THE EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED SIGNED BEHAVIORAL CONTRACT BETWEEN A VOLUNTEER WORKER AND HIS/HER SUPERVISOR: A FIELD EXPERIMENT

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

LYNNE CUTLER

1975

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

THESIS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 1293 10550 2169

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED SIGNED BEHAVIORAL CONTRACT BETWEEN A VOLUNTEER WORKER AND HIS/HER SUPERVISOR: A FIELD EXPERIMENT

By

Lynne Cutler

Student volunteers in four social service agencies were randomly assigned to three conditions: 1) a contract conditon where a volunteer wrote an individualized signed behavioral contract with his/her supervisor that specified expected, less than expected and more than expected performance levels; 2) a discussion condition where a volunteer met with his supervisor to discuss general feelings, anxiety and concerns; and 3) a control condition where a volunteer did not have these planned meetings or a behavioral contract. These treatment conditons were tested to see the effect on volunteer's satisfaction, supervisor/teacher ratings, interaction and changes in the child/children the volunteer works with. A multivariate analysis of variance revealed a positive effect due to the contract and discussion conditions on volunteer's, activity and supervisor's satisfaction. The results also indicated that a volunteer's need for clarity moderates the effectiveness of the contract such that a contracted volunteer with a high need for clarity stays with the agency longer, has a greater satisfaction towards his activities and reports a better relationship with his child than a volunteer with a high need for clarity not on the contract. This type of volunteer also tends to be more satisfied with his supervisor and has a clearer role perception.

THE EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED SIGNED BEHAVIORAL CONTRACT BETWEEN A VOLUNTEER WORKER AND HIS/HER SUPERVISOR: A FIELD EXPERIMENT

BY

Lynne Cutler

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Social Sciences

1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the utilization of volunteers in mental health agencies and schools has increased. Often these organizations place the volunteer and agency in a polemic situation where the agency has few guidelines on how to use the volunteer and consequently, the volunteer is unclear of his/her role in the agency. Perhaps this confusion contributes to the volunteer's dissatisfaction, dropout rates, and underutilization of talents and skills.

How then, can an agency provide guidelines to its volunteers? One possible method used to communicate behavioral goals is the goal attainment scaling procedure developed by Kiresuk and Sherman (1968). Criteria for expected, less than expected, and more than expected levels of treatment/administrative outcomes are written in a contract format. Initially, this procedure was designed to evaluate different treatment modes within a mental health agency, but subsequently has been used in settings to evaluate mental health programs; the outcome of treatment and training programs on clients; the use of evaluation feedback data in group therapy sessions, and mutually determined goals between client and therapist (Garwick and Vanderpool, 1973).

Similar procedures, such as management-by-objectives (Odiorne, 1965), goal-setting (Locke, 1966) and behavioral objectives (Duchastel, 1973), are used in other formal settings, i.e., industry, scientific research, and most currently in education. Usually the specific methods used to identify and quantify the goals are not delineated. Mager's goal analysis

procedure is a useful tool in approaching this problem (1972). This procedure consists of five steps whereby goals and expectations that are considered important are translated into specific measurable behaviors. Ideally, it allows one to discover the essence of a goal so it can be communicated and evaluated objectively (Mager, 1962, 1972).

The agencies selected for the study have general objectives and goals, an accomplishment few volunteer programs have. Most of these goals and objectives, however, are not tangibly related to the volunteer's skills and behaviors and therefore may become statement of intent rather than the realization of those objectives. Perhaps then the techniques of goal analysis and goal attainment can be used with volunteers to decrease dropout rates and increase satisfaction and effectiveness. Specifically, then, this study assesses the effectiveness of an individualized, signed behavioral contract between a volunteer worker and his/her supervisor.

Review of Literature

Goals guide a person's actions and thoughts. Locke maintains that "people's statements about how they intend to perform and their goals in a situation are good predictors of their actual performance in the situation." (Cited by Lawler, 1970.) This suggests that when people set goals for themselves, they are motivated to act according to these goals. For example, Bryan and Locke (1967), in a laboratory setting, found that when an initially slow-motivated group were given specific goals they caught up with an initially high-motivated group. It was also found that setting goals in boring tasks increased interest (Locke, 1967). In a later study, Locke (1968) found persons with very hard goals perform consistently better than persons with easy goals, even though the former

may not realize their goals; and in his review of eight laboratory studies, six snowed that persons with highly specific goals performed at significantly higher levels than persons with the more general goal of "doing their best." Further, Locke and Bryan (1969) found that a person's goals affect not only how hard a person works, but also what aspects of a more complicated task he focuses on. Recently, Latham and Baldes (1975) empirically tested Locke's theory in six logging companies using a time series design. They found that performance improved immediately upon the assignment of a specific hard goal as opposed to the more generalized goal of "doing your best," and that this increase held constant across nine consecutive months, the duration of the study.

Management-by-objectives is a popular assessment technique used in industry that combines feedback performance with goal-setting. In 1965 Meyer, Kay and French empirically studied the effects of a participative interview with mutual goalsetting versus a non-participative interview with superior-imposed goals. Results showed that mutual goal-setting resulted in more goal accomplishment than super-imposed goals; and persons accustomed to participation reacted more favorably to the participative interview than those not accustomed to participation.

A person, however, may be very motivated and set goals for a particular job or task and still perform incorrectly or become disenchanted because he perceives his role incorrectly or is subjected to incongruent messages. Role conflict exists when the behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent and the person experiences stress, becomes dissatisfied and performs less effectively than if the expectations imposed on him did not conflict (Kahn, et. al., 1964). For example, conflict exists when a person's internal standards and values are in opposition

to the defined role behaviors. A theoretically and empirically separate construct-role ambiguity refers to the lack of necessary information available to a given organization position that increases the probability a person will be dissatisfied with his role, will experience anxiety, will distort reality, and will thus perform less effectively (Kahn, 1964). Rizzo et. al. (1970) reviewed several articles that provide empirical support to role ambiguity theory, and conclude that role ambiguity results in undesirable consequences for both organization members and for organization performances. Similarly, Lawler (1970) maintains that it is important for supervisors and subordinates to have common perspectives so that the subordinate does not perform incorrectly because he perceives his role inaccurately. He suggests that supervisors and subordinates work toward developing shared perceptions, i.e., specific goals and objectives of how the subordinate's job should be accomplished. To alleviate ambiguity of the volunteer's role, John Cauley, past director of the Office of Volunteer Programs at Michigan State University, suggests that agencies write volunteer job descriptions that outline the volunteer's duties and reponsibilities (1974). Further, Sorum (1974) maintains that behavioral goals can and should be used at various levels of a volunteer program. For instance, they can be used to specify agency, individual staff members', or individual volunteers' roles and objectives.

In general, there is evidence that "goal-setting" is a beneficial tool that provides the agency with evaluative feedback and may increase performance. It is possible, however, that individual differences may diminish or enhance the contract's effectiveness. For example, in a survey of the literature, there are some personal variables that seem

to predict the volunteer's effectiveness. Goodman's study on big brothers (1972) reports that a college student with an outgoing profile was the most effective companion therapist. Even though this profile is mainly a composite of various personality tests, including a ninety-minute group assessment procedure, specific background characteristics also emerged. The person who had previous experience with children, a person-oriented college major, had participated in many extracurricular activities during high school and college, with a high school grade point average around 3.0 was most effective.

