

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

The Impact of Individual Social Responsibility and Volunteerism on Life Satisfaction: A Study of Physiotherapists in Turkey

El impacto de la responsabilidad social individual y el voluntariado sobre la satisfacción con su vida entre profesionales de la salud: el caso de los fisioterapeutas en Turquía

Akın Başkent. Istanbul University, Istanbul, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation, Turkey.

Email: akin.baskent@istanbul.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7956-5861>

Yusuf Adıgüzel. Anadolu University, Rectorship, Turkey.

Email yusufadiguzel@anadolu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8400-1099>

Feyza Dalaylı. Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Department of New Media and Communication, Turkey.

Email: feYZa.dalayli@comu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2193-8236>

Received: November 19, 2024.

Accepted: March 05, 2025.

Conflicts of interest: None.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.71164/socialmedicine.v18i3.2025.1931>

Abstract

This study aims to examine the relationship between physiotherapists' levels of individual social responsibility, volunteer motivation, and life satisfaction. While there are limited studies that explore individual social responsibility alongside other variables, this research is unique in evaluating both volunteer motivation and life satisfaction. Data were collected through questionnaires sent to an email list of 5,000 physiotherapists in Turkey, resulting in 115 responses. Ethical approval for the study was granted, and the validity and reliability of the data collection tools were assessed. The study used the Individual Social Responsibility Scale,¹⁰ the Volunteer Motivation Inventory,¹¹ which identifies reasons for volunteering, and the Life Satisfaction Scale.²⁰ The results revealed several significant relationships between the sub-dimensions of individual social responsibility and volunteer motivation among physiotherapists, while no significant correlation was found between individual social responsibility and life satisfaction. Additionally, the findings indicated that younger physiotherapists, particularly those around the age of 24, place greater importance on social responsibility and volunteering, and consequently, report higher levels of life satisfaction compared to their older counterparts.

Key Words: Individual social responsibility, volunteer motivation, life satisfaction, physiotherapist

Resumen

Objetivo. Dilucidar la relación entre el nivel de responsabilidad social individual entre fisioterapeutas, su motivación para el voluntariado y su satisfacción con la vida. A pesar de que hay un número limitado de estudios que abordan la responsabilidad social individual, con otras variables, esta investigación se distingue por evaluar las variables de motivación, junto con la satisfacción con la vida. **Metodología.** Para recopilar los datos, se enviaron cuestionarios a grupos de correo electrónico de 5,000 fisioterapeutas en Turquía, obteniendo respuestas de 115. Se obtuvo la aprobación ética para la investigación y se evaluaron la validez y confiabilidad de las herramientas de recopilación de datos. El estudio implementó la Escala de Responsabilidad Social Individual desarrollada por¹⁰, el Inventario de Motivación para el Voluntariado de Esmond y Dunlop,¹¹ que define las razones para el voluntariado, y la Escala de Satisfacción con la Vida de Diener, Emmons, Larsen y Griffin.⁸ **Resultados.** Según los hallazgos, se identificaron numerosas relaciones significativas entre los subdimensiones de la responsabilidad social individual y las de motivación para el voluntariado entre los fisioterapeutas, mientras que no se encontró una valoración significativa entre las subdimensiones de la responsabilidad social individual y la satisfacción con la vida. También se considera que los fisioterapeutas más jóvenes, alrededor de los 24 años, otorgan mayor importancia a la responsabilidad social y al voluntariado, en comparación con sus colegas mayores y, en este contexto, tienen una mayor satisfacción con la vida.

Palabras clave: responsabilidad social individual, motivación para el voluntariado, satisfacción con la vida, fisioterapeuta



Introduction

Individual Social Responsibility (ISR) refers to the accountability individuals take for their actions, aiming to positively impact communities beyond emergency groups. ISR activities include social development roles and collaborative efforts to address community issues, fostering societal improvement.¹⁴ Unlike institutional or state-led social responsibility, ISR is voluntary and grounded in societal norms and values.¹⁰ It also involves awareness of the societal impact of personal behaviors, encompassing actions such as philanthropy, community volunteering, supporting social and political activities, and acting with empathy and justice.⁷ ISR is typically viewed in two dimensions: individual internal moral identity and symbolic public moral identity, which reflect personal and public moral self-perceptions.⁴

