

Journal of Athlete Development and Experience

Volume 1 | Issue 3

Article 2

December 2019

Volunteer Motivations, Satisfaction, and Future Intent: A Comparative Analysis Between Student-Athletes and Service-Learning Students

Tiesha R. Martin

Radford University, tmartin116@radford.edu


Mark Slavich

Grand View University, m Slavich@grandview.edu

Jennifer L. Gellock

University of North Alabama, jgellock@una.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/jade>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Sports Management Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martin, Tiesha R.; Slavich, Mark; and Gellock, Jennifer L. (2019) "Volunteer Motivations, Satisfaction, and Future Intent: A Comparative Analysis Between Student-Athletes and Service-Learning Students," *Journal of Athlete Development and Experience*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 3 , Article 2.

DOI: [10.25035/jade.01.03.02](https://doi.org/10.25035/jade.01.03.02)

Available at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/jade/vol1/iss3/2>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Athlete Development and Experience by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

JADE

Journal of Athlete
Development and Experience




PAADS

VOLUME 1
ISSUE 3

GLOBAL PARTNERS



BGSU
Bowling Green State University



UNIVERSITY OF
ARKANSAS
College of Education
& Health Professions
Department of Health,
Human Performance &
Recreation

Volunteer Motivations, Satisfaction, and Future Intent: A Comparative Analysis Between Student-Athletes and Service-Learning Students

Tiesha R. Martin

Radford University

Mark Slavich

Grand View University

Jennifer L. Gellock

Virginia Commonwealth University

Martin (tmartin116@redford.edu) is corresponding author.

Abstract

Developing socially responsible and civically engaged citizens has been a priority of higher education in the United States since its conception. As an extension of higher education, intercollegiate athletics has been tasked with the same objective. One method to accomplish this objective is student-athletes' engagement in community service. With the growing amount of attention placed on community service, it is becoming increasingly important to understand student-athletes' volunteer experiences in order to help administrators better coordinate impactful service opportunities for them. Using functionalist theory as a framework, the purpose of this study was to assess student-athletes' motivations to volunteer, satisfaction with their experiences, and future intent to volunteer. Further, the current study also compared student-athletes' volunteer experiences with those of university service-learning students. The results highlight the functions that student-athletes deem as most important for their decision to volunteer and provide insight into the extent to which student-athletes are satisfied with their current volunteer experiences and future intent to volunteer. Practical implications for university athletic administrators are discussed.

Keywords: *Community Service, Motivations, Satisfaction, Service-learning, Student-athlete, Volunteer*

Since its conception, a priority of higher education has been to assist in the development of socially responsible and civically engaged citizens (Labaree, 1997). One way to achieve this objective is through volunteering and community service (Gallant, Smale, & Arai, 2010; Payne, 2000; Schlereth, Scott, & Berman, 2014). Many institutions of higher education look to provide service opportunities for their students. As an extension of higher education, athletic departments have been tasked with producing socially responsible and civically engaged student-athletes (Brown, Hoye, & Nicholson, 2014; Harvery, Levesque, & Donnelley, 2007). While the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) does not mandate student-athlete community service participation, almost all university athletic departments encourage and often require their athletes to engage in service (Huml, Svensson, & Hancock, 2017; Jarvie & Paule-Koba, 2012). Consequently, an increasing number of athletic departments also are including community service and engagement in their mission statements (Andrassy & Bruening,

2011). According to a report produced by the NCAA in 2014, most student-athletes believe they have a responsibility to participate in volunteer or service activities in their community. Additionally, 50% of student-athletes reported that some form of community service is required as a part of their athletic participation (NCAA, 2014). While some studies have addressed the outcomes of community service for student-athletes (Fuller et al., 2015; Jarvie & Paule-Koba, 2012; McHugo, 2005), as well as the frequency of such activities (Huml et al., 2017), there is a sufficient gap in the literature in regard to why student-athletes participate in community service and whether they are satisfied with the volunteer opportunities their athletic departments provide. With the growing amount of attention placed on community service, it is becoming increasingly important to understand students-athletes' volunteer experiences in order to help administrators better coordinate impactful volunteer opportunities for their students.

In addition to the growth of volunteerism and community service within college athletic departments, students on campus who similarly participate in community service are service-learning students. Service-learning is a pedagogy that combines traditional teaching methods and the inclusion of a service activity (Ehrlich, 1996). That is, service-learning students have the opportunity to apply what they learn in the classroom to community service work. This service work is a part of course requirements. Research indicates that service-learning students are likely to learn more about diversity, become more socially and politically aware, and become likely to engage in service in the future as a result of their experiences (Simons & Cleary, 2006).

Because community service participation is being emphasized in higher education, it is important to recognize the motivational factors that influence an individual's desire to volunteer. Looking at the comparison between student-athletes and service-learning students provides an opportunity to compare two groups who may have different motivational factors influencing their engagement in community service activities. Several studies have compared student-athletes to other non-student-athlete groups such as members of fraternities and sororities (Warner, Sparvero, Shapiro, & Anderson, 2017), the general student population (Gorczynski, Coyle, & Gibson, 2017; Hawley, Hosch, & Bovalrd, 2014), and service-learning students (Fuller et al., 2011). These comparisons are made because research suggests that student-athletes have different college experiences than their non-athlete counterparts due to social and physical isolation and schedule constraints (Jolly, 2008; Watt & Moore, 2001).