Mitchell (1966) found that students who dressed casually, were idealistic, spontaneous, enthusiastic, and dependable were most effective, while those in their first term at school tended to overestimate the amount of free time they would have available and thus, were poor risks. Further, Truax and Mitchell (1971) in a review of salient therapist characteristics concluded that empathy, warmth, and genuineness are most important. In their paper, they also outline a procedure to select helping personnel with these characteristics. Specifically, they look for people low in anxiety, depression, introversion who at the same time are striving, dominant, active autonomous individuals.

A variable specifically related to the present research design concerns a person's need for clarity; i.e., how does this need interact with his job satisfaction and effectiveness? In an experimental study, Lyons (1971) investigated tne relationship between role clarity and reported satisfaction, tensions, propensities to leave and withdrawal of registered nurses having different needs for clarity. The results showed that: 1) when nurses demonstrated a high need for clarity, role ambiguity significantly decreased satisfaction, increased tensions, and

increased propensities to leave; 2) when nurses showed a low need for clarity, there were no significant correlations with these four factors; and 3) the low need for clarity nurses were not upset when they saw their roles as structured, which suggests that one can increase the degree of role clarity without driving out or dissatisfying those with a low need for clarity.

In general, the volunteer literature does not address the issue of goals as it pertains to volunteer organizations. This in turn will not alleviate the aforementioned ambiguous situation between the volunteer and the agency. In light of these issues, an experimental application of behavioral goals in volunteer agencies should be helpful to determine the usefulness of setting a behavioral contract. To this end, this study examines the efficacy of a behavioral contract between a student volunteer and a volunteer coordinator for social service agencies working with children and adolescents. In contrast to other studies where treatment effects are aimed primarily at the volunteer's development (Gruver, 1971), this study also measures the effects of the treatment on the children. Specifically, then, the following hypotheses tested tne effects of behavioral contracting on volunteers and the children they worked with:

1) The contracted volunteer will have greater job satisfaction than non-contracted volunteers.

2) The supervisors and teachers will evaluate contracted volunteers as more effective.

3) The contracted volunteers will be more effective with the children.

4) The contracted volunteers who attain their goals will have greater job satisfaction, higher supervisor ratings, and will be more effective with the children than the volunteers who did not attain their goals.

5) The volunteers with high need for clarity will be more effective with the contract than without.

In addition, correlational data on the relationship between volunteer characteristics (demographic and personality) and the volunteer and child outcome measures are also collected. However, no formal hypotheses are presented.

METHODS

Subjects

Seventy-seven (34 male and 43 female) single Michigan State University students participated in this study. They ranged in age from 18 to 29 with a mean age of 20. Of these, 74 were white. These students volunteered to MSU Office of Volunteer Bureau and were placed by November 1, 1974, into one of the following agencies: Big Brother/Big Sister of America, Everett Big Brothers, Reach--Everett Elementary School, and Gier Park Elementary School. These agencies are located in Lansing, Michigan, and require the volunteer to meet individually with a child once a week for nine months. Most of the children find it difficult to adjust socially, academically or emotionally to their environment. Table 1 shows the initial sample size, target population, and the type of conditions under which the volunteer worked. By March 1975, 15 volunteers quit and two children moved.

Table 1. Agency Characteristics

Agency	# of Volunteers	Target Population	Working Environ.
Big Brother/Big Sister	33	6-17 years old	varies
Everett Big Brothers	13	elementary	after schl.
Reach	19	elementary	in & after school
Gier	12	elementary--learning disability	in school

Research Design

This is a 4 X 3 factorial design, with 4 agencies and 3 treatment conditions. Some measuring instruments were administered in a pretest-posttest format, although for some only a posttest was administered. Table 2 illustrates the design and the sample sizes. Within each agency half the volunteers were assigned to the behavioral contract condition. In this condition the supervisor wrote an individualized signed contract with the volunteer (Appendix A) that specified expected, less than expected, and more than expected performance levels. The volunteer also wrote personal goals and expectations. The remaining volunteers were divided into two groups in order to determine if the contract worked because of the contract specifically or as a result of increased rapport between the volunteer and the supervisor: a discussion condition where the volunteer met with the supervisor to discuss general feelings, anxieties, concerns; and secondly, a control group where the volunteer did not have these planned meetings or a behavioral contract. Because of Gier Park's small sample size, it did not have the discussion condition.

Table 2. Research Design and Sample Size in each Treatment Level

Agency	Contract (n)	Discussion (n)	Control (n)
Big Brother	17	8	8
Everett Big Brothers	5	4	4
Reach	9	5	5
Gier Park	6	0	6

Big Brother/Big Sister volunteers were randomly assigned to the treatment conditions. In the other agencies, the volunteers attended on the same day and thus, days were randomly assigned and counterbalanced across agencies in order to keep the conditions separate. Although there is no reason to suspect any systematic difference in the days the students volunteered, demographic information and personality measures were initially taken on all volunteers. And as can be seen in the results sections, the treatment groups did not differ on any of these measures, which supports the randomization's effectiveness.

Measures

In selecting criteria for change, the experimenter attempted to include measures that were standardized, brief, and sensitive to slight changes. All had good internal consistency ($r > .60$) in the current study using Hoyt Analysis of Variance. The following describes the covariate indices (volunteer background measures), and the criterion measures (volunteer satisfaction, volunteer evaluation, process measures, and children measures). Figure 1 shows when the tests were administered.

Figure 1. Test Administration

	October	December	March	April/May
Background Questionnaire	X			
Volunteer Satisfaction			X	
Volunteer Evaluation		X	X	
Process Measures			X	
Children Measures	X			X

Background Questionnaire and Personality Measures (see Appendix B) Each volunteer was asked questions concerning his/her religious background, religiosity, ethnic background, parental occupation and education, college major, reasons for volunteering and previous work experiences with children. Another set of questions tapped the person's need for clarity (Lyon 1971), trust in people (Survey Research Center 1966), empathy towards others (Hogan 1969), and personality in terms of extraversion-introversion and neuroticism-stability (Eysenck Personality Inventory Format 1968).

The need for clarity scale consisted of four questions each with five alternatives. Scores can range from 5 to 20. Split-half reliability was estimated to be .82; in the current study, r is .79. Trust in people (Survey Research Center 1969) is a three forced-choice scale that measures a person's trust in others. Scores range from 1 (low trust) to 6 (high trust). Inter-item correlations were at least .48. For this study, internal reliabilities were .72 and .61 for the volunteers and children respectively. The empathy scale (Hogan 1969) is a 64-item, forced-choice pencil and paper test that measures the ability of the person to understand another's condition or state of mind without actually experiencing that person's feelings. In the scale's construction, internal consistency coefficient using the Kuder-Richardson formula 21 is .71 and for test-retest correlation after two months, r= .84. The split-half reliability for the Eysenck inventory ranged from .74 to .91 using Spearman Brown prophecy formula and test-retest reliabilities range from .80 to .97 for the separate test forms.

