

Motives for volunteering : A study of Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS) volunteers

RAINA AGGARWAL* AND ARCHNA KUMAR

Department of Development Communication and Extension, Lady Irwin College, Delhi University,
DELHI, INDIA (Email : raina_agg@yahoo.com)

ABSTRACT : Why do significant numbers of people engage in the unpaid helping activities known as volunteerism? Drawing on motivations underlying human behaviour, Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) was used. The study assess the motivational functions of youth volunteers especially decisions about becoming a volunteer in the Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan. Volunteerism is considered an important, and increasingly popular, mechanism for enabling young people to not only engage in social issues and contribute to sustainable human development but also their own self-development. The Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS), an autonomous organization under the government is the largest network of rural youth in the country for channelizing the power of youth on the principles of voluntarism, self-help and community participation. The motivational profile of youth volunteers captured by Volunteer Function Inventory revealed that 'understanding' was the most important function of motivation *i.e.* volunteering in NYKS for youth volunteers was a way to gain knowledge about oneself and world, learn new skills and abilities. Understanding the differentials in volunteer function for gender, age, educational level and family income of youth further highlighted the context of the lives of youth. No difference was seen in the motivation across gender and family income. Interestingly no difference in 'career' function across all age groups further highlighted the concern of livelihood issues dominating the lives of youth volunteering with NYKS. Further, difference amongst volunteers of different educational level for 'understanding' function highlighted the difference in learning they sought due to their volunteering.

KEY WORDS : NYKS : Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan, Volunteers

View Point Article : Aggarwal, Raina and Kumar, Archna (2015). Motives for volunteering : A study of Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS) volunteers. *Internat. J. Home Sci. Extn. & Comm. Manage.*, **2** (2): 116-125.

Article History : Received : 22.05.2015; Accepted : 24.06.2015

INTRODUCTION

The study of motives for volunteering is a recurring theme in the specialized literature in the field, and has important repercussions for the management of volunteer programmes, since the motives that emerge as important for volunteers will determine the type of recruitment,

task assignment, training, and so on.

A review of the literature indicates that motivation for youth volunteering is a multifaceted phenomenon meriting further study (Fitch, 1987; Hadsell and Cwik, 1987; Gillespie and King, 1985; Parnell, 1990; Smith, 1981). The field is highly complex and related theories

* Author for correspondence

are so varies and contradictory that no single conceptual model has received general support. Two primary constructs in the literature examining volunteer motivation are egoism and altruism, with theories emphasizing egoism asserting that actual motives for volunteering are self-seeking, while theories emphasizing altruism maintain that volunteers act primarily to help others (Martin, 1994). Batson (1991) used end-state goals, the volunteers' ultimate goal, rather than unintended by-products to differentiate between egoistically and altruistically motivated helping; even if both types of motivation are present, it is this ultimate goal that defines whether their motivation is egoistic or altruistic. For example, although a person's own welfare may be improved in some way be altruistically motivated helping (e.g., it may produce seemingly egoistic feelings of personal satisfaction or relief, the personal gain could be unintended by-product and not the ultimate goal of the behaviour; thus, Batson would likely classify the motivation as altruistic.

Clary *et al.* (1992) observe that people may have at any point motivational multiplicity for volunteering, which may also change with time. According to Smith (1981) also most people volunteer for multiple reasons with altruism, being a minor motivation. He found selfish reasons, such as self-esteem and self-development, were more salient motivations, than the tradition more socially acceptable reasons, of wanting to help others. It has been argued that altruism is only one of several reasons that explain why people volunteer (for example, others may relate to tradition, status and reciprocity). A dominant approach to analysing volunteer motivation is concerned with:

The need being met, the motives being fulfilled, and social and psychological functions being served by the activities of those people who engage in volunteer work (Clary *et al.*, 1992). An advantage of this approach is that it allows a wide range of factors to be involved in understanding the complex interrelations of volunteer motivations. Six categories of motivations or psychological functions that may be met by volunteering have been identified (Clary *et al.*, 1998):

- Value function: people may volunteer to express or cat on values important to the self (e.g. altruism);
- Understanding function: people may volunteer as they see it as an opportunity to increase their knowledge of the world and develop and practices particular skills;
- Esteem function: volunteering may allow people

to engage in psychological development and enhance their self-esteem.

