

**EXAMINING MOTIVATIONS TO VOLUNTEER  
USING SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY**

by

PATTI JEANE DAVIS-SMITH

(Under the Direction of W. Keith Campbell)

**ABSTRACT**

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) has identified three essential needs for optimal psychological growth and well-being: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. The SDT perspective further suggests that satisfying an individual's basic psychological needs will result in optimal functioning, and that social situations that allow individuals to feel self-determined serve as nutriments for psychological well-being. I proposed that for some individuals, engaging in volunteer work serves as a source of psychological nutriments. As such, volunteering functions as a mechanism for satisfying their basic psychological needs. To test this hypothesis, I conducted two studies, in which I expected need satisfaction to be a psychologically meaningful variable. In Study 1, I examined the associations between need fulfillment, aspects of personality (e.g., self-esteem) and volunteering (e.g., length of service). In Study 2, I further explored the role of need fulfillment in motivations to volunteer using persuasive communications to solicit future volunteer behavior (e.g., donating time to a fictitious upcoming volunteer fair). The results from Study 1 support the overarching hypothesis that when volunteer work satisfies an individual's basic needs, they will experience greater levels of psychological well-being and positive volunteer outcomes. However, the findings from Study 2 provide limited initial support for the efficacy of utilizing need-relevant messages in persuasive communications. Discussion centers around further research on the motivational foundations of volunteerism, implications for the practice of helping, and implications for the nature of volunteering.

**INDEX WORDS:** Volunteering, Self-determination theory, Need satisfaction, Motivation

**EXAMINING MOTIVATIONS TO VOLUNTEER  
USING SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY**

by

PATTI JEANE DAVIS-SMITH

B.A., SPELMAN COLLEGE, 2004

M.S., THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, 2006

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2010

© 2010

Patti Jeane Davis-Smith

All Rights Reserved

**EXAMINING MOTIVATIONS TO VOLUNTEER  
USING SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY**

by

PATTI JEANE DAVIS-SMITH

Major Professor: W. Keith Campbell

Committee: Leonard Martin  
Adam Goodie

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2010

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Faculty, friends, and family members have helped me to complete this dissertation. I would like to express my gratitude to these individuals for their support and assistance.

The University of Georgia's Psychology Department has provided me with a tremendous graduate education: they have taught me how to think about psychological problems; they have provided me with scientific opportunities and economic support; and they have shown me how to approach my work as a social scientist.

In the time that W. Keith Campbell has been my advisor, he has had an enormous impact on the present project. Keith has been a strong and supportive advisor; always encouraging my work and keeping me focused on the important issues. His willingness to keep trying new approaches is a quality I will carry with me throughout my professional career.

The members of my dissertation committee, Leonard Martin and Adam Goodie, have generously given their time and expertise to better my work. I want thank them for their valuable contributions and their good-natured support.

I thank the late Michael Kernis for quite literally teaching me about self-determination theory, and for encouraging me to follow my interest in volunteerism. He has had a lasting effect on the way I think about social psychology, and is truly missed.

I want to thank my amazing friends for their die-hard support throughout my graduate career. Danielle George, Eric Brewington, Naima Toney, Tamerah Hunt, and

Kathleen Holland, have all taken an active interest in my educational goals. More importantly, they have given me an outlet where I can laugh, cry, troubleshoot, indulge and let off steam.

I'd like to thank my family being a wonderful source of advice and encouragement. I could always count on their questions about much longer I would be in school, and their thrilled (or perhaps relieved?) responses when I told them the end was drawing near. Their excitement and support is the best cheering squad a girl could ever ask for.

I thank my mother, Patricia Davis for her unwavering support and guidance. She is an amazing parent and has had an indelible impact on the woman I am today. I also thank my grandmother, Alethia Davis for always enabling my love of reading and learning. Her warm strength inspires and amazes me every day.

I most want to thank my husband H. Jason Smith for his love, reinforcement and willingness to share his wife with her laptop. His compassionate partnership gave me the freedom to focus and finish. I love him more and more daily.

For these individuals, and all others whose names I did not mention, but contributed in any form towards the successful completion of this dissertation, I am eternally grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Taking a Functional Approach – Motivation to Volunteer .....	3
Another Function of Volunteering: Psychological Need Satisfaction .....	5
Why Study Volunteer Motivation using SDT.....	6
Overview of the Present Research.....	7
2 STUDY 1: NEED SATISFACTION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL OUTCOMES .....	9
Method .....	9
Results .....	13
Discussion .....	17
3 STUDY 2: NEED SATISFACTION AND PERSUASIVE MESSAGES.....	19
Method .....	19
Results .....	23
Discussion .....	31
4 GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	32
Motivational Foundations of Volunteerism.....	33
Caveats .....	36
Implications for the Practice of Volunteering .....	36

Implications for the Nature of Volunteering and Conclusions .....	37
REFERENCES.....	39
APPENDICES	
A Self-Determination Scale .....	45
B Volunteer Need Satisfaction (VNS).....	46
C Satisfaction with Volunteer Experience.....	47
D Intrinsic Volunteer Motivation Scale.....	48
E Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.....	49
F Life Satisfaction Scale.....	50
G Demographic Questionnaire .....	51
H Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) .....	54
I Fictitious Volunteer Fair Flyers .....	55
Autonomy Flyer .....	33
Relatedness Flyer .....	36
Competence Flyer .....	33
Control Flyer.....	36
J Study 2 Prompts and Items .....	59

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Every year, millions of people devote substantial amounts of their time and energy to helping others. One important manifestation of human helpfulness is volunteerism, whereby people provide, among other services, companionship to the lonely, tutoring to the illiterate, counseling to the troubled and health care to the sick, and do so on a regular, ongoing, voluntary basis, with their voluntary helping often extending over long periods of time.

Based on recent statistics, many Americans seem to be answering the “call to volunteer.” In 1993 an estimated 89.2 million (47.7%) American adults spent time volunteering (Hodgkinson, Weitzman, Abrahams, Crutchfield, & Stevenson, 1996). This includes formal volunteering, which involves specific time commitments to organizations, and informal volunteering, as exemplified by the many emergency workers who volunteered during the World Trade Center tragedy. A more recent estimate of formal volunteering is that 61.8 million (26.4%) of Americans age 16 and over volunteered in 2008 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008). In addition to the direct benefits obtained by recipients because of “people helping people,” volunteerism provides economic benefits to society. For example, the 15.0 billion hours of formal volunteering have an estimated value of \$182 billion (Hodgkinson et al. 1996).

The idea that an individual would make significant personal sacrifices for another person, particularly when that person is a complete stranger, has long fascinated social

psychologists (e.g., Batson, 1991; Eisenberg, 1986; Latane' & Darley, 1970; Pilavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981; Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio & Pilavin, 1995; Staub, 1978). Although studies of helping are common among general psychology texts, the existing literature speaks heavily about types of helping that are somewhat different from volunteerism, focusing on helping in contexts where the helper is faced with an unexpected need for help. This calls for an immediate decision to act and an opportunity for the helper to provide a single, generally brief act of help. (e.g., Bar-Tal, 1984; Benson et al., 1980; Pilavin & Charng, 1990).

Factors uncovered by research on the helping that occurs in these kinds of contexts, sometimes referred to as *spontaneous helping*, may be important influences in volunteerism as well. Yet, volunteerism appears to be illustrative of a different kind of helping, a kind that is more prototypic of *planned helping*, which often "calls for considerably more planning, sorting out of priorities, and matching of personal capabilities and interests with type of intervention" (Benson, et al., 1980, p.89). Thus volunteers (a) often actively seek out opportunities to help others; (b) may deliberate for considerable amounts of time about whether to volunteer, the extent of their involvement, and the degree to which particular activities fit with their own personal needs; and (c) may make a commitment to an ongoing helping relationship that may extend over a considerable amount of time and that may entail considerable personal costs of time, energy and opportunity (Benson, et al. 1980).

The defining and characteristic features of volunteerism as voluntary, sustained and ongoing helpfulness suggest that it may be productive to adopt a motivational perspective and to inquire about the motivations that may lead individuals to seek out

volunteer activities, to commit themselves to voluntary helping, and to sustain their involvement in volunteerism over extended periods of time. After all, the fundamental concerns of motivational inquiry with understanding the processes that move people to action – the processes that initiate, direct and sustain action – are precisely the concerns engaged by the questions “why do people volunteer?” and “what sustains voluntary helping?”