Volunteer Satisfaction Questionnaire. Two scales from the Job Description Inventory (Smith, Kendal, Hulin, 1969) were used as dependent measures. One scale measured the satisfaction with "job" activities;

the other measured the volunteer's satisfaction with his supervisor and/or teacher. Beside each item the volunteer was asked to write "Y" if the item described a particular aspect of his activities (supervision), "N" if the item did not describe that aspect, or a "?" if he could not decide. Scores can range from 0 to 54. "Y" was scored 3, "N" was scored 0, and "?" was 1. The estimated split-half internal consistency corrected by the Spearman Brown formula was .84 for activities and .87 for the supervision scale. For the volunteer's satisfaction with his activities, r = .79; for volunteer's satisfaction toward his teacher, r = .90.

The role ambiguity scale designed by House (1970) was used to measure the volunteer's understanding of his duties. The volunteer rated himself on six items, using a seven-point scale ranging from very false to very true. House reports internal consistency estimates of .78 and .80 for these six items. Internal reliability for the volunteers in this study is r = .84. A record was kept on the number of months each volunteer stayed in the agency.

Volunteer Evaluation. In review of the literature, no standardized evaluation forms appropriate to the activities of the volunteers in this study were found to measure the volunteer's performance. As a result, the experimenter designed a thirteen-item, five-point scale (Appendix C) that assessed volunteer behaviors that seemed appropriate to the volunteer's responsibility. Scores can range from 0 to 52, high scores reflecting higher performance. This scale has good internal consistency estimates for the supervisors, r = .92 and .96, as well as r = .93 and .90 for the teachers.

Process Measures. The volunteer described his overall relationship with the child, using Goodman's Report for parts 5 and 6 (1972). Part 5 describes the amount of intimacy witnessed by the volunteer during the time spent together, and part 6 contains ten items on a six-point scale relevant to a two-person encounter. In this section, first the volunteer described his feelings or behaviors and then described his perception of the child's feelings or behaviors during their visits. No internal consistency reliabilities were reported for the scale; however, in this study r is .94 for the volunteer's interaction and .92 for the volunteer's report of the child's interaction.

Children Tests. Since ultimately the volunteer's effectiveness is reflected in the children they work with, five change measures were attained on the children.

1. The teacher or school counselor rated each child's self-concept using McDaniel's Inferred self-concept scale (1969). This thirty-item, five-point scale mainly covers social relations. Scores can range from 1 to 5, low scores reflecting higher performances. Reported split-half reliabilities were .86, .86, and .90 for ratings by counselors, teachers, and both combined. The internal consistency estimate for the participants in this program is .92.

2. The child's trust in people (Survey Research Center, 1969).

3. Grades, absenteeism and tardiness record.

Procedure

Figure 2 outlines the steps taken in the study.

Figure 2. Summary of Activities---October 1974-May 1975

Step #	Months	Experimental Condition	Discussion Condition (Placebo effect)	Control Condition
1	September	Obtained contractual agreements with agencies.	Obtained contractual agreements with agencies.	Obtained contractual agreements with agencies.
2	October	Group orientation on campus.	Group orientation on campus.	Group orientation on campus.
3		Volunteer background questionnaire.	Volunteer background questionnaire.	Volunteer background questionnaire.
4		Pretesting of children.	Pretesting of children.	Pretesting of children.
5		Orientation session at agency/ assignment of child.	Orientation session at agency/assignment of child.	Orientation session at agency/assignment of child.
6			Supervisor met with designated "non-contracted" volunteers to answer any questions the person may have had and to discuss in general any feelings, anxieties, or concerns of the volunteer (5-15 min. per volun.).	
7		Experimenter met with supervisor to perform a goal analysis on the volunteer's role in their agency, and to train supervisor in this process. (1-2 hrs.)		
8		Supervisor met with "contracted" volunteers to write the behavioral contract. (5-15 min. per volunteer)		

Figure 2 (cont'd.).

Step #	Dates	Experimental Condition	Discussion Condition (Placebo effect)	Control Condition
9	December	Supervisor met with "contracted" volunteers to review the volunteer's progress towards the contract goals and to revise the contract (5-15 min. per volunteer).	Supervisor met with designated "non-contracted" volunteers to answer any questions the person may have had and to discuss any feelings, anxieties, or concerns of the volunteer. (5-15 m. per volun.)	
10		Supervisor and teacher evaluate the volunteer (5-10 m.)	Supervisor and teacher evaluate the volunteer (5-10 m.)	Supervisor and teacher evaluate the volunteer (5-10 m.)
11	March	Supervisor met with "contracted" volunteers to review the volunteer's progress towards the contract goals and to revise the contract (5-15 min. per volunteer).	Supervisor met with designated "non-contracted" volunteers to answer any questions the person may have had and to discuss any feelings, anxieties, or concerns of the volunteer (5-15 m. per volun.).	
12		Supervisor and teacher evaluate the volunteer (5-10 m.)	Supervisor and teacher evaluate the volunteer (5-10 m.)	Supervisor and teacher evaluate the volunteer (5-10 m.)
13	April/May	Posttest of children.	Posttest of children.	Posttest of children.
14		Volunteer satisfaction questionnaire.	Volunteer satisfaction questionnaire.	Volunteer satisfaction questionnaire.

Typically, volunteers at Michigan State University contact the MSU office of volunteer programs and are referred to an agency that interests the student. Then, the agency holds an orientation meeting and some screen the volunteers. (Of the four agencies selected for the study only Big Brother screens its volunteers.) After this, the volunteers are assigned to their child, teacher, and other responsibilities. In this study, all the volunteers followed the above procedure, except that they were also asked to complete a background questionnaire. The volunteers were told that a graduate student in conjunction with the Office of Volunteers Programs were evaluating some programs and trying to determine whether certain volunteers worked better with certain children. The volunteer did not know of the contracting experiment.

Then, as previously explained, the volunteers were assigned to the treatment conditions. First, the supervisor met with the discussion group. This was done in order to keep the contract and discussion (placebo) conditions separate because the supervisor met with both the experimental and placebo groups. Next, the experimenter met individually with the supervisors to perform a goal analysis on the volunteer's role in their agency, and to train the supervisors in this process. Then in December and March, the supervisor met with the contract and discussion groups (Big Brother/Big Sister did not meet with the volunteers in December.). This time, however, when the supervisor met with the contracted volunteers they jointly evaluated the volunteers' progress towards the previously specified goals and, when necessary, revised the contract. (See Appendix D for Volunteer Progress Report form.) Thus, volunteers in the contractual group and discussion met the same number of times. (Three times for all agencies except Big Brothers, which met

twice.) Control volunteers had no scheduled contact with their supervisors. In all other aspects of the volunteer program, the volunteers were treated the same. Actual contact between volunteer and child ranged from 30-45 min./wk. at Gier Park, from 1-3hrs./wk. at Reach, from 1 1/2-3 hrs./wk. at Everett, and 2-6 hrs./wk. at Big Brother/Big Sister.

