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A broad range of activities are often included in volunteering. The motivations for volunteering are also many-faceted. Volunteers form most of the workforce in India’s non-profit sector, which is one of the largest and fastest growing sectors in the world. However, volunteering in India has hardly received any scholarly attention. Applying our understanding based on findings on volunteering has been warned against since volunteering does not even mean the same thing for different people living in different cultures and countries.

This study thus attempts to understand the kind of people who are drawn to volunteering. Specifically, the role of personality traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs of those who volunteer are explored. Volunteering activities, it is argued, can be of two types – help volunteering, leading to altruism and helping, and involvement volunteering, requiring personal involvement in the community. It is argued that values and self-efficacy beliefs mediate the role of traits in volunteering. A survey was administered to 228 postgraduate students studying in a professional college. Standardized scales for measuring volunteering do not allow the distinction between help and involvement volunteering. Therefore a scale was designed to measure the extent of volunteering based on the context of the college from which the students were sampled. Personality traits, self-efficacy beliefs, and values were measured using standardized scales.

Data was analysed using PLS-SEM. It was found that agreeableness and extraversion traits, universalism values, and social self-efficacy beliefs were positively correlated with help volunteering. Extraversion trait, stimulation value, and social self-efficacy beliefs were positively correlated with involvement volunteering. Universalism fully mediated the effect of agreeableness on help volunteering. No support was found for the mediation of self-efficacy beliefs on help or involvement volunteering. The study demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between helping and involvement types of volunteering. The reasons and type of people who volunteer to help seem to be different from those who volunteer to get involved in the community or cause.

Further investigation with larger and more diverse sample would help in contributing further to the understanding of volunteers and their motivations. The study has managerial implications mainly in terms of helping selection and retaining of volunteers for various types of activities and in promotion and branding of volunteering events and organizations. Communication for attracting volunteers that require help or involvement may be designed differently for helping kind of activities versus those that require involvement of people.
The non-profit sector in India engages a large workforce of 19.4 million persons (Srivastava & Tandon, 2005). Almost 85 percent (around 16.5 million) of these 19.4 million are volunteers, most of who work on a part-time basis. Full-time volunteers themselves add up to 3.4 million and outnumber the central government employees (3.3 million in 2000) and workforce in other key industries such as mining and construction. The number of total volunteers (16.5 million) is far greater than both the central and state government employees put together (10.7 million). In light of the above numbers, Srivastava and Tandon (2005) call for greater understanding of volunteering to harness its full potential. However, in spite of a large number of volunteers, volunteering, particularly student volunteering, as a subject has not received much attention in India (Ghose & Kassam, 2014). Students in India form the next wave of volunteers of one of the world’s largest NPO sector and are faced with a wide range of opportunities in the NPO and NGO sector (Ghose & Kassam, 2014). Therefore, there is a greater need to understand volunteering in general and student volunteering in particular. Besides, scholars have been urging for greater attention to studying volunteering in non-western contexts as volunteering manifests differently in different cultures and contexts (Dekker & Halman, 2003).

This paper aims to contribute in this regard by studying student volunteering in India. Further, it seeks to contribute to the understanding of the role of individual level psychological variables in volunteering. Recent literature on prosocial behaviour has emphasized on the crucial role of these personality variables in prosociality, which is the enduring nature of individuals to exhibit prosocial behaviours such as sharing, caring, helping, and showing empathic concern (Caprara, Alessandri, & Eisenberg, 2011). Traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs have been found to explain engagement in prosocial behaviours (see Caprara et al., 2011). It is thus plausible that traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs play an important role in volunteering behaviour, which also includes a prosocial dimension (Carlo, Okun, Knight, & de Guzman, 2005).

In the research on volunteering, the role of individual values has received some attention. Dekker and Halman (2003) contend that values play an important role in volunteering. Values, which are deep-rooted dispositions that guide behaviour can manifest as motivations for volunteering (Dekker & Halman, 2003). Likewise, Wilson (2000) contends that motives play a crucial role in public discourse on volunteering. Substantial attention has been directed towards developing an inventory of volunteering motives (See Clary & Snyder, 1999). In a review on volunteering, Wilson (2000) finds only weak and inconsistent support for the relationship between values and volunteering. However, only religious and civic values like altruism, beneficence, justice, equality, and inequality have been considered in these studies (Wilson, 2000). Other values that are universal in nature, such as Schwarz values (1994), have not been considered.