Volunteerism, closely linked to ISR, involves motivations that researchers have categorized into sub-dimensions, such as selfishness and altruism.¹⁶ Studies have identified various motivations for volunteering, indicating that no single classification captures all the factors. Clary and Snyder's *Motivation to Volunteer (MTV)* study identified 28 motives, concluding that volunteers seek both tangible rewards and altruistic satisfaction.⁵ They developed the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), which includes six sub-dimensions—values, understanding, career, social, esteem, and protective—demonstrating that volunteering can serve different functions for different individuals. Esmond and Dunlop further expanded on this with the Volunteer Motivation Inventory (VMI), which identifies ten sub-scales, including values, reciprocity, acceptance, and career development, to better understand what attracts and retains volunteers.¹¹

In Türkiye, volunteerism studies have adapted scales, such as the "Motivational Scale for Sport Volunteers," and the VFI, to explore reasons behind volunteer participation. Research includes understanding motivations at events like the Universiade 2005 Izmir Summer Games and the 17th Mediterranean Games. Other studies examine

university students' perceptions of volunteering perceptions and their motivations.^{2,22,13,24}

Life satisfaction, which is a cognitive process, involves evaluating life quality based on self-chosen criteria.^{23,20} It represents the positive outcome of comparing personal expectations with current realities.¹⁷ Positive life satisfaction involves general happiness and a positive evaluation of one's entire life, influenced by multiple factors. Evaluations are based on comparing life conditions with personal standards, and positive life satisfaction is indicated by more favorable evaluations than negative ones.²⁰

Several components influence life satisfaction, including income, social status, government policies, relationships with family, and social environment.³ Life satisfaction is dynamic and affected by personal circumstances, daily pleasures, goal achievement, personal identity, physical wellbeing, and social relations.²¹ Social support from close relationships, including spouses, children, and friends, positively impacts life satisfaction.¹ Factors such as positive identity, freedom, broad social circles, political stability, mental and physical health, and good family relationships are also significant contributors to life satisfaction.^{18,9}

This study conducted with physiotherapists explores the impact of individual social responsibility and volunteerism on life satisfaction, and the interplay among these three factors forms the core issue of the research.

Method

Participants

The research population consists of physiotherapists who have graduated in their field and are currently practicing in Türkiye. The sample was selected randomly from individuals who received the e-form via email and social media links. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Istanbul University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee. Out of 500 physiotherapists contacted, 115 agreed to complete the form and were included in the study.

Scales

Three different scales were used as data collection tools in the research, with written permission obtained from their developers. These include the Individual Social Responsibility Scale developed by Eraslan, the Volunteer Motivation Inventory developed by Esmond and Dunlop and adapted to Turkish by Çevik, and the Life Satisfaction Scale developed by Diener et al. and adapted to Turkish by Yetim.^{11,20} Additionally, a Demographic Information Form with some questions was added to the scale forms to more fully describe the participants.

The Individual Social Responsibility Scale consists of 32 items on a 5-point Likert scale (1: Strongly Disagree – 5: Strongly Agree); the Volunteer Motivation Inventory consists of 44 items on a 5-point Likert scale (1: Definitely Disagree – 5: Definitely Agree); and the Life Satisfaction Scale consists of 7 items on a 7-point Likert scale (1: Definitely Disagree – 7: Definitely Agree). The SPSS 21.0 program was used for the analysis of data obtained through questionnaire forms. Collected data were analyzed using arithmetic mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage calculations. The Spearman correlation test was used for correlation analysis when parametric test assumptions were met. The relationship between individual social responsibility, volunteer motivation, and life satisfaction was examined through correlation analysis.

Limitations and Direction

The main limitations of this study include the sample size, the study being conducted solely with

physiotherapists, the use of three scales, limitations related to the age and gender of the interviewers, and the correlation studies between the three scales.

This research investigated the levels of individual social responsibility, the relationship between volunteer motivation and life satisfaction among physiotherapists. In this context, 115 physiotherapists were reached online. The levels of individual social responsibility and volunteer motivations of physiotherapists were examined by breaking them down into sub-dimensions, and whether the sub-dimensions of individual social responsibility and volunteer motivation vary depending on age and gender demographic variables was also explored. Future research could expand demographic factors for various comparisons. Additionally, the number of participating physiotherapists could be increased.

