Motivation to Collaborate: Applying Motivation Theory to Community Organizations and Universities Working Together
Alexa N. Darby, Frances Ward-Johnson, Gabrielle Newman, Margot Haglund, Tammy Cobb

Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement
Vol. 4, No. 2, Fall 2013

Research has identified a variety of reasons community organizations choose to collaborate with universities. This study applies Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation to investigate the motivations for, benefits of, and challenges inherent in university collaboration for 15 community organizations. The study examined community partners’ anticipatory cognitive motivation, which is comprised of forethought, cognized goals, and outcome expectancies; the academic service-learning experience itself; and community partners’ retrospective reasoning, including perceived benefits and challenges. The study found that community partners are motivated to collaborate with the university not by external incentives but as a result of their desire to fulfill cognized goals and achieve expected outcomes.
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In academic service-learning initiatives, success or failure depends heavily on the relationship between university students, faculty and staff, and the community organizations with which they partner (Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). According to the Campus Compact annual survey (2012), in the two-year span from 2010 to 2012, member institutions offered slightly more service-learning courses, resulting in an increase in faculty and student engagement with the community. These relationships are contingent on effective communication, positive interactions, and a mutual understanding of needs (Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon, Hilgendorf, & Scott, 2009; Worrall, 2007).
Community organizations are motivated to foster these relationships and collaborate with campus communities by their desire to educate college students about their clients’ needs and the societal issues affecting the clients they serve (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Bell & Carlson, 2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007). Some organization staff members are motivated to educate students about the inner workings of the nonprofit world (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006), while others are motivated to work with the university by their wish to educate college students about cross-cultural differences. Despite the evident benefits of such partnerships, they present a number of inherent challenges as well (Bell & Carlson, 2009; Martin, SeBlonka, & Tryon, 2009; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Worrall, 2007). Given the increasing institutionalization of academic service-learning initiatives and the need for universities to maintain community ties over the long term, there is a crucial need to understand the factors that maintain and increase, as well as those that decrease, community partners’ motivation to collaborate with undergraduate students. This study applies the lens of motivation theory to explore the reasons community organizations establish and sustain collaborations with university faculty, staff, and students.

Community organizations gain a variety of benefits by partnering with university service-learning classes. Community partners recognize the value of having students enrolled in a course connected to their work at the organization (Konwerski & Nashman, 2002; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Worrall, 2007). The benefits of partnering with academic service-learning courses include acquiring more help for the organization, supporting the university’s efforts to positively impact the community, obtaining assistance with short-term projects, and cultivating future volunteers and donors (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Bushouse, 2005; Martin, SeBlonka, & Tryon, 2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Stater & Fotheringham, 2009; Tryon et al., 2008; Worrall, 2007). Community members enjoy working with college students because they bring energy and new ideas to their organizations and clients (Martin, SeBlonka, & Tryon, 2009; Vernon & Foster, 2002). Organizations may also engage in such partnerships to bring in additional resources and improve their own organizational processes (Worrall, 2007).

Yet for all their advantages, these partnerships are not without their challenges. Community partners have identified a need for more faculty involvement, greater accountability from students, and longer-term student involvement than what is typically provided by short class periods and semester-long time frames (Bell & Carlson, 2009; Martin, SeBlonka, & Tryon, 2009; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Worrall, 2007). In addition, they note that the increased demand on staff time required to manage the students is a difficulty of such arrangements (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Bell & Carlson, 2009; d’Arlach, Sanchez, & Feuer, 2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008; Worrall, 2007).

The present study uses motivation theory to identify the factors that motivate community partners to initiate and sustain their commitment to academic service-learning. While previous literature has outlined the benefits and challenges of university/community partnerships in academic service-learning, little is known about community organizations’ motivational process in collaborating with university faculty, staff, and students.
While it is clear that community partners are motivated to work with universities, identifying the particularities that drive and sustain such collaborations is essential to ensuring their longevity. In this study, the researchers applied Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation to understand the perspectives and motivational process of community organizations collaborating with a university. Bandura’s model highlights the use of forethought and retrospective reasoning in maintaining and altering individual motivation. In this process, individuals examine their personal cognitive goals, expected outcomes, and perceived causes of success and failure, which allows them to alter or maintain their motivation. The value of this research lies in identifying the factors that increase and decrease community members’ motivation to collaborate with universities, with the goal of developing approaches to strengthen these relationships and foster long-term partnerships.

