

Social Exchange Theory, Interpersonal Communication
Motives, And Volunteerism:
Identifying Motivation to Volunteer and The Rewards and
Costs Associated

Michael W. Corrigan

Thesis Submitted To The
College Of Arts And Sciences
At West Virginia University
In Partial Fulfillment Of The
Requirements For The Degree Of

Master of Arts
In
Communication Studies

Matthew M. Martin, Ph.D., Chair
Kevin M. Leyden, Ph.D.
Katherine Thweatt, Ed.D.

Department of Communication Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia
2001

Keywords: Volunteerism, Social Exchange Theory,
Interpersonal Communication Motives, Motivation, Rewards,
Costs, Egotistic, and Altruistic.

© Copyright 2001 Michael W. Corrigan

The research objective of this study was to identify the motives behind an individual's reasons for volunteering and discuss the equilibrium of rewards versus costs needed in order to sustain and better manage volunteer staffs. The participants for this study were drawn from a sample population of 177 individuals from three states (Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia) who actively participated as volunteers. The sample participants were active volunteers in six different organizations that assisted hospital patients, underprivileged or at-risk youth, church related concerns, schools, and other miscellaneous services. Answers to the research questions proposed in this study offered a start to a more comprehensive application of communication theory to volunteerism. From the results one can assume that Interpersonal Communication Motives play a strong role in determining what motivates an individual to volunteer. Where rewards and costs more likely play a more definitive role in determining whether a volunteer continues to donate their time and energies.

Acknowledgements

A special thank you goes out to the following list of wonderful people and pets:

Amanda- Thanks for always being the word of encouragement I could count on in the dimmest hours of despair. I promise to never make you discuss communication theory ever again. Yeah, right. ☺

Matt- You are the man! Your support, patience, wisdom and experience were and always will be irreplaceable.

Kevin- Without you I would be bowling alone in our mission to build community.

Dr. Pat- Thanks for never giving up on me and your continued support of "Corriganism."

Bear- Thanks for staying up all of those long nights with me. I don't know how I could have got by without you licking my feet for hours on end.

Ginger- You're the best watch dog in the world. Keep up the good bark.

Fellow

Classmates- Thanks for welcoming "the old man next to Dave" back into the college life and allowing me to be apart of a wonderful experience. Cheers!

And last but not least, I would like to thank all of the volunteer agencies that so gladly donated their time and energies to make this study possible.

"How far that little candle throws his beams! So shines a good deed in a naughty world." Shakespeare

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

For millions of Americans, volunteering is an essential element to wellness and feeling positive about one's self. By contributing a few hours a week to a good cause (i.e. underprivileged or challenged youth groups, retirement homes, hospitals, etc.), volunteers often experience positive feedback that can correlate to higher self-competence and self-liking (Bosson & Swann, 1999). Ideally, through helping others, one's self-worth is elevated and as a result an individual can find meaningful interaction and higher status in society.

This research explores the reasoning behind these "shining" examples of goodwill and the individual motives as to why so many exchange their personal time and energies in search for such rewards. By applying Social Exchange Theory (SET) and measuring the interpersonal communication motives most often identified in active volunteers, this study hopes to gain additional insight into motivation to volunteer (MTV) and provide useful data for applied use in the profit and non-profit organizational sectors. Past research has proposed that recruiting efforts might improve

the personnel situation by placing greater emphasis on altruistic service motives of volunteers (Shyles, & Ross, 1984). The research objective of this study is to identify the motives behind an individual's reasons for volunteering and discuss the equilibrium of rewards versus costs needed in order to sustain and better manage volunteer staffs.

Volunteerism

Research has shown that helping others is good for the soul and may be good for the body as well. A University of Michigan longitudinal study of 1,000 older adults over an 8-year period found that those who volunteer experience a higher survival rate than those who did not volunteer (Consumer Reports on Health, 1999). There are many psychological studies on helping behavior that confirm the importance of altruism in everyday life (Piliavin & Chang, 1990). Friends, neighbors, and family members help each other, and strangers benefit from the spontaneous Good Samaritan efforts of others (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1994). For these reasons and many more, volunteering has become an American tradition and a valuable asset to the American economy.

The spirit of volunteerism first swept America in the nineteenth century. Initially fueled by religious revivals in the 1820's, the first generation of volunteers were

drawn to charity in a very personal and religious way (McCarthy, 1982). However, increasingly throughout the twentieth century, those who became wealthy withdrew from direct community involvement and were replaced by a corps of middle class professionals and bureaucrats who standardized charitable services (McCarthy, 1982). Today's volunteer efforts are a reflection of this historical development and diversified growth of the American volunteer force.

One trend pointing towards this continuous growth of volunteer demand is that many voluntary, public, and private human service agencies are recruiting volunteers to complement and enrich service delivery (Cnaan, 1990). Volunteers enable administrators to sustain current services and expand both the quantity and diversity of services without exhausting the agency's budget (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). Additionally, volunteers are expected to be better employees, more enthusiastic, and more involved (Stohl & Jennings, 1988). Upon further examining demographic differences, from the early 1990's, between the 95 million plus who volunteered and those who did not, it was found that women volunteered more than men, whites more than minorities, and those with higher incomes more than those with lower incomes (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991).

Similar findings were discovered in the early 1970's, when Rosenthal and Rosnow (1975) found that due to volunteer work often precluding paid employment, the average volunteer was usually younger, better educated, high in need of social approval, and of higher socioeconomic status. In other words, the average volunteer is normally a higher educated, well-established, eager, young worker who does not receive pay. These are the volunteers whom many administrators would prefer to attract, and one way to attract such volunteers would be to appeal to their motives so long as such motives are known. However, prior to identifying the MTV, the first step is to further identify these "free workers" (i.e. where are these volunteers?).

In 1989, 68.3% of the volunteer hours were donated to non-profit organizations, 5.6% to for-profits, and 26.1% to government, mostly local public schools (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1992). In 1993, the value of volunteer labor provided to American organizations was an estimated \$182.3 billion according to the Independent Sector, a Washington, D.C. research group (Rose-Ackerman, 1996). At an average of 5 hours a week per volunteer, organizations received nearly twenty billion hours in service a year in the early 1990's.

According to the Independent Sector, nearly 50% of Americans, 109 million, are currently volunteering—14% more than in 1995 (Christian Science Monitor, December 1999). However, the Independent Sector research also discovered that although millions more were volunteering, they were “doling out their valuable hours in ever-smaller proportions” (Christian Science Monitor, December 1999). The average volunteer put in 3.5 hours per week in 1999, down nearly an hour from 1995 according to Independent Sector. This decrease in volunteer hours is already being felt by organizations across America in shortages of staff to handle crisis hotlines and other organization needs (Wall Street Journal, November 1999).

Sara Melendez, president of Independent Sector, cautioned that it’s too early to draw conclusions from the decreasing numbers of average volunteer efforts (Christian Science Monitor, December 1999). She noted that this new volunteering trend “mirrors the way Americans live nowadays: working and traveling more, and having to volunteer sporadically or through their work place”(p. 20). However, with the volunteer force playing such a crucial part in the American economy, it is of importance to take a closer look at what can motivate an individual to volunteer and continue to volunteer.

Motivation to volunteer (MTV) requires careful consideration by both the organization and the individual because recruitment and selection of volunteers is a costly, time-consuming joint process that can be critical to the future use of volunteers in an agency (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). Although the motives that initially influence people to volunteer may differ from those that influence their decision to continue to volunteer (Gidron, 1984), it is important to understand the initial motivation of those who remain as volunteers for a long period (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). Therefore, considering the negative stigma sometimes associated with egotistic self-interest or the practice of satisfying personal needs and drives one might question if the act of social exchange in volunteering is initially altruistic or egotistic.

