

11-1991

## Differences Among Community Service Volunteers, Extracurricular Volunteers, and Nonvolunteers on the College Campus

R. Thomas Fitch  
*University of Georgia*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered>

 Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

### Recommended Citation

Fitch, R. Thomas, "Differences Among Community Service Volunteers, Extracurricular Volunteers, and Nonvolunteers on the College Campus" (1991). *Higher Education*. 85.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered/85>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Service Learning at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Higher Education by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

MN00135

National Information Center  
for Service Learning  
1954 Buford Ave, Room R290  
St. Paul, MN 55108-6197

# Differences Among Community Service Volunteers, Extracurricular Volunteers, and Nonvolunteers on the College Campus

R. Thomas Fitch      Counseling and Human Development Services, University  
of Georgia

*Students involved in volunteer community service activities display different demographic characteristics and interpersonal values than do other students.*

Throughout much of the history of American higher education there have been student clubs and organizations outside of the formal curriculum. Clubs, fraternities, sororities, intercollegiate athletics, and student-run publications developed during the 19th century to add to literary, dramatic, musical, and social organizations that came into being as early as 1719 at Harvard (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

As the student affairs profession emerged during this century an emphasis has been placed on the education of the whole student and the concept of "student development" (Miller & Prince, 1976). Indeed, much emphasis during the 1980s has been placed on student involvement in the total educational environment as a means of enhancing student development. A report by the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) contended that the more highly involved students are (through studies, participation in student organizations, work on-campus, and frequent interaction with faculty and student peers), "the greater will be their growth and achievement, their satisfaction with their educational experiences, and their persistence in college, and the more likely they are to continue their learning" (p. 17).

The importance of student involvement in the

educational environment is further supported by Astin (1977, 1984a, 1984b). He concluded that students who participate in almost any type of extracurricular activity are less likely to drop out and more likely to be satisfied with their college experience than those who do not participate.

Volunteer community service (i.e., giving time to help others for no pay) is one type of extracurricular activity that has been encouraged as being an important way to develop socially responsible and allocentric values. Although student organizations that foster volunteer service are nothing new, the impetus for student volunteerism has been stimulated in recent years by the creation of two organizations with a national scope: the Project for Public and Community Service, which was created in 1985 by a group of college presidents in the belief that community service is essential to a well-rounded education, and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League, which was established to build and strengthen on-campus activities that promote volunteer service (Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service, 1986).

The extent to which students actively participate in volunteer service varies from study to study. For example, a survey at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1984) revealed that 29% of college students had volunteered for a charity organization since entering college. Another report by the Independent Sector (1985) found that 43% of the people in the 18-24 age group had volunteered during the preceding year. Astin's 1990 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) study found that 65% of entering college freshmen reported having performed volunteer work

R. Thomas Fitch is an assistant professor of Counseling and Human Development Services and can be contacted at 402 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602.

in the year before entering college. It is expected to participate in community service work with Levine and Hirsch (1990) indicating student volunteering in recent years. It is a significant minority of students who do not participate in some type of

Although some research has examined the characteristics of volunteerism, little research has examined the personality characteristics of volunteerism. Allen and Rouse (1986) of the personality characteristics of volunteerism, looked at the differences between student volunteers with nonvolunteers. They concluded that volunteers were more internalized moral status, more positive attitude toward service, and more self-efficacious. They also found that volunteers were more emotionally stable than nonvolunteers. Fitch (1987) looked at student volunteers and nonvolunteers and found that they were not very different from the general population with the exception of residence hall students. He found that the reasons for volunteering were "a sense of satisfaction" and "a sense of purpose."

If student affairs professionals accept the premise that involvement in service enhances the development of the student and creates a healthier campus environment, then ways should be developed to enhance the quality and quantity of student involvement. An examination of the characteristics of student volunteers versus nonvolunteers is necessary to determine if there are differences for doing so. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine if there are differences between students who are involved in volunteer activities and those who are not involved.

