relationship that has increasing theoretical and practical relevance, given recent trends away from total reliance on employees with traditional work status (Cappelli, 1997; Kalleberg, 2000). Another contribution is our model with its emphasis on fulfillment of psychological contracts (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Rousseau, 1995) that support individual role identities (Burke, 1991; Stryker, 1980) as predictors of individual initiative (Grant, 2000; Frese and Fay, 2001; Organ, 1988; Van Dyne et al., 1995).

**Theoretical Implications**

The framework and model make a number of theoretical contributions. First, our research is distinct because it focuses on a non-traditional form of individual-organizational relationship, and yet still emphasizes behaviors (helping) that facilitate accomplishment of the organization’s mission. In contrast, most existing research on organizational citizenship behavior focuses on behaviors of paid employees. Unlike traditional employment (see Table 1), volunteer work tends mostly toward the symbolic—based on service or social needs. Accordingly, it may be viewed as a relatively weak situation where roles are less constrained and the effects of personal identity on helping can be explored more easily. We do not want, however, to oversimplify the comparison. Employee work also has important symbolic aspects (Pfeffer, 1981), and volunteer work can be highly instrumental (Murnighan et al., 1993). Thus, the framework has important implications for both settings.

A second contribution is our emphasis on fulfillment of personal motives that support individual role identity, because it provides an expanded perspective for predicting citizenship behavior based on psychological contract fulfillment. Thus, the framework responds to Penner et al.’s (1997) observation that although motives and identity are critical to organizational citizenship behavior, they are not commonly included in models. An exception is a recent study by Rioux and Penner (2001) that demonstrates fulfillment of functional motives predicts employee citizenship behavior. Since this approach is based on identity fulfillment and self-verification (Burke, 1997; Freese and Burke, 1994), it contrasts with prior
research that emphasizes employee perceptions of social exchange and employer violations of obligations (Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Robinson, 1996; Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Robinson and Morrison, 2000; Thompson and Bunderson, 2003; Turnley and Feldman, 2000). Inclusion of the role identity perspective suggests identity maintenance through self-verification as a potential "deep structure" in which social exchanges are embedded.

Third, the chapter differentiates two forms of helping (traditional helping directed at the organization and its employees versus helping directed at clients of the organization). In building our model, we have predicted differential effects of role identity and fulfillment of psychological contracts on these two forms of helping. Thus, we have viewed volunteer helping citizenship behavior as an aggregate construct where the antecedents for the two types of helping differ from each other. More specifically, we have proposed that a strong organization-specific role identity enhances client helping, regardless of fulfillment of individual functional motives. In contrast, we have also proposed that a strong organization-specific role identity can detract from (reduce) traditional forms of helping (e.g., helping directed at the organization or at employees of the organization) when volunteers experience low fulfillment of their individual functional motives.

A fourth contribution relates to ongoing definitional concerns about citizenship behavior as extra-role (Morrison, 1994). Empirical research suggests that employees and their supervisors differ in what they define as in-role and extra-role behavior, and how they respond to these differences (Eastman, 1994; Morrison, 1994). For unpaid workers, the distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviors is even more blurred, since unpaid workers have somewhat more freedom to ignore or redefine aspects of their specific roles. Morrison's study demonstrated that citizenship behavior is a function of how broadly employees define their duties, but she did not explicate the theoretical mechanisms that might cause these effects. We suggest that the role identity perspective described in this chapter represents one set of mechanisms, because it suggests that although role definitions share a general core (e.g., the socially legitimated view of volunteers and their roles), individual volunteers negotiate their unique personal role identities based on self-consistency and self-enhancement needs.

A fifth contribution is our simultaneous focus on multiple identities (general role identity and organization-specific role identity). Although researchers recognize that self-concept is multifaceted (Markus and Wurf, 1987), our understanding of different identities and how they are interrelated is limited (see Grube and Piliavin, 2000, for a rare exception). The same can be said for identity-related attachments (e.g., organizational identification). For instance, both Katz and Kahn (1978) and Mael and Ashforth (1995) differentiate occupational identification from organizational identification, but do not address the relationship between these two forms of identification. Our framework takes a first step in this direction and provides a conceptual basis for linking a general identity with a more specific identity.