RESULTS

Background Characteristics

To address the issues concerning the efficacy of the randomization and any biases that could be attributed to attrition, differences in treatment conditions versus quit-did not quit were tested in two-way ANOVA's and MANOVA's on the volunteer's background characteristics. The interactions were not significant on any of the background variables ($p < .24$). And as can be seen in Table 3, the multivariate F ratios indicate the treatment groups are homogeneous with respect to age, number of children in the family, birth order, SES (Occupational Code/Wisconsin Bureau of Census, 1963), population of hometown, college year, number of activities in college and high school, reasons for volunteering, personality factors, religiosity. Also, the volunteers did not differ in sex ($\chi^2 = .59$, $df = 2$, $p < .198$); college major ($\chi^2 = 16.07$, $df = 10$, $p < .10$); previous experience with youth ($\chi^2 = .54$, $df = 2$, $p < .76$); elected offices ($\chi^2 = 4.39$, $df = 2$, $p < .11$); high school GPA ($F(2,65) = 1.67$, $p < .19$); or college GPA ($F(2,58) = 1.66$, $p < .20$).

- - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 3 here
- - - - - - - - - - - -

Similarly, those who quit were no more likely than those who didn't quit to differ in sex ($\chi^2 = 1.54$, $df = 2$, $p < .46$); college major ($\chi^2 = 3.58$, $df = 4$, $p < .46$); previous experience with youth ($\chi^2 = 2.15$, $df = 2$, $p < .34$); elected office ($\chi^2 = .59$, $df = 2$, $p < .74$); high school GPA ($F(1,65) = 1.53$, $p < .22$); or college GPA ($F(1,58) = 3.67$, $p < .06$). Furthermore, the hypothesis for no main effects due to quitting could not be rejected on any of the other variables as illustrated in Table 4.

Table 3. Comparison of Treatment Groups on Background Characteristics

Variable	N	Contract X	Discussion X	Control X	Univariate F	Univariate p<	Multivariate F	Multivariate p<
Age in yrs.		20.1	19.9	20.05	.09	.91		
# of siblings		3.67	3.12	3.7	.49	.61		
Birth order		2.1	4.2	2.2	1.29	.28		
SES		58.	58.1	51.2	.46	.63		
Hometown pop.	71	3.3	2.9	3.3	.78	.46	.52	.88
Yr. in coll.		2.81	2.47	2.87	.58	.56		
# coll. activ.		2.54	5.06	2.13	2.19	.12		
# h.s. activ.		3.81	7.3	4.04	3.78	.03		
# reasons for volunteering		3.2	2.9	2.95	.05	.95		
# academic reasons	77	.95	.76	.83	.09	.91	1.06	.39
Neuroticism		8.2	8.5	8.3	.07	.94		
Extroversion		10.9	13.9	14.4	1.86	.16		
Trust		5.28	5.53	5.55	.58	.56		
Empathy		40.	41.5	39.1	.86	.43		
Need for clarity	75	14.7	12.5	14.45	3.03	.055	1.48	.15
Religiosity		2.8	2.6	2.9	.29	.75		
Church attendance	72	2.7	2.65	2.4	.6	.55	1.09	.36

Table 4. Comparison of Volunteers who quit with those who did not, according to Background Characteristics

Variable	N	Did Not Quit X	Quit X	Univariate F	Univariate p<	Multivariate F	Multivariate p<
Age in yrs.		20.09	19.79	.26	.61		
# of siblings		3.46	3.93	.69	.41		
Birth order		2.67	2.50	.01	.90		
SES		55.37	58.57	.15	.69		
Hometown popul.	71	3.26	3.07	.32	.58	.38	.86
Yr. in coll.		2.81	2.53	.51	.48		
# coll. activ.		3.07	2.60	.12	.73		
# h.s. activ.		4.37	5.8	1.1	.30		
# reasons for volunteering		2.89	3.73	2.33	.13		
# academic reas.	77	.79	1.2	1.55	.22	1.83	.12
Neuroticism		8.1	9.0	.57	.45		
Extroversion		12.72	12.07	.09	.76		
Trust		5.47	5.2	.94	.34		
Empathy		40.20	39.60	.14	.71		
Need for clarity	75	14.12	14.27	.03	.87	.34	.89
Religiosity		2.74	2.8	.04	.84		
Church attendance	72	2.57	2.6	.004	.95	.02	.97

To summarize, these analyses show no systematic drop-out rate by treatment group and serve as a justification of the treatment group's homogeneity.

Before preceeding to the results of the dependent measures, some comment is in order concerning the manner in which the data were analyzed. The first three hypotheses were tested with multivariate and univariate analyses of variance. In general, when the criteria seemed to measure the same construct, a multivariate analysis, agency by treatment, was employed. However, sample sizes on some of the measures differed because a

volunteer quit, or there were no supervisor-teacher evaluations for a particular agency. As a result, the appropriate univariate analysis, agency by treatment, was used for the evaluation measures, and for determination of the volunteer's satisfaction with his/her teacher.

Since this is a nonorthogonal design, unequal cell size, and the aim was to test each main effect, a reordering was done for each criterion measure when either of the main effects was significant. Therefore, the probabilities given in the text refer to the main effect as it was ordered last in the MANOVA or ANOVA run. Lastly, in the multivariate analyses, the univariates will not be discussed unless the multivariate F ratio is significant at the .10 level.

The analyses for the first, second and third hypotheses that contracted volunteers will be more satisfied, have higher evaluations and be more effective, are shown in Tables 5, 6 and 9 and the treatment and agency observed combined cell means are reported in Tables 10 and 12 respectively. None of the interactions between agency and treatment are significant (Table 5).

- - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 5 here
- - - - - - - - - - - -

Treatment Effects

Table 6 presents the results of the main effect due to the treatment conditions: contract, discussion, control.

- - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 6 here
- - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5. Interaction Effects

Variable	N	df	Univariate F	Univariate p<	Multivariate F	Multivariate p<
VOLUNTEER MEASURES						
Activity Satis.	66	5,55	1.18	.332		
Supervis. Satis.	66	5,55	.82	.54		
Months	66	5,55	.38	.86		
Multivariate Satis.	66	15,146			.72	.76
Teacher Satis.	24	1.19	1.79	.196		
Role Clarity	66	5,55	.82	.543		
Teacher Eval. Fall	27	1,23	.41	.53		
Teacher Eval. Winter	19	1.14	3.17	.097		
Super. Eval. Winter	62	5,51	.34	.889		
PROCESS MEASURES						
Vol. Interaction	67	5,56	1.01	.42		
Child Interaction	67	5,56	2.23	.064		
Multivariate Inter.	67	10,110			1.27	.25
CHILD MEASURES						
GPA Spring	52	5,44	1.13	.36		
Absent	52	5,44	1.44	.23		
Tardy	52	5,44	.89	.49		
Multivariate Acad.	52	15,116			1.12	.35
Self-Concept	67	5,56	.86	.52		
Trust	49	5,38	.31	.907		

Table 6. TREATMENT EFFECTS: Results of the Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance on Criterion Measures

Variable	N	df	Univariate F	Univariate p<	Multivariate F	Multivariate p<
VOLUNTEER MEASURES						
Activity Satis.	66	2,55	3.62	.033 *		
Supervis. Satis.	66	2,55	3.66	.032 *		
Months	66	2,55	.92	.40		
Multivariate Satis.	66	6,106			2.0	.071 +
Teacher Satis.	24	2,19	.82	.456		
Role Clarity	66	2,55	.81	.452		
Teacher Eval. Fall	27	1,23	.00	.977		
Teacher Eval. Winter	19	2,14	1.82	.198		
Super. Eval. Winter	62	2,51	2.19	.122		
PROCESS MEASURES						
Vol. Interaction	67	2,56	1.62	.208		
Child Interaction	67	2,56	3.44	.039		
Multivariate Inter.	67	4,110			1.69	.157
CHILD MEASURES						
GPA Spring	52	2,44	.87	.43		
Absent	52	2,44	2.33	.11		
Tardy	52	2,44	1.18	.32		
Multivariate Acad.	52	6,84			1.39	.229
Self-Concept	67	2,56	.45	.64		
Trust	49	2,37	.38	.68		

+ $p < .10$

* $p < .05$

The only significant treatment effect occurred in the volunteer satisfaction measures (Multivariate F = 2.01, df = 6.106, $p < .0713$). To further explain the significant treatment effects, the univariate F statistics were examined to locate which of the individual variable contributed most to the observed multivariate effects and are also found in Table 6. An inspection of the univariate F statistics indicates the volunteer's satisfaction and activity satisfaction are the primary contributors ($p < .035$).