Methods
The researchers in this study are faculty members and undergraduate students at a small, private liberal arts university in the southeastern United States. The county in which the university is located has approximately 151,000 residents. The county’s priorities with regard to health issues are health care access, obesity, mental health, and substance abuse. The county’s priorities in relation to social issues are education, poverty, homelessness, and domestic violence. Among the families living in this community, 22.8% of children live in poverty, which is higher than the state average. The economic downturn has left many residents without jobs and created a shortage of affordable housing. This area is the largest metropolitan area in the state with two major interstates, but it offers limited public transportation.

IRB approval was obtained for this study. The participants included 15 staff members from community organizations that have partnered with the local university. The participants were selected on the basis of the county’s priorities. Community partners were solicited for participation through email and/or phone calls. The staff members of the organizations in this study serve a wide range of community needs, from assisting homeless or impoverished children and adults to providing health care for community members, and have collaborated with university faculty and students on many occasions.

The first two authors of this paper conducted hour-long individual interviews with one or two staff members from each organization who are directly involved in the partnership. Community partners were asked how they became involved with the university and what factors contribute to their motivation to continue this involvement. The interviews were transcribed verbatim, analyzed for themes, and examined through the lens of Bandura’s model of motivation.

1 The exact reference is not provided to maintain the confidentiality of the participating organizations. Retrieved from “[X] Community Assessment: 2011.”
We began the analysis process with three questions: (a) What factors increased the community partners’ motivation to partner with the university? (b) What factors decreased community partners’ motivation to partner with the university? and (c) What factors help sustain community partners’ commitment to the university? These questions guided the coding of each transcript. Once the transcripts were coded, we used the constant comparative method to identify patterns and categories across the transcripts (Roulston, 2010). These categories led to the development of themes, which we then examined through the lenses of various models of motivation theory. Block quotes should use “Quotation” style.

**Figure 1: Bandura’s (1997) Model of Cognitive Motivation**

We selected Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation, as illustrated in Figure 1, which provides a framework for understanding the intricacies of individual motivation. In this model, a person's overall motivation is described as their “anticipatory cognitive motivator” (p. 123). The anticipatory cognitive motivator is comprised of forethought, the performance itself, and the individual's retrospective reasoning about the performance.

The concept of forethought encompasses an individual’s thoughts about their cognized goals and expected outcomes. Bandura explained that individuals’ cognized goals provide a “direction to their behavior and create incentives to persist until they fulfill their goals” (Bandura, 1993, p. 130). In addition to formulating cognized goals, individuals also anticipate the expected outcome of a situation. Expected outcomes are a key element of Bandura’s model, based on his assertion that “People act on their beliefs about what they can do, as well as on their beliefs about the likely outcomes of performance” (Bandura, 1993, p. 130).

During and after an event, which Bandura (1993) refers to as a “performance,” individuals use retrospective reasoning to determine the perceived causes of success or failure. Together, forethought, the performance itself, and the retrospective reasoning that follows, influence an individual’s level of motivation, or in Bandura’s terminology, their “anticipatory cognitive
motivator” (p. 123). In the following section we apply this model of motivation to community partners’ perspectives on collaborating with university students, faculty, and staff.

**Findings**

*Figure 2: Findings through the Lens of Bandura’s Model of Cognitive Motivation*

As illustrated in Figure 2, the researchers applied Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation but modified some of the terms. Our version illustrates how community partners use forethought, the academic service-learning experience, and retrospective reasoning to determine their anticipatory cognitive motivation. Forethought relates to their cognized goals and expected outcomes, while retrospective reasoning relates to their perceptions of the benefits and challenges of collaborating with the university community.

Community partners begin the academic service-learning course using forethought to formulate their goals and expectations. As the experience unfolds, community partners experience benefits and challenges in relationship to the students, faculty and university, leading to retrospective reasoning. Anticipatory cognitive motivators, in the form of cognized
goals and outcome expectancies, provide the motivation for pursuing the academic service-learning experience and offer a framework through which to examine the benefits and challenges of this experience.