There is limited support for the role of personality traits in volunteering. A few studies have found agreeableness (Smith & Nelson, 1975) and extraversion (Burke & Hall, 1986; Kosek, 1995; Smith & Nelson, 1975) to be positively related to volunteering. The role of some of the widely studied individual beliefs such as self-efficacy beliefs has hardly been studied. Besides, studies on prosocial behaviour have emphasized on the importance of mediating effects of values and self-efficacy beliefs in the relationship between traits and behaviour (See Caprara et al., 2011). In case of volunteering, Carlo et al. (2005) have found the role of agreeableness and extraversion to be partially mediated by prosocial value motivation. This points to the need to study both the direct and mediating effects of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs on volunteering. In addition, it is important to differentiate between different types of volunteering.

**Volunteering**

A broad range of activities is covered under volunteering. It expresses differently and has different connotations in different countries and cultures (Dekker & Halman, 2003). Nonetheless, volunteering broadly implies any activity in which one invests one’s own time freely for the benefit of others (Wilson, 2000). Generally, it is unpaid, non- obligatory, and takes place in an organized context (Dekker & Halman, 2003). Defined this way, volunteering does not preclude volunteers from gaining benefits from such work. From a behavioural perspective, volunteering is defined, simply, as producing goods or services below market prices without any reference to intentions (Wilson, 2000). According to this definition, volunteering does not even entail a desire to help others. The distinction between activities that involve an intention to help others and activities that do not involve such intention is clear in Dingle’s (2001 as cited in Dekker & Halman, 2003)
classification. Dingle’s classification of volunteering activities includes: Mutual and self-help (jointly managing public goods etc.), philanthropy or service (beneficiaries being deprived sections not belonging to volunteer’s group and largely organized by nonprofit), campaigning or advocacy (supporting cause and interest of either own group or other group), and finally, participation and self-governance (working on boards, committees of non-profit organizations, etc.).

As can be seen from above, volunteering covers a broad spectrum of activities, which could be influenced differently by different traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. To fully understand the effect of these variables, it is necessary to specify the type of volunteering under consideration. Broadly, literature seems to suggest that volunteering is an unpaid service done in an organized context, with or without the intention to help others. Volunteering thus entails two aspects: prosocial or helping aspect and community involvement aspect. Accordingly, volunteering can be classified into two categories of behaviours, one which consists of primarily helping behaviours and the other consisting of primarily community involvement behaviours. We say primarily because, the distinction between these two types is not always clear. A volunteering activity, can involve both helping and community involvement aspects. However, depending on which of these two aspects is the dominant one, it is possible to classify the activity as either ‘primarily helping’ or ‘primarily community involvement’. For simplicity, in this paper, these two types of activities are referred to as ‘help volunteering’ and ‘involvement volunteering’ respectively. In Dingle’s classification mentioned previously, while philanthropy or service category clearly belongs to the helping type, mutual and self-help groups, participation and self-governance categories belong to the involvement type. Campaigning or advocacy category can belong to either type depending on whether it concerns the interests of other groups or one’s own group. This distinction between helping and involvement types is important for delineating the role of different traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs in volunteering.

Social Interaction and Volunteering
Several studies have emphasized on the importance of social interaction and social networks in influencing volunteering behaviour. Wilson and Musick (1997) found that social networks and social interaction were the key determinants of volunteering. Similarly, Putnam (2000) showed that formal groups, both religious and secular, played a major role in volunteering. Lee and Chang (2007) found that volunteering was much more influenced by socialization and relationships with others than giving, suggesting that social interaction played a greater role in volunteering than in giving. Wilson (2000) reasoned that high-income people volunteered more than low-income people in spite of higher opportunity costs, because, belonging to higher socio-economic status possibly connected them to more social networks. Similarly, Jones (2006) argued that volunteering was facilitated by face-to-face social ties and individuals’ relationships with others. Jones found that community ties were the strongest predictors of volunteering behaviour. Community integration strongly influenced the number of hours people spent volunteering. In their study, personal resources like income, education, and wealth played a less important role in understanding volunteering behaviour. Surprisingly, even prosocial values did not play a significant role after taking into effect the role of community integration.

Strong social networking leads to greater awareness of voluntary organizations and social issues. It also leads to a greater likelihood of being asked, encouraged, and influenced to volunteer. Volunteering in turn results in a more active investment in community integration. Social interaction, thus, seems to play a crucial role in both types of volunteering, more so in involvement type of volunteering, for which social network and interaction are prime motivators.

Traits, Values, and Self-efficacy Beliefs
Caprara et al. (2011) examined the role of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs in prosocial behaviour. They found that all three contributed to prosociality and together explained a significant portion of unique variance in prosociality. Besides, they also found values and self-efficacy beliefs to mediate the relationship between traits and prosocial behaviour. We draw on this framework to examine the role of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs in volunteering.