- Career function: people may volunteer to gain experiences that will benefit their careers;
- Social function: volunteering may help people 'fit in' and get along with social groups they value;
- Protective function: volunteering may help people cope with inner anxieties and conflicts.

In summary, the literature on volunteer motivation indicates that it is multifaceted phenomenon that reflects multiple-causation. The motivations are complex and represent basic human needs along with the state of people's personal and social lives (Gillespie and King, 1985). A wide range of factors, operating together, not probably influence the extent to which individual engage in social participation and help to explain why they do so (Edward and White, 1980). Only by understanding why people are motivated to serve can administrators and organizations know how to better facilitates that service.

The goal of the study was to assess the motivation of youth volunteering with NYKS and to study the difference in the mean scores of six volunteer functions for gender, age, educational level and family income.

METHODOLOGY

Sample :

The sample was made up of 550 volunteers of Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS). The Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports has been designated as the nodal Ministry for development and empowerment of youth and adolescents in the country. Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan is one of its flagship programmes of the ministry and is implementing arms setting up, mentoring and nurturing rural youth clubs for promoting youth development. For the study, states from north zone covered by NYKS *i.e.* Delhi, Haryana. Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh were selected.

Understanding the profile of youth provided insights about the background of youth and their circumstances and context. With nearly three-fourth of youth volunteers falling in the age group of 19 years and more and half of the volunteers completed graduation and one-fourth of them were 12th pass. Career and livelihood were critical concern in their lives. With 64 per cent was unemployed and almost similar number of youth volunteers belonging to families having monthly family income less than Rs. 15000. Further accentuated the criticality of youth being able to economically contributed to family income.

Interestingly, the study sample also had only one-fourth of women and rest were male volunteers.

Tools used :

Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) is a tool designed to yield a motivational profile for an individual volunteer by understanding the needs and motivations that volunteers seek to satisfy through volunteering. The VFI is a 30 statement inventory that helps to identify six primary motivational functions, that can be satisfied by volunteering namely values, understanding, career, social, esteem and protective. The instrument of VFI uses a five point scale and six score values are calculated for each individual that correspond to six different motivational functions which can be satisfied by volunteering.

The scoring procedure for the VFI consists of summing the scores of the five items that make up each of the scales and then dividing the sum by five. This will result in a number between 1 (where the motive is not very important to the volunteer) and 7 (where the motive is very important). Thus, each volunteer will receive a score for each of the six scales (Value, understanding, social, career, esteem and protective). This will give a profile of the motivations for volunteering with the highest score representing the most important motivation and the lowest score representing the least important motivation. The scoring pattern that was originally developed by the clary, snyder and ridge in VFI was used.

OBSERVATION AND ASSESSMENT

The scores obtained from the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) were converted into the mean score for each of the six functions independently and are presented in Tables 1 to 7.

Table 1: Mean scores of volunteer function assessed by VFI of youth volunteers

Functions of motivation	Mean
Social	25.49
Values	26.98
Career	26.46
Understanding	29.36
Esteem	28.81
Protective	26.41

For youth volunteers, 'understanding' was the most important function of motivation with the mean score of 29.36. Thus, for youth volunteers volunteering in NYKS is a way to gain knowledge on oneself and world, learn new skills and abilities. The youth volunteers of NYKS related volunteering with the learning process, new perspectives and the increase of experiences. Majority of youth volunteers considered their volunteer work as an important means for enhancing their knowledge base and their understanding about people, their lives and also about themselves and their circumstances and context.

The following statistical analysis was done to see the difference in the mean scores of six volunteer functions for gender, age, educational level and family income.