**Cognized Goals**

Community partners start each collaboration with the university using forethought to identify their cognized goals. Twelve of the 15 participants in the study identified their primary cognized goal as educating students about their organization and the needs of their clients. Two staff members at a community organization serving the terminally ill felt responsible for educating college students about the community and its needs. They explained, “I would say the students are eager to learn and it is our responsibility as a community to expose them to other things [beyond the campus].” Their cognized goal of educating students about the community as a whole was represented in a majority of the participants’ responses.

Similarly, another community partner, whose role is to expand health awareness and health initiatives in the community, identified her cognized goal as helping college students broaden their perspective by introducing them to approaches to life different from their own. She noted:

> You have to remind them it’s not about them, but it’s about this community that you’re serving and the initiative. Even though you’re doing service-learning, this experience where you’re walking into their home or community center or neighborhood isn’t necessarily about you. So helping them kind of put that feeling aside.

For this community partner it is important for college students to begin understanding perspectives different from their own. She wants them to overcome their self-centeredness to focus on the needs of others.

The cognized goals of the community partners extend much deeper than simply completing a project or documenting the students’ service hours. They feel a responsibility to educate college students about the day-to-day issues and challenges facing their clients and their community. This cognized goal comprises a key element of the forethought of community partners embarking on the academic service-learning experience.

**Outcome Expectancy**

Linked to their cognized goals are community partners’ outcome expectancies. Ten of the 15 participants in the study emphasized that their primary expected outcome was for the students to provide extra help to their organization. A staff member for a community organization that serves teachers and families of children from birth to age five emphasized that university students had provided excellent help to her organization. She commented:
I think [the college students] have been really helpful to us and doing things that have to get done, but that maybe are not top priorities for the folks who are working day-to-day with everybody. So that has been really helpful.

Community partners come to rely on the college students’ assistance, particularly with tasks their organizations might not otherwise have the time or staffing to accomplish.

Similarly, a local medical clinic serving low-income residents relies on the college students to help with their evening clinics. A staff member for the organization stated:

*We also do labs in the evenings. So people are going up and down the hallways, and you might have five people at the window because, you know, you’ve got people that are walking in that wanna be seen, or they wanna turn in their eligibility, and you’ve got three people checking out. I mean it is just really hectic in the evenings, and I mean we just, we could not do it without these students.*

Like other community partners, this organization has come to expect and count on college students to be able to serve the many clients who need their assistance.

For community partners, educating college students about the purpose of their organization and the societal challenges their clients face comprised the core of their cognized goals. Over time, these community organizations have grown to depend on college students to assist with the day-to-day functioning of their organizations, and such reliance dictates their expected outcomes. Their forethought, including identifying cognized goals and expected outcomes, lays the groundwork for their vision of the service-learning experience.

**Perceived Benefits**

As the academic service-learning experience unfolds, community partners use retrospective reasoning to identify the benefits and challenges of their relationship with the academic service-learning students and the university. Reflective of their expected outcome, 10 of the 15 community partners identified the primary benefit of this collaboration to be the extra help the students provide. Additionally, 7 of the 15 community partners found the quality of students and their work to be a benefit. Finally, 5 of the 15 community partners identified the college students’ age to be helpful in mentoring younger students who are clients at their site and in bringing fresh ideas to their organizations.

Ten of the 15 community partners emphasized that the college students provided extra help their organization badly needed. A community partner in an organization providing services to teachers and families of children from birth to age five shared, “It’s just that we need the help and that it’s good quality help most of the time.” The assistance college students provide with day-to-day tasks enables the organization’s staff members to focus on other responsibilities.