### ***Taking a Functional Approach – Motivation to Volunteer***

One useful approach to answering this question begins with the premise that volunteering serves different functions for different people. The functional approach to human behavior has a history that spans over a century (e.g., Angell, 1907; Dewey, 1896; James, 1890). More recently, the functional strategy has been utilized to understand the motives behind volunteering (see Clary et al., 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1991, 1995, 1999; Clary, Snyder, & Ridge, 1992; Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1996; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Omoto, Snyder, & Berghuis, 1993; Snyder, 1993; Snyder, Clary, & Stukas, 2000; Snyder & Omoto, 1992a, 1992b).

Clary and Snyder (1991) defined functional analysis as being “concerned with the reasons and purposes that underlie and generate psychological phenomena—the personal and social needs, plans, goals, and functions being served by people’s beliefs and their actions” (p.123). As a result, a main premise of functionalist theorizing is that while different people can perform the same actions, these actions may serve different psychological functions for different individuals. This approach initially identified with functional theories of attitudes and persuasion (e.g., Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956; Snyder & DeBono, 1987) and has broadened to include

analyses of diverse cognitive, affective, behavioral, and interpersonal phenomena (e.g., Cantor, 1994; Snyder, 1992, 1993).

According to this perspective, people may have similar attitudes or engage in similar behavior, but these attitudes or behaviors may satisfy different motivational functions. As the functional approach has been utilized with respect to the functions attitudes may serve, this approach has also helped to reveal underlying motivations of volunteering. Omoto & Snyder (1993) found five functionally oriented motivations for engaging in volunteer work: community concern, values, understanding, personal development, and esteem enhancement. In a later investigation, Omoto and Snyder (1995) show that AIDS volunteering motivated by this function and by the personal development and understanding functions leads to a longer commitment, suggesting the importance of the relational motives for volunteers as well as for nonprofit management.

Similarly, Clary et al. (1998) identified six distinct functions potentially served by volunteering: (i) the *value* function indicates concern for others; (ii) the *understanding* function is connected with the need to learn and improve one's knowledge of the world; (iii) the *social* function refers to the desire to conform to the norms and expectations of one's circle of peers; (iv) the career-related benefits are pooled in the *career* function; (v) the *protective* function refers to the need to protect oneself; and (vi) the *enhancement* function relates to volunteering as a means to enhance positive affects and to increase one's self-esteem (Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1996).

### ***Another Function of Volunteering: Psychological Need Satisfaction***

SDT has identified three essential needs for optimal psychological growth and well-being: competence, relatedness, and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to SDT, a need for competence reflects the need to feel effective in one's efforts and capable of achieving desired outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The need for relatedness involves a need to feel connected to and understood by others (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Finally, autonomy reflects the need to feel volitional in one's actions, to fully and authentically endorse one's behaviors, and to act as the originator of one's own behavior. While this definition of psychological needs and the specification of these particular psychological needs have been the source of considerable debate, a growing body of research has provided evidence for the role of each of these in psychological health and well-being (Carver & Scheier, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kernis, 2000).

A broad literature has demonstrated the importance of ongoing feelings of competence for optimal functioning and well-being. For example, White (1959) theorized that feeling competent is an integral contributor to self-confidence. Bandura's (1977) work on self-efficacy has found that believing that one can bring about desired outcomes is an important determinant of psychological health. Similarly, Carver & Scheier (1990) have shown that believing that one is effectively making progress toward one's goals is psychologically beneficial.

The need to connect with and feel understood by others is a distinct human need that is echoed in most theories of human motivation and development (for review, see Reis & Patrick, 1996). Baumeister and Leary (1995) referred to this as the need to belong, and they reviewed extensive evidence demonstrating its vital role in human

motivation. Further evidence for the need for relatedness is evident in studies involving daily experiences. For example, Watson (1988) found that the more opportunities participants had to interact with important others within a given day, the more positive affect they experienced.

The need for autonomy has been the most controversial aspect on the SDT conceptualization, stemming largely from misconceptions regarding the definition of autonomy. From the SDT perspective, autonomy refers to self-government or to the extent to which people feel self-determined in their actions. Autonomy is not to be confused with independence. From the SDT perspective, autonomy does not involve independence or detachment from others. Rather, it involves a sense of volition, agency and initiative. Thus fulfillment of one's need for autonomy does not preclude feeling related to and connected with others. Studies show that autonomy is positively associated with relatedness and well-being (Ryan and Lynch, 1989) and that those who functioned more autonomously had more positive social experiences (Hodgins, Koestner and Duncan (1996).

SDT prescribes that overall psychological health requires the satisfaction of all three needs. It is through the satisfaction of these needs that individuals are able to move through the experience of achieving effectiveness, connectedness, and intrinsic motivation.

### ***Why Study Volunteer Motivation Using SDT***

Anecdotally, individuals report that volunteering has made them “grow as a person.” This suggests that psychological growth is a motivational concern for individuals engaging in volunteer work. Despite the seemingly comprehensive nature of

the aforementioned functional approaches to volunteer motivation, there still appears to be a lack of an explanation of the specific benefits to psychological well being. It is plausible that another motivational approach could more appropriately deal with this issue.

SDT posits that satisfying an individual's basic psychological needs will result in optimal functioning (Patrick, Canevello, Knee & Lonsberry, 2007). The SDT perspective further suggests that optimal functioning in general and need fulfillment in particular arise out of social contexts that provide nutrients consistent with these needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Said another way, social situations that allow individuals to feel autonomous, competent and related to others serve as nutrients for psychological well-being.

I proposed that for some individuals, engaging in volunteer work serves as a source of psychological nutrients. As such, volunteering functions as a mechanism for satisfying their basic psychological needs. This leads to greater psychological well-being and greater satisfaction with their volunteer work.

### ***Overview of the Present Research***

To test this hypothesis, I conducted two studies, in which I expected need satisfaction to be a psychologically meaningful variable. The proposed studies went beyond previous research by examining: (a) the role of need fulfillment, in general motivations to engage volunteer work (Study 1), and (b) the role of need fulfillment in responses to opportunities to volunteer (Study 2). As in previous research, I examined the unique contribution of each need to these outcomes. SDT asserts that fulfillment of all three needs is necessary for optimal personal well-being, although it is unclear if all

three needs are equally important when it comes to motivations to engage in volunteer work.

In Study 1, I examined the associations between need fulfillment, aspects of personality (e.g., self-esteem) and volunteering (e.g., length of service) as well as the unique contribution of each need to these outcomes. In Study 2, I further explored the role of need fulfillment in motivations to volunteer using persuasive communications to solicit future volunteer behavior (e.g., donating time to an upcoming volunteer fair).

## CHAPTER 2

### STUDY 1: NEED SATISFACTION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL OUTCOMES

The purpose of Study 1 was to examine how need fulfillment in volunteering is associated with psychological outcomes. As such, I set out to address three questions. First, do volunteer needs alone predict measures of psychological well-being and volunteer outcomes? Second, is the relationship between volunteer need satisfaction, well-being and volunteer behavior maintained when controlling for demographic information? Finally, does volunteer need satisfaction predict well-being and volunteer outcomes beyond what is accounted for by SDT?

I hypothesized that: (a) when volunteer work satisfies an individual's basic needs, he or she will experience greater psychological well-being, satisfaction with his or her volunteer work and intrinsic motivation (*Hypothesis 1*), (b) these relationships will be maintained despite controlling for demographic information (*Hypothesis 2*), and (c) that volunteer need satisfaction predicts psychological and volunteer outcomes beyond what is predicted by SDT (*Hypothesis 3*).

#### ***Method***

##### **Participants**

Participants were 80 female and 21 male undergraduate students participating for partial fulfillment of a course requirement. All participants were engaged in volunteer work, or had been within the past 12 months. The average age was 19.9 years ( $SD =$

2.9); their average length of volunteer service was 3.90 years ( $SD = 3.20$ ) across an average of 2.14 organizations ( $SD = 1.70$ ). On average, it had been 57 days ( $SD = 72$ ) since participants last volunteered. The most popular reported volunteer activities were mentoring youth (20%), tutoring (13%), and fundraising (13%). Only 33% reported volunteering to satisfy a requirement; 69% have a primary organization they volunteer with but 47% do not engage in volunteer every week; 55% typically volunteer with a few friends and 77% do not share their volunteering with their social network.