As James Coleman posed the question, how can we have both free riders (individuals concerned only with their own rewards) and zealots (individuals concerned with rewards for all involved) in similar social structures (Cook, 1987)? Will it matter if individuals are volunteering for a public-good or for private goods? The conclusion many have drawn is that it should not matter whether they are ego driven or altruistic in their motives (Cook, 1987). Individuals are perceived to interact with others in order

to obtain some kind of reward or an equitable exchange, and no matter if that reward is selfish or altruistic, the reputational concerns of the individual will most likely help to make them a cooperative volunteer (Chong, 1991, p 72). Evidence of this indiscriminant exchange is supported by the many equitable relationships that are formed within "required" (i.e. mandated by employer or school) volunteer partnerships (e.g. service learning programs) despite the lack of altruistic goals. However, let us not forget that the chance of an inequitable relationship is just as probable in altruistic motivated volunteer relationships (Hinck, 2000).

Volunteering, though often quite rewarding, occasionally results in frustration. Due to lack of trust and friendship, it is often more difficult to exchange love and money with a stranger rather than a friend (Roloff, 1981). Additionally, Douglas (1991) found that talking with strangers or acquaintances was less satisfying and comforting for people. Therefore, equitable relational interactions with strangers in the volunteer setting will most likely be more difficult to obtain than exchanges with personal friends (Gachter & Fehr, 1996). A major reason for leaving relationships is due to inequitable exchange of rewards and costs (Roloff, 1981). Active volunteers who are

reporting equitable and rewarding relationships are also the most motivated and are more likely to continue their services (Pandey, 1979). Many organizations are aware of this need of cost/reward equilibrium and in response are publishing numerous web sites on the internet that allow one to find an organization in search of volunteers that fit and match one's personal interests and goals.

Volunteers can gain experience in a possible field of study or build up their resumes for a new career path by exchanging their personal time. Some exchange their love and compassion for reinforcing gratitude in the form of a simple, reciprocating 'thank you' or smile (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978). Others spend time with less fortunate persons to meet requests by their employers, local law enforcement authority, or school to meet community service requirements.

This practice of organizationally encouraged volunteerism is becoming quite common in the American corporation and university. Burger King, for example, allows employees to take two paid hours a week to volunteer. First Union National Bank permits employees to volunteer up to four hours per month during working hours on education-related projects. Additionally, universities are implementing service learning programs for students to

apply their skills and share their knowledge outside of the classroom in the community. However, one must be careful not to set too high of an expectation of rewards to be received from volunteering.

Miller's (1997) study found that many students who took part in service learning programs that worked with children of poverty and incarcerated youth were left with negative feelings when they realized that they could not change the world or even help a few children (Hinck, 2000). Due to an inability to connect with these troubled youth (i.e. Strangers), they found themselves not wanting to be a part of the volunteer program. For these reasons it is of monumental importance that the volunteer relationship is reflective of an equitable exchange in order to obtain continued volunteerism. By employing Social Exchange Theory (SET) one can take a closer look at the cost and reward analysis considered by those who contemplate or participate as volunteers and possibly further aid to identify the motives behind the rewards sought.

Social Exchange Theory

Research studies done on adolescents considering volunteering showed that those who wanted to volunteer were brought up in an environment where giving was rewarded and encouraged (Hinck, 2000). This study showed that the act

of volunteering was not situational but due mostly to the process by which their parents had raised them. In contrast, other studies conducted have found support for situational reasons (i.e. required community service)(Cook, 1987). In both cases, the end result is most likely either positive reinforcement due to rewards gained or negative effects due to costs exceeding rewards gained from the interaction.

SET can be conceptualized as an expanded game matrix (Roloff, 1981). SET asserts that individuals think about their relationships in economic terms and then they tally up the costs to compare them to the perceived rewards that are offered (West & Turner, 2000). For instance, a younger neighbor might conceive an elderly neighbor giving them a hot baked apple pie as an equal exchange (i.e. costs = rewards) for reciprocating the favor of shoveling off the elderly neighbor's snow-covered sidewalk. The standard representing what individuals (volunteers) should receive in rewards for their costs (i.e. apple pie) is referred to as the comparison level (CL) (Roloff, 1981). When the individual does not receive rewards measuring up to one's expected return on costs and continue with the relationship, we refer to this as the comparison level for alternatives (Clalt) (Roloff, 1981).

In sum, SET is the voluntary transference of a random object or activity from one person to another in return for other objects or activities (Roloff, 1981). Psychological theorists have long recognized that interpersonal behavior is all about resource seeking (Foa & Foa, 1974). As a result there are numerous forms of the SET to account for the equally diverse number of resources people seek as reward for their interactions and behavior with others.

Michael Roloff (1981) discussed five of these differing theories on SET in his book Interpersonal Communication: The Social Exchange Approach. Roloff observed that the common theme amidst these theories is tied to the self-interest of both parties interacting. For our purposes we will concentrate on the Thibaut and Kelly SET, also known as the theory of interdependence (TOI), that assumes that people view life as a marketplace where rewards are sought for certain costs (West & Turner, 2000). Thibaut and Kelly asserted that individuals interact with others based on drive-reduction to maximize personal gains (rewards) and minimize personal losses (costs).

Therefore, each group's outcome is dependent upon the other group's behavior as well as their own behavior and motives. Thus theoretically assuming that one group's rewards sought will affect the other groups costs to be

given. As with economic exchange theory, the more defined these costs and sought rewards (i.e. Money for goods) are clarified, the more likely an equitable relationship can occur in the interaction (Foa & Foa, 1974). Further definitions of costs and rewards are important first steps to understanding SET more clearly.

Costs are the elements of relational life that have negative value to a person (Roloff, 1981). For example, a volunteer might consider time spent as a form of cost exchanged. Rewards are considered positively valued activities or objects that meet a person's needs or reduce a personal drive (Roloff, 1981). Blau (1964a), a social exchange theorist, described six types of social rewards: personal attraction, social acceptance, social approval, instrumental services, respect/prestige, and compliance/power (Roloff, 1981). In the case of volunteering this reward can take the form of learning, love, gratitude, perceived higher status associated with giving back to the community, and an overall sense of positive spirituality (Hinck, 2000). So what then constitutes an equitable reward?

Walster, Walster, and Berscheid (1978), in their book Equity: Theory and Research, predicted that in the year 2000 "humans will not only have somewhat different ideas as

who is entitled to a reward; they will also have a somewhat broader notion as to what constitutes reward" (pg.259).

With the arrival of the new millenium upon us, what then are the rewards volunteers seek? In an article published in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel in 1999, local volunteers discussed their participation in a variety of activities.

The following is an excerpt from the article:

One Saturday morning a month, Marian Byers fires up the commercial range in the basement kitchen of a south side church. Leading a small platoon of volunteers, she churns out several hundred servings of turkey parmigiana or salmon loaf drizzled with cream sauce, earning smiles from frayed or homeless men and women, some with babies on their hips.

They come to St. John's Episcopal Church for nourishment from the gathering interfaith meal ministry. There, Byers, a quality assurance technician in Northwestern Mutual Life's restaurant division, finds plenty of sustenance, too—of an intangible sort.

Helping out "is not a selfless thing for me because I get so much out of it," she said. "I'm the needy one."