Given these differences, one might expect student-athletes to have different motives for volunteering, and different levels of satisfaction with their volunteer experiences, which may lead to a different level of engagement in community service in the future than non-athlete students. Specifically, comparing the experiences of student-athletes to service-learning students may prove insightful, as service-learning is a well-established, evidenced-based form of getting students involved in their community. Thus, the purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to better

understand student-athletes' volunteer experiences (i.e., motives to volunteer, satisfaction, future intent to volunteer) and (2) to compare student-athletes' volunteer experience with that of service-learning students. Exploring how student-athlete and service-learning students' volunteer experiences differ could allow athletic department administrators to look to another area of campus with an established student community service system and determine if they are creating the best possible volunteer experiences for their student-athletes. The following sections of this manuscript provide background on the theoretical framework utilized to guide the study as well as a review of literature on community service of student-athletes and other relevant populations.

Theoretical Framework

The current study applied functionalist theory of motivation as the theoretical framework. Functionalist theory holds that "people can and do perform the same actions in the service of different psychological functions" (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1517). This means that human behavior is facilitated by particular motives and those motives vary from person to person. Thus, even individuals that are performing the same action are doing so for the services of different functions or motives. Functionalist theorists also argue that any attempt to change behavior or attitudes only can be successful if those functions or motives are addressed (Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). Within the context of this study, student-athletes and service-learning students are motivated to volunteer for a number of different reasons, and in order to influence their attitude toward volunteering (i.e., satisfaction and future intent), administrators have to address these motivations through the volunteer opportunities they plan.

Clary and colleagues (1998) were the first to apply functionalist theory to volunteer motivations. The authors suggest there are six functions served by volunteering – Value, Understanding, Social, Career, Protective, and Enhancement. The Value function suggests that individuals may choose to volunteer to express values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others. Sergent and Sedlacek (1990) found that students volunteered mostly because they

realize the importance of helping others. The Value function is considered an intrinsic motivation. The Understanding function deals with volunteerism as a mode to exercise knowledge and abilities that might otherwise go unpracticed and to learn new skills. This idea was supported by Martin, Warner, and Das (2016), who found that students who volunteered with older adults in a sport setting were able to apply course content to their volunteer experience and learn new skills. The Social function reflects motivations concerning relationships with others. It suggests that individuals may be motivated to volunteer by societal pressures. Volunteering may offer opportunities to be with one's friends or to engage in an activity viewed favorably by important others. The Career function is concerned with career-related benefits that may be obtained from participation in volunteer work. The Protective function suggests that in an effort to protect the ego, individuals may volunteer to reduce guilt over being more fortunate than others and to address one's own personal problems. Finally, the Enhancement function deals with volunteerism as a mode for personal development. Previous research supports this function by suggesting that volunteerism in general leads to civic engagement and social responsibility (Schlereth et al., 2014). Many athletic departments require community service for their athletes in order to serve this function. Clary and colleagues (1998) developed the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), a scale used to measure these six functions of volunteerism.

Functionalist theory previously has been used to explain volunteers' motivations for a number of populations including adults (Dwyer, Bono, Snyder, Nov, & Berson, 2013; Francis, 2011), parents (Kim, Zhang, & Connaughton, 2010), youth (Law, Shek, & Ma, 2011), and college students (Pearl & Christensen, 2017; Schatteman, 2014). Additionally, it has been used in a number of different volunteer settings, including sport (Eley & Kirk, 2002; Hallmann & Harms, 2012). Research that has utilized the VFI and functionalist theory primarily has been consistent. Many studies have indicated that participants scored highest on the Value subscale, which indicates that volunteers tend to be motivated by altruistic or humanitarian reasons (Dwyer et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2010; Truesdell, 2016). Furthermore, several

studies have indicated that the Value function predicts future volunteer commitment (Brayley et al., 2014; Dwyer et al., 2013). While the functionalist theory of motivation has been applied to a number of populations, the current study provides the opportunity to apply the theory to a previously unexplored group (i.e., student-athletes).

Review of Literature

Volunteer Motivation and Satisfaction

Previous literature suggests that understanding motivations to participate in community service is important to gain insight into individuals' volunteer experiences (Harrison, 1995; Sergent & Sedlacek, 1990; Shye, 2010). Volunteer motivation can be defined as a drive of individuals to seek out volunteer opportunities, to commit themselves to helping, and to sustain their involvement in volunteerism over extended periods of time (Shye, 2010). Henderson (1980) suggested that individuals have unique motivations and expectations for their volunteer experience. Understanding these motivations can contribute to providing volunteers with a satisfactory experience. Warner, Newland, and Green (2011) further argued that motivation and satisfaction go hand-in-hand when assessing volunteers' commitment to volunteering and their commitment to a specific volunteer organization. That is, satisfaction typically deals with whether or not motives were fulfilled. Together, this research suggests that it is important to access both motivation and satisfaction in order to better understand volunteers' experiences.

Several studies have explored the link between volunteer satisfaction and retention (Dwiggins-Beeler, Spitzberg, & Roesch, 2011; Pauline, 2011; Taylor & Pancer, 2007). Taylor and Pancer (2007) found that individuals who were satisfied with their volunteer experience were more likely to volunteer in the future. Similarly, Dwiggins-Beeler et al. (2011) found that generalized satisfaction was positively associated with retention and recruitment among long-term volunteers.

Additionally, past studies looked at the determinants or antecedents of volunteer satisfaction. Finkelstein (2007) found that individuals were more satisfied with their volunteer experience if

the experience met their goals and expectations. Galindo-Kuhn and Guzley (2002) suggested that communication quality, organizational support, and integration are factors that have an effect on volunteer satisfaction. Other factors that can influence volunteer satisfaction include type of activity (Dwiggins-Beeler et al., 2011), variance in activity (Okun & Eisenberg, 1992), and relationships with other volunteers (Pauline, 2011). Based on previous literature, one can deduce the importance of assessing both motivation and satisfaction in better understanding student-athletes' and service-learning students' volunteer experiences.