Role of Traits
Traits refer to individual differences in tendencies to show stable patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviour (Costa
& McCrae, 1992). Five-factor theory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) identifies five such traits also referred to as the Big Five: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. The five-factor structure has been shown to be largely valid across many countries and cultures (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). Out of these five traits, agreeableness has been found to be strongly linked to prosocial behaviours (See Caprara et al. 2011). Costa and McCrae (1992) associate altruistic, trustworthiness, and trusting behaviour with agreeableness. Agreeable people value affiliation and tend to be cooperative, trusting, gentle, and kind. They are also compliant and modest. Specific to volunteering, extant literature finds agreeableness to be positively related to volunteering (Carlo et al., 2005; Smith & Nelson, 1975). In fact, Carlo et al. (2005) found agreeableness trait to be the strongest predictor of volunteering. However, this study included only helping type volunteering behaviours. Given the strong association between agreeableness and prosocial behaviour (See Caprara & Steca, 2007), it is likely that agreeableness is associated with help volunteering.

On the other hand, extraversion is likely to influence both types of volunteering. Extraversion is viewed as an aggregate of two components – affiliation and agency (Costa & McCrae, 1992). While affiliation indicates a need to have warm personal relationship, agency stands for the need for being assertive and influential. Extraverts experience and express positive emotions. Extraverts also tend to seek stimulation and find change as stimulating (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Specific to volunteering, extraversion is found to have a positive influence (Burke & Hall, 1986; Carlo et al., 2005; Kosek, 1995; Smith & Nelson, 1975). As discussed earlier, social networks play a very important role in volunteering, sometimes even more than values and personal resources. The gregarious and active nature of extraverts draws them naturally into many social networks. Extraverts are more involved in social networks and hence are more aware of volunteering organizations. Strong social networks also imply that they are more likely to be requested to volunteer. In fact, Wilson (2000) considers social networks as the main reason why extraverts volunteer. However, the affiliation component of extraversion, with a need to experience warm personal relationships, can motivate helping type behaviour also. Thus, it is posited that extraversion is likely to influence both types of volunteering.

Hypothesis 1: Agreeableness influences only help volunteering and extraversion influences both help and involvement volunteering.

Role of Values

Caprara et al. (2011) argued that traits did not result in prosocial behaviours, unless people valued others’ welfare. According to them, values set such motivational goals and enhance the capacities needed to achieve these goals. Values are cognitive representations of desirable and abstract goals (Schwartz, 1994). According to Schwartz, they are general principles and beliefs that guide behaviour and serve as standards according to which people evaluate self and others. They are trans-situational and transcend specific actions. The hierarchy of values, the order of relative importance people give to different values, is relatively stable. This stability gives values an enduring dispositional nature that guides consistency in behaviour. Schwartz’s (1994) theory of values constitutes ten such basic values, which express distinct motivations. This theory also identifies the dynamics of compatibility and conflict among them. The ten values are conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, and security. Each of these values is congruent with a set of few other values and conflict with another set of values. Such relations of congruence and compatibility form the value structure and this value structure is similar across various cultures (Schwartz, 1994). However, the relative importance that individuals and groups give to each of these values differs substantially.

These ten values have been grouped into four broad higher order categories and two bipolar dimensions (Schwartz, 1994). The group ‘openness to change’ consists of self-direction and stimulation values. This group competes with the opposite higher order group ‘conservation’ which consists of security, conformity, and tradition values. On the other bipolar dimension, ‘self-transcendence’ group consisting of universalism and benevolence values oppose and compete with ‘self-enhancement’ group, which consists of power and achievement values. Hedonism, the remaining tenth value belongs to both openness to change and self-enhancement.

Out of these ten values, self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) values have been found to influence prosocial behaviours (see Caprara & Steca, 2007). Spe-
Specific to volunteering, Wilson (2000) finds that studies have so far shown only a weak and inconsistent relation between values and volunteering. However, such studies have only studied moral or prosocial values like altruism, beneficence, justice, and equality (Wilson, 2000). Other values might as well play a role. Clary and Snyder (1999) found that volunteering was influenced by several motivations. Similarly, Dekker and Halman (2003) argued that different people were attracted to the same type of volunteering with different value systems. For instance, achievement values can lead to volunteering behaviours when expected to bring social acceptance and accolades (Schwartz, 2010). Besides, according to Wilson (2000), volunteering need not always entail a desire to help others and volunteers may even seek benefits from volunteering. Clary and Snyder (1999) contended that volunteering was motivated by both self-transcendence (altruistic) as well as self-enhancement (egoistic).