At soup kitchens, community centers, restaurants and charity events, countless food professionals like

Byers donate their kitchen expertise to improve the lot of others. Their motivations may be as numerous as the peppercorns in a grinder, but personal satisfaction is the common ingredient.

(Source: Guensburg, 1999, p. G1)

Like Byers, many volunteers are just trying to feel better about themselves. However, a simple smile or 'thank you' satisfies not all volunteers. As the above example proposes, there are just as many desired rewards and motives as there are volunteers. All volunteers have their own personal agendas to fulfill, be it altruistic or egotistic.

The basic assumptions of Thibaut and Kelley's SET is that humans are rational beings that seek rewards and avoid punishments based upon the individual's standards to evaluate the costs and rewards (West & Turner, 2000). Additionally, Thibaut and Kelley believe that people often take part in this relational exchange in order to gain reinforcement (Roloff, 1981). Assuming that the relationships are interdependent in a relational life that is a process (West & Turner, 2000), then what are the motives that initiate the volunteer process? Due to a lack of recent quantitative research and scales linking SET and volunteerism, we must consider utilizing further research

into the motives and how such motives correlate with the costs and rewards associated with SET. To further explore this link between the cost and reward exchange let us now consider the research on motives to communicate.

Interpersonal Communication Motives

People use communication as a tool to mold their self-concepts (e.g. ego needs) (Rubin & Martin, 1998). Basic human needs produce motives to achieve particular goals that lead to development of plans and enactment of behaviors to ultimately gratify those needs (Rubin & Martin, 1998). Since needs and motives are often used interchangeably, the terms are sometimes confused. For our purposes we will define needs as the things we do not have, motives as the reason for actions to obtain these needs, goals as aims or intended purpose, and plans as organized strategies for action (Rubin & Martin, 1998).

In 1954, Maslow identified a five-level hierarchy of primary human needs. Maslow proposed that humans have a basic need for physiological necessities (i.e. food, water) and safety (protection from harm). In addition, Maslow identified three higher needs of social belonging, ego (self-esteem and approval), and self-actualization. The mass popularization of Maslow's hierarchy triangle model of ascending human needs has greatly influenced scientific

research into human behavior (Ruggiero, 1998). The Interpersonal Underworld by Schutz is one major study reflective of this influence.

In 1966, Schutz identified three reasons why "people need people": inclusion, control, and affection. Schutz' seminal studies found that people have three primary interpersonal needs: to be included in communication with others, to have control in their interpersonal behavior interactions, and to possibly gain affection from these encounters. Additionally, Schutz' measurements of fundamental interpersonal relations orientations (FIRO-B) were found to behave quite differently and independent of each other. Furthermore, Schutz posited that each of these primary needs produce different types of behavior dependent upon if the individual's behavior based on the need is best described as deficient, excessive, ideal, or of a pathological nature.

For example, inclusion is concerned with whether or not a relationship exists. Whereas affection and control are mainly concerned with relations already formed. Additionally, affection is always a one-to-one relationship, inclusion is a one-to-many relation, and control may be either one-to-one or one-to-many. Control differs from the other two even further with respect to the

differentiation between the persons involved in the control situation.

For instance, a person who likes to control does not often like to be controlled. Yet for inclusion and affection there is a tendency for participants to act similarly in both the behavior they express and the behavior they want from others (i.e. friendly people like other people to treat them friendly). There are other circumstances when people who like to include others do not want to be included themselves, but these are behavior types that are not as frequently identified.

However, many of these different behaviors within each need can be explained more fully when we consider whether the person contains a deficient, excessive, or ideally balanced disposition. For instance, an undersocial individual seeking inclusion will behave differently from an oversocial person. An undersocial might not claim to want to be included with others, but unconsciously craves to be a part of the interaction.

On the other hand, oversocial people tend to be extroverts that outwardly and internally show the same high need for inclusion. Additionally, when these inclusion needs are not met and a person experiences feeling of alienation, results often are reflective of a pathological

or psychopathic personality. Schutz' FIRO-B studies have served as origination and quantitative justification for the basis of much interpersonal communication motives research. From Schutz' findings we can further see the numerous different behaviors capable of being produced from just considering these three primary needs and/or motives.

However, in 1988, Rubin, Perse, and Barbato, identified three additional motives (through their studies of mass media communication) people have for communicating with each other: pleasure (need to be entertained and aroused), escape (need to avoid activities and communicating with others), and relaxation (need to unwind and rest). Furthermore, Rubin et al. surmised that control and escape motives correlated negatively with motivation to communicate, while affection, inclusion, relaxation, and pleasure had a positive relationship. In other words, those who possessed the negative motives were less likely to communicate with others, while those who were motivated positively were more likely to interact with others.

With these findings in mind, it is easier to see that different types of motivation lead to satisfying different types of needs. Rubin and Martin (1998) defined a motive as a relatively general disposition that will influence actions that are expected to lead to a particular kind of

consequence or goal. It is also assumed that motives can lead to different behaviors (Rubin, & Martin, 1998), especially when considering the different relationships that we interact within (Graham, Barbato, & Perse, 1993).

We can anticipate that our motives for communicating with others may differ and be reflected in whom we talk to (relationship level), how we talk with others (communicator style), and what we talk about (self-disclosure)(Graham, Barbato, & Perse, 1993). For example, a motive to communicate cannot exist independent of a partner (who), with whom one interacts in a given communicator style (how), concerning a particular subject (what) (Graham, Barbato, & Perse, 1993). Therefore the content of our volunteer interactions is dependent upon the volunteer circumstance, status of relationship with those in the volunteer setting, and the collective set of communication approaches and motives.

By measuring the motives most often found in numerous volunteer relationships, this study hopes to further explore the use and effects of the motives in volunteerism. Additionally, we question how these motive-reliant behaviors could possibly be in accordance with gaining rewards. By considering the relationships between these two relating theoretical approaches (i.e. SET and interpersonal

communication motives) one can see that there possibly are similarities and correlation that might exist. So what then are the reasons people volunteer?

Rationale

Do rewards have to equal or exceed costs in order for volunteerism to take place or continue? Are rewards the same as motives or are rewards the end result of our motives? It is the rationale of this study that research needs to be done on active volunteers to better identify volunteer's potential for success and to keep active volunteers satisfied with their efforts. This study hopes to find further information to shine some light on the relational exchange levels needed for volunteer program success.

Research on people's motives within groups, in general, suggests that when members interact to meet needs of inclusion and affection, and not to meet needs of control and escape, they experience greater satisfaction and perceive their groups as being more cohesive (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Martin & Anderson, 1998). In contrast, those who communicate for control needs are more goal oriented in their communicative behaviors and report higher levels of communication compared to group members with less pronounced control tendencies (Martin & Anderson, 1998).

Following this line of reasoning, volunteers with a high need for control might take a more active role in socializing others into groups, while highly motivated people might be more receptive and help promote group socialization (Anderson, Riddle, & Martin, 1999, p 147).

With a lack of recent research in the communication studies field on the motives to volunteer or altruistic acts, it is this author's opinion that such applied research can be a valuable asset to the public. Also such research can serve as support for the communication studies field as to the importance and usefulness of our field's focus of study. In the past, other social scientists have taken the position that such psychological reasons (or motives) behind volunteering or collective action participation cannot be measured accurately (Olson, 1971, pp. 60-63). Yet cursory examination of the reasons for volunteer participation reveals that selective material incentives for volunteering are seldom of sufficient value to constitute the primary motivating factor (Chong, 1991, p 32). Therefore the use of reliable interpersonal communication motive scales can possibly help to define such motives.