In order to determine the nature of the significant treatment effects, the estimated differences between the following mean contrasts were examined: 1) contract minus discussion; 2) contract minus other; 3) contract plus discussion minus other; 4) contract minus control. These estimates and their 95 percent univariate confidence intervals are given in Table 7, following Yelon and Schmidt's (1973) procedure.

Table 7. TREATMENT EFFECTS: Estimates of the Contrasts and the 95 Percent Univariate Confidence Intervals

Contrast	Activ. Satis.	Super. Satis.
Contract minus Discussion	-1.46 ± 5.36	.09 ± 5.28
Contract minus Other	2.36 ± 4.23	3.39 ± 4.16
Contract plus Discussion minus Control	6.92 ± 5.05 *	6.66 ± 4.97 *
Contract minus Control	6.19 ± 5.14 *	6.71 ±13.14 *

Examination of these contrasts shows the first and second are not significant. Thus, the predicted hypothesis that the contracted

volunteers would be more satisfied is not supported. The third and fourth contrasts, however, are significant and positive, suggesting that persons who had more contact with their supervisors are more satisfied with their supervisors and activities.

The intercorrelation matrix between the three dependent measures---activity satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, and number of months in the program---reveals an interesting pattern, as shown below in Table 8.

Table 8. Intercorrelations Between Activity Satisfaction, Supervisor Satisfaction and Months At Agency

	A	S	M
Activities (A)	1.00		(Symmetrical)
Supervisor (S)	.58 **	1.00	
Months (M)	.34 **	.18	1.00

** $p < .01$

A correlation of .58 was found between the activity and supervisor measures. However, supervisor satisfaction is not correlated with months, whereas activity satisfaction is significantly related with months. What this suggests is that reported activity satisfaction is a better predictor of actual behavioral outcomes.

Agency Effects

The multivariate F ratio for the main effect due to agency is also significant for the satisfaction measures.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 9 here
- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 9. AGENCY EFFECTS: Results of the Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance on Criterion Measures

Variable	N	df	Univariate F	Univariate $p_<$	Multivariate F	Multivariate $p_<$
VOLUNTEER MEASURE						
Activity Satis.	66	3,55	.94	.427		
Supervis. Satis.	66	3,55	.52	.668		
Months	66	3,55	5.33	.003 **		
Multivariate Satis.	66	15,146			2.14	.025 *
Teacher Satis.	24	1,19	.04	.85		
Role Clarity	66	3,55	1.17	.331		
Teacher Eval. Fall	27	1,23	3.51	.074		
Teacher Eval. Winter	19	1,14	.87	.368		
Super. Eval. Winter	62	3,51	8.01	.0002 **		
PROCESS MEASURES						
Vol. Interaction	67	3,56	1.64	.189		
Child Interaction	67	3,56	.72	.544		
Multivariate Inter.	67	6,110			1.45	.207
CHILD MEASURES						
GPA Spring	52	3,44	.69	.565		
Absent	52	3,44	.85	.476		
Tardy	52	3,44	.87	.465		
Multivariate Acad.	52	9,102			.77	.65
Self-Concept	67	3,56	.72	.55		
Trust	49	3,37	1.16	.34		

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 10. TREATMENT EFFECTS: Combined Cell Means and Standard Deviations of Criterion Measures

Variable	Contract	Discussion	Control
VOLUNTEER MEASURES			
Activity Satis.			
X	43.97	44.93	37.94
SD	(6.00)	(5.11)	(11.93)
N	33	15	18
Supervis. Satis.			
X	47.85	47.67	40.67
SD	(6.73)	(4.59)	(10.34)
N	33	15	18
Months			
X	6.05	6.7	6.45
SD	(1.54)	(1.18)	(1.45)
N	37	17	23
Teacher Satis.			
X	46.27	38.25	43.78
SD	(6.34)	(5.19)	(14.41)
N	11	4	9
Role Clarity			
X	25.15	24.0	22.89
SD	(4.98)	(2.94)	(7.82)
N	33	15	18
Teacher Eval. Fall			
X	39.17		39.8
SD	(12.19)		(10.64)
N	12		15
Teacher Eval. Winter			
X	38.75	45.5	45.
SD	(7.83)	(6.24)	(7.29)
N	8	4	7
Super. Eval. Winter			
X	34.97	41.	31.18
SD	(10.58)	(7.39)	(6.71)
N	30	15	17
PROCESS MEASURES			
Vol. Interaction	48.85	51.36	49.65
X	(4.79)	(3.81)	(4.27)
SD	33	14	20
N			
Child Interaction			
X	45.3	50.00	47.2
SD	(6.48)	(4.26)	(4.93)
N	33	14	20

Table 10.--Continued

Variable	Contract	Discussion	Control
CHILD MEASURES			
GPA Spring			
X	2.33	2.61	2.06
SD	(.82)	(.875)	(.83)
N	27	13	16
Absent			
X	2.79	7.14	2.47
SD	(1.01)	(8.53)	(.95)
N	27	13	16
Tardy			
X	38.15	28.08	46.88
SD	(33.81)	(25.3)	(20.68)
N	27	13	16
Self-Concept			
X	4.02	4.15	3.67
SD	(2.31)	(1.911)	(2.24)
N	32	15	20
Trust			
X	4.96	5.27	4.92
SD	(1.04)	(.521)	(.86)
N	25	11	13

Examination of the univariates, however, reveals that this effect is only significant with respect to months ($p < .0028$). Three agency comparison groups were formed: 1) Big Brother/Big Sister minus Everett; 2) Reach minus Gier; 3) Big Brother plus Everett minus Gier plus Reach, as can be seen in Table 11.

Table 11. AGENCY EFFECTS: Estimates of the Contrasts and the 95 Percent Univariate Confidence Intervals

Contrasts	Supervisor Evaluation Winter	Months
BB/BS minus Everett	-9.74 ± 7.33 *	1.05 ± 1.06
Reach minus Gier	17.03 ± 10.09 *	-.87 ± 1.27
BB/BS plus Everett minus Geir plus Reach	-.95 ± 6.39	1.14 ± .84 *

Neither the first nor the second contrast is significant; however, the third, which compares the Big Brother agencies with the school agencies, is significant, in that volunteers affiliated with Big Brother agencies may stay as much as two months longer with the agency.