Gender on functions of motivation :

On the basis of gender (the two groups *i.e.* male and female), the difference in scores of youth volunteers was compared for the six volunteer functions. The following hypothesis was tested using the t-test.

H_{01a} : There is no significant difference b/w the gender groups on functions of motivation

H_{A1a} : There is a significant difference b/w the gender groups on functions of motivation.

t-test indicated that no significant difference occurs

Table 2: Statistical analysis

Statistical test	Purpose
Paired 't' test, ANOVA	Difference in the mean scores of the six volunteer functions assessed by the volunteer function inventory (VFI) for the following volunteer grouping: Gender (Group I- Male ;Group II- Female) Age (Group I-15-18 years; Group II- 19-25 years; Group III- 25 years and above) Educational qualification (Group I- Secondary; Group II- Higher Secondary; Group III- Graduation or Higher degree) Family income (Group I- up to Rs. 5000; Group II- Rs. 5001- 15000 ; Group III- Rs. 15001- 25000; Group IV- Rs. 25001 and above)
Scheffe test	Inter- Group differences among above groups

b/w the gender groups on functions of motivation. So, two groups of gender do not differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we accept the Null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.

For both the Male and Female, ‘Understanding’ was the most important function of motivation with the mean score of 29.24 and 29.52. Both the male and female youth volunteer said that volunteering provided them the opportunity for new learning experiences and the chance to enhance their knowledge, skills and abilities.

Age on functions of motivation :

Youth volunteers were classified into the three groups based on their age *i.e.* 13-18 years, 19-24 years and 25 years and above. The difference in scores of each group was compared for the six volunteer functions to test the hypothesis. No significant difference was found for the ‘career’ function of motivation amongst the volunteers of different age groups at 5 per cent level of confidence. Volunteers differed in all other functions of motivation except the career function of motivation. Clearly, ‘career’ concern was common aspect influencing motivation of volunteers of all ages.

To test the following hypothesis, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) was performed.

- H_{02a}: There is no significant difference b/w the age groups on ‘social’ function of motivation
- H_{A2a}: There is a significant difference b/w the age groups on ‘social’ function of motivation.

For the *social function*, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) indicates that for the age groups on ‘Social’ function of motivation, p value is .010 and a significant difference occur b/w the age group on the ‘Social’ function of motivation. So, three groups of age differ

significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

The Scheffe test indicates that for the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years), p value is .010 and a significant difference occur b/w the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years) on the ‘Social’ function of motivation. And no significant difference occurs b/w the age group (19-24 years and 25 years and above) and (25 years and above and 13-18 years). So, only (13-18 years and 19-24 years) age group differ significantly on ‘Social’ function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

For the *Value function*, to test the following hypothesis, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) was performed.

- H_{02b}: There is no significant difference b/w the age groups on ‘Value’ function of motivation
- H_{A2b}: There is a significant difference b/w the age groups on ‘Value’ function of motivation.

ANOVA indicates that, p value is .024 and a significant difference occurs b/w the age group on the ‘Values’ function of motivation. So, three groups of age differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. The Scheffe test indicates that for the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years), p value is .043 and a significant difference occurs b/w the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years) on the ‘values’ function of motivation. And no significant difference occurs b/w the age group (19-24 years and 25 years and above) and (25 years and above and 13-18 years). So, only (13-18 years and 19-24 years) age group differ significantly on ‘Value’ function of motivation at 5 per

Table 3: Difference in mean scores of functions of motivation on gender groups

Functions of motivation	Sex	N	Mean	t- test for equality of means
Social	Male	432	26.2708	.133
	Female	118	25.4322	
Values	Male	432	27.0995	.766
	Female	118	27.2627	
Career	Male	432	26.3889	.900
	Female	118	26.4661	
Understanding	Male	432	29.2454	.625
	Female	118	29.5254	
Esteem	Male	432	28.9398	.480
	Female	118	29.3475	
Protective	Male	432	26.2546	.340
	Female	118	26.8136	

cent level of confidence.