Answers to the proposed research could help save American organizations millions of dollars in training, as

well as saving millions of Americans time and energy by keeping individuals focused on volunteering in the right places that meet their individual or altruistic needs. To test these ideas and questions that are relevant to those who volunteer as well as the organizations that seek volunteers, the following research questions (RQ) were examined:

- RQ 1: What are the most often sought rewards?
- RQ 2: What are the most common costs associated with volunteerism?
- RQ 3A: Is volunteerism reliant upon comparison levels? Must rewards equal or exceed costs in order for volunteerism to be active?
- RQ 3B: Why would one continue to volunteer if costs outweigh rewards?
- RQ 4: What are the most prevalent MTVs?
- RQ 5: Do the interpersonal communication motives correlate significantly with MTVs?
- RQ 6: Are MTVs defining of or correlating to the rewards we seek?

CHAPTER 2

Method

Participants

The participants for this study were drawn from a sample population of 177 individuals from three states (Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia) who actively participated as volunteers. The sample participants were active volunteers in six different organizations that assisted hospital patients, underprivileged or at-risk youth, church related concerns, schools, and other miscellaneous services. All participants were required to have volunteered at least 3 hours a month for the past 2 months prior to the administering of survey.

The average number of hours volunteered per month was 26 hours with a range from 3 to 160 hours. The average length of volunteer months spent at the organizations was 38 months with a range from 2 to 180 months. The mean age of the sample was 46 with a range from 18 to 88. There were 131 females and 41 males with 5 non-reports. Furthermore, 49 participants were single, 87 were married, 10 were divorced, and 20 were widowed (11 non-reports). Education levels ranged from: 6 junior high level education, 82 high school level education, 50 college level education, and 33 with graduate degrees (6 non-reports).

Demographic analysis also found that 60 participants were employed full-time, 24 were employed part-time, and 79 reported no employment (14 non-reports). Many of the participants who reported being unemployed noted that they were either full-time students or retired. The average personal income of the participants was \$26,000 with a range from \$0 to \$100,000. The average household income was \$44,944 with a range from \$0 to \$125,000.

Religious demographics were reported as follows: 88 participants attended church weekly, 11 participants attended bi-monthly, 14 participants attended monthly, 31 participants attended a few times a year, and 24 participants reported never attending church (9 non-reports). Measurements concerning past volunteer experience found that 124 participants reported previously volunteering at another organization and 50 participants reported never volunteering before (3 non-reports). Additionally, 69 participants reported that their parents had volunteered and 103 reported that parents had not ever volunteered.

Procedure

Participants completed a multiple scale survey to help clarify the rewards and costs associated with motivation to volunteer and to measure the interpersonal communication

motives most prevalent in the sample. Additionally a typology was used to identify the motives as to why they volunteer. Participants were asked to respond to the survey as they pertain to the agency that the volunteer activity is taking place. The surveys were distributed to the participating agencies and the staff was trained to administer the survey under procedures in accordance with guidelines for research with human participants (American Psychological Association and the institution involved). All surveys upon completion were inserted into attached envelope by participants and sealed to insure complete anonymity.

Instruments

There are three main concerns for this study. The first is the strength and level of equitability exchange of the relationship between volunteers perceived rewards and costs. The second is the identification of MTVs. And the third is to measure and correlate the findings with interpersonal communication motives. Exchange is measured through a series of open-ended self-report questions (i.e. What rewards have you received from volunteering?) that allowed the volunteer to identify qualitatively and rate quantitatively the rewards and costs obtained and given. The answers were then coded, categorized, and analyzed to

identify the rewards and costs most often associated with volunteers. Additionally, the motives were measured through a coded self-report question as well as two additional motives based measurements.

The first such measurement is the interpersonal communication motives (ICM) scale. ICM is a highly reliable 28-item, six-factor instrument ($\alpha=.93$). Each sub-scale was reliable as well and achieved the following reliability alphas: pleasure, $\alpha=.89$; affection, $\alpha=.83$; inclusion, $\alpha=.91$; escape, $\alpha=.88$; relaxation, $\alpha=.91$; control, $\alpha=.76$. Respondents indicated how much a series of 28 statements are like their own reasons for talking to a person at a single relationship (5= exactly, 1= not at all).

Likewise, MTV ($\alpha=.80$), a 28-item Likert-type measurement motives-based volunteer survey (1 to 5 with 5 being the highest level of agreement) developed by Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) was administered to identify the volunteer relationship motives. Although past studies proposed MTV to be a unidimensional scale, factor analysis in this study found more support for a typology and no such evidence of unidimensionality. However, the findings from treating this scale as unidimensional were very interesting and correlated significantly with many other variables.

The questions of importance in this survey were to determine the most prevalent costs and rewards, perceived equitable exchanges of costs and rewards associated with volunteerism, and identifying MTVs and ICMS most common to the sample. Copies of the instruments are included in Appendix A.

CHAPTER 3

Results

Research Question One (RQ1) inquired as to what the most often sought rewards are in a volunteer. Self reported rewards were placed into 25 different categories. Frequency distribution of the 25 rewards was analyzed to identify the top 10 most commonly reported rewards. The three most commonly identified rewards were: (1.) making friends, (2.) personal satisfaction, and (3.) helping others. See Table 1 in Appendix A for findings.

Research Question Two (RQ2) inquired and measured the most common costs associated with volunteering. Self reported costs were placed into 10 different categories. Frequency distribution of the 10 costs was analyzed to identify the 10 most commonly reported costs. The three most commonly identified costs were: (1.) none (i.e. No costs), (2.) transportation expenses, and (3.) time. See Table 2 in Appendix A for findings.

Research Question Three A (RQ3A) sought to measure if volunteers would continue to volunteer even if costs outweighed rewards. Results of a t-test supported the belief that the majority of the volunteers would continue to serve in spite of costs outweighing rewards. A total of 105 participants reported that they would continue

volunteering even if costs outweighed rewards. In contrast, 37 participants reported that they would not continue if costs outweighed rewards. T-test results found no significant differences between those who answered yes to continuing compared to those who answered no ($t(140) = .79$; $p > .05$) to continuing (for the yes group, $M = 5.88$, $SD = 3.22$; for the no group, $M = 5.41$, $SD = 2.80$).

RQ3B was based on a survey question that asked for a self-report qualitative answer as to why one might continue to volunteer in spite of costs outweighing rewards. Most of the answers were reflective of the phrase "the cause is greater than the costs." Many of the participants who responded to RQ3B reported that the "costs are not an issue" and that it was part of the act of volunteering. Findings on these qualitative answers will be addressed in more depth in the discussion section.

RQ4 measured the most prevalent MTVs found in the volunteer sample. Descriptive statistics were performed on the 28-item MTV typology. The most commonly reported motivation to volunteer was that "Volunteering is an opportunity to do worthwhile" ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 0.54$). The least commonly reported motivation to volunteer was "I was lonely" ($M = 1.74$, $SD = 1.28$). See Table 3 in Appendix A for findings.