A second main effect due to agency is significant for the March supervisor evaluations ($p < .002$). The agencies differed in two contrasts, also summarized in Table 11 above. Inspection of the means in Table 12 shows that the ratings were highest in Everett and Reach, followed by Big Brother/Big Sister, then Gier Park.

- - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 12
- - - - - - - - - -

Table 12. AGENCY EFFECTS: Combined Cell Means and Standard Deviations of Criterion Measures

Variable	BB/BS	Everett	Reach	Gier Park
VOLUNTEER MEASURES				
Activity Satis.				
X	43.97	39.09	41.94	43.11
SD	(5.42)	(8.40)	(7.399)	(12.9)
N	30	11	16	9
Supervis. Satis.				
X	47.93	43.91	44.5	43.67
SD	(5.83)	(8.99)	(5.46)	(12.87)
N	30	11	16	9
Months				
X	7.31	6.38	5.31	5.08
SD	(0.52)	(1.51)	(2.48)	(2.22)
N	33	13	19	12
Teacher Satis.				
X			44.31	43.37
SD			(6.12)	(15.28)
N			16	8
Role Clarity				
X	25.2	23.36	22.25	25.89
SD	(3.08)	(3.74)	(5.94)	(11.03)
N	30	11	16	9
Teacher Eval. Fall				
X			42.94	33.7
SD			(7.24)	(18.27)
N			17	10
Teacher Eval. Winter				
X			43.67	40.43
SD			(7.11)	(7.61)
N			12	7
Super. Eval. Winter				
X	31.44	41.82	45.33	26.29
SD	(12.05)	(3.55)	(3.41)	(10.97)
N	32	11	12	7
PROCESS MEASURES				
Vol. Interaction				
X	49.81	47.17	51.13	49.62
SD	(4.9)	(4.5)	(4.49)	(2.3)
N	32	12	15	8
Child Interaction				
X	47.72	44.83	46.6	46.88
SD	(5.79)	(5.53)	(6.33)	(3.17)
N	32	12	15	8

Table 12.--Continued

Variable	BB/BS	Everett	Reach	Gier Park
CHILD MEASURES				
GPA Spring				
X	2.62	2.25	2.23	2.09
SD	(1.05)	(.78)	(.68)	(.84)
N	16	12	17	11
Absent				
X	2.59	3.19	5.98	2.39
SD	(1.23)	(8.01)	(6.92)	(.95)
N	16	12	17	11
Tardy				
X	40.31	35.42	32.94	46.82
SD	(33.83)	(31.29)	(18.06)	(31.71)
N	16	12	17	11
Self-Concept				
X	3.5	3.86	4.46	4.19
SD	(2.48)	(2.64)	(1.42)	(2.33)
N	25	13	18	11
Trust (w/covariate)				
X	5.27	5.3	4.73	4.78
SD	(.84)	(0.55)	(.89)	(1.27)
N	15	10	15	9

Hypotheses four and five were analyzed by way of correlations and are reported in Tables 13 and 15, respectively.

Table 13. Correlations Between Meeting Goals and the Criterion Measures[a]

Variables	Met Goals Fall	Met Goals Winter
	N = 14	N = 28
Activity Satis.	.44	.31
Supervis. Satis.	.35	.03
Months	-.18	.23
Teacher Satis.	.16	.21
Supervis. Eval. Fall	-.48	
Supervis. Eval. Winter		.45 **
Teacher Eval. Fall	.05	
Teacher Eval. Winter		-.55 **
Vol. Interaction	.30	.30
Child Interaction	.46	.42 *
Trust	.05	.10
Self-Concept	.28	.40 *
GPA Spring	.20	.52 **
Absent	.29	-.10
Tardy	.26	.13

[a] Sign on self-concept is reversed so that a positive number indicates a high degree of self-concept.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The fourth hypothesis, concerning the degree to which contracted volunteers met their goals, in relationship to their satisfaction and effectiveness, is not significant for any of the criterion measures in the fall. However, the correlations suggest that a volunteer who meets his goals in the winter tends to have higher supervisor evaluations, greater perception of his interaction with his child, and his child has a higher self-concept and grade point average. With respect to the

latter, these results should be interpreted somewhat cautiously, since it might be that a child with a higher self-concept and grade point average might aid the volunteer in meeting his goals.

Also, the teacher's evaluation negatively correlates with the volunteer attaining his goals, the opposite of the prediction. Furthermore, the relationships between the volunteer evaluations and the child measures suggest that the teacher's evaluation of the volunteer is more positively related to the child's behavior than the supervisor's evaluation (See Table 14). For instance, when the teacher evaluation is high the child's self-concept as well as the child's trust in other people are also high, though the latter is not significant. However, when the supervisor's evaluation of the volunteer is high the child's self-concept and trust in others appears to be low.

Table 14. Correlation Between Volunteer Evaluations and Child's Personality Measures[a]

Variables	Supervisor Evaluation	Teacher Evaluation
Pretest Trust	-.52 *	.02
Posttest Trust	-.19	.40
Pretest Self-Concept	-.65 **	.18
Posttest Self-Concept	-.35	.48 +

[a] Sign on self-concept is reversed so that a positive number indicates a high degree of self-concept. N = 15 for trust; N = 16 for self-concept.

\+ $p < .10$

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 15 presents the correlations concerning the fifth hypothesis; the volunteers with high need for clarity will be more satisfied and effective with the contract than without. Except for the volunteer evaluation measures this hypothesis is supported: as need for clarity increases, and if the volunteer is on the contract, he/she is more satisfied and effective.

Table 15. Correlations of Need for Clarity and Criterion Measures for Contracted and Non-Contracted (Discussion and Control) Volunteers

Variables	NEED FOR CLARITY N	Contract	Non-Contract	N	Test of Significance for Differences Between r's, p <
Activity Satis.	33	.33	-.32	35	.01
Supervis. Satis.	33	.04	-.29	32	.10
Months	37	.21	-.26	40	.05
Role Clarity	33	.37	.03	35	.10
Teacher Satis.	11	-.21	-.14	13	ns
Supervis. Eval. Fall	18	-.30	-.08	21	ns
Supervis. Eval. Winter	29	-.31	-.15	32	ns
Teacher Eval. Fall	12	-.39	.05	14	ns
Teacher Eval. Winter	8	.24	-.32	11	ns
Vol. Interaction	33	.40	-.19	34	.01
Child Interaction	33	.36	-.22	34	.01

The contracted volunteers with high need for clarity are significantly higher in the predicted direction than non-contracted volunteers with a high need for clarity for length of stay in the agency, activity satisfaction and relationship with child. Also, the contracted volunteer tends to have higher role clarity and supervisor satisfaction. The difference between correlations did not reach significance for the

volunteer's satisfaction with his teacher or the teacher/supervisor evaluations.

DISCUSSION

The foregoing results show that the contract is beneficial to volunteers with a high need for clarity. A contracted volunteer with a high need for clarity stays with the agency longer, has a greater satisfaction towards his activities and reports a better relationship with his child than a volunteer with a high need for clarity not on the contract. This type of volunteer also tends to be more satisfied with his supervisor and clearer of his role. Also, the negative relation between role clarity and the outcome measures for the non-contracted group suggests an interaction effect, such that volunteers with low need for clarity may do better without a contract.