For *Career Function*, to test the following hypothesis, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) was performed.

H_{02c} : There is no significant difference b/w the age groups on 'career' function of motivation

H_{A2c} : There is a significant difference b/w the age groups on 'career' function of motivation.

ANOVA indicates that p value is .315 and no significant difference occur b/w the age group on the 'Career' function of motivation. So, three groups of age do not differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we accept the Null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.

For the *Understanding function*, to test the following hypothesis, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) was performed.

H_{02d} : There is no significant difference b/w the age groups on 'understanding' function of motivation

H_{A2d} : There is a significant difference b/w the age groups on 'understanding' function of motivation.

ANOVA indicates that for the 'understanding' function, p value is .001 and a significant difference occur b/w the age group on the 'Understanding' function of motivation. So, three groups of age differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

The Scheffe test indicates that for the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years), p value is .002 and a significant difference occurs b/w the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years) on the 'Understanding' function of motivation. And no significant difference occurs b/w the age group (19-24 years and 25 years and above) and (25 years and above and 13-18 years). So, only (13-18 years and 19-24 years) age group differ significantly on 'Understanding' function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

Further for the age group of (19-24 years) and (25 years and above), 'Understanding' was the most important function of motivation with the mean score of 30.00 and 29.03. Both the age group reflected an interest in enhancing their learning.

Table 4 : Difference in mean scores of functions of motivation on age groups

Motivation function	Age groups	Mean	Std. deviation	p	Remarks scheffe test indicates significant differences
Social	13-18 years	24.5682	5.08727	.010	The age group (13-18 years) and (19-24 years) differs significantly
	19-24 years	26.5603	5.26976		
	25 years and above	26.1000	5.56837		
	Total	26.0909	5.37678		
Values	13-18 years	26.0682	5.68886	0.24	The age group (13-18 years) and (19-24 years) differs significantly
	19-24 years	27.6844	4.99712		
	25 years and above	26.7944	5.42156		
	Total	27.1345	5.27910		
Career	13-18 years	25.5682	6.25657	0.31	-----
	19-24 years	26.6631	5.70103		
	25 years and above	26.4111	6.01468		
	Total	26.4055	5.89751		
Understanding	13-18 years	27.6136	5.65163	.001	The age group (13-18 years) and (19-24 years) differs significantly
	19-24 years	30.0035	5.36663		
	25 years and above	29.0389	5.48677		
	Total	29.3055	5.50917		
Esteem	13-18 years	27.6818	5.68431	.004	The age group (13-18 years) and (19-24 years) differs significantly
	19-24 years	29.7482	5.32473		
	25 years and above	28.5556	5.69546		
	Total	29.0273	5.55328		
Protective	13-18 years	24.2955	5.43120	000	The age group (13-18 years) and (19-24 years) differs significantly
	19-24 years	27.1667	5.40764		
	25 years and above	26.1500	5.81798		
	Total	26.3745	5.63117		

For the *Esteem function*, to test the following hypothesis, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) was performed.

- H_{02e}: There is no significant difference b/w the age groups on 'esteem' function of motivation
- H_{A2e}: There is a significant difference b/w the age groups on 'esteem' function of motivation.

ANOVA test indicates that for the age groups on 'Esteem' function of motivation, p value is .004 and a significant difference occur b/w the age group on the 'Esteem' function of motivation. So, three groups of age differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. So, only (13-18 years and 19-24 years) age group differ significantly on 'Understanding' function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

The Scheffe test indicates that for the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years), p value is .009 which means there is 0.9 per cent probability that any deviation from expected result is due to chance only. As p<.05, a significant difference occurs b/w the age group (13-18

years and 19-24 years) on the 'Esteem' function of motivation. And no significant difference occurs b/w the age group (19-24 years and 25 years and above) and (25 years and above and 13-18 years). So, only (13-18 years and 19-24 years) age group differ significantly on 'Esteem' function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

Further one way ANOVA indicates that for the age group (13-18 years), 'Esteem' was the most important function of motivation with the mean score of 27.68. Volunteering in NYKS led to the increase in youth volunteer's self-esteem, making them feel important or necessary, making them feel better about themselves or being a way of making new friends. The youth volunteers stated that they were volunteering as a way of changing positively, of developing and becoming stronger as a person. 'Protective' was the least important function of motivation with the mean score of 24.29.