## METHOD

### Sample

A sample of student volunteers and nonvolunteers from a large university, including students in 8 physical education classes, was selected. The physical education classes are required for all students using these classes.

er supported by  
concluded that  
most any type of  
likely to drop  
sified with their  
who do not par-

ce (i.e., giving  
) is one type of  
been encouraged  
develop socially  
alues. Although  
r volunteer ser-  
etus for student  
d in recent years  
tions with a na-  
ublic and Com-  
ated in 1985 by  
n the belief that  
o a well-rounded  
Outreach Oppor-  
blished to build  
ivities that pro-  
is Compact: The  
munity Service,

its actively par-  
aries from study  
at the Carnegie  
ent of Teaching  
college students  
ganization since  
ort by the Inde-  
that 43% of the  
had volunteered  
in's 1990 Coop-  
Program (CIRP)  
ng college fresh-  
d volunteer work

in the year before entering college. Only 14% expected to participate in volunteer or community service work while in college, however. Levine and Hirsch (1990) reported research indicating student volunteerism has been increasing in recent years. It does seem evident that a significant minority of college students do participate in some type of volunteer activity.

Although some research has been done on the characteristics of volunteers in general, very little research has examined college students in particular. Allen and Rushton (1983) in a review of the personality characteristics of community volunteers, looked at 20 studies comparing volunteers with nonvolunteers and concluded that volunteers were more empathic, had more internalized moral standards, had a more positive attitude toward self, perceived themselves as more self-efficacious and competent, and were more emotionally stable than nonvolunteers. Fitch (1987) looked specifically at college student volunteers and determined that they are not very different from the general student population with the exception that women and residence hall students are overrepresented. The reasons for volunteering involved egoistic ("a sense of satisfaction") as well as altruistic motives.

If student affairs professionals accept the premise that involvement in volunteer service enhances the development of individual students and creates a healthier campus environment, then ways should be found to promote the quality and quantity of such involvement. An examination of the characteristics of volunteers versus nonvolunteers may provide some clues for doing so. Therefore the purpose of this study was to determine if there are characteristics that distinguish student volunteers from other students who are involved in extracurricular activities not of a service nature and from those who are not involved at all.

## METHOD

### Sample

A sample of students was drawn from 10 different academic classes at a major southeastern university, including 1 psychology, 1 sociology, and 8 physical education classes. Because physical education is required for all students, I felt that using these classes would result in a repre-

sentative sample. Classifying the students on the basis of Holland's (1966) typology of academic majors revealed a fairly balanced sample. Although women were overrepresented (60%), a chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences,  $\chi^2(2, N=285)=2.51, p=.28$ , between men and women on type of involvement or non-involvement. A total of 330 students participated in the research, resulting in 285 usable sets of surveys (85%). In this study, the three groups were compared by examining their demographic characteristics and their interpersonal values because aspects of relating to other people are a major component of involvement in extracurricular, including community service, activities.

### Instrumentation

The Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV; Gordon, 1976) and a demographic questionnaire were used. The demographic items were used to measure sex, ethnicity, place of residence, class standing, academic major, political orientation, religiosity, part-time work information, marital status, and information about extracurricular activities, including volunteer community service.

The SIV consists of 30, forced-choice sets of three statements (or triads) from which the respondent is instructed to select the one that is most important in interpersonal relationships for him or her. The SIV yields scores on six scales of interpersonal values: Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence, and Leadership.

Reliability estimates for the SIV have been determined through test-retest administrations and internal analyses (Gordon, 1976). For internal consistency, Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 estimates on the six scales ranged from .71 to .86. In one study of short-term consistency (10 days), correlations ranged from .78 to .89, and in a study of longer range stability (1 year), correlations ranged from .55 to .79. Gordon (1976) has also established validity through statistically significant correlations of the SIV scales with at least nine other personality measures.