Service Learning

Service-learning is a pedagogical method that integrates community service with academic service (Ehrlich, 1996). That is, the service component typically is tied to other requirements of the course. Service-learning students are provided with the structure and opportunity to reflect on experiences and learning gains throughout the course (Bruening, Madsen, Evanovich, & Fuller, 2010). Students have the choice to take courses they are interested in and are provided with the opportunity to apply applicable skills to real-world problems while learning valuable lessons from the experience (McClam, Diambra, Burton, Fuss, & Fudge, 2008). Students being able to critically think and reflect on their experience is an important piece to the assessment of student learning gains and what makes these courses valuable to higher education (Molee, Henry, Sessa, & McKinney-Prupis, 2010). Engaging in service-learning has produced a host of learning, personal, and social outcomes for college students, including increased ability to apply course content (Martin et al., 2016), increase critical thinking skills (Hebert & Hauf, 2015), increase self-efficacy (Sanders, Van Oss, & McGeary, 2016), leadership (Huda, Mat The, Nor Muhamed, & Mohd Nasir, 2018), and social and cultural understanding (Kohlbray, 2016).

The functionalist theory of motivation and the VFI have been used to understand the volunteer experiences of service-learning students. Research suggests that appealing to student motivations can help service-learning instructors and administrators better recruit students and engage them in civic

activities (Pearl & Christensen, 2017; Schatteman, 2014). Accordingly, Chapman and Morley (1999) utilized the VFI to assess the volunteer motivations and satisfaction of collegiate service-learning students. They found that among college service-learning students, Value and Understanding were the most important motives to volunteer, while Protective and Social were the least important. The authors also found that the Value, Protective, and Social functions were predictive of overall satisfaction with service experience. Pearl and Christensen (2017) also utilized the VFI to assess college students' participation in service-learning and found differences in motivation according to race.

Student-Athlete Volunteer Experience

Despite the growing amount of focus on community service within athletic departments (Andrassy & Bruening, 2011; Schlereth et al., 2014) and the growing amount of research concerning student-athletes' experiences (Gayles, 2009), there have been only a few studies that explored student-athletes' community service experiences. Furthermore, most of the previous studies on student-athletes' volunteer experiences have looked at personal development outcomes, not volunteer motivation or their level of satisfaction with the opportunities the athletic department provides for them.

Fuller and colleagues (2015) found that student-athletes who participated in service had increased social competence and intention for continued community involvement after their volunteer experience. However, the same study assessed the outcomes of a service-learning experience for both student-athletes and non-athletes and found that student-athletes were less socially active than their non-athlete counterparts following the same service experience. Other positive outcomes of community service for student-athletes include increased self-esteem, a positive impact on team dynamics (Jarvie & Paule-Koba, 2012), and an increased sense of civic duty and social responsibility (McHugo, 2005). Both McHugo (2005) and Jarvie and Paule-Koba (2012) found that student-athletes had a future intent to volunteer after their volunteer experience.

More recently, some studies specifically have focused on student-athlete volunteer motivations. Huml and colleagues (2018) developed a model for athlete community service motivation by assessing the role that athletic identity and student involvement play in determining student-athletes' motivations to engage in community service (Huml, Hancock, Weight, & Hums, 2018). Researchers in this study utilized a modified version of VFI to measure student athletes' motivation to perform community service. The results revealed that years in college and the use of service as punishment negatively impacted volunteer motivation for student-athletes. While this study used the VFI to better understand how student-athletes are motivated to engage in community service, volunteer motivation and subscales of the VFI were viewed collectively and not as individual functions influencing one's decision to engage in community service.

There also are methodological concerns about the previous research on student-athletes' volunteer experiences. Much of the research on student-athlete community service has used qualitative methods with relatively small sample sizes. Considering gaps in the literature, there is a need for additional quantitative, generalizable study that looks at student-athlete volunteer motivation and satisfaction. Thus, the purpose of the current study was to explore student-athletes' motivations for volunteering, satisfaction with their experiences, and future intent to volunteer. This study also aimed to compare student-athlete volunteer experiences with that of service-learning students. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Based on the VFI, how do student-athletes and service-learning students rate the importance of each function to volunteer?
2. Based on the VFI, to what extent is there a difference in the functions to volunteer between student-athletes and service-learning students?
3. To what extent is there a difference in future intent to volunteer between student-athletes and service-learning students?
4. To what extent are there differences in volunteer satisfaction between student-athletes and

service-learning students?

5a. Which function(s) predict(s) future intent to volunteer for student-athletes?

5b. Which function(s) predict(s) future intent to volunteer for service-learning students?

Method

Procedures

Utilizing a convenience sample, student-athletes from four universities and service-learning students from one university were chosen to take part in this study. After numerous schools initially were identified for potential inclusion in the study, four schools indicated desire to participate and survey student-athletes while one of the four also agreed to survey service-learning students, resulting in the final total. Athletic department administrators from each of the four mid-major NCAA Division I universities sent out a link to a survey via email to all student-athletes (N = 1139). Additionally, the survey was sent out at one public research university to all students who had taken a service-learning course the year before data was collected (N = 1200) by a staff member in the Office of Community Engagement. A reminder email was sent out approximately two weeks after the original survey disbursement (Dillman, 2000; Greenhalgh & Greenwell, 2013) and the survey remained open for one additional week. Respondents filled out the survey, which asked questions related to their motivations/reasons for volunteering, their satisfaction with their previous volunteer experiences, and their future intent to volunteer. Additionally, all participants, whether student-athlete or service-learning students, indicated the type of service or volunteer experience they completed. Respondents indicated they participated in social service (i.e., tutoring, visiting schools or nursing homes, reading to children, serving at a soup kitchen), coaching or teaching, and functionary work (i.e., sweeping, filing, and shelving for a charitable organization).