Research Question Five (RQ5) questioned whether the interpersonal communication motives (ICMs) would correlate significantly with the motivations to volunteer (MTVs). Results of a Pearson Correlation did find significant correlations between MTVs and all sub-scales of the ICM scale. The MTVs that were most positively related to pleasure were: (1.) "This is an educational experience" ($r=.35$, $p<.01$), (2.) "Volunteering is opportunity to right social injustices" ($r=.34$, $p<.01$), and (3.) "This volunteering gave me an opportunity to vary my weekly activities" ($r=.30$, $p<.01$). The MTVs that were most positively related to affection were: (1.) "It is God's expectation that people will help each other" ($r=.39$, $p<.01$), (2.) "Volunteering for others makes me feel better about myself" ($r=.35$, $p<.01$), and (3.) "Volunteering for this agency enables it to provide more care for less money" ($r=.31$, $p<.01$). The MTVs that were most positively related to inclusion were: (1.) "I was lonely" ($r=.47$, $p<.01$), (2.) "A relative or friend was/is a client of this organization" ($r=.36$, $p<.01$), and (3.) "This volunteering gave me an opportunity to vary my weekly activities" ($r=.36$, $p<.01$).

The MTVs that were most positively related to escape were: (1.) "My employer/school expects their employees/students to provide volunteer community service"

($\underline{r}=.39$, $\underline{p}<.01$), (2.) "I was lonely" ($\underline{r}=.38$, $\underline{p}<.01$), (3.) "Being involved with this organization is considered prestigious" ($\underline{r}=.37$, $\underline{p}<.01$), (4.) "A relative or friend was/is a client of this organization" ($\underline{r}=.37$, $\underline{p}<.01$), and (5.) "I did not have anything else to do with my time" ($\underline{r}=.35$, $\underline{p}<.01$). The MTVs that were most positively related to relaxation were: (1.) "I wanted to gain practical experience toward paid employment or a new career" ($\underline{r}=.38$, $\underline{p}<.01$), and (2.) "A relative or friend was/is a client of this organization" ($\underline{r}=.27$, $\underline{p}<.01$). The MTVs that were most positively related to control were: (1.) "My employer/school expects their employees/students to provide volunteer community service" ($\underline{r}=.33$, $\underline{p}<.01$), (2.) "I was lonely" ($\underline{r}=.33$, $\underline{p}<.01$), and (3.) "I did not have anything else to do with my time" ($\underline{r}=.32$, $\underline{p}<.01$). See Table 4 in Appendix A for complete list of findings.

The last research question, Research Question Six (RQ6), looked at whether the MTVs correlate significantly to the rewards a volunteer might seek. Results of a Pearson Correlation did find significant correlations between MTVs and several of the rewards. The MTVs that were most positively related to rewards were: (1.) "This is an educational experience" ($\underline{r}=.27$, $\underline{p}<.01$), (2.) "Volunteering is an opportunity to develop relationships with others"

($\underline{r}=.27$, $\underline{p}<.01$), and (3.) "I have past experience providing similar service" ($\underline{r}=.26$, $\underline{p}<.01$).

Additionally, Pearson Correlations were run on costs and exchange values. Results of a Pearson Correlation once again did find significant correlations between MTVs and several of the costs. The MTVs that were most positively related to costs were: (1.) "My employer/school expects their employees/students to provide volunteer community service" ($\underline{r}=.30$, $\underline{p}<.01$), (2.) "I did not have anything else to do with my time" ($\underline{r}=.26$, $\underline{p}<.01$), and (3.) "If I did not volunteer there would be no one to carry out this volunteer work" " ($\underline{r}=.26$, $\underline{p}<.01$). Pearson Correlations ran on exchange scores only found one significant correlation with "If I did not volunteer there would be no one to carry out this volunteer work" " ($\underline{r}=-.23$, $\underline{p}<.01$). A complete list of findings is presented in Table 5 located in Appendix A.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

In an attempt to define what "humans" (i.e. volunteers) constitute as a reward in the new millenium, RQ1 identified 25 self-reported rewards that the participants listed in the administered survey. Although one must be careful in placing too much credence on self-reported responses due to past biases discovered in self-report surveys, in this study the self-report method was necessary and considered more reliable then asking the volunteer participant to pick from a list of rewards defined by the researcher. By considering the findings in Table 1, one can see that the volunteer answers held many different opinions as to what forms a reward.

Just as each individual has a unique schema for interacting with others, a volunteer has a vast variety of rewards that one might perceive as a positively valued outcome from one's volunteer interactions. As one can see from reviewing the top ten rewards listed in Table 1, these rewards are altruistic as well as egotistic. However, the list of rewards does lean towards supporting a more egotistic perception of the participants. "Making friends", gaining "personal satisfaction" and "recognition", and a whole host of personal

spiritual/religious growth rewards, are just a few of the individualistic gains experienced by the volunteers that dominate the list of self-reported rewards. Of the 25 rewards registered in the survey, "helping others" and "helping the group (i.e. Organization) meet their needs" were the only two altruistic rewards identified.

RQ2 sought to define the most common costs associated with volunteering. From a sample of 177 participants only 10 different costs were reported. However, a quick overview of the costs in Table 2 leads one to question if a response bias existed. The number one cost listed most frequently by the participants was that they experienced no costs (i.e. "none") during their volunteer experience.

Social Exchange Theory would argue that there are costs in every interaction or exchange. Yet for some reason, a majority of the participants chose to ignore the obvious costs associated with volunteering. Reasons for such avoidance of reporting the negative elements could be quite diverse and numerous. Future research into measuring self-reported costs might consider additional measurements to account for the avoidance. None the less, the costs that were identified serve this study well in alerting one to the most commonly associated costs experienced by volunteers. Being cognizant of a volunteer's

transportation expenses, loss of free time and quality time with family, uniform costs, and emotional stress are important factors to consider in effective volunteer management.

From the findings of RQ1 and RQ2 one can see that rewards and costs associated with the volunteer experience are of an overwhelming personal nature to the individuals who donate their time and energies. Furthermore, when taking into account that this sample was taken from a diverse age group of volunteers who assisted a broad spectrum of organizations and causes, the small number of rewards and costs reported and common across the sample is of significance when applying findings to volunteerism in general. By considering the most common rewards and costs perceived by the participants, organizations reliant upon a volunteer work force might be wise to consider if their volunteer program is supplying such rewards valued by the volunteer as well as minimizing reported costs most prevalent and demanding to the volunteer.

Unlike paid employees, volunteers do not have an opportunity to move up the ladder. Additionally, they are normally not the recipients of the monetary gains that keep most of Americans loyal to their employer. In other words, a major deciding factor as to whether a volunteer remains

at an organization is heavily dependent upon the rewards and costs perceived in the experience produced by the organization. However, as RQ3A findings suggest, the rewards do not always have to exceed the costs.

RQ3A found that a majority of the volunteers in the focus sample would continue to volunteer even if costs outweighed rewards. Although 105 participants said yes to continuing in spite of higher costs exceeding rewards, and 37 said no to continuing, one must also question why 35 participants chose to ignore the question altogether. The fact that this question decisively had the highest level of non-reports makes one question if the subject of high costs associated with volunteering is a subject that many volunteers mentally choose not to consider.

In fact, several participants avoided answering yes or no to the question and wrote "this is not an issue" or "this is something I cannot think about at this time." Such statements could be considered reflective and/or even more supportive of the statistical difference measured. The truth could be that many volunteers enter the activity knowing full well that there will be costs involved that may not ever reach equilibrium with received rewards. By addressing RQ3B, further insight can be considered as to

why many volunteers choose to continue to volunteer in light of costs exceeding rewards.

In Social Exchange Theory terms, many of the participants were of the comparison level for alternatives category. "The cause is greater than the costs" is a statement that basically summarizes most of the answers given to RQ3B. Numerous respondents who answered yes to continuing when costs exceed rewards provided a statement that explained one's justification for continuing in the cost laden relationship. The plethora of reasons cited by the participants is quite reflective of the large number who had no concern for high costs.