Findings

Table 1. Distribution of Demographic Information

		n	%
Gender	Male	32	27,80
	Female	83	72,20
Age	24 and under	37	32,20
	25-34	38	33,00
	35-44	22	19,10
	45 and older	18	15,70

Source: all tables are based on the data from the research

The table presents the demographic information of the participants. Accordingly, 72.2% of the participants are female, and 27.8% are male. The age group of 25-34 years constitutes 33% of the sample, while those aged 24 and under account for 32.2%.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	mean	sd.	min.	max.	skewness	Kurtosis
Social Responsibility Awareness	24,05	3,39	14	30	-0,129	-0,398
<i>Environmental Responsibility</i>	16,10	2,61	4	20	-0,974	3,141*
<i>Social Solidarity</i>	8,82	1,49	2	10	-1,833	4,857*
<i>Sensitivity</i>	10,13	1,39	5	13	-0,852	2,258
<i>Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups</i>	4,17	1,40	2	9	0,615	0,787
<i>Societal Interest</i>	5,66	1,74	3	11	0,404	0,039
<i>Volunteering</i>	11,32	1,79	3	15	-0,815	3,026*
<i>Foresight</i>	2,13	0,89	0	5	0,790	1,134
<i>Adoption of Social Responsibility</i>	4,97	1,53	2	10	0,284	0,019
Individual Social Responsibility Total	87,36	5,87	73	102	0,006	-0,373
<i>Values</i>	19,88	2,82	9	25	-0,749	1,645
<i>Appreciation</i>	16,05	2,45	9	23	0,398	0,864
<i>Social Effects</i>	14,13	2,61	7	20	-0,391	0,104
<i>Reciprocity</i>	7,01	1,67	2	10	-0,395	-0,067
<i>Reactivity</i>	14,43	2,40	7	20	-0,322	-0,162
<i>Self-Esteem</i>	18,16	2,72	8	25	-0,247	1,028
<i>Social</i>	13,82	3,89	5	25	0,259	0,217
<i>Career Development</i>	12,42	1,99	8	17	0,192	-0,186
<i>Understanding</i>	19,43	3,04	8	25	-1,142	2,709
<i>Protective</i>	16,50	3,58	5	25	-0,286	0,697
Volunteer Motivation Inventory	151,83	19,75	76	212	-0,026	1,794
Life Satisfaction Scale	21,70	6,43	7	35	-0,237	-0,638

For the purpose of determining the conformity of the data obtained from the scales to the normal distribution, skewness and kurtosis values have been calculated. The skewness and kurtosis values derived from the scales are considered sufficient for a normal distribution if they fall between +3 and -3.^{12,19,15,6} According to the obtained skewness and kurtosis values, the sub-dimensions of

Environmental Responsibility, Social Solidarity, and Volunteering do not exhibit a normal distribution. Therefore, non-parametric methods will be used for these sub-dimensions. Parametric methods will be employed for other scales and sub-dimensions that demonstrate conformity to normal distribution.