However, when one does not take this personal variable, need for clarity, into consideration, the contract does not increase a volunteer's length of stay at the agency or relationship with his child. Here, the only significant finding is that the volunteer in the contract or discussion groups express greater satisfaction towards his activities and supervisor than the volunteer in the control condition. One explanation of these data may be that the volunteer enjoys and responds positively to the attention given by his/her supervisor, in that they both learn about one another and share personal experiences. Unfortunately, this is not reflected in the volunteer's behavior in terms of length of stay with the agency. The hypothesis that this is the Hawthorne effect must be ruled out since volunteers were unaware that they were participants in an experiment where they were divided into control and experimental groups.

The prediction that goal attainment increases effectiveness is partially supported: the supervisor rates the volunteer higher who meets his goals, and goal attainment positively relates with the child's self-concept and trust in others. However, supervisor ratings and teacher ratings were not correlated, indicating the supervisor and teacher hold differing expectations. Furthermore, goal attainment negatively correlates with teacher evaluations which suggests that the contract should be formulated with teacher's assistance. The possible importance of formulating goals with the teacher is further suggested when one examines correlations between teacher evaluations, supervisor evaluations and the child measures. Teacher evaluations are more highly correlated with child outcomes than the supervisor evaluations. These results must be interpreted with some caution since teacher evaluations are available only on the 15 volunteers who were still working in March at Reach and Gier Park.

Perhaps other possible reasons, in addition to the need for clarity, explain why the contract did not work for all the volunteers. One possible reason may be that non-contracted volunteers intrinsically set similar goals for themselves or the agencies provide sufficient role clarity for the majority of volunteers. This is supported by the fact that the mean role clarity scores for volunteers in all groups were moderately high. Thus, the volunteers may not have needed the additional clarity provided by the contract.

A second reason concerns the strength and implementation of the treatment conditions. For example, the supervisor only met with the volunteer three times during the academic year, and there were no procedures established to hold the volunteer to the contract. Furthermore, the supervisors at some agencies were not convinced of the merits of behavioral contracting and frequently released a volunteer from his

responsibilities without reminding him of the contract's terms; for instance, they were especially lenient when a volunteer stated his intentions of resigning because of scheduling conflicts.

Before discussing the agency effects some comment needs to be made pertaining to the limitations of this study. First, the data are collected from only four programs located in Lansing, Michigan at one point in time. Further, the programs are similar and only include students. With these limitations in mind, it is interesting to note that the volunteer dropout rate is highest in Reach and Gier Park. These agencies, in contrast to the Big Brother programs, require the volunteer to work with a classroom teacher and more than one child. Although definitive reasons for the higher dropout rate cannot be ascertained from the present findings, some possible explanations are suggested: the school programs are more formal and thus, may become more restrictive in that one-to-one relationships between volunteer and child, supposedly first in priority, assume a role secondary to classroom responsibilities. Consequently, the volunteer may lose some of his autonomy and spend less time with his child.

An alternative explanation may be that each agency attracts volunteers with common personality attributes. The analyses reported do not answer this question. However, as previously mentioned the comparison between the people who quit with those who remained in the agencies did not differ on any background or personality dimensions. Therefore, the implications of this agency effect are important to the extent that the agency may have control over designing a program that would attract and retain volunteers and certainly seems worthy of closer investigation.

The final question addressed in this study concerns whether personality and demographic characteristics predict volunteer effectiveness. In this study college major, number of activities participated in high school, high school grade point average, year in college, empathy, neuroticism and extroversion/introversion did not differentiate those volunteers who quit from those who didn't. Although these findings do not take into account other evaluative measures, i.e., supervisor/teacher evaluations or changes in the children, these results do not support Mitchell's (1966), Goodman's (1972), or Traux and Mitchell's (1971) findings that these personal attributes provide predictive information.

In a review of the literature, only three studies examine the moderating influence of personal differences on a worker's response role ambiguity. Kahn (cited by Johnson, 1975) found a significant relationship between role ambiguity and job-related tension for managers classified as high in need for cognition. No relationship was found for managers classified as low in need for cognition. Similarly, Lyons (1971) found that for nurses with a high need for clarity, role ambiguity was associated with propensity to leave, greater voluntary turnover and lower work satisfaction. The correlations of role clarity with voluntary turnover, propensity to leave, and work satisfaction were nonsignificant for nurses classified as low in need for clarity. Johnson (1975) found that need for independence and achievement moderate the relationship between role clarity and satisfaction. Specifically, task ambiguity is more negative for high need for achievement subjects than for those with a low need for achievement. Also, the relationship

between task ambiguity and satisfaction tends to be more negative for subjects with a low need for independence.

When viewed in conjunction with Kahn's, Lyons' and Johnson's work, the results of this study provide additional justification to the theory that different types of individuals respond differently to role ambiguity. The data also extend Lyon's findings to a different population (students) in different types of organizations (schools and volunteer agencies). Furthermore, to the best of the author's knowledge, this is the first application of an intervention strategy to ameliorate the negative effects of role ambiguity. To conclude, then, the data suggest that increasing role clarity through the use of a behavioral contract will make volunteers with a high need for clarity more satisfied and effective, as well as make volunteers, in general, more satisfied with their activities and supervisors. However, volunteers with low need for clarity may perform better without the structure provided by the contract.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - VOLUNTEER CONTRACT

Agency's goals	Volunteer's goals
Level of expected attainments	
Most Unfavorable performance thought likely	
Less than expected performance	
Expected level of performance	
More than expected performance	
Most favorable performance thought likely	

Signature of Volunteer_____Date_____

Signature of Supervisor_____Date_____

APPENDIX B - VOLUNTEER QUESTIONNAIRE

Code_____

We are trying to find out what volunteer characteristics work best with what type of kid or adult. During the year, we will be asking you to fill out questionnaires periodically, and will relate this to how your kids do and perceive your relationship. This information will be used only for research and will NOT be used to evaluate you. We greatly appreciate your cooperation in sharing this information with us and it will be kept confidential.

1. Name:_____Student Number_____
   last first middle

2. Address:_____
   number and street

   _____
   city, state and zip code

   _____
   phone number

3. Sex: _____male _____female

4. Birthdate___/___/___

5. Race:

   ____Caucasian

   ____Negro

   ____Mexican

   ____Chinese

   ____Indian

   ____Japanese

   ____Other (Specify)

   _____

6. What is the size of the place where you lived when you went to High School?

   ____Farm (3 acres or more)

   ____Rural area or town less than 10,000

   ____Small city (10,000 to 50,000)

   ____Large city (50,000 to 125,000)

   ____City over 125,000

   ____no information

7. Year in College:

____Freshman

____Sophomore

____Junior

____Senior

____Graduate student

____Other (specify)

_____

8. First term at MSU? __yes __no

9. College major_____

10. College minor_____

11. College GPA_____

12. High School GPA_____

13. How many children did your parents have? (Circle the appropriate number.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

14. What was the order of your birth in the family? That is, were you the oldest, next oldest and so on? (Circle the appropriate number showing order of birth from the oldest to the youngest.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15. What did your father (or father substitute) do for a living while you were growing up?