### Research Design

The hypothesis used for this study was that there are no statistically significant differences among students involved in volunteer community service, students involved in other extracurricular

activities, and uninvolved students on the six interpersonal values measured by the SIV.

After the data were collected, students were placed into one of three categories for the purpose of testing the hypothesis: (a) no extracurricular involvement, (b) current involvement in extracurricular activities, none of which were community service in nature, and (c) current involvement in extracurricular activities, at least one of which involved community service. Students indicating involvement with only on-campus service activities ( $n=4$ ) were placed in the third group. Students indicating involvement in off-campus service activities only ( $n=7$ ) were not included in the sample. Examples of the service activities included service fraternities and organizations (i.e., Circle K, Alpha Phi Omega), tutoring, and Communiversy (an umbrella organization in the institution's Department of Student Activities that coordinates student involvement in community volunteer activities such as Big Brother/Big Sister and Adopt-A-Grandparent programs). Some students were involved in service activities through other organizations such as social fraternities or sororities and religious groups (i.e., the Baptist Student Union). Examples of other extracurricular activities included judiciary councils, intramurals, residence hall councils, and social Greek organizations with no service component.

### Data Analyses

The research hypothesis was tested in the null form using a significance level of .05. A series of six one-way ( $1 \times 3$ ) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) was run with the involvement category as the independent variable and one of the SIV scales as the dependent variable for each ANOVA. Post-hoc *t* tests to compare means of individual cells were performed on each ANOVA with significance at the .05 level of probability.

### RESULTS

Of the 285 total participants, 104 (36%) were not involved in any extracurricular activities, 136 (48%) were involved in extracurricular activities but not service activities (referred to hereafter as the *extracurricular group*), and 45 (16%) were involved in extracurricular and

community service activities (referred to hereafter as the *service group*).

In the noninvolved and extracurricular groups, men and women were approximately equal in proportion to their representation in the total sample, but the service group had proportionately more women. Seventy-one percent of the service group was female as compared with 60% of the total sample.

The sample was overwhelmingly White (92%), as would be expected at a predominantly White institution. The breakdown of Blacks in the three groups did not fit the pattern for the total sample, with 13 of the 18 Blacks (72%) being in the noninvolved group and only 3 Blacks being in the extracurricular and 2 in the service groups.

Students living in residence halls were overrepresented in the service group whereas those living off-campus (not with parents) were overrepresented in the noninvolved group,  $\chi^2(6, N=285)=24.75, p=.0006$ . Academic majors were classified using Holland's (1966) code. Social majors were overrepresented in the service group, undecided majors were overrepresented in the noninvolved group, and enterprising majors were most likely to be in the extracurricular group,  $\chi^2(12, N=285)=22.86, p=.028$ . Students at the lowest religiosity level (1 on a scale from 1 to 5) were overrepresented in the noninvolved group, whereas students at the highest level (5) were overrepresented in the service group,  $\chi^2(8, N=282)=16.8, p=.03$ . Chi-square analyses for class standing, political orientation, and part-time employment status were not significant.

Because the service group is of special interest in this study it is appropriate to report some additional descriptive statistics about that group. The mean number of hours involved in service activities over the 4 weeks previous to participating in this study was 7.05 (with a standard deviation of 6.68). Subdividing their service involvement by organization through which it was performed revealed the following: 16 (36%) involved through service organizations; 13 (29%) involved through social fraternities or sororities; 10 (22%) involved through religious groups; and 6 (13%) involved through some combination of service, religious, and Greek organizations.