## **Procedure**

Participants were first given an overview of the study, and informed that this study was investigating attitudes towards volunteer work. Next, participants were given a battery of self-report measures (described below). Following the completion of the questionnaires, participants were debriefed and given credit for their participation.

## **Measures**

*Self-determination scale (SDS)*. The SDS was designed to assess individual differences in the extent to which people tend to function in a self-determined way (Sheldon & Deci, 1996). The SDS is a short, 10-item scale, with two 5-item subscales. The first subscale is awareness of oneself (e.g., “A: My emotions sometimes seem alien to me” or “B: My emotions always seem to belong to me”). The second is perceived choice in one’s actions (e.g., “A: I sometimes feel that it’s not really me choosing the things I do” or “B: I always feel like I choose the things I do”). Participants were instructed to respond using a one (only A feels true) to nine (only B feels true) Likert type scale. Responses to these items were summed; scores on each subscale could

range from one to 45 (Self-awareness subscale  $M = 20.32$ ,  $SD = 3.42$ ; perceived choice subscale  $M = 18.42$ ,  $SD = 4$ ), with higher scores indicating greater self-awareness and greater perceived choice in one's actions.

*Volunteer needs satisfaction (VNS)*. This 21-item scale is a modified version of the Basic Need Satisfaction at Work Scale (Deci et al., 2001) and is used to assess the extent to which individuals experience satisfaction of their three basic needs – autonomy, competence, and relatedness – while volunteering. Participants were instructed to respond using a one (not at all true) to seven (very true) Likert type scale and to consider their feelings and experiences from the past year of volunteer work. Responses to these items were summed; scores on each subscale could range from seven to 49 [Autonomy  $M = 34.14$  ( $SD = 5.60$ ); Relatedness  $M = 43.24$  ( $SD = 8.22$ ); Competence  $M = 32.51$  ( $SD = 5.62$ )], with higher scores indicating greater need satisfaction during volunteer work.

*Satisfaction with volunteer experience scale*. This measure of volunteer satisfaction is comprised of 14 items (Omoto & Snyder, 1995). Participants were instructed to rate their level of satisfaction on nine dimensions (e.g., *satisfying*, *rewarding*, *disappointing*, *boring*), using a one (not at all) to seven (extremely) Likert type scale. Participants were also asked to rate their agreement with five general satisfaction items (e.g., “Overall I am satisfied with my experience as a volunteer”) using a one (strongly disagree) to seven (strongly agree) Likert type scale. Responses to these items were summed; scores could range from 14 to 98 ( $M = 78.04$ ;  $SD = 12.34$ ), with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with past volunteer experiences.

*Intrinsic volunteer motivation scale.* This seven-item measure is a modified version of the interest/enjoyment subscale of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI; Ryan, 1982). This subscale is the self-report measure of intrinsic motivation, and assesses interest/enjoyment during a particular activity. Participants were asked to indicate how true the statements are for them during their volunteer work using a one (not at all true) to seven (very true) Likert type scale. Responses to these items were summed; scores could range from seven to 49 ( $M = 28.47$ ;  $SD = 3.04$ ), with higher scores indicating greater intrinsic motivation.

*Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSE).* The RSE is a measure of global feelings of self-worth is comprised of ten items (e.g., "I am a person of worth")(Rosenberg, 1965). Participants were instructed to respond to each item on a 5-point Likert type scale, with anchors "Strongly Disagree" (1) and "Strongly Agree" (5), and to base their responses on how they *typically* or *generally* feel. Responses to these items were summed; scores could range from 10 to 50 ( $M = 38.09$ ;  $SD = 5.34$ ), with higher scores reflecting higher or more positive self-esteem.

*Life satisfaction scale.* The Life Satisfaction scale is a short, 5-item instrument designed to measure global cognitive judgments of one's life, (e.g., "I am satisfied with my life.") (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985). Participants were instructed to respond to each item using a one (strongly disagree) to seven (strongly agree) scale. Responses to these items were summed; scores could range from seven to 35 ( $M = 24.63$ ;  $SD = 4.95$ ), with higher scores indicating greater life satisfaction.

*Demographic Questionnaire.* Participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, classification, major, organizations they are involved with, length of volunteer

service, type of volunteer work they have/are engaged in, and personal motivations for volunteering.

## Results

### Preliminary Analyses

In order to determine if volunteer need fulfillment was associated with measures of psychological well-being and aspects of volunteer activity, I first calculated two sets of correlations, one for each type of outcome.

As anticipated, fulfillment of autonomy, competence and relatedness needs while volunteering is associated with greater feelings of self-determination (both self-awareness and perceived choice), self-esteem, and life satisfaction (see Table 1).

Table 1: *Correlations between volunteer need satisfaction and measures of psychological well-being*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Volunteer autonomy needs	-						
2 Volunteer competence needs	.74**	-					
3 Volunteer relatedness needs	.70**	.74**	-				
4 Self-awareness	.37**	.46**	.37**	-			
5 Percieved choice	.51**	.56**	.58**	.39**	-		
6 Self-esteem	.46**	.53**	.32**	.53**	.40**	-	
7 Life Satisfaction	.44**	.34**	.38**	.44**	.41**	.49**	-

[Note: The self-determination scale has two subscales: self-awareness and perceived choice; \*\* $p < .01$ ]

Fulfillment of these needs while volunteering is also associated with greater intrinsic motivation and satisfaction with volunteer experience. However, contrary to expectation, volunteer need fulfillment is not significantly associated with length of service, or the number of organizations participants have volunteered with within the past year; all  $ps > .10$  (see Table 2).

Table 2: *Correlations between volunteer need satisfaction and aspects of volunteering*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Volunteer autonomy needs	-						
2 Volunteer competence needs	.74**	-					
3 Volunteer relatedness needs	.70**	.74**	-				
4 Length of service	.11	-.13	-.16	-			
5 Num. of organizations	.01	.00	.05	.46**	-		
6 Intrinsic motivation	.37**	.33**	.39**	-.01	.23*	-	
7 Satisfaction	.61**	.58**	.58**	.00	.18	.58**	-

[Note: Length of service= number of years volunteering; \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .]

### **Predicting psychological well-being and volunteer outcomes using volunteer need satisfaction**

To test the predictive ability of volunteer need satisfaction, I conducted two sets of hierarchical regressions in which I regressed two measures of psychological well-being (self-esteem and life satisfaction) onto each VNS scale score. In the first set of analyses I first entered the motivationally relevant VNS scale score into the equation (Step 1). Then I simultaneously entered gender, length of service, type of activity, if the volunteering satisfied a requirement, and the number of organizations they have volunteered with during the past year (Step 2) to determine if any would be significant predictors of psychological well-being.

In the second set of analyses, I first entered the motivationally relevant VNS scale score into the equation (Step 1), followed by both self-determination subscales (self-awareness and perceived choice) simultaneously (Step 2) to determine if volunteer needs predicted psychological well-being beyond SDT.

I repeated these analyses for the two volunteer outcomes (intrinsic motivation and satisfaction with volunteer experience). The findings from all of the regression analyses described above are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: *Volunteer needs predicting psychological well-being and volunteer outcomes*

	<u>Psychological Well-being</u>		<u>Volunteer Outcomes</u>	
	<b>self-esteem</b>	<b>life satisfaction</b>	<b>satisfaction w/experience</b>	<b>intrinsic motivation</b>
<b>autonomy need</b>				
<i>alone</i>	.56**	.43**	.66**	.36**
<i>with controls</i>	.54**	.46**	.68**	.37*
<i>beyond SDT</i>	.25*	.24*	.61**	.36**
<b>relatedness need</b>				
<i>alone</i>	.38**	.45**	.54**	.35**
<i>with controls</i>	.34**	.47**	.55**	.33**
<i>beyond SDT</i>	.07	.17	.46**	.37**
<b>competence need</b>				
<i>alone</i>	.59**	.31*	.58**	.36**
<i>with controls</i>	.57**	.61	.61**	.36**
<i>beyond SDT</i>	.32**	.04	.47**	.32**

[Note: alone = volunteer need is the sole predictor; with controls = predictive ability of volunteer need were controlled by gender, length of service, type of activity, if it satisfied a requirement, and number of organizations; beyond SDT = analyses testing if volunteer needs predicted beyond what is accounted for by SDT. All values are betas. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .]