Not only do community partners appreciate the extra help, but 7 of the 15 participants also emphasized the high quality of the students and their work, which helps the community...
partner accomplish both daily tasks and broader organizational goals. A community partner whose organization serves the terminally ill shared:

*I have found everyone that I have met has been very smart, very outgoing, really seems to have their head on straight and their act together. They knew what they wanted, [and] they had goals. I’ve been real impressed with the students I’ve met from [the university] because we’ve had interns from other schools that were not as together. So I attribute that whatever [the university] is doing over there it is working. I would highly recommend anyone to take some [university students]. They do a great job. They are dependable. They help our patients and they help our staff. So yeah, it’s been a real positive thing for us; it really has and I think the students we’ve had, most of them would say it’s been positive for them as well.*

In their retrospective reasoning, this community partner and others view the high caliber of the college students as a benefit to their organization. They appreciate the students’ intelligence, dependability, and helpfulness to their staff and clients. Interestingly, the community partner reports experiences with other college students that have not been uniformly positive. This suggests that universities have the ability to influence community partners’ motivation to collaborate by adequately preparing students for their on-site experience, clearly outlining expectations for professional behavior, and communicating the standards and requirements for students in their role as campus representatives in these organizations.

Another benefit for community organizations is the age and attitude of the college students. In some organizations the college students serve as mentors for younger clients, while other organizations find that the college students’ youthfulness benefits their staff and clients by introducing fresh ideas into their organization. Expanding on this point, a community partner who works in a retirement community noted:

*One huge thing is that there are fresh ideas. Things through a college student’s eyes look a lot different than they do through a staff member’s eyes who has been there, done that, seen it happen, you know, for years on end. So they come in, they bring fresh ideas, so that sometimes re-energizes the staff. But it also keeps the residents feeling engaged as well. So that’s probably the biggest way I’d describe it. So take out the work factor, you know all the things that they do that we don’t get to, it’s just their ideas a lot of times are fresh and make us think outside our own little boxes.*

This community partner emphasized the value of the new ideas and energy college students bring to her organization. In addition, since this organization serves the elderly, the college students are able to engage the residents in new and different ways. These benefits for the organization and its clients play a key role in the community partner’s retrospective reasoning and ultimately influence her anticipatory cognitive motivation.
**Perceived Challenges**

While collaborations with university students, faculty, and staff offer numerous benefits for community organizations, they also inevitably present challenges. Eight of the 15 community partners identified a key challenge as finding students who are a good fit for their organization and who are also responsible. Eight of the 15 community partners expressed a desire for more interaction with faculty members. Community partners also struggle with the university calendar and the relatively brief length of time students are available to work with them. Four of the 15 participants found a semester to be too short, both because their clients form bonds with the college students, and because when college students are working on projects, they don’t have enough time to get the work completed well. Additionally, 3 of the 15 community partners cautioned other community organizations about the extra time it takes to train college students and plan what they are going to do.

Eight of the 15 community partners had a difficult time with the college students not following through with their requirements and organizational expectations. The staff member of an organization that serves food to the homeless and families in need explained:

> They come and they work, they don’t come to the training, they don’t show up on time. When they call and say, “Can we do anything? Is there something [I] can do? Or is there some time we can schedule because I have my classes?” and blah blah blah, and you put them down [on the schedule] and count on them, you cannot count on them to show up. Now, you have those that are exceptions, and they are wonderful, when they come. But you have to be very flexible outside your hours. They want to come after 4 o’clock in the afternoon because they’ve got classes all day or transportation problems, or they want to come on Saturdays. Most nonprofits aren’t open on Saturdays. But we’re here on Saturdays, and that’s how a lot of students are able to get some time in is on Saturdays.

This community partner was frustrated by college students who failed to follow through with their commitments to the organization. The partner noted that college students often did not understand the nonprofit world and expected community organizations to adjust their hours to accommodate the student’s schedule. While many students are responsible, the challenging students stay in the minds of community partners, influencing their anticipatory cognitive motivation and potentially impacting their interest in continuing to collaborate with the university.

The amount of interaction between community partners and faculty members varied; however, 8 of the 15 participants agreed that they would prefer more faculty interaction. It is important to note that the seven participants who were satisfied with the level of interaction were all meeting frequently with their faculty partner or the community outreach representative from the Center for Service Learning at the university. Community partners noted in particular their desire for more in-person and email interaction with faculty, and for increased communication about student progress. For example, one participant who wanted to be kept informed of
students’ progress on their projects noted, “I think I would have liked a little more. . . . It may just be something as simple as, you know, copying me on the progress reports.”