For the *Protective function*, to test the following hypothesis, ANOVA test (multiple comparisons) was performed.

Table 5: Difference in mean scores of functions of motivation on educational level groups

Functions of motivation	Educational level	N	Mean	Std. deviation	p	Remarks scheffe test indicates significant differences
Social	Secondary level	108	26.3519	5.25306	.846	-----
	Higher Secondary	159	25.9811	5.32545		
	Graduation or higher degree	283	26.0530	5.46692		
	Total	550	26.0909	5.37678		
Values	Secondary level	108	27.7685	5.35751	.018	(Secondary and Higher Secondary) and (Higher Secondary and Graduation or higher degree) differs significantly
	Higher Secondary	159	26.1509	5.65035		
	Graduation or higher degree	283	27.4452	4.96795		
	Total	550	27.1345	5.27910		
Career	Secondary level	108	26.2130	6.29946	.305	-----
	Higher Secondary	159	25.8931	6.16297		
	Graduation or higher degree	283	26.7668	5.57496		
	Total	550	26.4055	5.89751		
Understanding	Secondary level	108	29.7685	5.02816	.004	(Secondary and Higher Secondary) and (Higher Secondary and Graduation or higher degree) differs significantly
	Higher Secondary	159	28.0755	6.25568		
	Graduation or higher degree	283	29.8198	5.13499		
	Total	550	29.3055	5.50917		
Esteem	Secondary level	108	29.2315	5.58303	.098	-----
	Higher Secondary	159	28.2327	5.99176		
	Graduation or higher degree	283	29.3958	5.25238		
	Total	550	29.0273	5.55328		
Protective	Secondary level	108	26.0000	5.96877	.092	-----
	Higher Secondary	159	25.7358	5.82275		
	Graduation or higher degree	283	26.8763	5.35567		
	Total	550	26.3745	5.63117		

H_{02f} : There is no significant difference b/w the age groups on 'protective' function of motivation

H_{A2f} : There is a significant difference b/w the age groups on 'protective' function of motivation.

ANOVA indicates that the age groups on 'Protective' function of motivation, p value is .000 and a significant difference occur b/w the age group on the 'Protective' function of motivation. So, three groups of age differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

The Scheffe test indicates that for the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years), p value is .001 and a significant difference occurs b/w the age group (13-18 years and 19-24 years) on the 'Protective' function of

motivation. And no significant difference occurs b/w the age group (19-24 years and 25 years and above) and (25 years and above and 13-18 years). So, only (13-18 years and 19-24 years) age group differ significantly on 'Protective' function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

ANOVA test (multiple comparison b/w the groups) indicates that all the three groups of age differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence on all functions of Motivation except the 'Career' Function of Motivation.

Educational level on functions of motivation :

Youth volunteers were classified into the three groups based on their educational level *i.e.* secondary, higher secondary and gradation or higher degree. The

Table 6 :Difference in mean scores of functions of motivation on family income groups