*Hypothesis 1: Predicting well-being and volunteer outcomes using volunteer needs.* All three VNS needs were found to be significant predictors of psychological well-being and volunteer outcomes. Autonomy needs significantly predicted more positive self-esteem [ $t(99) = 5.43, p < .001$ ], life satisfaction [ $t(99) = 3.83, p < .001$ ],

satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(99) = 6.94, p < .001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(99) = 3.13, p < .01$ ]. Relatedness needs significantly predicted more positive self-esteem [ $t(99) = 3.32, p < .01$ ], life satisfaction [ $t(99) = 4.06, p < .001$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(99) = 5.12, p < .001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(99) = 2.94, p < .01$ ]. Finally, competence needs significantly predicted more positive self-esteem [ $t(99) = 5.80, p < .001$ ], life satisfaction [ $t(99) = 2.67, p = .01$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(99) = 5.68, p < .001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(99) = 3.10, p < .01$ ].

*Hypothesis 2: Predicting well-being and volunteer outcomes using volunteer needs when controlling for demographics.* All but one of the previously reported associations was maintained when controlling for demographic qualities of the participants. Autonomy needs continued to significantly predict more positive self-esteem [ $t(94) = 4.93, p < .001$ ], life satisfaction [ $t(94) = 3.73, p < .01$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(94) = 6.84, p < .001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(94) = 2.96, p < .01$ ] when controlling for demographics. Relatedness needs continued to significantly predict more positive self-esteem [ $t(94) = 2.87, p < .01$ ], life satisfaction [ $t(94) = 3.96, p < .001$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(94) = 5.01, p < .001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(94) = 2.75, p < .01$ ] when controlling for demographics. Finally, competence needs continued to significantly predict self-esteem [ $t(94) = 5.13, p < .001$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(94) = 5.45, p < .001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(94) = 2.89, p < .01$ ] but did not significantly predict life satisfaction when controlling for demographics.

*Hypothesis 3: Predicting well-being and volunteer outcomes using volunteer needs beyond SDT.* The final set of analyses examines the predictive ability of volunteer needs beyond what was predicted by SDT. As anticipated, when controlling

for SDT subscales, all three VNS needs were found to be significant predictors of psychological well-being and volunteer outcomes. Autonomy needs continued to significantly predict more positive self-esteem [ $t(97) = 2.57, p=.01$ ], life satisfaction [ $t(97) = 2.40, p<.02$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(97) = 5.23, p<.001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(97) = 3.21, p<.01$ ] when controlling for SDT. Relatedness needs continued to significantly predict satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(97) = 5.08, p<.001$ ] and intrinsic motivation [ $t(97) = 3.48, p<.01$ ], but failed to predict either measure of psychological well-being when controlling for SDT. Finally, competence needs continued to significantly predict self-esteem [ $t(97) = 3.15, p<.01$ ], satisfaction with volunteer experience [ $t(97) = 4.54, p<.001$ ], and intrinsic motivation [ $t(97) = 2.65, p<.01$ ] but did not significantly predict life satisfaction when controlling for SDT.

## ***Discussion***

The results from Study 1 support the overarching hypothesis that when volunteer work satisfies an individual's basic needs, they will experience greater levels of psychological well-being and positive volunteer outcomes. Satisfaction of autonomy, relatedness and competence needs while volunteering is associated with more positive self-esteem, increased life satisfaction, greater satisfaction with their volunteer experiences and intrinsic motivation (Hypothesis 1). In all but a few instances, these relationships are maintained (and in some cases descriptively strengthened) when controlling for demographic aspects about the individual and their volunteer history (Hypothesis 2), and when verifying that volunteer need satisfaction has significant predictive ability beyond SDT (Hypothesis 3). These findings support the proposition that a match between an individual's motivational goals and the fulfillment of these

goals can enhance their psychological well-being, feelings of satisfaction towards their volunteer work, and their intrinsic motivation.

**CHAPTER 3**  
**STUDY 2: NEED SATISFACTION**  
**AND PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATIONS**

Persuasive messages are effective to the extent that they are able to speak to the motivations specific to the recipient. In this applied context, if organizations were able to create recruitment materials that were tailored to individuals' psychological needs, these need-relevant messages would be more appealing and could ultimately allow organizations to be more successful in their recruitment efforts.

The purpose of Study 2 was to determine if need-relevant messages could be used to persuade participants to volunteer. After viewing an ad for a fictitious volunteer fair, participants were asked to evaluate the flyer, indicating how persuasive the flyer was and how the flyer fit psychologically. The second dependent measure took this a step further by asking participants if they were donate time to work a volunteer fair being held on their campus, and share information about the volunteer fair with their friends.

The primary hypotheses were that participants' scores on each VNS scale would best predict evaluations of its corresponding flyer (*Hypothesis 1*) and behavioral responses when presented with opportunities to volunteer (*Hypothesis 2*).

***Method***

**Participants**

Participants were 72 male and 48 female undergraduate students participating for partial fulfillment of a course requirement. All participants were engaged in volunteer

work, or had been within the past 12 months. The average age was 20 years ( $SD = 1.95$ ); their average length of volunteer service was 3.75 years ( $SD = 3.19$ ) across an average of 1.91 organizations ( $SD = .99$ ). On average, it had been 47 days ( $SD = 69$ ) since participants last volunteered. The most popular reported volunteer activities were mentoring youth (14%), tutoring (13%), and fundraising (13%). Only 31% reported volunteering to satisfy a requirement; 79% have a primary organization they volunteer with but 48% do not engage in volunteer every week; 54% typically volunteer with a few friends and 78% do not share their volunteering with their social network.

## **Procedure**

Participants were first given an overview of the study, and told that they were participating in an online “Volunteer Advertising Study.” Next, participants completed the VNS and a state measure of mood (both described below). Then they viewed and evaluated one of four flyers (autonomy, relatedness, competence, and control) created to help promote an upcoming volunteer fair at another university. Their task involved viewing the flyer and rating it on several dimensions to indicate their overall evaluation of it. After rating the flyers, participants were told a similar fair is being held at their university, and were given an opportunity to get involved by donating their time and/or sharing information about the volunteer fair with a friend. Finally, participants were fully debriefed and given credit for their participation.

*Volunteer needs satisfaction (VNS)*. As described in Study 1, this 21-item scale is assesses the extent to which individuals experience satisfaction of their three basic needs – autonomy, competence, and relatedness – while volunteering. Scores on each subscale could range from seven to 49 [Autonomy  $M = 32.39$  ( $SD = 6.17$ ); Relatedness

$M = 40.87$  ( $SD = 7.88$ ); Competence  $M = 30.38$  ( $SD = 5.49$ ), with higher scores indicating greater need satisfaction during volunteer work.

*Mood.* Mood was assessed using the 20-item Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS is comprised of two mood scales, one measuring state positive affect and the other measuring state negative affect. Participants were instructed to respond to each item using a one (very slightly) to five (extremely) Likert type scale. Responses to the items on each scale were summed and scores could range from one to 50 on each mood scale. Negative affect scores were subtracted from positive affect scores for an overall state measure of mood ( $M = 38.09$ ;  $SD = 5.3$ ) with higher scores indicating greater feelings of positive affect.

*Experimental materials.* Each flyer was constructed using one side of an 8.5 x 11 sheet of paper. The three VNS flyers started with one statement corresponding to a single basic need's motivational reason for volunteering followed by an invitation to read further. The middle section of the VNS flyers contained a need-relevant that advocated volunteerism as a way to satisfy one of the three basic needs identified by the VNS. The control flyer started with a generic reason for volunteering, followed by an invitation to read further. The middle section of the control flyer contained a neutral message about the benefits of volunteering. The bottom section of the flyer was constant across all four flyers and contained fictitious information about the time, date and location of the volunteer fair.

Using the autonomy flyer as an example, the top of the flyer contained the statement "Express yourself...attend the volunteer fair!" in large bold face type. The

middle section began with the following standard statement: "You're probably thinking that if you become a volunteer, you'll just have to give. While you're helping others, volunteering can help you!" This was followed by "Volunteering: is flexible; you decide when and how much time you want to give; is a great way to convey your ideas and opinions; says a lot about the real you." This section then finished with the summary statement "Come find out how you can volunteer and express your true self!" (See Appendix I for full materials).