Results of the ANOVAs for each of the six scales of the SIV comparing type of involvement (noninvolved, extracurricular, and service) are reported in Table 1. Significant differences were

### Summary of /

Source
Types of Involvement

found, testing at the .05 of Conformity, Indepen

Post-hoc *t* tests, rep performed for each of t nificant differences to c ferences lay. On the C vice group scored signi other groups, but there tween the noninvoly

### Post-hoc T tests

Means
Group 1 = 11.02 Group 2 = 11.61
Group 1 = 17.95 Group 2 = 17.88
Group 1 = 19.08 Group 2 = 17.50

Note. Group 1 is noninv

Journal of College St

activities (referred to group). extracurricular groups, approximately equal in representation in the total group had proportionate-one percent of the services compared with 60%

overwhelmingly White students at a predominantly Black school. The breakdown of Blacks in the sample did not fit the pattern for the total sample. Of the 18 Blacks (72%) in the sample, 13 were in the service group and only 3 were in the extracurricular and 2 in the noninvolved group.

service halls were overrepresented in the service group whereas those in the extracurricular (with parents) were overrepresented in the noninvolved group,  $\chi^2(6, N=106)$ . Academic majors and minors (1966) code. So, students in the service group were overrepresented in the sample, and enterprising students were overrepresented in the sample,  $\chi^2(2)=22.86, p=.028$ . Religiousness level (1 on a scale of 1-5) was overrepresented in the sample,  $\chi^2(2)=16.8, p=.03$ . Chi-square for standing, political affiliation, and employment status

is of special interest. It is appropriate to report some statistics about that group. Students involved in service activities previous to participation in the study were 7.05 (with a standard deviation of 1.5) indicating their service involvement through which it was measured. Following: 16 (36%) in fraternities or sororities; 13 (29%) in religious groups; and 11 (25%) in some combination of service and religious organizations.

for each of the six types of involvement (noninvolved, extracurricular, and service) are significant differences were

**TABLE 1**  
Summary of Analyses of Variance for Type of Involvement: SIV Scales

Source	df	Mean Square	F-Ratio	p
<b>Support Scale</b>				
Types of Involvement	2	11.15	0.48	.63
Error	282	23.20		
<b>Conformity Scale</b>				
Types of Involvement	2	105.86	3.06	.05
Error	282	34.59		
<b>Recognition Scale</b>				
Types of Involvement	2	2.47	0.10	.90
Error	282	25.68		
<b>Independence Scale</b>				
Types of Involvement	2	419.10	11.03	.00
Error	282	37.99		
<b>Benevolence Scale</b>				
Types of Involvement	2	155.70	4.12	.02
Error	282	37.83		
<b>Leadership Scale</b>				
Types of Involvement	2	18.41	0.46	.64
Error	282	40.26		

found, testing at the .05 level, for the SIV scales of Conformity, Independence, and Benevolence.

Post-hoc *t* tests, reported in Table 2, were performed for each of the three scales with significant differences to determine where the differences lay. On the Conformity scale, the service group scored significantly higher than both other groups, but there were no differences between the noninvolved and extracurricular

groups. There were significant differences among all three groups for the Independence scale, with the noninvolved group scoring highest, the extracurricular group scoring next highest, and the service group scoring lowest. The post-hoc *t* tests for the Benevolence scale revealed differences between the service group and both other groups, with the service group scoring higher. There were no differences be-

**TABLE 2**  
Post-hoc *T* tests for SIV Scales With Significant Differences on ANOVAs

Means	Group 2 = 11.61			Group 3 = 13.60		
	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Conformity</b>						
Group 1 = 11.02	-0.75	238	0.46	-2.67	147	0.01
Group 2 = 11.61				-2.19	179	0.03
<b>Benevolence</b>						
Group 1 = 17.95	0.09	238	0.89	-2.49	147	0.01
Group 2 = 17.88				-2.62	179	0.01
<b>Independence</b>						
Group 1 = 19.08	2.03	238	0.04	4.39	147	0.00
Group 2 = 17.50				3.10	179	0.00

Note. Group 1 is noninvolved; Group 2 is extracurricular; Group 3 is service.

tween the noninvolved and extracurricular groups.

## DISCUSSION

Although only 16% of the students in this sample were involved in community service, they are markedly different from other students in a variety of ways. This 16% is smaller than the figures cited earlier because students in this study were placed in the service group only if they were currently involved in an ongoing organized community service activity (excluding things such as donating blood or raking a neighbor's yard).