---

16. What was your mother's (or mother substitute) occupation?

---

17. What was the last year of schooling your father completed?

____Graduate professional training

____College/University graduation

____Partial college

____High school graduate

____Partial high school (10 or 11)

____Junior high school (8 or 9)

18. What was the last year of schooling your mother completed?

____Graduate professional training

____College/University graduation

____Partial college

____High school graduate

____Partial high school (10 or 11)

____Junior high school (8 or 9)

17. Continued

____Seven years or less of school

18. continued

____Seven years or less of school

19. What is your present marital status?

____Never married

____Married

____Separated

____Divorced

____Widowed

20. How often do you attend church?

____Once or more weekly

____Not more than 3 times monthly

____Seldom (e.g. on special occasions)

____Never

21. What is your attitude toward religion? By this I mean you are...

____Extremely devout

____Devout

____Moderate

____Lukewarm

____Not at all

22. When you were in high school how many extracurricular activities did you participate in? _____

_____

23. During college how many extracurrivular activities have you participated in?_____

_____

24. Have you held any elective or appointed offices in school, church, club, or any organized group during high school or college? ___yes ___no

25. Have you ever worked with young people before? ___yes ___no
If yes, please briefly describe what you did.

26. Please list any previous volunteer work you have participated in.

27. Check the reason(s) why you are volunteering.

____to meet other volunteers

____to help others

____opens up job possibilities

____to get dates

____it looks good on my academic record

____it will help me in my degree program

____other volunteers say it is a good/fun experience

____I know a kid/adult who had a volunteer, and it seemed like a good thing.

____I volunteered before and liked it.

____it supplements my academic record

____is a requirement for my degree program

____Other, please specify_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C - VOLUNTEER EVALUATION

Volunteer's Name_____ Date_____
Rater's Name_____ Code_____

As part of the ongoing MSU volunteer research project, we are concerned with your judgment of the volunteer's effectiveness. Please try to describe your perception of the volunteer you work with on the following items. Do not skip items; when you are unsure, give us your best guess. This information will be used only for research and will not be shown to the volunteer. We greatly appreciate your cooperation in sharing this information with us and it will be kept confidential.

ITEMS TO BE RATED

21. Plans activities/ assignments	4 3 2 1 0	Does not plan activities/assignments
22. Interacts well with children	4 3 2 1 0	Interacts poorly with children
23. Completes assignments	4 3 2 1 0	Does not complete assignments
24. Attends regularly	4 3 2 1 0	Is frequently absent
25. Initiates contact with me	4 3 2 1 0	Does not initiate contact with me
26. Shows resourcefulness in helping provide enrichment experiences	4 3 2 1 0	Lacks resourcefulness in helping provide enrichment experiences for child
27. Is punctual	4 3 2 1 0	Is often late
28. Asks for my advice	4 3 2 1 0	Does not ask my advice
29. Is able to accept criticism	4 3 2 1 0	Unable to accept criticism
30. Keeps me informed of child's progress	4 3 2 1 0	Does not keep me informed of child's progress
31. Arranges extra time to meet with child	4 3 2 1 0	Spends "required" time with child
32. Puts in additional time if situation arises	4 3 2 1 0	Does not put in additional time if situation arises
33. Excellent overall performance	4 3 2 1 0	Poor overall performance

34. Would you like to continue working with this volunteer? ___yes ___no

APPENDIX D - VOLUNTEER PROGRESS REPORT

Please circle the response that best describes the volunteer's level of performance for each agency and personal goal, using the scale below.

most unfavorable performance thought likely	less than expected performance	expected level of performance	more than expected performance	most favorable performance thought likely
1	2	3	4	5

Agency Goal

1. 1 2 3 4 5
2. 1 2 3 4 5
3. 1 2 3 4 5
4. 1 2 3 4 5
5. 1 2 3 4 5
6. 1 2 3 4 5
7. 1 2 3 4 5

Volunteer Goals

1. 1 2 3 4 5
2. 1 2 3 4 5
3. 1 2 3 4 5
4. 1 2 3 4 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Campbell, D.T., and Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

Eysenck, H.J. Eysenck Personality Inventory. California: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1968.

Goodman, Gerald. Companionship Therapy. California: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

Mager, Robert F. Goal Analysis. California: Fearon Publishers, 1972.

Mc Daniel, E.L. A Manual for the Inferred Self-Concept Scale. Texas: 1969, reprinted 1970.

Mitchell, W.E. "The use of College Student Volunteers in the Outpatient treatment of troubled children" in Mental Health with Limited Resources. ed: H.R. Huessy. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1966, 28-37.

Odiorne, G.S. Management by Objectives. New York: Pitman, 1965.

Schindler, Eva and Rainman. The Volunteer Community--creative use of human resources. Washington: NTL Learning Resources, 1971.

Smith, Patricia Cain. Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, A Strategy for Study of Attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Sobey, Francine. The Nonprofessional Revolution in Mental Health. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Truax, Charles and Mitchell, K. "Research on Certain Therapist Interpersonal Skills in Relation to Process and Outcome" in Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change. ed: Bergin and Garfield. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

Journals

Bryan, Judith F. and Edwin A. Locke. "Goal-Setting as a Means of Increasing Motivation," Journal of Applied Psychology, No. 51, 274-277.

Cauley, John. "Job Descriptions: Matching Volunteer Skills with Agency Needs," Synergist, 2 (Winter 1974), 36-42.

Duchastel, Philippe C. and Merril, F. "The effects of Behavioral Objectives on Learning: A review of empirical studies," Review of Educational Research, 43, 1973.

Gruver, Gary. "College Students as Therapeutic Agents," Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 76, No. 2 (1971), 111-127.

Goal Attainment Scaling Workshop, ed: Garwick and Vanderpool. Minnesota: 1973.

Hogan, Robert. "Development of an Empathy Scale," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33 (1969), 306-307.

Johnson, Thomas. "Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Satisfaction: Moderating Effects of Individual Differences," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 3, 329-333.

Kiresuk, Thomas. "Goal Attainment Scaling: A General Method for Evaluating Comprehensive Community Mental Health Programs," Community Mental Health Journal, 4 (1968).

Lawler, E. "Job Attitudes and Employee Motivation: Theory, Research and Practice," Personnel Psychology, 23 (1970), 223-238.

Locke, E.A. "Relationship of Intentions to Level of Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 50 (1966), 60-66.

Locke, E.A. "Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 3 (1968), 157-189.

Locke, Edwin A. "Performance Goals as Determinants of Level of Performance and Boredom," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 51 (1967), 120-130.

Locke, E.A. and Bryan, J. "The Directing Function of Goals in Task Performance," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 4 (1969), 35-42.

Locke, E.A., Cartledge, N. and Knerr, C. "Studies of the Relationship Between Satisfaction, Goal-Setting, and Performance," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 5 (1970), 135-158.

Lyons, Thomas F. "Role Clarity, Need for Clarity, Satisfaction, Tensions and Withdrawal," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 6 (1971), 99-110.

Rizzo, J.R., House, R. and Lirtzman. "Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 15 (1970), 150-163.

Sorum, J. "A Guide to Managing Student Volunteer Programs: An Objective-Centered Approach," Synergist, Vol. 3 (Spring 1974).

Yelon, Stephen L. and Schmidt, William H. "The Effect of Objectives and Instructions on the Learning of a Complex Cognitive Task," The Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 41 (Spring 1973), No. 3, 91-95.

Government Publications

Wisconsin Bureau of Census. Methodology and scores of socioeconomic status paper #15, 1963.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293105502169