*Flyer evaluation: persuasive appeal.* After viewing the flyer, participants were first asked to evaluate its persuasive appeal ("How effective was this flyer? " How appealing was this flyer?" "How persuasive was this flyer's message?" "How influential was this flyer?") using a one (not at all) to seven (extremely) Likert type scale. Responses to these items were summed; scores could range from four to 28 ( $M = 15.99$ ;  $SD = 4.83$ ), with higher scores indicating greater persuasive appeal.

*Flyer evaluation: psychological fit.* After evaluating the flyer's persuasive appeal, participants were asked to evaluate the flyer's psychological fit ("To what extent do you feel this volunteer fair is a good idea?" "To what extent do you agree that the volunteer fair should occur?" "How 'right' does this volunteer fair feel?") using a one (not at all) to seven (extremely) Likert type scale. Responses to these items were summed; scores could range from three to 21 ( $M = 15.89$ ;  $SD = 3.81$ ), with higher scores indicated greater feelings of psychological fit.

*Behavioral component: time donation (in hours).* After evaluating the flyer, participants were told a similar volunteer fair was being held on their own campus soon. They were then be asked if they were willing to donate their time, and if so, to quantify

how much time they'd be willing to donate in 1 hour increments. Participants in this study donated an average of 2.7 hours ( $SD = 5.63$ ) to volunteer at the fictitious fair.

*Behavioral component: information sharing.* After indicating if they are willing to donate their time to volunteer at fictitious fair, participants were told that they could elect for an email to be sent on their behalf to some of their friends in an attempt to inform as many students as possible about the upcoming fair. If participants elected to share the information, they were asked to provide the first names of the friends they would like to forward an email to in an empty text box. On average, participants in this study were willing to share information about the volunteer fair with 1.87 friends ( $SD = 3.29$ ).

After entering the first name of the friends they wanted to share the information with, participants were told that they would have an opportunity to enter the friends' email addresses on the following screen by clicking to move to the next page. However, moving to the next page led participants to the debriefing section. If participants were unwilling to share the information with a friend, they were directed straight to the debriefing section. At this point, participants were fully debriefed and given credit for their participation.

## **Results**

### **Preliminary Analyses**

In order to determine if need fulfillment was associated with evaluations of its corresponding flyer and behavioral responses to opportunities to volunteer, I first calculated four sets of correlations, one set for each flyer.

Table 4 shows the correlations between volunteer needs, evaluations of their corresponding flyers and behavioral outcomes. Among participants who viewed the

autonomy flyer, autonomy needs were associated with greater length of service and a greater number of days since last volunteered but not evaluations of the flyer, or behavioral outcomes; all  $ps > .10$ . Among participants who viewed the relatedness flyer, relatedness needs were not significantly associated with evaluations of the flyer or behavioral outcomes; all  $ps > .10$ . However, among participants who viewed the competence flyer, competence needs were associated with greater ratings of the corresponding flyer's psychological fit. Competence needs are not significantly associated with evaluations of the corresponding flyer's persuasive appeal or either behavioral outcome; all  $ps > .10$ .

Table 4: *Associations between relevant-need fulfillment, flyer ratings and behavioral outcomes*

	<b>autonomy flyer</b>	<b>relatedness flyer</b>	<b>competence flyer</b>
Autonomy needs	-	.66**	.54**
Relatedness needs	.76**	-	.73**
Competence needs	.56**	.66**	-
Flyer evaluation: persuasive appeal	.24	-.23	.32
Flyer evaluation: psychological fit	.12	.15	.48**
Behavioral component: time donation	-.03	.15	.15
Behavioral component: information sharing	-.01	.04	.08
Length of Service	.41**	.17	-.18
Days Since	-.62**	.13	.50*

Among participants who viewed the control flyer (see Table 5), satisfaction of autonomy and relatedness needs is associated with greater feelings of psychological fit with the need relevant flyer. Relatedness need satisfaction is also associated with a greater willingness to share information about the volunteer fair with a friend.

Table 5: *Control flyer associations between need fulfillment, flyer ratings and behavioral outcomes*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Autonomy	-								
2 Relatedness	.70**	-							
3 Competence	.74**	.81**	-						
4 Flyer evaluation: persuasive appeal	.19	.03	.06	-					
5 Flyer evaluation: psychological fit	.44*	.39*	.33	.40*	-				
6 Behavioral component: time donation	.00	.04	.07	.04	.15	-			
7 Behavioral component: information sharing	.35	.51**	.34	.04	.45*	.13	-		
8 Length of service	.32	.35	-.52**	-.10	-.10	.24	-.11	-	
9 Days since	.39	.14	-.02	-.22	.29	.02	-.26	-.19	-

[Note: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .]

### **Hypothesis 1: Predicting evaluations of flyers with need-relevant messages**

I hypothesized that viewing a flyer with a need-relevant message would persuade participants to rate it more favorably. Specifically, that scores on volunteer needs satisfaction questionnaire would predict ratings of the volunteer fair flyer's persuasive appeal and psychological fit.

To assess this predictive ability, I conducted four sets of hierarchical regressions in which I regressed the evaluations of one of the flyers onto the three VNS scale scores. For the VNS flyers, I first entered the motivationally relevant VNS scale score into the equation (Step 1), followed by the remaining two VNS scores (simultaneously; Step 2), mood, length of service, and number days since last volunteered

(simultaneously; Step 3) to determine if any would be significant predictors of evaluations of that flyer.

For the control flyer, all three VNS motivations were first entered simultaneously (Step 1), and then followed by mood, length of service, and number of days since last volunteered (simultaneously; Step 2) to predict flyer evaluations. Table 6 presents the findings from the regression analyses described above.

Table 6: *Volunteer needs predicting evaluations of flyers with need relevant messages*

	<b>Flyer Evaluations</b>	
	<b>persuasive appeal</b>	<b>persuasive appeal</b>
<b>autonomy flyer</b>		
<i>autonomy need</i>	.30	.16
<i>with other VNS scores</i>	.61	.20
<i>with controls</i>	.64	.15
<b>relatedness flyer</b>		
<i>relatedness need</i>	-.28	.14
<i>with other VNS scores</i>	-.19	-.03
<i>with controls</i>	-.41	-.31
<b>competence flyer</b>		
<i>competence need</i>	.42*	.53**
<i>with other VNS scores</i>	.52	.66**
<i>with controls</i>	.33	.46
<b>control flyer</b>		
<i>all 3 VNS scores</i>		
autonomy	.36	.19
relatedness	.10	.20
competence	-.35	.14
<i>with controls</i>		
autonomy	.32	.00
relatedness	-.06	.18
competence	-.52	.36

[Note: need = volunteer need was the sole predictor; with other VNS scores = predictive ability of volunteer need was controlled by the 2 remaining volunteer needs; with controls = ability of volunteer need was controlled by mood, length of service, and number of days since last volunteered; all 3 VNS scores = the three volunteer needs were used simultaneously as predictors. All values are betas. <sup>a</sup>  $p < .10$ ; \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .]

*Predicting persuasive appeal.* Results revealed only very limited support for Hypothesis 1. Only the VNS competence score predicted ratings of the competence flyer's persuasive appeal [ $t(28) = 2.06, p = .05$ ]. No VNS scale significantly predicted

participants' evaluations of the autonomy flyer, the relatedness flyer, or the control flyer; all  $p$ s > .10.

*Predicting psychological fit.* Again, results revealed tenuous support for Hypothesis 1. Only the VNS competence score predicted feelings of fit towards its corresponding flyer [ $t(28) = 2.78, p = .01$ ]. This relationship was maintained when controlling for the VNS autonomy and relatedness scores [ $t(26) = 2.15, p = .05$ ]. No VNS scale significantly predicted participants' evaluations of the autonomy, relatedness, or control flyers; all  $p$ s > .10.

## **Hypothesis 2: Predicting behavioral responses to opportunities to volunteer**

I hypothesized that when presented with opportunities to volunteer, viewing a flyer with a need-relevant message would persuade participants to respond favorably. Specifically, that scores on volunteer needs satisfaction questionnaire would predict a greater willingness to donate time to the fair and to share the information with a greater number of friends.

To assess this predictive ability, I conducted four sets of hierarchical regressions in which I regressed the opportunity responses of one of the flyers onto the three VNS scale scores. For the VNS flyers, I first entered the motivationally relevant VNS scale score into the equation (Step 1), followed by the remaining two VNS scores (simultaneously; Step 2), mood, length of service, and number days since last volunteered (simultaneously; Step 3) to determine if any would be significant predictors of behavioral responses to that flyer.