A challenge for 4 of the 15 community partners was the short-term nature of the relationship. While some faculty members collaborate with community partners for a year, others work with community organizations on projects that last only a semester. Some community partners in the study struggled with the university calendar and what it meant for their organization and clients. They noted that clients form bonds with students who may be gone after only a semester. They also noted that often a semester is not long enough for the college student to complete a good project.

The problem of the short-term nature of relationships formed between students and clients was highlighted by the staff member of an organization that provides after-school programming for youth, in which the college students assist the children with homework. The staff member was concerned about his clients becoming attached to the college students, who were gone after only a semester. He stated:

I just remember how several years ago that the kids really became attached to some of the people and then it’s like the next year there [was] not that class; they’re not there. That was one of the tough parts. I know nothing’s forever but...if I had the optimal situation they would start kind of when the public school started and be there the whole duration of our school calendar. But our school calendar doesn’t run the same way or at least get them to the end of the year when they do the [end of grade test] or something like that so we can have some kind of practice stuff, you know, that they do getting prepped for the end of the grade test.

This community partner was concerned about the effects on young clients who formed relationships with college students, only to have to say goodbye to them when the university’s semester was over. Additionally, since the university does not offer the same classes every semester there are times the community organizations don’t have any college student assistance. The lack of consistency in the academic service-learning courses offered each semester, combined with the fact that college students don’t work for the community organizations for a full year, present a substantial challenge for community partners.

When community partners agree to work with an academic service-learning class, they add additional responsibilities and time commitments to their already busy schedules. Three community partners emphasized this point. A community partner who provides assistance and resources to women in the community explained, “It took a lot more of our time than we thought it should have to get to a final product, to help them get to the final product that [the students] needed.”

During and after an academic service-learning experience, community partners retrospectively reason about the benefits and challenges associated with collaborating with the university. This retrospective reasoning, through which community partners compare actual accomplishments
and outcomes to their original cognized goals and expected outcomes, dictates community partners’ anticipatory cognitive motivation to continue collaborating with the university.

**Incentives**

Participants reported that their sustained commitment to partnering with the university was fueled by the shared goal of improving the community. When asked whether extrinsic factors such as workshops, free event tickets, stipends, or free university courses would enhance their motivation to continue collaborating with the university, they replied that while these incentives would be appreciated, they would not influence motivation. Instead, participants noted their interest in finding new ways to work with students and involve students in long-term programs.

Twelve of the 15 community partners indicated an interest in taking free courses at the university. Participants emphasized that this incentive is consistent with their cognized goal of learning skills to help them better meet the needs of their organization and their clients. In addition to free university courses, seven community partners indicated that a stipend for their organization would be helpful. The community partners made it clear that this would not influence their motivation to collaborate with the university, but that receiving a stipend for each class they worked with would help their organizations, which are already financially strained.

Finally, when community partners were asked whether free tickets to university events would be an incentive for collaboration, only 3 of the 15 participants said they would enjoy this benefit. For each incentive mentioned, the 15 community partners stressed that such offers would not increase their motivation to collaborate with the university, even though in some cases the incentives would be welcome.

Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation illuminates the complex process associated with community partners’ motivation. Community partners are not motivated by incentives, but by a reflective process that includes forethought and retrospective reasoning. Their forethought about cognized goals and expected outcomes, the academic service-learning experience itself, and their retrospective reasoning about perceived benefits and challenges fueled their anticipatory cognitive motivation. When asked to collaborate with the university, community partners reference their anticipatory cognitive motivation to make their decision.

**Discussion**

Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation provides a framework for understanding the motivational process of community organization staff members who collaborate with students, faculty, and staff at universities. This model illuminates the forethought and retrospective reasoning that fuel community partners’ anticipatory cognitive motivations. In this process, community partners enter into a collaboration with an academic service-learning class, using
forethought to reflect on their cognized goals and expected outcomes. The participants identified their cognized goals as educating college students about their organization, their clients, and the societal issues associated with their mission. In their thoughts about expected outcomes, it was clear that community partners value the extra help and fresh perspectives college students provide to their organizations.