Clary and Snyder (1999) identified six motivations for volunteering: expressing prosocial values (values), seeking to exercise unused skills or learning about the world (understanding), psychological growth and development (enhancement), gaining career-related experience (career), strengthening social ties (social), and overcoming negative feelings and personal problems (protective). These six motivations can be linked to the set of values as specified by Schwartz (1994). While prosocial values motive clearly belongs to self-transcendence values, career motive clearly belongs to the achievement values. Understanding motive draws mainly from stimulation values and partly from achievement value. Stimulation values endorse the motivation for having a varied and exciting life and seeking stimulating experiences (novelty, change and challenge) (Schwartz, 1994). Understanding motive draws from stimulation values when it concerns with learning about new things, gaining new perspectives, and learning to deal with a variety of people. When it refers to gaining experience and exploring strengths, it is likely to draw from achievement value. Social motive draws from achievement and stimulation values. The values of achievement and stimulation endorse motivational goals that draw people into extensive social networks. Achievement values emphasize on striving to excel by demonstrating competence according to social norms (Schwartz, 1994) and social networks help people in achieving their personal goals and can serve as sources for excitement seeking and stimulation. Enhancement motive, which is the need for being perceived as important and necessary, also belongs to achievement value. In summary, apart from self-transcendence values, achievement and stimulation values are also likely to play a role in volunteering.

The distinction between help volunteering and involvement volunteering is of importance in understanding the role of values. It is likely that self-transcendence values, which are crucial in case of prosocial behaviour, influence help volunteering. Involvement volunteering, on the other hand, might entail achievement and stimulation values as social interaction plays an important role in this type of volunteering. Stimulation values, by motivating to seek varied life experience and achievement values, by motivating to strive to excel by demonstrating competence according to social norms, serve as motivations for community involvement and extensive social interaction.

**Hypothesis 2:** Universalism and benevolence values influence help volunteering and achievement and stimulation values influence involvement volunteering.

Prosocial literature examines the combined role of benevolence and universal values (self-transcendence) on prosocial behavior (Caprara & Steca, 2007; Caprara et al., 2011). Specific to volunteering, it is necessary to distinguish between these two values. While benevolence promotes a concern for the welfare of one’s in-group, members who are in frequent personal contact, universalism promotes a concern for the welfare of everyone, including those that do not belong to in-group, sometimes even nature. Accordingly, while benevolence is likely to relate to prosocial behaviours that benefit one’s in-group, universalism is likely to promote prosocial behaviors that benefit people in general. Help volunteering largely involves helping out-group than in-group. Help volunteering mostly involves helping those who are not frequently in personal contact. Therefore, it is likely that universalism has a greater role to play in help-volunteering.

**Hypothesis 3:** Universal values play a greater role than benevolence values in help volunteering.

**Role of Self-efficacy Beliefs**

Values serve as motivational goals for behaviour. However, for such motivation to result in action, people need to have self-efficacy beliefs about their abilities to exhibit...
such behaviours (Caprara & Steca, 2007). Self-efficacy is the belief in one’s competence and capabilities to cope successfully with emergent situations. Self-efficacy is essential for developing competencies and regulating action.

Self-efficacy beliefs play a more direct role than values in prosocial behaviour (Caprara et al., 2011). Interpersonal self-efficacy beliefs include empathic and social self-efficacy beliefs. Empathic self-efficacy beliefs are the beliefs of a person about his/her capacity to understand others’ perspectives, feelings, and needs (Caprara & Steca, 2007). These beliefs have been shown to influence various prosocial behaviours. Like all prosocial behaviours, expressing concern for others and some understanding of other’s emotions and perspective are important in case of help volunteering. Therefore, empathic self-efficacy is likely to be associated with this type of volunteering. Empathic self-efficacy may not be of importance in case of involvement volunteering, in which expressing concern for others and understanding other’s emotions is not important. Similarly, social self-efficacy, which is the belief of a person about his/her capacity to effectively interact and manage relationships with others, has also been shown to influence prosocial behaviour (see Caprara & Steca, 2007). Helping behaviour entails significant social interaction. Therefore, social self-efficacy is also important in case of help volunteering. On the other hand, since involvement type volunteering requires extensive social interactions and social networks, social self-efficacy appears to play an important role in this type of volunteering also. In other words, while social self-efficacy is likely to play an important role in both types of volunteering, empathic self-efficacy is likely to be of significance only in case of primarily help volunteering.

Hypothesis 4: Social self-efficacy beliefs influence both types of volunteering and empathic self-efficacy beliefs influence only help volunteering.

Mediation Mechanisms

So far, the effects of traits (extraversion and agreeableness), values (achievement, stimulation, benevolence and universalism), and self-efficacy beliefs (empathic and social) are seen on help and involvement types of volunteering. The next section discusses how each of these might influence each other in explaining choice to volunteer.