Participants

A total of 119 student-athletes and 139 service-learning students began the survey for an initial response rate of 10% and 11%, respectively.

The total number of student-athletes from each of the four schools was relatively evenly distributed, with no one school accounting for more than 40 student-athlete participants. Further, participant student-athletes were involved in a total of nine different sports, with no one sport accounting for more than 27% of the total sample. After initial examination of responses, some responses were thrown out due to lack of completion. Additionally, in an effort to create mutually exclusive categories, respondents that were both student-athletes and previously enrolled in a service-learning class were removed from analysis. Thus, the responses of 89 student-athletes and 82 service-learning students were included in the analysis. Demographic information for all participants is available in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographics of Study Sample

Factor	Total Sample	Student-Athletes	Service-Learning Students
Gender			
N	165	88	77
% Male	29	16.9	39.8
% Female	70.9	83.1	60.2
Race			
N	171	89	82
% Caucasian	51.5	53.9	48.9
% African American	28.1	35.2	20.7
% Asian/ Pacific Islander	7.8	2.3	14.6
% Hispanic/ Latino	8.2	5.7	11
% Other	4.1	3.4	4.9
Year in School			
N	170	89	81
% 1st Year	5.8	11.2	0
% 2nd Year	16.4	21.3	11.1
% 3rd Year	40.3	40.4	40.7
% 4th Year	28.7	32.6	24.7
% 5th Year/ Graduate	8.8	5.6	11.1

Measures

Volunteer Motivation. The instrument used to measure volunteer motivation was the VFI, developed by Clary et al. (1998). The scale consists of 30 items and measured the six functions of volunteering. The responses to each item were measured using a 7-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Extremely Unimportant) to 7 (Extremely Important). Mean scores for each function were calculated and used in data analysis. Additionally, the reliability for each function was tested for proper loading and yielded a Cronbach's alpha of at least .86, which suggests high internal consistency of the items (Nunnally, 1978). A full list of items and results of the internal consistency reliability analysis are presented in Appendix A.

Volunteer Satisfaction. Volunteer Satisfaction was measured by a satisfaction scale developed by Clary and colleagues (1998). On six 5-point Likert-type items, respondents indicated their level of satisfaction and personal fulfillment gained from serving in the program to the following questions: "How much did you enjoy your volunteer experience?," "How personally fulfilling was your volunteer experience?," "How worthwhile was your volunteer experience?," "How important was your contribution to the program?," and "To what extent did you accomplish some 'good' through your work?" Responses to these items were averaged, producing a mean satisfaction score. A calculation of internal consistency reliability yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .89.

Future Intent to Volunteer. Future intent to volunteer was measured by one 5-point Likert-type scale question that asked participants to rate on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the extent to which they agree with the following question: "Based on my previous volunteer experiences, I want to volunteer in the future."

Student-Athlete Status. Student-athlete status was a dichotomous variable indicated by whether or not the respondent was a student-athlete or service-learning student.

Data Analysis

In reaction to the low response rate and in order

to account for non-response bias, a preliminary analysis was conducted to determine if the sample was representative of the population. Research suggests that late respondents closely resemble non-respondents (Creswell, 2002; Greenhalgh & Greenwell, 2013). According to Siebert (2006), if there are no significant differences between early and late respondents, researchers can confidently presume respondents to be representative of non-respondents. In the current study, early respondents were identified as student-athletes or service-learning students who completed the survey prior to the administration of a reminder email (Dillman, 2000; Greenhalgh & Greenwell, 2013). Several one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine if early and late respondents differed significantly in terms of demographics and with regard to the dependent variables (Siebert, 2006).

In order to analyze research question one, mean scores for each function were used to determine how student-athletes and service-learning students rated the importance of each of the volunteer functions. Additionally, with two related groups being analyzed, multiple paired samples t-tests were run to determine if function means are statistically different from each other. For research questions two and three, independent samples t-tests were run to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between how student-athletes and service-learning students rated each volunteer function and if there was a statistically significant difference in future intent to volunteer between student-athletes and service-learning students. The fourth research question utilized an independent samples t-test to examine a potential difference in volunteer satisfaction based upon whether students were student-athletes or service-learning students. Finally, for research question five, two multiple linear regressions were conducted to determine which of the functions significantly impacted student-athlete and service-learning students' future intent to volunteer.

Results

For the preliminary analysis, two-way ANOVAs revealed no statistically significant differences were found between early and late respondents for demographics (i.e., gender, year, and

race), volunteer satisfaction, future intent to volunteer, and each of the volunteer functions. This suggests that while the response rate was low, the sample was representative of the population.

In regard to research question one, descriptive statistics indicated that both student-athletes and service-learning students ranked Value as the most important volunteer function. The overall ranking order was the same for both student-athletes and service-learning students, with Value the highest-rated followed by Understanding and Career. However, the variance between functions was much larger for service-learning students. Paired samples t-tests revealed that Value, Understanding, and Career were rated significantly different from the other functions for student-athletes, while each function (with the exception of Social and Protective) was significantly different from each other. For full paired sample t-test results on student-athlete and service-learning students' functions for volunteering, see Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Paired Sample t-test for Student-Athlete Volunteer Motivations

Function	Importance to Decision to Volunteer: <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)		
	1	2	3
Value	5.41 (1.12)		
Understanding	5.27 (1.15)		
Career	5.14 (1.27)	5.14 (1.27)	
Enhancement		4.6 (1.22)	4.6 (1.22)
Social		4.55 (1.36)	4.55 (1.36)
Protective			4.53 (1.25)

Note. All subset differences are statistically significant at .05

Table 3

Paired Sample t-test for Service-Learning Student Volunteer Motivations

Function	Importance to Decision to Volunteer: <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)				
	1	2	3	4	5
Value	6.13 (.83)				
Understanding		5.89 (.91)			
Career			4.71 (1.35)		
Enhancement				4.38 (1.39)	
Social					3.92 (1.29)
Protective					3.82 (1.23)

Note. All subset differences are statistically significant at .05

For research question two, the independent samples t-test revealed there was a statistically significant difference in how student-athletes and service-learning students rated the importance of Social, Value, Protection, and Understanding as a motive to volunteer at the $p < .05$ level. Value and Understanding were rated higher by service-learning students while Social and Protective were rated higher by student-athletes.