However, as one participant explained, "It is not about the costs." Another points out, "It's the right thing to do." Statements of necessity, such as "The church has to have volunteers—it's my gift to God" or "Saving a child's life is worth more than any cost" pointed towards the apparent perception that no other alternative existed besides volunteering. "I love children and want to help" or "because it benefits more people than myself" are similar to the cognitive process of a person who knows CPR and finds it impossible to not come to the rescue in an emergency.

"Volunteering is volunteering!" For many it is a family tradition or an inherent condition that does not allow them to abandon their duties. Whether it is from a higher power or an internal guilt complex that one gets a calling to become a devoted volunteer, from the qualitative answers given in this survey it would seem that many no matter what the costs would be unable to quit. Therefore, with a more comprehensive understanding of the rewards and costs from the perception of a volunteer, let us now consider further the most prevalent motivations to volunteer.

RQ4 was based on an analysis of the Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) motivation to volunteer scale. This scale was based on 28 motives found in past volunteer literature and research. Table 3 highlights the most prevalent MTVs found in this volunteer sample.

As previously supported by Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991), closer examination of Table 3 supports the theory that volunteers act not from a single motive or a category of motives but from a combination of motives. The distributions of mean scores of the MTVs show several tight groupings of motives. Findings on the MTVs also support that volunteerism is both egotistic and altruistic.

Although volunteering was a chance to do worthwhile, to better society, and to return good fortune, volunteerism was also a chance to develop new relationships, to feel better about one's self, and to gain educational experience. Attention to these most prevalent MTVs could provide direction for recruitment efforts. To know what motivates a volunteer is to know what attracts a volunteer. However, as we can see that volunteers hold diverse perceptions of the motives to volunteer, rewards to be gained from volunteering, and the costs in exchange for the experience, how then do we know which motives attract certain volunteers?

RQ5 and RQ6 are a start to discovering how interpersonal communication motives play a role in the volunteer decision process and identifying which MTVs, rewards, and costs attract certain personality types. RQ5 inquired as to whether the interpersonal communication motives would correlate significantly with the MTVs. Results found that significant relationships did exist (refer to Table 4).

Of the six interpersonal communication motives, pleasure and affection had the most significant correlations. Pleasure correlated positively with 17 MTVs including educational and work experience, broadening one's

horizons and activities, gaining prestige and new relationships, and righting social injustices. Affection correlated positively with 19 MTVs including many of the MTVs that related to loneliness, building relationships, serving God and family expectations, as well as improving one's self esteem. Inclusion correlated with 12 MTVs and as expected many of them related to being a part of prestigious organizations or career field, and occupying free time to eliminate loneliness. Escape, relaxation, and control correlated positively with similar amounts (respectively 13, 14, and 12) and many of the same MTVs as the other ICMS.

Another interesting finding was that two MTVs associated with gaining educational and work experience were related to all six ICMS. An additional two other MTVs related to work and organization prestige were related to five of the six ICMS. Beyond the work and educational experience MTVs, "I was lonely" was the only other MTV to load significantly on all ICMS. In contrast, the MTVs "I agree with this organization's goal and want to assist", "Volunteering is an opportunity to do worthwhile", "Volunteering is an opportunity to return good fortune", and "Volunteering for this agency enables it to provide

more care for less money" were related to one or less of the ICMS.

Findings of RQ5 would suggest that even though many participants did not list work or educational experience as a common reward gained from volunteering, the MTV typology measure would lead one to believe differently. Answers to RQ5 might also help explain why many of the participants did not report rewards relating to the organization's success or making a difference in the community. However, with making friends being the most reported reward, loneliness would possibly be an underlying circumstance or cause to the participants reporting such relational gains without blatantly admitting to being an undersocial person seeking inclusion.

Such findings would suggest that perceived self-report biases are valid and that many participants are not as willing to self-report their true motives to volunteer or self-disclose the rewards most valuable to them as expected. RQ5 also provides insight as to how one might attempt to recruit more volunteers by appealing to the MTVs most prevalent and significantly correlating to ICMS. The challenge would be to create a campaign that combines appeals for loneliness, work and/or educational experience,

and prestige of belonging while still touting the altruistic side of volunteerism.

RQ6, the final research question that this study considered, explored whether the rewards correlated to the MTVs. Moderately significant correlations were supported with rewards and 11 of the MTVs. Once again educational and past work experience as well as association with a prestigious organization were part of the correlation. Likewise, broadening horizons, developing new relationships, and working with different age groups were of significance. Doing worthwhile and helping the organization provide more care for less also made the list of positive correlations.

However, given that the correlations were low and that only 11 of the 28 MTVs were significant, answers to RQ6 would signify that rewards and motivation to volunteer are not strongly related. Compared to MTVs correlation with the ICMs one can see a considerable higher level of correlation in numbers and strength.

The findings suggest that rewards are not as an important factor in motivating a volunteer. However, this lack of support does not mean that rewards are not a significant factor to sustaining volunteerism. The

findings do however suggest that ICMs might play a stronger role in what motivates a volunteer rather than rewards.

Answers to the research questions proposed in this study offer a start to a more comprehensive application of communication theory to volunteerism. From the results one can assume that ICMs play a strong role in determining what motivates an individual to volunteer. Where rewards and costs more likely play a more definitive role in determining whether a volunteer continues to donate their time and energies.

Furthermore, results also foreshadow that more in-depth statistical analysis of ICMs, MTVs, rewards, and costs could play a part in determining how to select the ideal volunteer. Findings could determine methods to identifying if a person falls into the comparison level for alternatives category that produces truly committed volunteers. Future research into volunteerism could benefit by considering hypotheses that look more closely at personality types and the ICMs and MTVs associated with those who volunteer for the longer periods of time with no concern for costs or rewards.

Further research into sex and age differences might also provide more support for identifying the ideal volunteer. However, identifying the ideal volunteer for

one organization could be a downfall for another organization that strives to help a different cause. The participants in this study varied greatly in opinions and responses from organization to organization. Those who helped the elderly and ill at the hospital had much different responses to those who helped at-risk youth. Therefore, the 88-year-old volunteer that contributes numerous hours a month to the hospital might not make it through a day at the teen center in the urban setting.

Such differences and doubts are reason and support for future research to apply communication theory to measuring larger groups of volunteers of one organization. One limitation of this study was that due to lack of funding, research was reliant upon measuring small populations of volunteers at the six generous organizations that participated. Although measuring small numbers (i.e. 18-54 volunteers) from numerous organizations is supportive of this study's validity, to increase the sample sizes and number of participating volunteer forces is conducive to future heuristic efforts.

Other limitations of this study were associated with creating a measurement that combined several scales that had never been used together before. Additionally, the measurement for the rewards and costs was created and used

for the first time and based upon self-reported answers. Although the survey produced a multitude of significant findings, future research will demand improving the measurement and providing further assurances protecting from response biases.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, only six research questions were addressed. The six questions have served this study well in creating "food for thought" for future applied use of communication theory into volunteer research. The findings from this first study if used correctly could help an organization to better attract and manage a volunteer force. By paying close attention to the MTVs that are most commonly identified and associated with an individual's interpersonal communication motives, an organization can begin to understand the true reasons why their free workers have decided to contribute so much time and energy. And by being thoughtful of the rewards and costs most commonly associated with volunteerism, an organization can strive to keep their volunteers in the "yes-I will never quit no matter what costs come to pass" category.

References

Anderson, C. M. & Martin, M. M. (1995). The effects of communication motives, interaction involvement, and loneliness on satisfaction: A model of small groups. Small Group Research, 26, 118-137.