Function of motivation	Family income	N	Mean	Std. deviation	p	Remarks scheffe test indicates significant differences
Social	Upto Rs. 5000	195	26.2359	5.59323	.655	-----
	Rs. 5001- 15000	196	26.1888	5.14508		
	Rs. 15001- 25000	137	25.6277	5.52003		
	Rs. 25001 and above	22	26.8182	4.62536		
	Total	550	26.0909	5.37678		
Values	Upto Rs. 5000	195	27.3026	5.47023	.930	-----
	Rs. 5001- 15000	196	26.9541	5.46250		
	Rs. 15001- 25000	137	27.1752	4.99544		
	Rs. 25001 and above	22	27.0000	3.58569		
	Total	550	27.1345	5.27910		
Career	Upto Rs. 5000	195	26.4974	6.25273	.989	-----
	Rs. 5001- 15000	196	26.3010	6.03717		
	Rs. 15001- 25000	137	26.4453	5.08591		
	Rs. 25001 and above	22	26.2727	6.47473		
	Total	550	26.4055	5.89751		
Understanding	Upto Rs. 5000	195	29.2923	5.36615	.941	-----
	Rs. 5001- 15000	196	29.3776	5.62324		
	Rs. 15001- 25000	137	29.1314	5.83576		
	Rs. 25001 and above	22	29.8636	3.56298		
	Total	550	29.3055	5.50917		
Esteem	Upto Rs. 5000	195	29.2051	5.60918	.918	-----
	Rs. 5001- 15000	196	29.0000	5.71906		
	Rs. 15001- 25000	137	28.9051	5.49583		
	Rs. 25001 and above	22	28.4545	3.93673		
	Total	550	29.0273	5.55328		
Protective	Upto Rs. 5000	195	26.4923	5.94942	.893	-----
	Rs. 5001- 15000	196	26.4796	5.68530		
	Rs. 15001- 25000	137	26.1533	5.05250		
	Rs. 25001 and above	22	25.7727	5.96763		
	Total	550	26.3745	5.63117		

difference in scores of each group was compared for the six volunteer functions to test the hypothesis.

As per the Table 5, no significant difference was found for the social, career, esteem and protective function of motivation amongst the volunteers of different groups of educational level at 5 per cent level of confidence. The means scores of functions of volunteers revealed that for the Secondary level group, 'Protective' with a mean score of 26.00 and for the Graduation or higher Degree, 'Social' with a mean score of 26.05 was the least important function of motivation. For the youth volunteers who were qualified till higher secondary, 'Esteem' with a mean score of 28.23 was the most important function of motivation and 'Protective' with a mean score of 25.73 was the least important function of motivation.

For the value function, to test the hypothesis ANOVA test was applied :

H_{03b}: There is no significant difference b/w the Educational level groups on 'Value' function of motivation

H_{A3b}: There is a significant difference b/w the Educational level groups on 'Value' function of motivation.

ANOVA (multiple comparisons) indicates that for the educational level groups on 'Values' function of motivation, p value is .018 and a significant difference occurs b/w the educational level on the 'Values' function of motivation. So, three groups of educational level differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

The Scheffe test indicates that for the educational level group (Secondary and Higher Secondary), p value is .048 and for the (Higher secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree), p value is .046 and a significant difference occurs b/w the (Secondary and Higher Secondary) and (Higher secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree) on the 'Value' function of motivation. And no significant difference occur b/w the educational

level group (Graduation or Higher Degree and Secondary) on 'Value' function of motivation. So, educational group of (Secondary and Higher Secondary) and (Higher Secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree) differs significantly on 'Value' function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

For the *Understanding Function*, to test the hypothesis, ANOVA test was applied:

H_{03d}: There is no significant difference b/w the Educational level groups on 'understanding' function of motivation

H_{A3d}: There is a significant difference b/w the Educational level groups on 'understanding' function of motivation.

ANOVA (multiple comparisons) indicates that for educational level groups on 'Understanding' function of motivation, p value is .004 and a significant difference occur b/w the educational level on the 'Understanding' function of motivation. So, three groups of educational level differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we reject the Null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

The Scheffe test indicates that for the educational level group (Secondary and Higher Secondary), p value is .046 and for the (Higher secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree), p value is .006, a significant difference occurs b/w the (Secondary and Higher Secondary) and (Higher secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree) on the 'Understanding' function of motivation. And no significant difference occur b/w the educational level group (Graduation or Higher Degree and Secondary) on 'Understanding' function of motivation. So, educational group of (Secondary and Higher Secondary) and (Higher secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree) differs significantly on 'Understanding' function of motivation at 5 per cent level of confidence.