During and after the academic service-learning class, community partners use retrospective reasoning to identify the benefits and challenges of the collaboration. Similar to previous research, the benefits identified in this study included the additional assistance the college students provide to community organizations, the students’ participation in short-term projects, and the energy and new ideas these college students bring to the organizations (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Martin, SeBlonka, & Tryon, 2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon et al., 2008; Vernon & Foster, 2002). Also consistent with previous literature, this study found that the challenges to collaboration included difficulties with scheduling, a desire for more faculty involvement, and a semester time frame that provides too little time for genuine collaboration (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; d’Arlach, Sanchez, & Feuer, 2009; Tryon et al., 2008; Worrall, 2007).

Unique to this study was the finding that community partners identified the quality of the students as alternately a benefit and a challenge. Some community partners found the students from the local university to be extremely responsible and to contribute high quality work, while other organizations identified challenges associated with finding responsible students who understood the needs of the organization. While some students were very dependable, others were unreliable or inflexible, and seemed not to recognize the implications of their actions for the relationship between the university and the community partner.

Having community partners share their motivational process (i.e., cognized goals) can assist students in understanding the value and impact of their work with the organization. Additionally, pairing experienced, responsible students with students new to the community organization may mediate initial challenges with responsibility. Faculty need to be in continual dialogue with both students and community partners to identify issues that may interfere with a student’s attendance or performance at the site. If consistent dialogue does not resolve a community partner’s concerns, faculty and community partners may choose to reassign a student to a different site or project.

As universities increasingly recognize the value of academic service-learning pedagogy for educating students and strengthening community bonds, they seek ways to support and motivate community partners to initiate and continue collaborations. The Campus Compact annual survey (2012) highlights the increase in recent years in the number of academic service-learning courses offered by institutions of higher education and the support provided to faculty and students involved in academic service-learning. However, the survey does not explore incentives requested by or provided to community partners, leaving open the question of how to align incentives to increase or sustain community partners’ motivation.
In this study, community partners emphasized that although extrinsic incentives would be welcome, such enticements would not increase their motivation. One exception seems to be that community partners did note that the opportunity to enroll in free classes at the university would help them improve the work they did for their organization, which might in turn increase their motivation. As institutions increase the number of academic service-learning classes they offer and consequently seek more placements for students within specific organizations, they need to keep abreast of the factors that sustain or increase a community partner’s motivation. While colleges and universities have begun to provide additional support to faculty in the form of course release time and financial support for implementing academic service-learning courses (Campus Compact, 2012), community partners have yet to receive benefits designed to enhance their motivational process.

The findings of this study emphasize that community partners’ motivation to collaborate with the university is based not on traditional incentives, but on a complex process of reflection that occurs before, during, and after the academic service-learning course. Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation provides the foundation for understanding the complex motivational process of community partners.

**Limitations and Future Research**

A main limitation of this study is its small sample size. Future research needs to expand on this study using Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation with a larger number of participants. Applications of Bandura’s model of motivation in future research could compare community partners who had few experiences with the university with those who had repeatedly collaborated with the university. Additionally, because all community partners were from the same county and all college students were from the same university, future research should examine the motivation of community partners in urban versus rural communities and among those who work with college students from more than one university. In light of the challenges of working with college students identified by the community partners, future research needs to examine ways for the university to support community partners in overcoming such challenges. A unique finding of this research was the community partners’ varying views of the quality of students’ work. Therefore, another recommendation for future research involves exploring the qualities community partners seek in academic service-learning students and their suggestions for how faculty can better prepare students to succeed at their site.

**Conclusion**

Despite the study’s limitations, it is important to note the extensive thought and commitment community partners contribute when collaborating with university students, faculty, and staff. The application of Bandura’s (1997) model of motivation further illuminates this point. The university educates its students, but community partners also play a crucial role in this education. Community members’ motivation to be co-educators for college students alongside
university faculty and staff fuels their commitment and their resilience in persisting through challenging times.
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### Appendix

**Table 1: Cognized Goals and Number of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognized Goals</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Educate about the organization and client needs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Outcome Expectancies and Number of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Provide extra help to organization</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Perceived Benefits and Number of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Provide extra help</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Produce high quality work</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Age and attitude provide assistance to organization and clients</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Perceived Challenges and Number of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Getting a responsible student</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>More interaction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Short-term nature of relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Extra planning time required</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Incentives and Number of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free classes at the university</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for working with courses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free tickets to university events</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>