Finally, for the most part, research on volunteerism has focused on what causes people to volunteer and how long they volunteer. These are and will remain important questions. However, when we look at the time between role entry and exit, we find very few empirical studies that consider volunteer contributions of time, energy, or personal resources on behalf of the organization and/or its clients (Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Grube and Piliavin, 2000; Penner and Finkelstein, 1998). By focusing on different forms of helping citizenship and providing a foundation for a new perspective on volunteer contributions and performance, our
framework provides a theoretically consistent structure for empirical investigations of volunteer behaviors.

Practical Implications

Our framework and model suggest a number of practical applications with relevance to non-profits, volunteers, and volunteer human resource management practices. First, actively recruiting and selecting individuals with volunteer experience and strong general role identities as volunteers should enhance OSRI and lead to a strong client focus. As Clary, Snyder, and Ridge (1992) recommended, administrators should tailor persuasive messages to different motivational perspectives of potential volunteers and match volunteers to activities that satisfy their motives. Coupled with structured early socialization experiences, this should clarify role expectations for volunteers and the organization and strengthen organization-specific role identity that, in turn, will enhance organization-directed helping.

Second, our ideas suggest that creating strategies to increase volunteer self-commitment through their role investments would be an important way to generate organization-specific role identity. This could be done, for instance, by providing frequent opportunities (with appropriate inducements) that encourage volunteers to take on new assignments. Alternatively, the organization could allow volunteers to represent the organization to the public and through behavioral commitment enhance OSRI (Salancik, 1977).

Third, our model indicates that the link between OSRI and the amount and target of volunteer helping is influenced by volunteer judgments of how well the organization meets its obligations. Because volunteer reasons for affiliation with the organization are primarily symbolic and not material (see Table 1), the “coins” of their “pay” need to include symbolic exchanges. Thus, managers of volunteers need to provide symbolic support, especially when it is valued by a particular volunteer or perceived as an obligation. Symbolic support includes recognition and appreciation for work done, personal interest in the volunteer’s life and well-being, timely and helpful feedback on the results of their efforts, and facilitating positive and supportive relationships with other volunteers.

Finally, the organizational design of volunteer work (see Table 1) highlights the difficulty of coordinating the work of volunteers (Pearce, 1993). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) suggest that organizational citizenship behaviors directed at the organization can effectively coordinate activities among team members and across work units. Our framework suggests that generating attachment to the role and the organization simultaneously is not only important to individual volunteer performance, but that it may provide volunteer coordinators and administrators with a mechanism to enhance organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

Future Research

Our first recommendation is for scholars to test the relationships in the model. Our thinking represents an interactionist approach, given that general role identity is largely the result of personal experiences prior to organizational membership, while contract fulfillment and organizational attachment are largely based on organizational experiences. In a field setting, a longitudinal study with measures at three different points in time would be optimal.
One could measure general volunteer role identity at organizational entry, along with functional motives and related reciprocal obligations based on volunteer beliefs about the psychological contract. Then, two or three months later, researchers could assess organization-specific role identity and reassess perceived contract obligations. Helping behaviors could also be assessed at this point (T2), but an additional delay (T3) would provide a more definitive test of proposed causal links. Since situated identification can be created even in temporary settings (Rousseau, 1998), these linkages could also be tested in a lab setting, perhaps in an organizational simulation. One advantage to this approach is that "real" field settings may attract those with strong volunteer role identities and thus create range restriction. Random selection of participants from the general population would assure a broader range of general role identity scores. An obvious disadvantage of the lab setting is that organizational attachment is unlikely to be deep-seated. Thus, a combined field and lab approach would provide the most insight.