Among the most important findings concerning demographic differences include those that *do not* seem to affect involvement. Neither sex, employment status, nor class standing seem to be associated with whether a student is involved in extracurricular activities. Women, however, are more likely than men to be in community service activities. This seems to fit the traditional feminine stereotype that women are more caring and service-oriented than men. Although workers are just as likely as nonworkers to be involved, they are not as likely to participate in service activities. It may be that the workers see such activities as more of a waste of their limited time and as not offering enough immediate tangible rewards.

The finding that there are only negligible differences relative to class standing suggests that students may be predisposed to be involved or not involved and that length of time in residence has little to do with becoming involved. It may be that students are merely continuing a pattern established before coming to college. This supports the finding by Fitch (1987) that the large majority of college students involved in community service was involved in such activities prior to entering college.

The fact that 72% of the Black students in this sample were not involved in any activities lends credence to the belief that many Blacks on a predominantly White campus tend to be uninvolved. Whether that is a function of the Black students themselves or the campus environment is difficult to determine; it is probably due to a combination of multiple factors.

The higher involvement of students living in residence halls is easily understandable, in that opportunities for participation are simply more

available to them due to their proximity to campus. The surprise is that they are so highly involved in service activities. It is possible that the type of student who lives on campus is more altruistic, or perhaps living in the halls fosters a sense of concern for others.

An examination of the subdivision of academic majors by type of involvement reveals three interesting results. Social majors were much more likely to be in service activities, true to the distinct possibility that they are preparing for careers in the helping professions. The overwhelming number of enterprising majors involved in extracurricular, but not service, activities supports the definition of that group (Holland, 1966) as preferring activities that require the manipulation of others; the entrepreneurial and risk-taking aspects of these students are easily recognizable in their high level of involvement. The overrepresentation of undecided majors in the noninvolved category suggests a general pattern of indecision and detachment from their overall educational career.

The high service involvement of the more religious-oriented students is probably due to the emphasis that most religions place on service to others. The fact that most of the students at the lowest level of religiosity are uninvolved in any activities suggests an interesting interpretation. It is possible that the lack of a religious nature is indicative of more independent persons who are disinclined to become involved in any formal organization, as demonstrated in this instance by their probable lack of affiliation with religious organizations or denominations.

Differences in interpersonal values among the three groups were evident on the Conformity, Independence, and Benevolence scales of the SIV. Although the Independence means were the only significantly different ones between the involved students (service and extracurricular) and the noninvolved students, when the service group is separated it becomes very obvious that students involved in service activities are quite different from the typical involved student. The students involved in service were significantly different from both of the other groups on all three scales, scoring higher on Conformity and Benevolence and lower on Independence.

The higher score on Conformity for the service group implies that these students are more interested than the others in doing what is socially correct and conforming to regulations. It is no surprise, then, that these students scored

lowest on Independence able to do things in one's own free will. The Benevolence score is also high; these students value helping others and doing things for others. Their involvement is high.

The pattern that emerges for the service-oriented students may be their reasons for being involved. It is possible that these students value helping others and doing things for others. Their involvement is high. The pattern that emerges for the service-oriented students may be their reasons for being involved. It is possible that these students value helping others and doing things for others. Their involvement is high. The pattern that emerges for the service-oriented students may be their reasons for being involved. It is possible that these students value helping others and doing things for others. Their involvement is high.

The students who score high on the Independence scale than the other two groups on the SIV. It is probable that these students are more independent and seek recognition and admiration for their activities.

The extracurricular students are significantly different from the noninvolved students on the Independence, Conformity, and Benevolence scales. These students are more independent and seek recognition and admiration for their activities. The pattern that emerges for the service-oriented students may be their reasons for being involved. It is possible that these students value helping others and doing things for others. Their involvement is high.

their proximity to campus are so highly involved. It is possible that involvement on campus is more significant in the halls fosters involvement.