Table 3. Correlation analysis of scales and sub-dimensions

		Social Responsibility Aware	Environmental Responsibility**	Social Solidarity**	Sensitivity	Awareness of Disadvantaged groups	Societal Interest	Volunteering**	Foresight	Adoption of Social Responsibility	Individual Social Responsibility Total
Values	r	0,660	0,517	0,500	0,290	-0,564	-0,446	0,412	-0,203	-0,206	0,572
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*	0,002*	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*	0,030*	0,027*	0,000*
Appreciation	r	0,169	0,314	-0,046	0,170	-0,061	-0,041	0,010	0,149	-0,046	0,286
	p	0,072	0,001*	0,628	0,069	0,515	0,662	0,912	0,112	0,622	0,002*
Social Effects	r	0,254	0,279	0,243	0,034	-0,265	-0,143	0,152	-0,225	-0,028	0,216
	p	0,006*	0,003*	0,009*	0,720	0,004*	0,128	0,106	0,016*	0,769	0,020*
Reciprocity	r	0,369	0,266	0,333	0,207	-0,346	-0,241	0,217	-0,124	-0,072	0,335
	p	0,000*	0,004*	0,000*	0,026*	0,000*	0,009*	0,020*	0,185	0,444	0,000*
Reactivity	r	0,410	0,344	0,247	0,193	-0,292	-0,298	0,124	0,064	-0,064	0,361
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,008*	0,038*	0,002*	0,001*	0,186	0,498	0,498	0,000*
Self-Esteem	r	0,316	0,345	0,170	0,249	-0,214	-0,235	0,053	-0,048	-0,085	0,310
	p	0,001*	0,000*	0,070	0,007*	0,022*	0,011*	0,571	0,610	0,365	0,001*
Social	r	0,005	0,109	-0,087	0,027	0,086	0,040	-0,006	0,047	-0,058	0,083
	p	0,954	0,244	0,356	0,773	0,360	0,670	0,952	0,615	0,536	0,378
Career Development	r	-0,071	0,080	-0,057	0,031	0,032	0,072	-0,028	-0,006	-0,126	-0,052
	p	0,452	0,397	0,542	0,744	0,737	0,446	0,769	0,947	0,180	0,582
Understanding	r	0,467	0,559	0,314	0,132	-0,534	-0,271	0,122	-0,305	-0,132	0,376
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,001*	0,161	0,000*	0,003*	0,196	0,001*	0,161	0,000*
Protective	r	0,249	0,228	0,159	0,165	-0,269	-0,153	0,001	-0,059	-0,007	0,249
	p	0,007*	0,014*	0,090	0,079	0,004*	0,103	0,992	0,530	0,939	0,007*
Volunteer Motivation Inventory	r	0,384	0,399	0,237	0,201	-0,328	-0,231	0,152	-0,099	-0,110	0,375
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,011*	0,031*	0,000*	0,013*	0,106	0,294	0,241	0,000*
Life Satisfaction Scale	r	0,142	0,166	0,050	-0,008	-0,078	-0,142	0,122	-0,036	-0,095	0,109
	p	0,131	0,077	0,598	0,929	0,406	0,131	0,192	0,703	0,311	0,244

The table displays the relationship test results for the scales and sub-dimensions. The correlation coefficients are interpreted according to Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan as follows:²⁵ 0-0.25 signifies a very weak relationship, 0.26-0.49 a weak relationship, 0.50-0.69 a moderate relationship, 0.70-0.89 a strong relationship, and 0.90-1.00 a very strong relationship. Accordingly:

The Values sub-dimension score shows moderate positive relationships with Awareness of Social Responsibility ($r=0.660$), Environmental Responsibility ($r=0.517$), Social Solidarity ($r=0.500$), and Total Individual Social Responsibility ($r=0.572$), and weak positive

relationships with Sensitivity ($r=0.290$). Weak negative relationships exist with Societal Interest ($r=-0.446$), Foresight ($r=-0.203$), and Adoption of Social Responsibility ($r=-0.206$). The Appreciation sub-dimension has weak positive relationships with Environmental Responsibility ($r=0.314$) and Total Individual Social Responsibility ($r=0.286$). The Social Impact sub-dimension shows weak positive relationships with Awareness of Social Responsibility ($r=0.254$), Environmental Responsibility ($r=0.279$), and weak negative relationships with Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups ($r=-0.265$). Other sub-dimensions show varying weak positive and negative relationships with these factors.

The table 5 presented compares scale scores based on participants' genders, using an independent groups t-test for the general scores and the Mann-Whitney U test specifically for Environmental Responsibility, Social Cohesion, and Voluntarism.

The analytical results reveal:

The analysis shows significant gender differences in various sub-dimensions of social responsibility. Females scored significantly higher than males in

Awareness of Social Responsibility ($p<0.05$), Environmental Responsibility ($p<0.05$), Social Cohesion ($p<0.05$), Individual Responsibility Total Score ($p<0.05$), Reciprocity ($p<0.05$), and Understanding ($p<0.05$). Conversely, males scored significantly higher than females in Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups ($p<0.05$). These findings suggest that females generally exhibit higher social responsibility scores across most sub-dimensions compared to males.