Extraversion Pathway

As discussed earlier, extraversion is expected to influence both types of volunteering. Extraverts have been found to value activity, pleasure, challenge and excitement, and achievement (Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, & Knafo, 2002). Achievement and stimulation values are expected to predict involvement volunteering. Therefore, these two values are likely to mediate the effect of extraversion only on involvement volunteering, even though extraversion is expected to influence both types of volunteering. On the other hand, universalism and benevolence values are argued to be associated with help volunteering. However, extraversion is not significantly associated with these two values (Roccas et al., 2002). Therefore, these values are not likely to mediate the relationship between extraversion and help volunteering.

Social self-efficacy beliefs are likely to play an important role in this pathway. Extraverts are high on generalized self-efficacy and social self-efficacy (Di Giunta et al., 2010). More importantly, Di Giunta et al. (2010) contend that strong correlations between extraversion and social self-efficacy point to the mediating role that social self-efficacy plays in channeling and fully actualizing the extraversion disposition. As noted earlier, social self-efficacy is important not only in case of involvement volunteering but also in help volunteering. Therefore, social self-efficacy is likely to mediate the effect of extraversion on both types of volunteering.

Hypothesis 5: Achievement and stimulation values and social self-efficacy beliefs mediate the relationship between extraversion and involvement volunteering.

Hypothesis 6: Social self-efficacy beliefs mediate the relationship between extraversion and help volunteering.

Agreeableness Pathway

Self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) values are likely to mediate the relationship between agreeableness and primarily help volunteering. Roccas et al. (2002) found agreeableness to be compatible with values of benevolence (0.45) and universalism (0.15). On the contrary, agreeableness conflicts strongly with achievement values and moderately with stimulation values. They reported negative correlation of agreeableness with achieve-
ment (-0.41) and stimulation values (-0.26). Both these values entail self-enhancement and an absence of concern for others. In other words, agreeableness endorses self-transcendence values and conflicts with achievement and stimulation values. Accordingly, it can be argued that the relationship between agreeableness and volunteering will be mediated by self-transcendence values (benevolence and universalism) and not by stimulation and achievement values. Caprara et al. (2011) reported such a relationship model in case of prosocial behaviours. Specific to volunteering, Carlo et al. (2005) found that ‘prosocial values motive’ mediated the role of agreeableness on volunteering. Agreeableness is associated with empathic self-efficacy beliefs (Caprara et al., 2011). The correlation between agreeableness and empathy has been found to be as high as 0.5 (Nettle, 2007). Empathy is also highly correlated with empathic self-efficacy (Di Giunta et al., 2010). Besides, self-transcendence values have been found to contribute to empathic self-efficacy beliefs (Caprara & Steca, 2007). The relationship between social self-efficacy and agreeableness has not been studied. Thus it is not possible to argue either way on the nature of relationship between social self-efficacy and agreeableness. In brief, among self-efficacy beliefs, only empathic self-efficacy beliefs are hypothesized to mediate the role of agreeableness in help volunteering.

**Hypothesis 7:** Universalism and benevolence values and empathic self-efficacy beliefs mediate the relationship between agreeableness and help volunteering.

Figure 1 captures Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 in the form of a model. The model specifies mediation mechanisms.

**METHODS**

**Participants**

Data was collected from post-graduate students of a management school in India via paper and pen method. The first author personally administered around 450 anonymous questionnaires among students. After removing responses with more than five percent missing values, there were 228 usable cases (female = 42 and male = 186). This sex ratio was representative of the student population in the institute. Age of participants ranged between 21 and 30, average age being 24. All students were of Indian origin.

**Measures**

For measuring traits, the 44-item version of the Big Five Inventory (BFI-V44; Benet-Martinez & John, 1998) was administrated. This short inventory provides for efficient assessment of the five dimensions without elaborately measuring various facets associated with each dimension (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998). It has also been found...
to be valid and reliable across ethnic groups and cultures (John et al., 2008). The respondents were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale. Only the items belonging to agreeableness and extroversion dimensions were used in this study. Agreeableness was measured using nine items and extraversion was measured using eight items. The sample item for extraversion was “is talkative” and the sample item for agreeableness was “is unselfish and helpful with others”. Previous studies have reported the scale to be reliable and valid (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998).

Values were measured using Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ) (Schwartz et al., 2001). This questionnaire was specifically developed for persons not educated in western schools that placed high importance on abstract, context-free thinking. The questionnaire consisted of 40 items that measured ten basic human values. Each item consisted of a short verbal portrait describing goals and aspirations of different persons that indirectly pointed to the importance of values. The respondents were asked to identify how much like them was the person described in the item on a six-point scale. Only items corresponding to achievement (four items), stimulation (three items), benevolence (four items), and universalism (six items) values were used for this study. The sample item for benevolence was “It’s very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for other people”. The reliability and validity of these items has been established across cultures (Schwartz et al., 2001).