The subdivision of academic involvement reveals

Social majors were more involved in service activities, true that they are preparing for professions. The over-enthusiastic majors in service, but not academic, activities that group ring activities that refer to others; the entrepreneurial aspects of these students in their high level representation of uninvolved category suggest indecision and detachment from educational career.

Involvement of the more social majors is probably due to the emphasis placed on service activities by most of the students at the university. They are uninvolved in interesting interpretations of the lack of a religious affiliation of independent persons who come involved in any activity demonstrated in this lack of affiliation with religious denominations.

Personal values among the students on the Conformity, Benevolence scales of the SIV means were different ones between the service and extracurricular students, when the service students' scores were very obvious that service activities are quite involved student. The service students were significantly different from other groups on all scales except on Conformity and Independence.

Conformity for the service students are more involved in doing what is socially acceptable to regulations. It is noted that these students scored

lowest on Independence, which includes being able to do things in one's own way and being free to make one's own decisions. The higher Benevolence score is also quite understandable; these students value helping the unfortunate and doing things for others, which is demonstrated by their involvement in activities that do just that.

The pattern that emerges for these service-oriented students may give some insight into their reasons for being involved in such activities. It is possible that these students perform service activities out of a sense of social obligation or a feeling of social responsibility combined with altruism. White (1981) suggested that college students involved in humanitarian efforts are inculcated with a sense of social responsibility at an early age, which may then grow into true altruism. Performing benevolent activities may be seen by these students as a way of conforming to what they see as being valued by society. Independence is not valued because that does nothing to help others to benefit society. It is interesting to note that the service group did not score significantly different from the other two groups on the scale of Recognition. These students are not necessarily seeking recognition and admiration for their service activities.

The students who are not involved in any activities are significantly higher on the Independence scale than both other groups. In addition, the noninvolved group scored higher on Independence than any of the other five scales of the SIV. It is probable that these students see involvement in organizations as limiting their ability to control their own lives and to do what they want when they want to do it. The relatively lower score on Conformity confirms this; these students do not place as much importance on what society values as they do on what they themselves value. The lower Benevolence score also fits this egoistic pattern.

The extracurricular group of students is different from the noninvolved students only on Independence, scoring lower on that scale. These students are more willing to give up a certain amount of independence in exchange for the rewards, whatever they may perceive them to be, offered by becoming involved in organizations. This group's difference from the service group (lower on Conformity and Benevolence; higher on Independence) suggest that they may seek rewards for being involved that are more

egoistic and individualistic in nature, rather than being involved out of a sense of doing what society values.

Some limitations of this study need to be noted. Because a cross-sectional research design was used, cause and effect relationships were not possible to determine. The instruments used in the study could not assess a cause and effect relationship between involvement and values. Whether involvement influences values or values influence involvement is a question that was not answered in the study. Also, because all the data were collected from students at a single, large, public institution, the results are relevant only for that population.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Levine and Hirsch (1990) indicated that there are reasons to be optimistic about student volunteerism in the 1990s, but challenges still remain. The challenge for institutions in general, and student affairs practitioners in particular, is how to stimulate involvement and provide positive involvement experiences. The results of this study contribute to a knowledge base about students that can help practitioners in their efforts. In order to stimulate involvement, it is important to understand the characteristics of those who are not involved. The demographic results of this study suggest several target subpopulations that seem to include more than their share of the uninvolved. Of serious concern to administrators at predominantly White institutions should be the lack of involvement of Black students. If it is true that involvement increases the satisfaction of students with the collegiate experience and also increases retention, then student affairs professionals need to be searching for ways to increase Black involvement.

Students living off-campus constitute another subpopulation that can be targeted for increased involvement. Although the problems associated with getting this group more involved are well known to many campus administrators, they do not diminish the importance of making the effort. Possible solutions include increasing on-campus enrollment, reaching out to the students in their off-campus neighborhoods, or some combination of both.