For the control flyer, all three VNS motivations were first entered simultaneously (Step 1), and then followed by mood, length of service, and number of days since last

volunteered (simultaneously; Step 2) to predict behavioral responses. The findings from these regression analyses are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: *Volunteer needs predicting behavioral responses to opportunities to volunteer*

	<b><u>Behavioral Components</u></b>	
	<b>time donation</b>	<b>information sharing</b>
<b>autonomy flyer</b>		
<i>autonomy need</i>	-.03	-.16
<i>with other VNS scores</i>	.32	-.43
<i>with controls</i>	.32	-.51
<b>relatedness flyer</b>		
<i>relatedness need</i>	.26	.04
<i>with other VNS scores</i>	-.10	-.33
<i>with controls</i>	-.22	-.21
<b>competence flyer</b>		
<i>competence need</i>	-.25	.05
<i>with other VNS scores</i>	-.25	-.16
<i>with controls</i>	-.09	.18
<b>control flyer</b>		
<i>all 3 VNS scores</i>		
autonomy	.00	-.10
relatedness	.28	.51
competence	-.31	.08
<i>with controls</i>		
autonomy	.14	-.24
relatedness	.32	.48
competence	-.16	.28

[Note: need = volunteer need was the sole predictor; with other VNS scores = predictive ability of relevant volunteer need was controlled by the 2 remaining volunteer needs; with controls = predictive ability of volunteer need was controlled by mood, length of service, and number of days since last volunteered; all 3 VNS scores = the three volunteer needs were used simultaneously as predictors. All values are betas. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .]

*Time donation.* The results failed to support Hypothesis 2. No VNS scale significantly predicted participants' willingness to donate time to volunteer at the

fictitious fair after viewing the autonomy, relatedness, competence or control flyers; all  $ps > .10$ .

*Information sharing.* Again, the results did not support Hypothesis 2. No VNS scale significantly predicted participants' willingness to share the information with a friend after viewing the autonomy, relatedness competence, or control flyers; all  $ps > .10$ .

## ***Discussion***

The findings from Study 2 provide limited initial support for the efficacy of utilizing need-relevant messages in persuasive communications. Of the four flyers tested, competence needs were the only volunteer need that best predicted evaluations of the competence flyer (Hypothesis 1); that is, participants judged the competence flyer as having persuasive appeal and fitting psychologically to the extent that it matched their competence motivations. Volunteer need satisfaction did not influence participants willingness to donate their personal time to the volunteer fair, or their willingness to share the information with their social network (Hypothesis 2). This suggests that need relevant messages could be an effective method for attracting the attention of potential volunteers, but may be an insufficient mechanism for shifting an individual from mere interest to action.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

In this set of investigations, I explored the motivational foundations of one form of prosocial behavior—the involvement in volunteerism. In Study 1 established that satisfaction of autonomy, relatedness and competence needs while volunteering is linked to increases in psychological well-being, satisfaction with the experience, and intrinsic motivation. I took this examination a step further in Study 2 by creating a fictitious opportunity to volunteer, presenting participants with a persuasive need-relevant message, and then measuring evaluations and behavioral responses to the message. Only the need to feel competent significantly predicted ratings of the competence flyer's persuasive appeal and feelings of congruence or fit. Taken together, these studies provide initial empirical support for a fresh functional approach, one that focuses on the satisfaction of basic psychological needs by participating in volunteer activities.

These studies also fit with approaches to motivation that emphasize the active role of individuals in selecting and pursuing activities that reflect important features of self and identity (e.g., Cantor, 1994; Snyder, 1993; Snyder & Cantor, 1998). Even more generally, some of my findings (particularly Study 1) and my suggested conceptualization of volunteers' motivations are compatible with psychological theorizing and research that point to the fit or match of the person and the situation, rather than the person or the situation alone, as the determinant of behavior (Cantor,

1994; Lewin, 1946; Snyder, 1993; Snyder & Ickes, 1985), including prosocial action (see Carlo, Eisenberg, Troyer, Switzer, & Speer, 1991; Knight, Johnson, Carlo, & Eisenberg, 1994).

For these reasons, I believe that my studies on volunteerism contribute to understanding helping behavior and prosocial activity. In addition, they speak meaningfully to the nature and processes of human motivation, and they have the potential to suggest theoretically informed solutions for meeting the needs of society.

### ***Motivational Foundations of Volunteerism***

A primary concern of the functionalist strategy of inquiry is identifying the motivational foundations of action and then developing sound means of assessing these motivations. Accordingly, I sought to develop a reliable and valid measure of the need fulfillment functions served by volunteer activity.

As predicted by the SDT approach, volunteers who received benefits congruent with personally important needs had greater satisfaction with themselves, their lives, and their volunteer activities (Study 1). There was a strong connection between engaging in volunteer work that fulfilled basic needs and ratings of positive self-esteem and life satisfaction. Further, this relationship persisted when exploring products of volunteering. When the volunteer work satisfies an individual's basic needs, people are more satisfied with the volunteer work itself and feel more intrinsically motivated to continue to volunteer. This finding may teach a particularly telling lesson about the nature of the motivations implicated by studying volunteerism using the SDT approach. That is, motivations may guide the agendas that people pursue as volunteers, not only by moving people to volunteer but also by defining what features of the volunteer

experience will constitute fulfillment of those motivations, with consequences for the satisfaction that volunteers derive from their service.

Conversely, I obtained only tenuous support for the supposition that people's responsiveness to persuasive appeals was greatest when the appeals addressed motivational concerns of importance to them (Study 2). I believe this study was potentially limited by its selective sample. This sample, as in Study 1, was limited to participants who were already engaged in volunteering. In hindsight, the study might have benefitted from eliminating that criterion, which would have diversified the sample by likely including participants who were not already volunteers. It is plausible that non-volunteers could respond differently to the experimental materials, subsequently impacting their responses to opportunities to volunteer. The method of administration could also be a limitation of this work. While it is extremely convenient to conduct research over the Internet, a live person might have lent an air of credibility (through verbal and non verbal cues) to the cover story that is difficult to accomplish online. Further, my study could have also benefitted from an alternative way to share the information with a friend. With growing concerns of ID theft and spam, it might have been more convincing to show participants what the sample email would look like, and include language ensuring that their privacy would be protected. Also including a timeframe for the data to be destroyed could lend credibility and authenticity to the request.

The focus of this work was to establish and underscore the role of SDT motivational processes in volunteerism. The proposition was based on past research on SDT; a growing body of literature demonstrates that psychological need fulfillment is

applicable in several domains, including the workplace and interpersonal relationships (e.g., Beard, Deci & Ryan, 2004; Gagne, 2003; LaGuardia, Ryan, Couchman & Deci, 2000, Vlachopoulos & Michailidou, 2006). Further, this conceptualization of volunteer need satisfaction sought to identify motivations of generic relevance to volunteerism. As such the items in the VNS never speak of particular kinds of volunteering; moreover, the testing sample included diversity in both demographics and type of volunteer task. I fully expect that there will be circumstances where more, albeit secondary, needs could emerge, as in cases where considerations relevant to specific forms of volunteerism are highly prominent (e.g., Omoto & Snyder (1995) identified five motivations through work on AIDS volunteers). Examining the interconnections between motivational frameworks used to study volunteerism would be an interesting and valuable extension of this research.

Motivations, from a strictly functional perspective, concern the agentic pursuit of ends and goals important to the individual; though the precise ends and goals can, and will, vary with the specific activity. The goal of the present research was to illuminate the fact that there are a variety of motivations that, in the lives of the individuals who harbor these motivations, set the stage for events that will determine what will draw people into volunteering and whether their experiences as volunteering will be satisfying ones. Future research on volunteer motivations will be able to determine whether these benefits (to psychological well being and otherwise) will ultimately be translated into intentions to continue to be active as volunteers and ultimately (demonstrated through longitudinal research) sustained helping over time.

## **Caveats**

Several limitations of this work have already been discussed. The lack of support for Study 2 could be attributed in part to the sample composition (only volunteers), the study administration method (only via the Internet), or a combination of the two. However, two additional limitations apply to both studies equally and bear quick mentioning here. The first is yet another issue of sample composition. Both studies used a solely undergraduate sample. While very common in psychological research, it is plausible that the findings could have differed, and be more readily generalized, if an older, more diverse population was utilized. A second limitation is that both studies were lab-based. There is an inherent benefit in examining pro-social phenomena in its most naturalistic setting and volunteer behavior is no exception.