Self-efficacy beliefs was measured using Perceived Empathic Self-efficacy Beliefs (PESE) scale and Perceived Social Self-efficacy Beliefs (PSSE) scale (Di Giunta et al., 2010). A sample item for PESE was “How well can you recognize your friends’ needs?” and a sample item for PSSE was “How well can you work or study with others?” These items used five-point response scale ranging from “1=not very well” to “5=very well”. There were six items for PESE and five items for PSSE. These scales were found to display acceptable psychometric properties in both western and non-western populations (Di Giunta et al., 2010).

**Volunteering**

The empirical setting involved graduate students in a management programme in a leading management school in India. Extant ways of measuring volunteering was not found to be suitable for this empirical setting. Volunteering, as discussed earlier, assumes different forms in different contexts and cultures (Dekker & Halman, 2003). The type of work and activities undertaken under the name of volunteering is different across countries, cultures, and contexts. A scale was developed following guidelines given by Hall (2001) in developing the new scale.

Broadly, literature seems to suggest that volunteering is an unpaid service done in an organized context and consists of ‘primarily helping type’ behaviours and ‘primarily community involvement’ type behaviours. Based on this understanding, in our empirical setting, volunteering is defined as a service offered without any compensation in an organized context. This excludes any private helping behaviours between students. In other words, for a behaviour to be considered as volunteering, it has to be done in an organized context and the student should not receive any compensation in return. Further, primarily helping behaviours were distinguished from primarily community involvement behaviours. Using this approach, a list of various volunteering activities that students in general took part in, were made. All these activities fell into six broad categories; three under primarily helping behaviours and three under involvement behaviours. A six-item scale was developed to capture these behaviours.

The questionnaire was circulated among experts (various student committee members and faculty members). This stage resulted in fine-tuning some of the questionnaire items to increase clarity. Either the wording of the questions was changed or activities listed under each category were modified. The final scale includes three items for involvement voluntary behaviours concerning behaviours such as organizing events, activities, etc. and three items for help volunteering behaviours such as mentoring, guiding, etc. The scale is given in Appendix 1.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSES**

Missing values were imputed using series mean. A two-step approach was used to test the hypotheses: assessment of the measurement (outer) model followed by the assessment of structural relationships (Hair, Hult, Tomas, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). This approach emphasizes on the need to assess the reliability and validity of the measurement model, in order to draw conclusions based on...
The partial least square method structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) for analysing data (Hair et al., 2013) was used. This method has few advantages over covariance based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM; Hair et al., 2013). It is more robust to non-normality, multi-collinearity, and sample size issues. The SmartPLS version 2.0. M3 was used for data analysis.

**Measurement Model**

Average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) indices for all the latent variables are given in Appendix 2. AVE and CR are greater than recommended values for all variables (AVE > 0.5; CR > 0.708), indicating good convergent validity and reliability respectively. AVE of each construct is greater than all its squared correlations with other construct with all other constructs. Loading of each indicator on its latent variable is greater than all its cross loadings on other constructs. Both these criteria indicate good discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981)

**Structural Relationships**

Three separate PLS-SEM models were used to validate Hypotheses 1 to 4. These hypotheses concern the direct effects of each of the three personality variables: traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs on help volunteering and involvement volunteering. In each model, help volunteering and involvement volunteering are endogenous variables. The exogenous variables in case of Hypothesis 1 are agreeableness and extraversion. In case of Hypotheses 2 and 3, they are universal, benevolence, stimulation, and achievement values, and in case of Hypothesis 4, they are social and empathic self-efficacy beliefs. The model as shown in Figure 1 was used to validate Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 summarizes standardized coefficients for the three models used for evaluating Hypotheses 1 to 4.

**Hypothesis 1**: As hypothesized, agreeableness is associated only with help volunteering (standardized coefficient 0.13). The coefficient of agreeableness on involvement volunteering is not significant at \( p = 0.05 \). Extraversion, as hypothesized, is associated with both help volunteering (0.23) and involvement volunteering (0.38).

**Hypothesis 2**: As per this hypothesis, universalism and benevolence are associated with help volunteering and stimulation and achievement values are associated with involvement volunteering. Universalism is associated with help volunteering (0.22) and stimulation values are associated with involvement volunteering (0.19). Further, achievement values are not significantly associated with either type of volunteering. Hypothesis 2, therefore, is only partially supported.

**Hypothesis 3**: As hypothesized, universal values play a greater role than benevolence values in help volunteering.

---

1 In case of agreeableness and extraversion traits, all the negatively worded items whose loadings were poor (< 0.4) had to be removed — 4 items in case of agreeableness and 3 items in case of extraversion. Likewise, because of poor loadings (< 0.4), 2 items had to be removed in case of universalism and 1 item in case of perceived social self-efficacy.
volunteering. While coefficient of benevolence values is not significant, the coefficient of universalism is modest (0.22).