Additionally, in regard to research question three, results revealed that service-learning students had a statistically significant higher future intent to volunteer than student-athletes. These results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Independent Sample t-test Results of VFI and Future Intent to Volunteer

	Student-Athletes (n = 87)	Service-Learning Students (n = 84)	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)			
Value	5.41 (1.12)	6.13 (.83)	3.71	0.001	.91
Understanding	5.27 (1.15)	5.89 (.91)	3.29	0.001	.60
Career	5.14 (1.27)	4.71 (1.35)	-1.84	0.068	.48
Enhancement	4.6 (1.22)	4.38 (1.39)	-1.44	0.152	.17
Social	4.55 (1.36)	3.92 (1.29)	-3.64	0.001	.48
Protective	4.53 (1.25)	3.82 (1.23)	-3.158	0.001	.57
Future Intent to Volunteer	4.53 (.726)	4.27 (.750)	2.30	.022	.35

For research question four, results of the independent samples t-test revealed a statistically significant difference ($p = .017$) between student-athletes and service-learning students' community service satisfaction. Service-learning students ($M = 4.41$, $SD = .67$) maintained a higher level of satisfaction than students-athletes ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .65$). Results can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Independent Sample t-test Results of Volunteer Satisfaction by Student Type

	Student-Athletes (n = 87)	Service-Learning Students (n = 84)	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)		
Volunteer Satisfaction	4.17 (.65)	4.41 (.67)	2.41	.017

Finally, concerning research question five, results of the multiple linear regression revealed that Understanding was the only function that significantly predicted future intent to volunteer ($\beta = .761, p < .001$) for student-athletes. This model corresponds to an adjusted R^2 value of .36, which suggests that the six VFI functions explain about 36% of the total variance in future intent to volunteer. Further, the F-value of 7.14 ($p < .001$) suggests that the model has significant predictive power when compared to the sample mean. An additional multiple linear regression was run to determine which of the functions significantly predicted service-learning students' future intent to volunteer. Results revealed that Value was the only function that significantly predicted future intent to volunteer for service-learning students ($\beta = .604, p < .001$). This model corresponds to an adjusted R^2 value of .37, which suggests that the six VFI functions explain about 37% of the total variance in future intent to volunteer. Further, the F-value of 6.65 ($p < .001$) suggests that the model has significant predictive power when compared to the sample mean. Results of both regressions are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Multiple Linear Regression for VFI Functions Prediction of Future Intent to Volunteer

Function	Student-Athlete (n = 81)		Service-Learning Student (n = 74)	
	Beta	Sig. (p)	Beta	Sig. (p)
Value	.074	.613	.604	.001*
Understanding	.761	.001*	-.01	.948
Career	-.19	.257	.31	.758
Enhancement	.106	.462	-.003	.985
Social	-.242	.074	-.082	.498
Protective	.029	.857	-.002	.998

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to apply functionalist theory of motivation to explore student-athletes' volunteer motivations and satisfaction and to compare those motivations and satisfaction with that of service-learning students. Prior research has indicated service-learning students are more likely to gain knowledge about diversity, become more socially and politically aware, and be more likely to engage in future service as a result of their coursework (Simon & Cleary, 2006). For these reasons, service-learning students provided a valuable comparison group to better understand the nuances between diverse student groups who participate in service for different reasons (Ehrlich, 1996; NCAA, 2014).

Results of the current study suggest student-athletes are motivated to volunteer, as all six motivation functions maintained mean scores of at least 4.5 and three were 5.0 or higher as measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale. Service-learning students in comparison only had three (Value, Understanding, and Career) of the six motivation functions with mean scores of 4.5 or above. Additionally, the two groups differ based upon their level of volunteer motivations, satisfaction with their experiences, and their future intent to volunteer, with significant differences found between each outcome.

In regard to research question one, both student-athletes and service-learning students rated Value as the function most important to their volunteer experience as indicated by mean scores. This suggests both groups of students feel it is important to volunteer for intrinsic reasons. This finding is consistent with previous research,

which suggests that students participate in community service because they believe it is important to help others (Sergent & Sedlacek, 1990). Furthermore, this finding is consistent with previous research that suggests the Value function is most important to general volunteers and service-learning students' decisions to engage in community service (Chapman & Morley, 1999; Dwyer et al., 2013; Trusedall, 2016). The difference in variance in how student-athletes and service-learning students rated each function is particularly interesting. Because of the smaller variance for student-athletes, the ranking of the Value, Understanding, and Career functions were not statistically significantly different from one another for this group. Thus, according to functionalist theory, athletic department administrators should focus on organizing volunteer opportunities that maximize not only the Value function, but the Understanding and Career functions, as all three are just as important to student-athletes' volunteer experience.

Research question two further investigated the differences of each function between student-athletes and service-learning students. Service-learning students had statistically significant higher mean scores of Value and Understanding compared to student athletes, while student-athletes rated the importance of the Social, and Protective functions statistically significantly higher than service-learning students. Specifically, for the Value function, service-learning students reported close to one standard deviation greater importance compared to student-athletes. In other words, these results suggest these two groups of students have not had the same type of volunteer experience. Further research is needed to explore the differences among the motivation functions between these two groups.