## ***Implications for the Practice of Volunteering***

There are two practical implications of this research. First, the functional approach proposes that continued participation depends on a person-situation fit, such that volunteers who serve in roles that match their own motivations will derive more satisfaction and more enjoyment from their service and be more likely to intend to continue to serve than those whose motivations are not being addressed by their activities. Support for these propositions comes from Study 1. Its clear practical implication is that coordinators of volunteer service organizations may find it useful (and again, applied research could evaluate the utility of doing so) to work to maximize the extent to which they provide volunteer opportunities that afford benefits matched to their volunteers' motivations. In so doing, perhaps lessen the rate of turnover in their volunteer labor force.

The second practical implication did not obtain empirical support, but still has significant implications. The functional approach suggests that underlying the decision to volunteer is a process by which individuals come to see volunteerism in terms of their personal motivations; one way that they can come to view volunteering this way is through exposure to persuasive messages. While the results of Study 2 provide limited initial support, they do begin to testify to the potential efficacy of this approach. However, significant findings for this type of study could have direct implications for organizations dependent on the services of volunteers; such organizations could use (and applied research potentially could demonstrate the utility of using) the VNS to assess the motivations of potential volunteers, or groups of potential volunteers, and then use this information to strategically promote their organizations in ways that speak to the volunteers they seek to recruit.

### ***Implications for the Nature of Volunteering and Conclusions***

In this set of studies, I tested hypotheses about two critical events in the volunteer process, satisfaction of volunteer helpers and recruitment of new volunteers. Although I did not find conclusive evidence that need-relevant persuasive communications can stir an individual to action, I did discover that volunteer need satisfaction leads to benefits to well-being and volunteer behavioral outcomes. Whereas research on prosocial behavior has most often focused on questions about whether a potential helper in a spontaneous helping situation will engage in a brief intervention (the prototypic example being research on bystander intervention in emergencies; e.g., Latane & Darley, 1970), attention to planned, sustained helping encourages us to

consider other often neglected questions about the voluntary initiation of helping, and continued investment in and commitment to service as a voluntary helper.

Considerations of ongoing, planned helping behavior also illustrate the influence of person-based processes on helping, an influence that has often been found lacking relative to the situational determinants of prosocial action typically studied in spontaneous helping situations (e.g., Clary & Snyder, 1991). Planned helpfulness represents a phenomenon in which the salient cues for action are less demanding, at least in comparison to emergency situations. It engages processes that encourage individuals to look inward to their own dispositions, motivations, and other personal attributes for guidance in deciding whether to get involved in helping, in the selection of a helping opportunity, and in the maintenance of helping over an extended course of involvement.

At the same time as volunteerism as a form of sustained, ongoing helping directs us to consider person-based processes, SDT reminds us that behavior (in this case planned, sustained helpfulness) is not simply a matter of being influenced by dispositions or by situational forces, but rather is jointly determined. Although the precise nature of this joint determination remains to be fully realized, individuals come with needs and motives important to them and volunteer service tasks do or do not afford opportunities to fulfill those needs and motives. Together, these features of persons and of situations are integrated in the agendas that individuals create and implement as they seek out, become involved in, and continue to be involved in volunteerism.

## REFERENCES

- Angell, J. R. (1907). The province of functional psychology. *Psychological Review*, 14, 61–91.
- Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34 , 2045-2068.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Baumeister, R.F., & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Benson, P. L., Dehority, J., Garman, L., Hanson, E., Hochschwender, M., Lebold, C., Rohr, R., & Sullivan, J. (1980). Intrapersonal correlates of non-spontaneous helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 110, 87-95.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2008). Volunteering in the United States, 2008. Retrieved November 1, 2009, from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm>
- Carver, C.S. & Scheier, M.F. (1990). Principles of self-regulation: Action and emotion. In E.T. Higgins & R.M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (Vol. 2, pp.3-52). New York: Guilford Press.
- Carver, C.S., & Sceier, M.F. (2000). Autonomy and Self-regulation. *Psychological Inquiry*, 284-291.

- Clary, E. G., & Miller, J. (1986). Socialization and situational influences on sustained altruism. *Child Development, 57*, 1358–1369.
- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 119–148). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1995). Motivations for volunteering and giving: A functional approach. In C. H. Hamilton & W. F. Ilchman (Eds.), *New directions for philanthropic fundraising* (No. 8, pp. 111–123). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*, 156–159.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Ridge, R. (1992). Volunteers' motivations: A functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 2*, 333–350.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., et al. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1516–1530.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Miene, P. K., & Haugen, J. A. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 1129–1149.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 25*, 485–505.
- Deci, E.K. & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.

- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagné, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern Bloc country. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 930-942.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larson, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.
- Gagné, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial behavior engagement. *Motivation and Emotion, 27*, 199-223.
- Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*, 285–303.
- Hodgins, H.S., Koestner, R., & Duncan, N. (1996). ON the compatibility of autonomy and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 227-237.
- Hodgkinson, V. A., Weitzman, M. S., Abrahams, J. A., Crutchfield, E. A., & Stevenson, D. R. (1996). Nonprofit almanac: Dimensions of the independent sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of psychology* (2 vols.). New York: Holt.
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163–204.
- Kernis, M.H. (2000). Substitute needs and the distinction between fragile and secure high self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 298-300.

- La Guardia, J. G., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Within-person variation in security of attachment: A self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfillment, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 367-384.
- Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 671–686.
- Omoto, A. M., Snyder, M., & Berghuis, J. P. (1993). The psychology of volunteerism: A conceptual analysis and a program of action research. In J. B. Pryor & G. D. Reeder (Eds.), *The social psychology of HIV infection* (pp. 333–356). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Patrick, H., Knee, C.R., Canevello, A., & Lonsbary, C. (2007). The role of need fulfillment in relationship functioning and well-being: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 434-457.
- Reis, H.T. & Patrick, B.P. (1996). Attachment and intimacy: Component processes. IN E.T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 523-563). New York: Guilford.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.
- Raskin, R. & Hall, C.S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate Form Reliability and Further Evidence of Construct Validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*, 159-162.

- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ryan, R.M. (1982). Control and Information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*, 450-461.
- Ryan, R.M. & Lynch, J.H. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Development*, *60*, 340-356.
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 719-727.
- Sheldon, K. M, & Deci, E.L. (1996). The Self-Determination Scale. Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester.
- Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a “functional” personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 251–264.
- Snyder, M., Clary, E. G.,& Stukas, A. A. (2000). The functional approach to volunteerism. In G. R. Maio & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes* (pp. 365–393). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Snyder, M.,& DeBono, K. G. (1987). A functional approach to attitudes and persuasion. In M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), *Social influence: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 5, pp. 107–125). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1992a). Volunteerism and society's response to the HIV epidemic. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, 113–116.
- Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1992b). Who helps and why? The psychology of AIDS volunteerism. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Helping and being helped: Naturalistic studies* (pp. 213–239). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Vlachopoulos, S. P., & Michailidou, S. (2006). Development and initial validation of a measure of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in exercise: The Basic psychological needs in exercise scale. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 103, 179-201.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 66, 297-333.

## APPENDIX A: SELF-DETERMINATION SCALE

Please read the pairs of statements, one pair at a time, and think about which statement within the pair seems more true to you at this point in your life. Indicate the degree to which statement A feels true, relative to the degree that statement B feels true, on the following 5-point scale:

**Only A feels true**    1    2    3    4    5    **Only B feels true**

If statement A feels completely true and statement B feels completely untrue, the appropriate response would be 1. If the two statements are equally true, the appropriate response would be a 3. If only statement B feels true then the appropriate response would be 5, and so on.

1.    A. I always feel like I choose the things I do.  
      B. I sometimes feel that it's not really me choosing the things I do.
2.    A. My emotions sometimes seem alien to me.  
      B. My emotions always seem to belong to me.
3.    A. I choose to do what I have to do.  
      B. I do what I have to, but I don't feel like it is really my choice.
4.    A. I feel that I am rarely myself.  
      B. I feel like I am always completely myself.
5.    A. I do what I do because it interests me.  
      B. I do what I do because I have to.
6.    A. When I accomplish something, I often feel it wasn't really me who did it.  
      B. When I accomplish something, I always feel it's me who did it.
7.    A. I am free to do whatever I decide to do.  
      B. What I do is often not what I'd choose to do.
8.    A. My body sometimes feels like a stranger to me.  
      B. My body always feels like me.
9.    A. I feel pretty free to do whatever I choose to.  
      B. I often do things that I don't choose to do.
10.   A. Sometimes I look into the mirror and see a stranger.  
      B. When I look into the mirror I see myself.