One other group that is particularly involved in extracurricular activities is the undecided majors. The implication is that these students

have need of some form of special help in making decisions and becoming committed in several areas of their lives. Perhaps institutional leaders need to find ways to encourage those responsible for academic advising to work to stimulate student involvement in the extracurriculum as well as in the curriculum.

The unfortunate finding of involvement status by class standing is that, for the most part, students do not become increasingly involved the longer they are in residence. If it is true that involvement patterns are established before students come to college, then the implications for high school and even elementary teachers and administrators become clear. Another possibility is that involvement in activities is a manifestation of personality type and is therefore resistant to change. In other words, a certain percentage of college students will not become involved no matter what. Although this is probably true to some extent, it is also possible that administrators and faculty simply have not tapped the ways to reach these students and offer them the rewards that will lead to involvement.

There is little doubt about the importance of community service work to the giver, the receiver, the community, and society. It is apparent, however, that only a minority of college students (16% in this study) are involved in such activities on an ongoing basis. This finding suggests that there may be utility for student affairs practitioners to create reward systems designed to encourage more participation in service work.

If noninvolved students value independence so much more highly, perhaps service activities can be organized in a way that these students can preserve a sense of independence. A loosely organized structure in which the service organization serves mainly as a coordinating body for service activities may be the best vehicle for stimulating these uninvolved independent students to become involved.

As White (1981) has contended, one of the most important keys to encouraging volunteer community service is that students must perceive the environment as rewarding such involvement. The institution, in all its aspects, must be permeated with a sense of humanitarianism. Levine and Hirsch (1990) posed some serious questions for institutions to consider concerning the values and ethics that colleges are communicating. Do policies, procedures, and opportunities exist to allow, much less promote, student involvement?

The data from this study suggest that service-involved students value doing what is viewed as being important by society (the institution being one aspect of that) and they apparently believe that the environment rewards their service involvement. Student affairs practitioners need to do what they can to promote a humanitarian environment on campus and a sense of the value of volunteer community service.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Rushton, J. P. (1983). Personality characteristics of community mental health volunteers: A review. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 12*(1), 36-49.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1984a). *Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1984b). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*, 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1990). *The American freshman: National norms for fall 1990*. Los Angeles: American Council on Education and University of California at Los Angeles.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service. (1986). *Questions and answers about campus compact*. Providence, RI: Author.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1984). *Carnegie survey of undergraduates*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Fitch, R. T. (1987). Characteristics and motivations of college student community service volunteers. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*, 424-431.
- Gordon, L. V. (1976). *Survey of interpersonal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Holland, J. L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and model environments*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.
- Independent Sector. (1985). *Americans volunteer 1985*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Levine, A., & Hirsch, D. (1990). Student activism and optimism return to the campuses. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 37*(10), p. A48.
- Miller, T. K., & Prince, J. S. (1976). *The future of student affairs: A guide to student development for tomorrow's higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- White, R. W. (1981). Humanitarian concern. In A. W. Chickering (Ed.), *The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## Genital Chlamydia Infection A Review and

W. Michael Felts

David M. White

Dianne Marshburn

*This article provides a review of the problems related to genital chlamydia infection and suggests some possible solutions.*

While public health education is directed at acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), another disease (STD) has quiet proportions. This disease, chlamydia infection (CT), the most common sexually transmitted disease in the United States, and infants are infected for Disease Control, 1991. Chlamydia infections cause permanent, long-term problems and have become a major public health problem in the United States. Over 75% of this disease is asymptomatic. Complications occurring during pregnancy (Washington et al., 1991) rates for genital CT infection in 20- to 24-year-olds cause the sexual behavior is the primary determinant of infection rate, the college students are considered at high risk.

The purpose of this

W. Michael Felts and David M. White are professors of health education at Carolina University. Gre Marshburn is director of clinical services at Pitt County Memorial Hospital. All correspondence should be sent to W. Michael Felts.