Table 4. Comparison of Scale Scores in Terms of Participants' Gender

	Male		Female		t/z	P
	Medium	sd.	medium.	sd.		
<i>Social Responsibility Awareness</i>	23,03	3,85	24,45	3,14	-2,031	0,045*
<i>Environmental Responsibility **</i>	15,38	2,30	16,39	2,68	-2,505	0,012*
<i>Social Solidarity **</i>	8,22	2,04	9,05	1,15	-2,021	0,043*
<i>Sensitivity</i>	9,94	1,59	10,20	1,31	-0,922	0,359
<i>Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups</i>	4,75	1,63	3,94	1,24	2,865	0,005*
<i>Societal Interest</i>	6,00	2,05	5,53	1,60	1,304	0,195
<i>Volunteering **</i>	10,97	2,31	11,46	1,54	-0,724	0,469
<i>Foresight</i>	2,28	0,99	2,07	0,85	1,125	0,263
<i>Adoption of Social Responsibility</i>	5,06	1,48	4,94	1,56	0,384	0,702
Individual Social Responsibility Total	85,63	6,04	88,02	5,70	-1,990	0,049*
<i>Values</i>	18,97	2,90	20,23	2,72	-2,186	0,031*
<i>Appreciation</i>	15,97	2,56	16,08	2,42	-0,226	0,822
<i>Social Effects</i>	13,91	2,49	14,22	2,67	-0,569	0,570
<i>Reciprocity</i>	6,50	1,74	7,20	1,61	-2,060	0,042*
<i>Reactivity</i>	14,16	2,58	14,53	2,33	-0,747	0,456
<i>Self-Esteem</i>	17,81	2,72	18,29	2,73	-0,840	0,403
<i>Social</i>	14,38	3,86	13,60	3,90	0,955	0,342
<i>Career Development</i>	12,47	2,08	12,40	1,97	0,171	0,865
<i>Understanding</i>	18,44	3,04	19,82	2,97	-2,223	0,028*
<i>Protective</i>	15,69	3,31	16,82	3,65	-1,529	0,129
Volunteer Motivation Inventory	148,28	19,46	153,19	19,80	-1,198	0,234
Life Satisfaction Scale	21,34	6,44	21,84	6,47	-0,372	0,711

Table 5. The Comparison of Scale Scores by Gender of Participants

	24 and under		25-34		35-44		45 and older		F/H	P
	medium	sd.	medium	sd.	medium	sd.	medium	sd.		
Social Responsibility Awareness	24,54	3,86	23,97	2,98	22,82	2,72	24,72	3,75	1,486	0,222
<i>Environmental Responsibility</i> **	16,73	3,08	16,03	2,38	15,23	2,25	16,06	2,29	7,949	0,047*
<i>Social Solidarity</i> **	9,00	1,51	8,92	1,32	8,23	1,90	8,94	1,11	4,355	0,226
<i>Sensitivity</i>	10,27	1,47	10,37	1,30	9,45	1,63	10,17	0,86	2,302	0,081
<i>Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups</i>	3,95	1,35	4,11	1,27	5,00	1,57	3,72	1,23	3,786	0,013*
<i>Societal Interest</i>	5,05	1,58	5,68	1,56	6,55	1,63	5,78	2,13	3,681	0,014*
<i>Volunteering</i> **	11,46	1,59	10,87	1,40	11,32	1,89	12,00	2,54	10,217	0,017*
<i>Foresight</i>	2,14	0,92	2,11	0,80	2,45	1,10	1,78	0,65	1,957	0,125
<i>Adoption of Social Responsibility</i>	5,00	1,68	5,13	1,38	4,95	1,46	4,61	1,65	0,470	0,704
Individual Social Responsibility Total	88,14	6,70	87,18	5,09	86,00	6,10	87,78	5,44	0,645	0,588
<i>Values</i>	20,35	3,01	20,08	2,10	18,45	3,25	20,22	2,84	2,467	0,066
<i>Appreciation</i>	16,84	2,40	15,82	2,42	15,77	2,69	15,28	2,05	2,146	0,099
<i>Social Effects</i>	15,30	2,95	13,87	2,30	13,14	2,32	13,50	2,09	4,346	0,006*
<i>Reciprocity</i>	7,59	1,89	7,11	1,43	6,27	1,64	6,50	1,25	3,815	0,012*
<i>Reactivity</i>	15,27	2,23	14,79	2,13	13,41	2,54	13,17	2,31	5,336	0,002*
<i>Self-Esteem</i>	19,41	2,65	18,13	2,38	16,82	2,72	17,28	2,61	5,596	0,001*
<i>Social</i>	14,73	4,24	13,00	3,84	13,64	3,69	13,89	3,31	1,267	0,289
<i>Career Development</i>	13,14	1,84	12,37	1,91	11,59	2,04	12,06	2,04	3,254	0,024*
<i>Understanding</i>	20,70	2,87	19,53	2,60	17,68	3,37	18,78	2,80	5,454	0,002*
<i>Protective</i>	17,24	4,04	17,47	2,89	14,73	3,72	15,11	2,54	4,569	0,005*
Volunteer Motivation Inventory	160,57	21,02	152,16	15,52	141,50	21,34	145,78	15,76	5,592	0,001*
Life Satisfaction Scale	20,78	6,47	20,00	6,91	24,77	5,11	23,44	5,39	3,458	0,019*