**Hypothesis 4:** As hypothesized, social self-efficacy is associated with both types of volunteering. However, the association of empathic self-efficacy with either type of volunteering is not significant. Empathic self-efficacy was expected to influence help volunteering. Thus, hypothesis 4 is only partially supported.

**Hypothesis 5:** According to this hypothesis, achievement and stimulation values and social self-efficacy beliefs mediate the relationship between extraversion and involvement volunteering.

The coefficients of each of the mediating variables are not significant in the presence of extraversion indicating lack of a mediating role. As noted earlier in Hypothesis 2, achievement values do not have a significant effect even in the absence of extraversion. The other two stimulation values and social self-efficacy have a significant effect on involvement volunteering in the absence of extraversion but do not have a significant effect in the presence of extraversion. Extraversion has a direct effect on involvement volunteering. Thus, Hypothesis 5 is not supported.

**Hypothesis 6:** No support is found for Hypothesis 6, which expects social self-efficacy to mediate the relationship between extraversion and help volunteering.

The coefficient of social self-efficacy is not significant in the presence of extraversion. Thus, extraversion has only a direct effect on help volunteering. In other words, when the effect of extraversion is taken into account, there is no unique variance to be explained by social self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 7:** According to Hypothesis 7, benevolence and universal values and empathic self-efficacy beliefs mediate the association between agreeableness and help volunteering.

Out of all the mediating variables, only universal values have a significant effect on help volunteering. As noted in Hypotheses 2 and 4, achievement values and empathic self-efficacy beliefs do not have a significant effect on help volunteering even in the absence of agreeableness. Therefore, only universalism has a mediating effect. Interestingly, when the effect of universalism is taken into account, the coefficient of agreeableness is not significant indicating that universalism fully mediates the relationship between agreeableness and help volunteering. Thus, agreeableness has only an indirect effect on help volunteering through universal values. Overall, there is partial support for Hypothesis 7.

**DISCUSSION**

This study was designed to examine the direct and mediating effects of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs on volunteering. It distinguished between two types of volunteering, one that entailed mainly helping others and the other which entailed mainly community involvement.

Overall, the results indicate that distinguishing between helping and involvement types of volunteering is useful for delineating the role of different traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. In case of traits, while extraversion is associated with both helping and involvement volunteering, agreeableness is associated only with helping type volunteering. Likewise, in case of self-efficacy beliefs, while social self-efficacy beliefs are associated with both types of volunteering, empathic self-efficacy is associated with neither. In case of values, while universalism is associated with both helping and involvement volunteering, agreeableness is associated only with helping type volunteering. Likewise, in case of self-efficacy beliefs, while social self-efficacy beliefs are associated with both types of volunteering, empathic self-efficacy is associated with neither. In summary, the fact that different values, beliefs, and personality traits are correlated with different kinds of volunteering suggests the value of not clubbing all volunteering for purposes of understanding who volunteers and why. The role of agreeableness and universalism only in case of help volunteering and not in involvement volunteering suggests that motivation to help plays a role only for help volunteering and not for involvement volunteering. The need and motivation for social activity and interaction seems to underlie involvement volunteering.

In addition, the results indicate the importance of considering the separate effects of universalism and benevolence values. Prosocial literature so far has only examined the combined role of universalism and benevolence values (as self-transcendence) on prosocial behaviour (See Caprara et al., 2011). Results of this study indicate that in case of help volunteering, universalism and not benevolence values are important. As discussed earlier, while universalism promotes a concern for the welfare of everyone, benevolence promotes only concern for the welfare of those in the in-group. As help volunteering involves
helping people in an organized context, not just those who are in frequent personal contact, benevolence values may not be important as in prosocial behaviour. The results also suggest that empathic self-efficacy which significantly influences prosocial behaviour, is not significant in help volunteering. Empathic self-efficacy is likely to be important for very specific volunteering activities, which involve emotional labour, such as volunteers for suicide prevention centres, Red Cross, etc. In this empirical setting, it was not possible to capture such activities under help volunteering. Importance of empathic self-efficacy needs to be explored in diverse volunteering contexts.

The results also add support to the growing literature on the importance of egoistic motivation in volunteering (See Ghose & Kassam, 2014). The fact that extraversion and social-self efficacy beliefs are associated with both types of volunteering points to the importance of social interaction and networks in volunteering. Their role even in help volunteering and the role of stimulation values in involvement volunteering add support to the importance of self-fulfilling (egoistic) motivation in volunteering. However, contrary to expectations, the results suggest that achievement values are not of significant importance in case of involvement volunteering. While studying volunteering motives, Clary and Snyder (1999) reported that prosocial, understanding, and enhancement motives were more important than career, social, and protective motives. If it can be argued that career and social motivations are related to achievement values, then it may explain why achievement values may not be as important in involvement volunteering. This needs to be verified in future studies.