Research questions three and four addressed the differences in future intent to volunteer and volunteer satisfaction between student-athletes and service-learning students. While service-learning students did have a statistically higher level of volunteer satisfaction compared to student-athletes, both groups exhibited a high level of volunteer satisfaction ($M = 4.41$ for service-learning students; $M = 4.17$ for student-athletes) and future intent to volunteer ($M = 4.53$ for service-learning students; $M = 4.27$ for student-athletes). This is not surprising

given that both groups were highly motivated by the Value function, and research indicates the Value function predicts volunteer satisfaction (Chapman & Morley, 1999). While the results indicate future intent to volunteer and volunteer satisfaction for student-athletes are high, there might be room for improvement when comparing the differences to service-learning students. Furthermore, research indicates that while student-athletes have intentions of becoming socially active citizens, they engage in fewer socially active activities due to their time commitments to athletics and academics, which may suggest why their future intent to volunteer is lower than their non-athlete peers (Fuller et al., 2015; Gayles, 2012).

Finally, the intrinsic motivation of service-learning students was exhibited by the finding of the Value function being the only one to predict future intent to volunteer among service-learning students. This is consistent with previous research that suggests the Value function predicts future commitment to service (Brayley et al., 2014; Dwyer et al., 2013). Interestingly, while the student-athletes rated the Value function the highest in importance, Understanding was the only function that predicted future intent to volunteer for student-athletes. The Understanding function is intrinsic in nature and likely well regarded and provides benefits to the volunteers themselves, while the Value function solely is focused on the needs of others. One explanation for this finding could be the lack of variance between the Value, Understanding, and Career functions for the student-athlete group. That is, while student-athletes ranked Value the most important, statistically speaking, serving the Value, Understanding, and Career functions through their service experiences are equally important to student-athletes.

Practical Implications

While both groups found motivations to volunteer, service-learning students indicated greater importance of the Value and Understanding functions. Additionally, service-learning students exhibited a higher level of both satisfaction with their volunteer experiences and future intent to volunteer. While small differences, they were statistically significant and provide practical information in that athletic

department administrators might look to service-learning to determine how to best maximize the volunteer experiences of their student-athletes. It is important to note there are innate differences between service-learning and athletic department mandated community service that may have contributed to these differences.

First, service-learning courses not only include volunteering, but also integrate strategic reflection of the experience into the course requirements (Bruening et al., 2010; Richard, Keen, Hatcher, Pease; 2016). Therefore, not only are service-learning students volunteering, but they are then thinking about, talking about, and reflecting on their community service experiences (what they got out of it, future behavior, needs of the community, etc.). How instructors design reflection can positively influence desired student outcomes (Einfield & Collins, 2008). For example, Richard and colleagues (2016) found that when service-learning students are able to reflect about the community in which they worked and their place within the community either individually, with classmates that are perceived as different, and with instructors, they are much more likely to engage in community service well after graduation. Furthermore, research suggests that this reflection can contribute to students' overall satisfaction with their community service experience (Mitchell et al., 2015). Clearly, reflection is key to producing positive outcomes such as satisfaction and future intent to volunteer for service-learning students. However, for student-athletes who engage in community service, this reflection may not be occurring at all. Athletic departments might consider providing student-athletes the opportunity to reflect on their experiences in order to maximize student-athlete satisfaction and increase future intent to volunteer.

The importance of intentional forethought when planning to implement community-based service opportunities into athletic departments cannot be overstated. One example of a sport-based service-learning course developed by Whitley, Farrell, Maisonet, and Hoffer (2017) that athletic departments could adopt, used a personal and social responsibility model (TPSR) to foster student learning. Athletic administrators could apply a similar framework

to strengthen the tie between community service experiences and fostering volunteer motives through student-athlete reflection. One example of a question Whitley et al. (2017) asked their students to reflect on was, "How did you connect respect, effort, goal setting, or leadership to possible education and/or career paths?"

Finally, the results of this study hold implications for how athletic departments might make the decision of which types of volunteer activities to plan for their student-athletes. As previously stated, the functionalist theory of motivation was applied in this study because in order to influence attitudes about a particular volunteering and community service, one must address the motivations or functions served by volunteering (Clary et al., 1998). The results of this study revealed that student-athletes deem Value, Understanding, and Career as the most important functions served by their volunteer experiences. Thus, in an effort to help increase volunteer satisfaction and future civic engagement, athletic departments should focus on creating volunteer experiences that help student-athletes serve those functions. One way athletic department administrators can do this is by allowing student-athletes to be more involved in the community service planning process. Student-athletes should be surveyed about what causes or activities are most important to them, what skills or knowledge they still want to gain, and what their career aspirations are. Volunteer opportunities then should be designed to reflect those responses. This suggestion is supported by Milette and Gangné (2008) who found that autonomy in deciding volunteer tasks was positively related to satisfaction and retention among volunteers.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

One limitation of this study is the context. Four schools were utilized based upon a convenience sample, and the response rates of student-athletes and service-learning students were 10 and 11%, respectively. Thus, the findings may not be generalizable to all schools. Also, when studying a topic such as community service among student-athletes, social desirability also is a threat to validity. While the student-athletes participating in the current

study were not mandated to take the survey and were told their responses were confidential, social desirability still may have played a role.

This study aimed to compare student-athlete volunteer experiences, which are typically structured, to another structured volunteer or community service system on university campuses. The results of this study suggest that service-learning students and student-athletes may be motivated to volunteer by different functions, and exhibit different levels of volunteer satisfaction and future intent to engage in service. However, the differences exhibited by these groups are likely due to the differences between service-learning and student-athlete volunteer initiatives rather than by student-athlete status. Future research may explore differences between the volunteer experiences of student-athletes and students volunteering on their own, or students that engage in other structured volunteer experiences through university clubs and organizations (i.e. Greek Life). Future research also may explore what specific aspects of service-learning or student-athlete volunteer initiatives may lead to volunteer satisfaction and future intent.