Second, we recommend that researchers refine and extend our conceptualization of the proposed relationships. We have described a preliminary model. Accordingly, it is incomplete and under-identified. Future research should consider additional constructs and perspectives that could expand and enrich this initial framework. For example, organizational factors such as socialization practices ought to be related to the formation of organization-specific volunteer role identity, such that more structured programs provide stronger links between general role identity and organization-specific role identity. Socialization and organizational culture could be assessed with program age, size, formalization of jobs, division of labor, and enforcement of performance and role expectations. Additionally, it would be useful to consider the role of individual difference factors that may influence volunteer role identity, perceptions of psychological contract fulfillment, and helping reactions. For example, those who are high in equity sensitivity may be more sensitive to role identity and psychological contract fulfillment, whereas those who are high in benevolence might have weaker reactions. In addition, because volunteers often have more leeway for role making, proactive personality may play a role in identity formation, perhaps moderating the relationship between socialization practices and organization-specific identity (Crant, 2000).

Future research should also consider the boundary conditions of this model. Perhaps the relationships are particularly relevant in some types of organizations, for some types of volunteer roles, or in some cultures. For example, volunteers who work individually versus those who work in group settings characterized by high interdependence may develop different organization-specific role identities. Similarly, volunteers who are highly interdependent or who work in groups with strong norms may develop shared mental models of psychological contract fulfillment. In response, this could increase homogeneity of volunteer helping in the group. Another potential boundary condition is our presumption that the organization mission included opportunities to help clients. Many volunteer-based organizations, however, are utilitarian, with no societal or client-related goals (e.g., a taxpayer association with the purpose of reducing member taxes). Perhaps volunteer role identity is not particularly meaningful in these settings.

In addition, future research could consider additional types of volunteer attitudes and behaviors. To what extent does organization-specific role identity influence affective or normative commitment to different foci (such as the organization, the client, or the cause)? Do these interact? For additional behaviors, it would be useful to consider additional types of helping and other types of citizenship. For example, it would be interesting to theorize about
whether challenging forms of citizenship (e.g., voice and speaking up to make suggestions for change) would be more or less prevalent among volunteers compared to regular employees. It also would be interesting to see if our proposed relationships could be modified to apply to more traditional employment roles.

Finally, research could consider an expanded set of outcomes such as other volunteer reactions to low fulfillment. For example, what happens to feelings of psychological ownership that are critical to self-directed volunteer behavior (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004) in extreme cases of violation? Do reactance and sabotage result from severe violation or do volunteers simply quit given the absence of continuance commitment? Thus a potentially fruitful area for empirical research could consider reduced satisfaction, decreased motivation, stress, emotional exhaustion, and burnout (Cropanzano, Rupp, and Byrne, 2003; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli, 2001; Maslach and Leiter, 1999) as additional reactions to role identity and fulfillment of psychological contracts.

CONCLUSION

This chapter had three general objectives. First, we emphasized the increasingly important contributions that volunteers can make to organizations that are faced with mounting competitive pressures. As major sources of support erode, such as government funding, organizations increasingly must turn to volunteers for help in terms of time and financial support. Second, we drew on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior literature to suggest that volunteers engage in different types of helping (directed at clients versus directed at the organization and its employees) and that their level of helping, like OCB, is influenced by their perceptions of psychological contract fulfillment. To date, most research on organizational citizenship has focused on paid employees with traditional employment status (see Bettencourt, 1997; Van Dyne, VandeWalle, Kostova, Latham, and Cummings, 2000 for exceptions). However, many of the most desirable employee behaviors are essentially voluntary in nature. Thus, understanding what drives helping behaviors of volunteers may provide insights for enhancing the contributions of paid workers. Third, building on the Volunteer literature, we suggested that role identity, with its emphasis on self-consistency and self-enhancement, is a key causal mechanism that predicts volunteer helping behavior. We conclude by encouraging other researchers to test and refine this initial conceptualization of role identity and volunteer helping behavior in organizations.
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