Regarding the mediating role of values and self-efficacy beliefs, these results add support to previous findings, which found that universalism mediated the role of agreeableness on help volunteering (Caprara et al., 2011). However, contrary to expectations, stimulation values although related to involvement volunteering, do not mediate the relationship between extraversion and involvement type volunteering. Likewise, social self-efficacy, although associated with both types of volunteering, does not mediate the role of extraversion. This could be due to a high correlation between extraversion and these two mediating variables. Extraversion has a high correlation of 0.48 with stimulation values and 0.61 with social self-efficacy. In other words, extraversion overshadowed the effects of these two mediating variables. Once the effect of extraversion on volunteering was taken into account, there is no unique variance to be explained by stimulation values and social self-efficacy beliefs. Future studies could be designed to tease out the mechanism of influence of traits and values on volunteering behaviour.

This study has a few limitations. The cross-sectional nature of this study does not allow drawing of any inferences regarding causality. However, Caprara et al. (2011) used a longitudinal study and found traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs to influence prosocial behaviour. Likewise, it is plausible in this case, for agreeableness, extraversion traits, universal and stimulation values, and social self-efficacy beliefs to influence volunteering. Further, this study focused on volunteering behaviours in a specific empirical setting with students in an Indian management school. The volunteering scale was developed specifically to capture volunteering in this context. Besides, the sample had only 15 percent female population, although, that was the ratio of female students in that college. These issues limit the extent to which the results are generalizable. More studies with greater sample size and of longitudinal nature are required to make stronger claims of generalizability and causality.

However, this study makes an important contribution in examining the question as to who would really volunteer and for what kind of causes or roles. First, it demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between helping and involvement types of volunteering. Different traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs influence the two types of volunteering differently. Moreover, it contributes to prosocial literature by delineating the role of universal and benevolence values in help volunteering. The study also contributes to the scant volunteering literature in a non-western context, especially India.

**PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS**

As noted in the beginning, volunteers form most of the workforce of one of the world’s largest and fastest growing non-profit sector in India. This study has practical implications for these non-profit organizations and for corporate social responsibility initiatives. The implications are mainly in terms of selection and retaining of volunteers and in promotion and branding of volunteering events and organizations. The study points to the need to distinguish between help and involvement vol-
unteering. For volunteering that mainly involves helping behaviours, organizations need to appeal to people who are agreeable and hold values of universalism. Organizations may emphasize on the caring and welfare aspects of help volunteering in promotion and branding activities. For involvement volunteering such as activism and campaigning, organizations need to be able to attract people who are extraverted and hold stimulation values. Our study also emphasizes on the role of social interaction and egoistic motivations in volunteering. Emphasizing on virtues of volunteering and opportunities for social interaction in promotion and branding is likely to help in attracting people for involvement volunteering. Designing of communication differently for activities that require help or involvement to attract different kinds of volunteers is a key takeaway from this study for managers and communication specialists in organizations.

Appendix 1: Items in Volunteering Scale

The following questions pertain to volunteering. By volunteering, we mean performing any service without compensation.

Indicate the number of hours you spent in the past 12 months in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>20 to 50 hours</td>
<td>50 to 100 hours</td>
<td>100 to 200 hours</td>
<td>200 to 400 hours</td>
<td>More than 400 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Taking part in the organization of your institute events (e.g. professional, cultural, sports etc.) and activities (for e.g. workshops, interactions, etc.)

2. Taking part in the organization of events and activities outside your institute

3. Performing activities of a committee(s) (e.g. Students Committee, Placement Committee, Mess Committee, Exchange Council, CCC, FII, etc.)

4. Helping other students in your institute as a part of an organized or formal activity (e.g. teaching, coaching, mentoring, counseling, giving guidance, etc.)

5. Helping other people (other than the students of your institute) as a part of an organized or formal activity [Prayaas activities, community service (e.g., distributing food, clothes), teaching, giving guidance, etc.]

6. Any other volunteering activity outside your institute [e.g. social service agencies, not-for-profit organizations (e.g. Red Cross), etc.]

Appendix 2: Measurement Model Validity and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.5359</td>
<td>0.8512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.5799</td>
<td>0.8724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>0.5873</td>
<td>0.8494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>0.5234</td>
<td>0.8132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
<td>0.8476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.6063</td>
<td>0.8601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived empathic self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.5421</td>
<td>0.8744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived social self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.5466</td>
<td>0.8266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help volunteering</td>
<td>0.5204</td>
<td>0.7604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement volunteering</td>
<td>0.5994</td>
<td>0.8152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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