Conclusion

In summation, this work highlights student-athletes' volunteer motivations, their satisfaction with their volunteer experience, and their future intent to engage in community service, and compares their experience to service-learning students. Overall, the results highlight the functions that student-athletes deem as most important in their decision to volunteer. In addition, the results provide insight into what extent student-athletes are satisfied with their volunteer experiences and whether they want to volunteer in the future. As community service continues to be of importance for athletic departments and as administrators continue to provide opportunities for community engagement for their student-athletes, understanding volunteer motivations should help administrators create the best possible opportunities that will help develop student-athletes into civically minded citizens.

References

- Andrassy, E., & Bruening, J. (2011). From rhetoric to reality: NCAA Division I athletic department mission statements and student-athlete community service efforts. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 271-288.
- Brayley, N., Obst, P., White, K. M., Lewis, I. M., Warburton, J., & Spencer, N. M. (2014). Exploring the validity and predictive power of an extended volunteer functions inventory within the context of episodic skilled volunteering by retirees. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42, 1-18.
- Brown, K. M., Hoye, R., & Nicholson, M. (2014). Generating trust? Sport and community participation. *Journal of Sociology*, 50, 437-457.
- Bruening, J. E., Madsen, R. M., Evanovich, J. M., & Fuller, R. D. (2010). Discovery, integration, application and teaching: Service learning through sport and physical activity. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 4, 31-48.
- Chapman, J. G., & Morley, R. (1999). Collegiate service-learning: Motives underlying volunteerism and satisfaction with volunteer service. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 18, 19-33.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1516-1530.
- Cohen, J. E. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative* (pp. 146-166). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys-The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Dwiggins-Beeler, R., Spitzberg, B., & Roesch, S. (2011). Vectors of volunteerism: Correlates of volunteer retention, recruitment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 2, 22-43.
- Dwyer, P. C., Bono, J. E., Snyder, M., Nov, O., & Berson, Y. (2013). Sources of volunteer motivation: Transformational leadership and personal motives influence volunteer outcomes. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24, 181-205.
- Ehrlich, T. (1996). Foreword. In B. Jacoby and Associates, *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp.xi-xvi). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Einfeld, A., & Collins, D. (2008). The relationships between service-learning, social justice, multicultural competence, and civic engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49, 95-109.
- Eley, D., & Kirk, D. (2002). Developing citizenship through sport: The impact of a sport-based volunteer programme on young sport leaders. *Sport, Education and Society*, 7, 151-166.
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2007). Correlates of satisfaction in older volunteers: A motivational perspective. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 24, 6-12.
- Francis, J. E. (2011). The functions and norms that drive university student volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16, 1-12.
- Fuller, R. D., Evanovich, J. M., Bruening, J. E., Peachey, J. W., Coble, C. J., Percy, V. E., . . . Corral, M. (2015). The impact of a sport-based service learning course on participants' attitudes, intentions and actions toward social change. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 8, 14-36.
- Galindo-Kuhn, R., & Guzley, R. M. (2002). The volunteer satisfaction index: Construct definition, measurement, development, and validation. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 28, 45-68.
- Gallant, K., Smale, B., & Arai, S. (2010). Civic engagement through mandatory community service: Implications of serious leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42, 181-201.
- Gayles, J. G. (2009). The student athlete experience. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, , 33-41.
- Gayles, J. G., Rockenbach, A. B., & Davis, H. A. (2012). Civic responsibility and the student athlete: Validating a new conceptual model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 88, 535-557.
- Gorczynski, P. F., Coyle, M., & Gibson, K. (2017). Depressive symptoms in high-performance athletes and non-athletes: A comparative meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 51, 1348-1354.
- Greenhalgh, G. P., & Greenwell, T. C. (2013). Professional niche sports sponsorship: An investigation of sponsorship selection criteria. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 14, 2-19.
- Hallmann, K., & Harms, G. (2012). Determinants of volunteer motivation and their impact on future voluntary engagement: A comparison of volunteer's motivation at sport events in equestrian and handball. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 3, 272-291.
- Harvery, J., Levesque, M., & Donnelly, P. (2007). Sport volunteerism and social capital. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 24, 206-223.
- Hawley, L. R., Hosch, H. M., & Bovaird, J. A. (2014). Exploring social identity theory and the "black sheep effect" among college student-athletes and non-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 37, 56-76.
- Hebert, A., & Hauf, P. (2015). Student learning through service learning: Effects on academic development, civic responsibility, interpersonal skills and practical skills. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16, 37-49.
- Henderson, A., Brown, S. D., Pancer, S. M., & Ellis-Hale, K. (2007). Mandated community service in high school and subsequent civic engagement: The case of the "double cohort" in

- Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36, 849-860.
- Henderson, K. A. (1980). Programming volunteerism for happier volunteers. *Parks and Recreation*, 15, 61-64.
- Huda, M., Mat Teh, K. S., Nor Muhamad, N. H., & Mohd Nasir, B. (2018). Transmitting leadership based civic responsibility: insights from service learning. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 34, 20-31.
- Huml, M., Hancock, M., Weight, E., & Hums, M. (2018). Building an Athlete Community Service Motivation Model: Investigating the relationship between athletic identity, student involvement, and community service. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 11, 189-213.
- Huml, M. R., Svensson, P. G., & Hancock, M. G. (2017). Community service in intercollegiate athletics: A student involvement approach to college athlete engagement. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 10, 101-121.
- Jarvie, B. D., & Paule-Koba, A. L. (2012). The perceptions and effects of community service participation among intercollegiate men's basketball players. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 5, 283-300.
- Jolly, C. J. (2008). Raising the question# 9: Is the student-athlete population unique? And why should we care?. *Communication Education*, 57, 145-151.
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24, 163-204.
- Kim, M., Zhang, J. J., & Connaughton, D. (2010). Modification of the volunteer functions inventory for application in youth sports. *Sport Management Review*, 13, 25-38.
- Kohlbray, P. W. (2016). The impact of international service-learning on nursing students' cultural competency. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 48, 303-311.
- Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 39-81.
- Law, B. M., Shek, D. T., & Ma, C. M. (2011). Exploration of the factorial structure of the revised personal functions of the volunteerism scale for Chinese adolescents. *Social Indicators Research*, 100, 517-537.
- Martin, T. R., Warner, S. M., & Das, B. M. (2016). Senior games: Service-learning with older adults in a sport setting. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 10, 43-53.
- McClam, T., Diambra, J. F., Burton, B., Fuss, A., & Fudge, D. L. (2008). An analysis of a service-learning project: Students' expectations, concerns, and reflections. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 30, 236-249.
- McHugo, M. P. (2005). The benefits felt by division IA student-athletes from participation in community service activities: A case study (Doctoral Dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
- Millette, V., & Gagné, M. (2008). Designing volunteers' tasks to maximize motivation, satisfaction and performance: The impact of job characteristics on volunteer engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 32, 11-22.
- Mitchell, T. D., Richard, F. D., Battistoni, R. M., Rost-Banik, C., Netz, R., & Zakoske, C. (2015). Reflective Practice That Persists: Connections between Reflection in Service-Learning Programs and in Current Life. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 21(2), 49-63.
- Molee, L. M., Henry, M. E., Sessa, V. I., & McKinney-Prupis, E. R. (2010). Assessing learning in service-learning courses through critical reflection. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 33, 239-257.
- NCAA. (2014). Playing it forward. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/mediacenter/feature/playing-it-forward>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Okun, M. A., & Eisenberg, N. (1992). Motives and

- intent to continue organizational volunteering among residents of a retirement community area. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 20, 183-187.
- Pauline, G. (2011). Volunteer satisfaction and intent to remain: An analysis of contributing factors among professional golf event volunteers. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 6, 10-32.
- Payne, C. A. (2000). Changes in involvement preferences as measured by the community service involvement preference inventory. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 41-53.
- Pearl, A. J., & Christensen, R. K. (2017). First-year student motivations for service-learning: An application of the Volunteer Functions Inventory. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 23(2), 66-82.
- Richard, D., Keen, C. H., Hatcher, J. A., & Pease, H. (2016). Pathways to adult civic engagement: Benefits of reflection and dialogue across difference in college service-learning programs. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 23(1), 60-74.
- Sanders, M. J., Van Oss, T., & McGeary, S. (2016). Analyzing reflections in service learning to promote personal growth and community self-efficacy. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 39, 73-88.
- Schatteman, A. M. (2014). Academics meets action: Community engagement motivations, benefits, and constraints. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, 6, 17-30.
- Schlereth, N., Scott, D., & Berman, S. (2014). The current state of corporate social responsibility behavior in national collegiate athletic association Division-I athletic departments. *Journal of Physical Education*, 1, 53-66.
- Sergent, M. T., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1990). Volunteer motivations across student organizations: A test of person-environment fit theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 255-261.
- Shye, S. (2010). The motivation to volunteer: A systemic quality of life theory. *Social Indicators Research*, 98, 183-200.
- Siebert, D. C. (2006). Maximizing response rates in survey research: Issues and methods. *Advances in Social Work*, 7, 1-11.
- Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching*, 54, 307-319.
- Smith, M., Bruner, J., & White, R. (1956). *Opinions and Personality*. New York: Wiley
- Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science*, 10, 59-64.
- Taylor, T. P., & Pancer, M. S. (2007). Community service experiences and commitment to volunteering. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 320-345.
- Truesdell, T. M. (2016). Motivation for volunteering with older adults in a rural community (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3728&context=dissertations>
- Warner, S., Newland, B. L., & Green, B. C. (2011). More than motivation: Reconsidering volunteer management tools. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25, 391-407.
- Warner, S., Sparvero, E., Shapiro, S., & Anderson, A. (2017). Yielding healthy community with sport. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 5, 41-52.
- Watt, S. K., & Moore, J. L. (2001). Who are student athletes?. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 7-18.
- Whitley, M. A., Farrell, K., Maisonet, C., & Hoffer, A. (2017). Reflections on service-learning: Student experiences in a sport-based youth development course. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 88, 23-29.

Appendix A

Volunteer Functions Inventory- Internal Consistency Reliability

Item
Protection (Cronbach's alpha = .86)
No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems
Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
Value (Cronbach's alpha = .90)
I am concerned about those less fortunate than me.
I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
I feel compassion toward people in need.
I feel it is important to help others.
I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
Career (Cronbach's alpha = .88)
Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.
I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.
Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
Social (Cronbach's alpha = .88)
My friends volunteer.
People I'm close to want me to volunteer.
People I know share an interest in community service.
Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
Understanding (Cronbach's alpha = .90)
I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
Volunteering lets me learn things through direct hands on experience.
I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
I can explore my own strengths.
Enhancement (Cronbach's alpha = .88)
Volunteering makes me feel important.
Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
Volunteering makes me feel needed.
Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
Volunteering is a way to make new friends.

JADE

Journal of Athlete
Development and Experience



PAADS

BGSU[®]
Bowling Green State University



College of Education
& Health Professions
*Department of Health,
Human Performance &
Recreation*