## APPENDIX B: VOLUNTEER NEED SATISFACTION (VNS)

The following questions concern your feelings about your volunteer work. Please indicate how true each of the following statement is for you given your experiences with volunteering. Please use the following scale in responding to the items.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
not at all true			somewhat true			very true

1. I feel like I can make a lot of inputs to deciding how my job gets done.
2. I really like the people I work with.
3. I do not feel very competent when I am at work.
4. People at work tell me I am good at what I do.
5. I feel pressured at work.
6. I get along with people at work.
7. I pretty much keep to myself when I am at work.
8. I am free to express my ideas and opinions on the job.
9. I consider the people I work with to be my friends.
10. I have been able to learn interesting new skills on my job.
11. When I am at work, I have to do what I am told.
12. Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from working.
13. My feelings are taken into consideration at work.
14. On my job I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I am.
15. People at work care about me.
16. There are not many people at work that I am close to.
17. I feel like I can pretty much be myself at work.
18. The people I work with do not seem to like me much.
19. When I am working I often do not feel very capable.
20. There is not much opportunity for me to decide for myself how to go about my work.
21. People at work are pretty friendly towards me.



## APPENDIX D: INTRINSIC VOLUNTEER MOTIVATION SCALE

For each of the following statements, please indicate how true it is for you, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true		somewhat true			very true	

1. While I volunteering I think about how much I enjoy it.
2. I find the volunteer work very interesting.
3. Volunteering is fun.
4. I enjoy volunteering very much.
5. I think volunteering was very boring. (R)
6. I think volunteering was very interesting.
7. I would describe volunteering as very enjoyable.

## APPENDIX E: ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and characteristics. Please read each statement and rate the extent to which you **typically** agree or disagree with it using the following scale:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
strongly disagree	disagree	neither agree nor disagree	agree	strongly agree

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
2. I feel like a person who has a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel like a failure.
4. I feel as if I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel as if I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish that I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think that I am no good at all.

## APPENDIX F: LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE

Please indicate how well each statement describes how you have felt about your life during the life during the PAST FEW DAYS.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
no agreement		some agreement	agree	very much agreement

1. In most ways, my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing
5. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.
6. At present, I am completely satisfied with my life
7. In the near future, a lot of things will have to change before I feel satisfied with my life.

## APPENDIX G: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female

Please answer BOTH of the following questions:

3. How do you describe yourself?

- a. Hispanic or Latino or of Spanish Origin
- b. Not-Hispanic or Latino

4. Please indicate beside your race. Mixed racial heritage should be indicated by checking more than one category.

- a. American Indian or Alaska Native
- b. Asian
- c. Black or African American
- d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- e. White

5. Are you a native English speaker?

- a. Yes
- b. No

6. What year of college are you currently in?

- a. Freshman
- b. Sophomore
- c. Junior
- d. Senior

7. What major have you declared or do you intend to declare (please type “undecided” if you have not yet decided)? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Are you presently, or have been within the past 12 months, engaged in volunteer work?

- a. Yes
- b. No

The following questions are about your volunteer work during the past year (If you have been volunteering for less than a year, these questions concern the entire time you have been volunteering.)

9. How long have you been a volunteer?
  - a. \_\_\_ years
  - b. \_\_\_ months
  
10. How many days has it been since you last volunteered? (If you are unsure, please try to estimate or leave blank) \_\_\_\_\_
  
11. How many hours during an average week are you engaged in volunteer work?
  - a. 1-3 hours
  - b. 4-8 hours
  - c. 8-10 hours
  - d. 10 or more hours
  - e. I do not engage in volunteer work every week.
  
12. How many organizations have you volunteered with during the past 12 months?
  - a. 1
  - b. 2
  - c. 3
  - d. 4
  - e. 5 or more
  
13. Is there a main organization that you do a majority of your volunteer work with?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
  
14. If so, how did you become involved with the main organization that you volunteer with?
  - a. You approached the organization
  - b. You were asked by your boss or employer
  - c. You were asked by a relative, friend or co-worker
  - d. You were asked by someone in the organization
  - e. You were asked by someone else
  - f. Some other reason
  
15. How would you describe your main volunteer activity?
  - a. Coach, referee or supervise sports teams
  - b. Tutor or teach
  - c. Mentor youth
  - d. Be an usher, greeter or minister
  - e. Collect, prepare, distribute or serve food
  - f. Fundraise or sell items to make money
  - g. Provide counseling, medical care, FIRE/EMS, or protective services
  - h. Provide general office services
  - i. Provide professional or management assistance, including serving on a board or committee

- j. Engage in music performance, or, other artistic activities
- k. Engage in general labor, supply general transportation to people
- l. Some other activity

16. Are you volunteering as part of a requirement for school or a social organization (e.g club, fraternity or sorority)?

- a. Yes
- b. No

17. Do you typically volunteer

- a. alone
- b. with one or two friends
- c. with a large group

18. Do you share information about your volunteer work on social networking sites such as Facebook or Twitter?

- a. yes
- b. no

**APPENDIX H: POSITIVE AFFECT  
NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE (PANAS)**

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent **you feel this way at the present moment** using the following scale:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
very slightly or not at all		moderately		extremely	
	1. ____	interested		11. ____	irritable
	2. ____	distressed		12. ____	alert
	3. ____	excited		13. ____	ashamed
	4. ____	upset		14. ____	inspired
	5. ____	strong		15. ____	nervous
	6. ____	guilty		16. ____	determined
	7. ____	scared		17. ____	attentive
	8. ____	hostile		18. ____	jittery
	9. ____	enthusiastic		19. ____	active
	10. ____	proud		20. ____	afraid

APPENDIX I: FICTITIOUS VOLUNTEER FAIR FLYERS

*Autonomy Flyer*

**Express your true self...  
attend the volunteer fair!**

*You're probably thinking that if you become a volunteer, you'll just have to give. While you're helping others, volunteering can help YOU!*

**Volunteering:**

- is flexible; **you decide** when and how much time you want to give
- is a great way to **convey your ideas and opinions**
- says a lot about **the real you**

**Come find out how you can volunteer  
and express your true self!**

**Campus Volunteer Fair**

April 15<sup>th</sup> • Ashbrook Center Atrium • 1-5 pm

**Meet new people...  
attend the volunteer fair!**

*You're probably thinking that if you become a volunteer, you'll just have to give. While you're helping others, volunteering can help YOU!*

**Volunteering:**

- adds to your **social network**
- gives you new ways to **interact** with your classmates
- helps you **know and care** about what happens in your community

**Come find out how you can volunteer  
and meet new people!**

**Campus Volunteer Fair**

April 15<sup>th</sup> • Ashbrook Center Atrium • 1-5 pm

**Learn something new...  
attend the volunteer fair!**

*You're probably thinking that if you become a volunteer, you'll just have to give. While you're helping others, volunteering can help YOU!*

**Volunteering:**

- teaches you interesting **new skills**
- gives you a sense of **competence**
- develops **strengths and capabilities** you didn't know you had

**Come find out how you can volunteer  
and learn something new!**

**Campus Volunteer Fair**

April 15<sup>th</sup> • Ashbrook Center Atrium • 1-5 pm

## **Volunteers needed...**

### **attend the volunteer fair!**

*You're probably thinking that if you become a volunteer, you'll just have to give. While you're helping others, volunteering can help YOU!*

#### **Volunteering:**

- is **a useful** way to spend your free time
- allows you to **make a difference** in your community.
- **looks good** on your resume.

**Come find out how you can volunteer  
and help your community!**

## **Campus Volunteer Fair**

April 15<sup>th</sup> • Ashbrook Center Atrium • 1-5 pm



The administration wants to reach out to as many students as possible. With everyone's help, this fair will be a tremendous success.

For your convenience, once the details have been finalized, the university can send an email on your behalf to your friend(s). The only information you need to provide is their first name and email address.

**10. Would you be willing to share this information with a friend?**

**c. yes**

**d. no**

**11. Please list the first name of each friend you would like to have an email sent to (one per line) \_\_\_\_\_**

Thank you for your willingness to share this information. On the next screen, you will have the opportunity to input the email address of your friend(s).