In the table, the comparison of scale scores by gender of participants through ANOVA tests, and the comparison for Environmental Responsibility, Social Solidarity, and Volunteering using the Kruskal Wallis H test are depicted. The results of the analyses indicate significant differences across age groups in various dimensions:

Participants aged 24 and under scored significantly higher than those aged 35-44 in Environmental Responsibility, Social Impact, Reciprocity,

Reactivity, Self-Esteem, Career Development, Understanding, Volunteer Motivation Inventory, and Protective sub-dimensions ($p < 0.05$). Participants aged 35-44 scored higher in Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups and Public Interest compared to other age groups ($p < 0.05$). Participants over 45 scored higher in Volunteering compared to those aged 25-34 ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, participants aged 35-44 had higher Life Satisfaction Scale scores than those aged 25-34 ($p < 0.05$).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study explores the complex relationship between physiotherapists' levels of individual social responsibility (ISR) and their volunteer motivation. The findings reveal a moderate positive correlation between the Values sub-dimension of volunteer motivation and various ISR components, such as Awareness of Social Responsibility, Environmental Responsibility, and Social Solidarity. This suggests that physiotherapists motivated by altruistic values are more likely to engage in socially responsible behaviors, supporting the idea that volunteerism driven by core values fosters a broader sense of social duty.⁵

Conversely, the weak negative relationship between the Values sub-dimension and aspects such as Public Interest and Proactivity reveals a skepticism among some physiotherapists about the necessity of individual social responsibility. This dichotomy reflects the tension between intrinsic volunteer motivations and the perceived efficacy or necessity of ISR, underscoring the complexity of motivations behind volunteering.¹¹

The positive correlations between Appreciation and ISR components, including Environmental Responsibility, suggest that recognition and appreciation enhance social responsibility. Similarly, the positive relationship between Reciprocity and ISR dimensions like Social Solidarity indicates that a belief in mutual support drives socially responsible behaviors. These findings highlight that volunteer motivations rooted in social appreciation and reciprocity can significantly enhance ISR.⁹

However, the negative correlations observed with Awareness of Disadvantaged Groups and Public Interest across several sub-dimensions of volunteer motivation indicate potential barriers in extending ISR to broader societal contexts. This might reflect a lack of confidence among physiotherapists in addressing societal issues effectively through volunteer efforts.

Overall, the study demonstrates that while altruistic and appreciative motivations enhance ISR, skepticism about the efficacy of individual efforts in broader social contexts poses a challenge.

Addressing these concerns through targeted interventions could further integrate volunteer motivation with social responsibility, enhancing the overall impact of physiotherapists' contributions to society.

In conclusion, the study finds that physiotherapists with higher individual social responsibility also tend to have higher volunteer motivation, although no significant relationship was found between individual social responsibility and life satisfaction. The three scales were also analyzed in relation to the physiotherapists' age and gender, with a detailed examination of the relationships between the sub-factors of volunteer motivation and individual social responsibility. The results show that women, compared to men, and younger individuals, compared to older ones, tend to have higher levels of individual social responsibility, volunteer motivation, and life satisfaction. These findings suggest that future research should further explore the effects of age differences, as the distribution of individual social responsibility, volunteerism, and life satisfaction may vary significantly across age groups.