Anderson, C. M., Riddle, B. L., & Martin, M. M. (1999). Socialization processes in groups. In L. R. Frey, D. S. Gouran, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *The handbook of group communication theory and research* (pp 139-166). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bosson, J. K. & Swann, W. B. (1999). Self-liking, self-competence, and the quest for self-verification. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 25, 1230-1244.

Chong, D. (1991). Collective action and the civil rights movement. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Miene, P. K., & Haugen, J. A. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting

volunteerism. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, 1129-1149.

Cnaan, R. A. (1990). Deployment of volunteers by governmental social services in Israel, Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 17(3), 150-173.

Cnaan, R. A., & Goldberg-Glen, R. S. (1991). Measuring motivation volunteer in human services. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27, 269-285.

Consumer reports on health. (1999, August). Copy Editor, 11, 1-9.

Cook, K. S., (1987). Social exchange theory. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Daspen, E. (1999, November 11). Volunteering on the run. The Wall Street Journal, p W1.

Douglas, W. (1991). Expectations about initial interaction: An examination of the effects of global uncertainty. Human Communication Research, 17, 355-384.

Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). Societal structures of the mind. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.

Gachter, S., & Fehr, E. (1996). Does social exchange increase voluntary cooperation? Kyklos, 49(4), 541-555.

Graham, E. E., Barbato, C. A., & Perse, E. M. (1993). The interpersonal communication motives model. Communication Quarterly, 41, 172-186.

Guensburg, C. (1999, Jan. 6). Cooking with conscience. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, p. G1, G5.

Hinck, S. S. (2000, November). Developing successful community-campus partnerships. Paper presented at National Communication Association Convention, Seattle, WA.

Hodgkinson, V. A. & Weitzman, M. S. (1992). Nonprofit almanac, 1992-1993: Dimensions of the independent sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hodgkinson, V. A. & Weitzman, M. S. (1994). Giving and volunteering in the United States. Washington, D. C.: Independent Sector.

Independent Sector. (1996). Giving and volunteering in the United States. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Martin, M. M. & Anderson, C. M. (1998). Interpersonal communication motives in small groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Saratoga Springs, NY.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality, New York: Harper.

McCarthy, K. D. (1982). Noblesse oblige: charity and cultural philanthropy in Chicago, 1848-1929. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Olson, M. (1971). The logic of collective action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pandey, J. (1979). Social participation as a function of internal/external control of reinforcement. Journal of Social Psychology, 107, 283-284.

Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. Annual Review Sociology, 6, 27-65.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1996). Altruism, non-profits, and economic theory. Journal of Economic Literature, 34, 701-728.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L., (1975). The volunteer subject. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1998). Interpersonal communication motives. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty. Communication and personality: Trait perspectives (pp. 287-307), Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Ruggiero, V. R., (1998). Beyond feelings: A guide to critical thinking. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Roloff, M. E. (1981). Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Rubin, R. B., Perse, E. M., & Barbato, C. A. (1988). Conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication motives. Human Communication Research, 14, 602-628.

Schutz, W. C., (1966). The interpersonal underworld. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Shyles, L., & Ross, M. (1984). Recruitment rhetoric in brochures advertising the all volunteer force. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 12, 34-49.

Steindorf, S. (1999, December 6). With less time to give, volunteers seek flexibility. The Christian Science Monitor, p 20.

Stohl, C., & Jennings, K., (1988). Volunteerism and voice in quality circles. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 52, 238-251.

Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978).
Equity: Theory and research. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc.

West, R. & Turner, L. H. (2000), Introducing
communication theory. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield
Publishing Co.

Appendix A

Dear Research Participant,

Thank you in advance for your participation in my study. The purpose of this study is to examine the reasons and motives for volunteering. Our goal is to help volunteers, and the organizations that survive upon volunteer assistance, to more effectively select the right volunteer opportunity. Your participation in this study is strictly confidential and purely voluntary. You may choose not to answer some of the survey questions. However, you should know that your anonymity and confidentiality are protected, and that answering truthfully to all of the answers will in no way impact your existing volunteer position.

Please answer all of the questions to the best of your knowledge and understanding. When survey is completed, please insert all pages into the enclosed envelope and seal shut by wetting glue strip and placing a large X across the sealed flap.

This study is being completed for my thesis requirements. If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me or my advisor Dr. Matt Martin in the Communication Studies Department at 304-293-3905.

Thank you,

Michael Corrigan
Communication Studies Department
Armstrong Hall
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) in considering why you volunteer.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Undecided	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

1. _____ This is an educational experience.
2. _____ I agree with this organization's specific goals and want to assist.
3. _____ If I did not volunteer there would be no one to carry out this volunteer work.
4. _____ I did not have anything else to do with my time.
5. _____ I was lonely.
6. _____ I have more free time now that kids have left home, retired, widowed, divorced.
7. _____ I wanted to gain practical experience toward paid employment or new career.
8. _____ I wanted to broaden my horizons.
9. _____ Being involved with this organization is considered prestigious.
10. _____ Volunteering for others makes me feel better about myself.
11. _____ Volunteering in this agency provides challenging activities.
12. _____ Most people in my community volunteer.
13. _____ Helping people in need improves my regard of my own situation.
14. _____ Volunteering creates a better society.
15. _____ My employer/school expects their employees/students to provide volunteer community service.
16. _____ Volunteering is opportunity to right social injustices.
17. _____ Volunteering is opportunity to develop relationships with others.
18. _____ Volunteering is an opportunity to work with different age groups.
19. _____ Volunteering is an opportunity to do worthwhile.
20. _____ Volunteering is an opportunity to return good fortune.
21. _____ A relative or friend is/was a client of this organization.
22. _____ I have past experience providing similar service.
23. _____ I am able to relate to the patients/ situation because of my own similar experience.
24. _____ This volunteering gave me an opportunity to vary my weekly activities.
25. _____ Previous contact with professionals in this organization inspired me.
26. _____ Volunteering for this agency enables it to provide more care for less money.
27. _____ It's a way of following a family tradition of helping those in need.
28. _____ It is God's expectation that people will help each other.

Here are several reasons people give for why they talk to other people. For each statement, provide a number that best expresses your own reasons for talking to other people. Use the following scale:

Put a “5” if the reason is **exactly** like your own reason

Put a “4” if the reason is **a lot** like your own reason

Put a “3” if the reason is **somewhat** like your own reason

Put a “2” if the reason is **not much** like your own reason

Put a “1” if the reason is **not at all** like your own reason

“I talk to people...”