Further, for the educational level group (Secondary and Graduation or Higher Degree), 'Understanding' was the most important factor of motivation with a mean score of 29.76 and 29.81. The youth volunteers said that the need to know oneself and the world better, to learn about

Table 7: Summary of difference in volunteer function of motivation for gender, age, educational level and family income

Independent variables	Social	Value	Career	Understanding	Esteem	Protective
Gender	No difference	No difference	No difference	No difference	No difference	No difference
Age	Difference	No difference	Difference	Difference	Difference	Difference
Educational level	No difference	Difference	No difference	Difference	No difference	No difference
Family Income	No difference	No difference	No difference	No difference	No difference	No difference

one's own limits and new perspectives, to explore one's own strengths.

So, all the three groups of educational level differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence on all functions of Motivation except the 'Values' and 'Understanding' Function of Motivation.

Family income on functions of motivation :

On the basis of family income, volunteers were classified into four groups *i.e.* Upto Rs. 5000, Rs. 5001-15000, Rs. 15001- 25000 and Rs. 25001 and above. The difference in scores of each group of family income was compared for the six volunteer functions to test the following hypothesis.

H_{04} : There is no significant difference b/w the family income groups on functions of motivation

H_{A4} : There is a significant difference b/w the family income groups on functions of motivation

ANOVA (multiple comparisons) indicates that for family income groups on all functions of motivation, $p > .05$ and no significant difference occur b/w the family income on all the function of motivation. So, four groups family income does not differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence. Therefore, we accept the Null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.

Further, the mean score of all the functions of motivation indicates that for all the family income groups (Upto Rs. 5000, Rs.5001-15000, Rs. 15001- 25000 and Rs. 25001 and above), 'Understanding' was the most important function of motivation with the mean score of 29.29, 29.37, 29.13 and 29.86. For the three family income groups (Upto Rs. 5000, Rs. 5001-15000, Rs. 15001-25000), 'Social' was the least important function of motivation with a mean score of 26.35, 26.18 and 25.62 and for the Rs. 25001 and above, 'Protective' was the least important function of motivation with a mean score of 25.77. So, all the four groups of family income do not differ significantly at 5 per cent level of confidence on all functions of motivation.

Thus, understanding the differentials in volunteer function for gender, age, educational level and family income of youth further highlighted the context of the lives of youth. No difference was seen in the motivation across gender and family income. Thus, men and women as well as the youth from all income groups had largely similar motivation for volunteering. With 'understanding' being the most important function of motivation influencing motivation of youth to volunteer in NYKS.

Clearly, opportunities for growth and learning were key aspect motivating their involvement with NYKS youth clubs.

Interestingly no difference in 'career' function across all age groups further highlighted the concern of livelihood issues dominating the lives of youth volunteering with NYKS. Finally, the emergence of difference amongst volunteers of different educational level for 'value' and 'understanding' function highlighted the differential in the background of youth because of education. The growth and learning they sought expectantly differed according to their educational level and their desire to help others.

Conclusion :

Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan is working at various fronts of youth development with a variety of programmes and schemes of the Department of Youth Affairs, Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports. Youth volunteers expressed different reasons for initially starting to volunteer with the NYKS. Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) was used to understand the current motivational profile of youth volunteers and understand the needs and motivations that volunteers sought to satisfy through volunteering. The youth volunteers scored 'understanding' function as highest with the mean score of 29.36. Thus, as per the VFI scores for youth volunteers, volunteering in NYKS is a way to gain knowledge on oneself and world, learn new skills and abilities. The youth volunteers of NYKS related volunteering with the learning process, for adding new perspectives and enhancing their experiences. Qualitatively also majority of youth volunteers considered their work as an important source for enhancing their knowledge, for expansion of their horizons and building self-confidence, understanding about social issues, improved social skills and understand diverse viewpoints and perspectives.