References

1. Adams, DL. Correlates of satisfaction among the elderly. *Gerontologist*.1971; 11: 64–68
2. Akman P. Effects of Motives, Volunteer Role Identity and Sense of Community on Sustained Volunteering. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü; 2008.
3. Appleton, S, Song, L. Life satisfaction in urban China: components and determinants. *World Development*.2008; 36: 11.
4. Aquino, K, Reed II, A.2002. The Self-Importance of Moral Identity, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002; 83(6): 1423-1440.
5. Clary EG, Snyder M, Ridge R. Volunteers' motivations: a functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 1992; 2: 333-350.
6. De Carlo, Lawrence T. On the Meaning and Use of Kurtosis, *Psychological Methods*. 1997; 2(3): 292-307.
7. Dias, LP. *Beginnings Human Relations* (v.1.0). 2012; [updated 2012; cited 2023 Nov 23]. Available from:<http://2012books.lardbucket.org>
8. Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1985; 49 (1): 71-75.

9. Dockery A. Happiness, Life Satisfaction and The Role of Work: Evidence from Two Australian Surveys, Unpublished Mimeo. 2004; [updated 2004; cited 2023 Dec 21]. Available from: https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/assets/documents/hilda-bibliography/working-discussion-research-papers/2001-2004/Dockery_happiness_life_satisfaction.pdf
10. Eraslan L. Bireysel sosyal sorumluluk ölçeğinin (BSS) geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması, Eğitim - Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi. 2011; 7(24): 81-91.
11. Esmond J, Dunlop E. Developing the Volunteer Motivation Inventory to Assess the Underlying Motivational Drives of Volunteers in Western Australia. Lotterywest Social Research Grant. 2004; 10(6): 1-81.
12. Groeneveld Richard A, Glen Meeden. Measuring Skewness and Kurtosis. The Statistician. 1984; 33: 391-399.
13. Güzel P, Ünlü H, Özbey S, Esentaş M. Gönüllülük ve Uluslararası Spor Organizasyonları:XVII: Akdeniz Oyunları. II. Rekreasyon Araştırma Kongresi, October 31 November 03 Kuşadası, Aydın; 2013 (SUPPL):S166-180.
14. Hatch C, Stephan S. Gender Effects on Perceptions of Individual and Corporate Social Responsibility, Scholarship and Professional Work, Business. 2015; 17(3): 63-71.
15. Hopkins Kenneth D, Douglas L W. Tests for Normality and Measures of Skewness and Kurtosis: Their Place in Research Reporting. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 1990; 50: 717-729.
16. Horton-Smith, D. Altruism, volunteers, and volunteerism. Journal of Voluntary Action Research. 1981; 10: 21-36.
17. Haybron DM. Happiness and the Importance of Life Satisfaction. Department of Philosophy, University of Arizona Draft.2004; [updated 2004; cited 2023 Dec 21]. Available from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.199.9197&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
18. Khakoo IG. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor December 14, Quality of Life: Satisfaction & Its Subjective Determinants: 2004; [updated 2004; cited 2023 Dec 21]. Available from: http://www.datafirst.uct.ac.za/saproject/sa_project/workshop/spp_projects/project.imraan.khakoo.pdf
19. Moors JJA. The Meaning of Kurtosis: Darlington Reexamined. The American Statistician. 1986; 40: 283-284
20. Myers DG, Diener E. Who is happy? Psychological Science. 1995; (6): 1:10-16.
21. Schmitter AC. Life satisfaction in centenarians residing in long-term care. 2003; [updated 2003; cited 2023 Dec 21]. Available from: <http://www.mmhc.com/articles/NHM9912/cutillo.html>.
22. Sertbaş K. Üniversite2005 İzmir Oyunlarında Görevli Gönüllü İnsan Kaynaklarının, Organizasyona Katılım Nedenleri Ve Motivasyonel Faktörlerin Analizi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü; 2006.
23. Shin DC, Johnson D M. Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. Social Indicators Research. 1978; 5: 475-492.
24. Şentürk M, Adıgüzel Y, Turan B. Üniversitede gönüllü olmak-Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Gönüllülük Algıları, Eğilimleri ve Deneyimleri Araştırması: İstanbul Üniversitesi Örneği. 1st Ed. İstanbul: Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kurumu; 2016.
25. Yazıcıoğlu Y., Erdoğan S. SPSS Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. 1st ed. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık; 2014.



Social Medicine
Health For All

ISSN: 1557-7112