- | | |
|--|--|
| ___ 1. Because it is fun. | ___ 27. To tell others what to do. |
| ___ 2. Because it is exciting. | ___ 28. To get something I don't have. |
| ___ 3. To have a good time. | |
| ___ 4. Because it is thrilling. | |
| ___ 5. Because it is stimulating. | |
| ___ 6. Because it is entertaining. | |
| ___ 7. Because I enjoy it. | |
| ___ 8. Because it peps me up. | |
| ___ 9. To help others. | |
| ___ 10. To let others know I care about their feelings. | |
| ___ 11. To thank them. | |
| ___ 12. To show others encouragement. | |
| ___ 13. Because I am concerned about them. | |
| ___ 14. Because I need someone to talk to or be with. | |
| ___ 15. Because I just need to talk about my problems sometimes. | |
| ___ 16. Because it makes me feel less lonely. | |
| ___ 17. Because it's reassuring to know someone is there. | |
| ___ 18. To put off doing something I should be doing. | |
| ___ 19. To get away from what I'm normally doing. | |
| ___ 20. Because I have nothing better to do. | |
| ___ 21. To get away from pressures and responsibilities. | |
| ___ 22. Because it relaxes me. | |
| ___ 23. Because it allows me to unwind. | |
| ___ 24. Because it is a pleasant rest. | |
| ___ 25. Because it makes me feel less tense. | |
| ___ 26. Because I want someone to do something for me. | |

29. What motivated you to volunteer at this organization?

29. What rewards have you gained from volunteering at this organization?

30. On a scale from 0 to 10, 0 being not all that rewarding and 10 being extremely rewarding, how would you rate your received rewards level at this organization? ____

31. What costs have you encountered while volunteering at this organization?

32. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being that costs are extremely low and 10 representing where costs are extremely high, please rate your cost level for volunteering at this organization. _____

33. How long (in months) have you volunteered at this organization? _____

34. How many hours do you volunteer a month? _____

35. Have you ever volunteered for any other organizations? Yes No

If you have previously volunteered elsewhere, what were your reasons for leaving?
Please explain:

36. Did your parents volunteer? Yes No

37. If someday the costs outweigh the rewards gained from volunteering at this organization, will you continue volunteering for this organization? Yes No

If YES why?

Demographics:

38. What is your age?

39. What is your gender? Female Male

40. How often do you attend church or religious ceremonies?

Weekly Monthly Bi-monthly Few times a year Never

41. What is your personal annual income? \$_____

42. What is your household annual income? \$_____

43. What is your current employment status?

Full-time Part-time Unemployed

44. What is your current marital status?

Single Married Divorced Widowed
Other_____

45. What was your highest level of education achieved?

Jr. High High School College Grad Graduate Degree

46. What was the date of graduation from your last degree (month/year)? ____/ ____

Table 1Most Often Sought Rewards in Volunteering

Rank	Reward	Frequency
1	Making Friends	44
2	Personal Satisfaction	29
3	Helping Others	26
4	Helped to Work With Others	13
5	Learned From Working With Others	12
6	Feel Better About Self- Accomplishment	10
7	Sense of Being	8
8	Spiritual Growth	7
8	Recognition	7
9	Spending Time With Others	6
9	Higher Self Esteem	6
9	Personal Benefit- Free Services	6
9	Getting Love From Others	6
10	Confirmation of Career Goals	4

Table 2Most Common Costs Associated with Volunteering

Rank	Cost	Frequency
1	None	75
2	Transportation Expenses	35
3	Time	26
4	Uniforms, Materials, etc.	10
5	Minimal Costs	9
6	Buying Things For The “Kids”	7
7	Being Away From Family	6
7	Emotional Stress	6
9	Limits Other Activities	3
10	Personal Safety	2

Table 3

Most Prevalent MTVs

Rank	Mean	SD	Motivation to Volunteer
1	4.77	0.54	Volunteering is an opportunity to do worthwhile.
2	4.67	0.68	I agree with this organization's specific goals and want to assist.
3	4.64	0.66	Volunteering creates a better society.
4	4.49	0.70	Volunteering is opportunity to develop relationships with others.
5	4.44	0.72	Volunteering for others makes me feel better about myself.
6	4.41	0.80	Volunteering is an opportunity to work with different age groups.
7	4.35	0.86	Volunteering is an opportunity to return good fortune.
8	4.28	1.09	It is God's expectation that people will help each other.
9	4.21	1.04	This is an educational experience.
10	4.10	0.96	Volunteering for this agency provides challenging activities.
11	3.92	1.06	Helping people in need improves my regard of my own situation.
12	3.82	1.18	Volunteering for this agency enables it to provide more care for less money.
13	3.77	1.21	I wanted to broaden my horizons.
14	3.67	1.19	This volunteering gave me an opportunity to vary my weekly activities.
15	3.55	1.23	Volunteering is an opportunity to right social injustices.
16	3.51	1.32	I am able to relate to the patients/situation because of my own similar experience.
17	3.46	1.39	Previous contact with professionals in this organization inspired me.
18	3.45	1.48	I have past experience providing similar service.
19	3.44	1.42	It's a way of following a family tradition of helping those in need.
20	2.99	1.31	Being involved with this organization is considered prestigious.
21	2.71	1.45	My employer/school expects their employees to provide volunteer community service.
22	2.68	1.69	A relative or friend is/was a client of this organization.
23	2.66	1.56	I have more free time now that kids have left home, retired, widowed,...
24	2.58	1.27	If I did not volunteer there would be no one to carry out this volunteer work.
25	2.60	1.14	Most people in my community volunteer.
26	2.50	1.55	I wanted to gain practical experience toward paid employment or new career.
27	1.85	1.30	I did not have anything else to do with my time.
28	1.74	1.28	I was lonely.

Table 4

Results of Pearson Correlation on MTVs and ICMS

MTV	Pleasure	Affection	Inclusion	Escape	Relaxation	Control
1	.35**	.24**	.18*	.17*	.16*	.17*
2	.15	.04	.04	.08	.00	.13
3	.11	.07	.07	.20**	.21**	.09
4	.14	.09	.26**	.35**	.22**	.32**
5	.17*	.18*	.47**	.38**	.23**	.33**
6	.03	.22**	.08	.06	-.03	.10
7	.33**	.16*	.28**	.28**	.38**	.25**
8	.42**	.21**	.18*	.14	.24**	.19*
9	.29**	.13	.21**	.37**	.25**	.26**
10	.16*	.35**	.23**	.08	.14	.12
11	.13	.24**	.04	-.08	-.10	-.10
12	.28**	.06	.11	.20*	.18*	.23**
13	.12	.25**	.17*	.08	.09	.19*
14	.00	.21**	-.03	-.06	.01	.08
15	.20*	-.02	.21**	.39**	.23**	.33**
16	.34**	.11	.14	.18*	.22**	.26**
17	.21**	.26**	.07	.07	.05	.05
18	.25**	.21**	.12	.02	.08	.06
19	.11	.29**	.00	-.15	.02	.11
20	.09	.21**	.09	.04	-.01	.12
21	.19*	.15	.36**	.37**	.27**	.28**
22	.29**	.13	.07	.12	.21**	.08
23	.19*	.35**	.05	.05	.13	.06
24	.30**	.22*	.36**	.24**	.26**	.15
25	.23**	.18*	.10	.20**	.04	.21**
26	.03	.31**	.08	-.01	-.02	.10
27	.19*	.29**	.15	.22**	.17*	.13
28	.07	.39**	.24**	.05	.07	.06

Note: * p<.05, ** p<.01

Table 5

Correlation Between MTVs, Rewards, Costs,
and Exchange Values

MTV	Rewards	Costs	Exchange Score
1	.27**	.13	.04
2	.10	-.05	.07
3	.04	.26**	-.23**
4	.08	.26**	-.13
5	-.01	.25**	-.13
6	-.00	.12	-.01
7	.11	.17*	-.11
8	.23**	-.03	.11
9	.18*	.19*	.01
10	.10	.03	.08
11	.14	-.03	.09
12	.20*	.08	-.05
13	-.00	.02	-.03
14	.04	-.00	.01
15	.14	.30**	-.15
16	.10	.13	-.06
17	.27**	.02	.11
18	.20**	.09	.06
19	.20*	-.07	.10
20	.11	.04	.02
21	.12	.16	-.05
22	.26**	.14	.04
23	.25**	.17*	-.03
24	.12	.19*	-.02
25	.24**	.16*	.02
26	.18*	.11	-.01
27	.09	.24**	-.09
28	.12	.11	-.04

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$