Understanding the differentials in volunteer function for gender, age, educational level and family income of youth further highlighted the context of the lives of youth. No difference was seen in the motivation across gender and family income. Thus, men and women as well as the youth from all income groups had largely similar motivation for volunteering. With 'understanding' being the most important function of motivation influencing motivation of youth to volunteer in NYKS. Clearly, opportunities for growth and learning were key aspect

motivating their involvement with NYKS youth clubs. Interestingly no difference in 'career' function across all age groups further highlighted the concern of livelihood issues dominating the lives of youth volunteering with NYKS. Finally, the emergence of difference amongst volunteers of different educational level for 'value' and 'understanding' function highlighted the differential in the background of youth because of education. The growth and learning they sought expectantly differed according to their educational level and their desire to help others.

REFERENCES

- Batson, C. D. (1991).** *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M. and Ridge, R. (1992).** Volunteers' motivations: A functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. *Non-profit Mgmt. & Leadership*, **2** (4) : 333-350.
- Clary, E., Snyder, M., Ridge, R., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A. and Haugen, J. (1998).** Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *J. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.*, **74** (6) : 1516-1530.
- Dolnicar, S. and Randle, M. (2007).** What motivates which volunteers? Psychographic Heterogeneity among volunteers in Australia, *Voluntas*, **18**(2) : 135-155.
- Edwards, J. N. and White, R. P. (1980).** Predictors of social participation: Apparent or Real? *J. Volunt. Act. Res.*, **9** (1-4) : 60-73.
- Esmond, J. and Dunlop, P. (2004).** *Developing the Volunteer Motivation Inventory to assess the underlying Motivational Drives of Volunteers in Western Australia.* Perth: Lotterywest & CLANWA inc.
- Finkelstien, M. A. (2009).** Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process. *Personality & Individ. Differ.*, **46** (5-6) : 653-658.
- Fitch, R.T. (1987).** Characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering for community service. *J. College Stud. Personnel*, September, 424-431.
- Gillespie, D.G. and King, A.E. (1985).** Demographic understanding of volunteerism. *J. Sociol. & Soc. Welfare*, **12** (4) : 798-816.
- Hadsell, C.D. and Cwik, L.M. (1987).** *Student volunteer recruitment programmes: The total concept.* College and University, **62** : 356-371.
- Martin, M. W. (1994).** *Virtuous giving: Philanthropy, voluntary service and caring.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Okun, M.A. and Schultz, A. (2003).** Age and motives for volunteering: Testing hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. *Psychol. & Aging*, **18** (2) : 231-239.
- Omoto, A.M., Snyder, M. and Martino, S.C. (2000).** Volunteerism and the life course: Investigating age-related agendas for action. *Basic & Appl. Soc. Psychol.*, **22**(3):181-197.
- Parnell, D. (1990).** Dateline 2000: The new higher education agenda. American Association of Community and Junior College, WASHINGTON, D.C .
- Planalp, S. and Trost, M. (2009).** Motivations of hospice volunteers. *American J. Hospice & Palliative Med.*, **26** (3) : 188-192.
- Randeron, J. (2008).** It's all about Altruism. *Philanthropy, Newsletter of the Centre for advancement of Philanthropy.* Mumbai: R.R. Chari for CAP.
- Shannon, C.S. (2009).** An Untapped resource: Understanding volunteers aged 8 to 12. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sec. Quarterly*, **38** (5) : 830-844.
- Smith, D. H. (1981).** Altruism, volunteers, and volunteerism. *J. Volunt. Act. Res.*, **10** (1) : 21-68.

■ WEBLIOGRAPHY

- Culp, K. and Schwartz, V.J. (1999).** Motivating adult volunteer 4-H leaders. *J. Extn.* [On-line] 37(1), *Article 1RIB5.* Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999february/rb5.php>.
- Ministry of Youth affairs and Sports, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (2011). Annual Report 2010-11. Retrieved from <http://www.nyks.org/resources/pdf/ap201011.pdf>.

2nd
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★