

Elite Athletes' Motivations to Volunteer And Interpersonal Communication Motives:
Identifying Volunteers' Interaction Position

Presented to the Faculty
Liberty University
School of Communication Studies

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts
In Communication Studies

By
Jeffrey K. Boettger
May 2007

Elite Athletes' Motivations to Volunteer And Interpersonal Communication Motives:
Identifying Volunteers' Interaction Position

Presented to the Faculty
Liberty University
School of Communication Studies

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts
In Communication Studies

By
Jeffrey K. Boettger

May 2007

Committee Members

William Mullen, Ph.D., Chair

Gina Barker, Ph.D., Member

William Gribbin, Ph.D., Member

Elite Athletes' Motivations to Volunteer And Interpersonal Communication Motives:
Identifying Volunteers' Interaction Position

Presented to the Faculty
Liberty University
School of Communication Studies

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts
In Communication Studies

By
Jeffrey K. Boettger
May 2007

William Mullen, Ph.D., Chair Date

Gina Barker, Ph.D., Member Date

William Gribbin, Ph.D., Member Date

Abstract

Volunteerism is a critical component of today's society, and Sport's philanthropy is an emerging and influential sector within the nonprofit industry. The current study dives into interpersonal interactions in a volunteer context, as framed by Interaction Adaptation Theory. The components – individuals' requirements, expectations, and desires – serve as underlying influences, or motivations, that direct all interaction. The objective of the study was to identify elite athletes' most prevalent motivations to volunteer (MTVs) and interpersonal communication motives (ICMs) as well as to determine any significant correlations between these motivations. The research focused on generating greater insight and understanding into the reasons, desires, and expectations of elite athletes for initial and ongoing communication in the volunteer context.

The sample was drawn from two sources: 1. Athletes from a moderately sized, private, liberal arts university, and 2. Current and former professional athletes who are members of the Professional Hockey Players Association. The Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale (ICMS) and the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) were applied through survey format, and an open-ended question addressed the desires and expectations that athletes have of organizations when asked to volunteer. The results serve to advance research on volunteerism and increase the application and use of communication theory within the volunteer context. They demonstrate that ICMs and MTVs play a significant role in predicting athletes' interaction position in a volunteer context. Of further importance is knowing and meeting their desires and expectations in order to facilitate smooth interaction, supporting prediction of greater overall satisfaction and likelihood of involvement. This exploratory study serves to advance knowledge and understanding of elite athletes and their interpersonal communication surrounding volunteer action.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Bill Mullen who served as the chair of my thesis committee. I so greatly appreciate your willingness to allow me to process the direction and focus of the study over time, lending your insight, support, and gentle encouragement throughout. The flexibility you demonstrated was tremendous – whether that meant meeting on a weekend, at a coffee shop, or in between appointments.

I would also like to thank Dr. Barker and Dr. Gribbin who were readers on my thesis committee. The feedback you both provided was invaluable and allowed for further reflection, focus, and refinement at significant points in this study. You too were flexible, and turn around times for edits or suggestions were fantastic – thank you so much.

One key organization that I would like to recognize and thank is the Professional Hockey Player's Association who embraced my vision to study elite athletes by allowing me to place my survey online through their member's only website. This was a great component of the study. Specific thanks to Andrew and Thomas who helped facilitate it all.

My family, friends, coworkers, and classmates are also to be thanked. I appreciate every one of you so much – your prayers and love carried me to be sure.

Finally, and most importantly, my thanks and praise is fully unto the God of this universe – and his son Jesus – who is the author and finisher of my faith, who sustained me, and who provides so many great and precious gifts. To you be the glory for all the good that will come from this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| SIGNATURE PAGE | i |
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iv |
| TABLES | vii |
| CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2 – REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 7 |
| Sports Philanthropy | 12 |
| Motivation To Volunteer | 18 |
| Interpersonal Communication Motives | 29 |
| Interaction Adaptation Theory | 39 |
| Rationale | 48 |
| CHAPTER 3 – METHOD | 53 |
| Sample | 53 |
| Procedure | 54 |
| Instrument | 56 |
| CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS | 63 |
| Professional Athletes | 64 |
| University Athletes | 67 |
| CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION | 71 |
| Motivation To Volunteer | 71 |
| Expectations and Desires | 75 |
| Interpersonal Communication Motives | 79 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| ICM & MTV Correlations | 82 |
| Limitations And Future Research | 86 |
| Conclusion | 88 |
| REFERENCES | 90 |
| APPENDIX A | 100 |
| Letter To Research Participants | 101 |
| Volunteer Questionnaire | 102 |
| VFI and ICM Scale Scoring Sheet | 108 |
| APPENDIX B | 109 |
| Original VFI Assumptions | 110 |
| Original Motivations to Volunteer Questionnaire | 111 |

Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Descriptive Stats on VFI subscales for Pro Athletes | 65 |
| Table 2: Descriptive Stats on ICM subscales for Pro Athletes | 65 |
| Table 3: VFI and ICM Subscales Correlations for Pro Athletes | 66 |
| Table 4: Descriptive Stats on VFI subscales for University Athletes | 67 |
| Table 5: Descriptive Stats on ICM subscales for University Athletes | 68 |
| Table 6: VFI and ICM Subscales Correlations for University Athletes | 69 |

Elite Athletes' Motivations to Volunteer And Interpersonal Communication Motives:

Identifying Volunteers' Interaction Position

CHAPTER I

“Unless we think of others and do something for them, we miss one of the greatest sources of happiness.” Dr. Ray L. Wilbur

Volunteering is an activity that millions of North Americans take part in each year. Much of this philanthropic action is contributed for a variety of reasons, including the benefits it brings to both those giving and receiving the action. As people give of their time they realize the personal rewards and energy it provides through the joy they experience both during and after their involvement. This too is the author's experience. As a young adult I often found myself making choices that involved new adventures. After spending one summer with a new friend in Michigan, one unique relationship stemming from that trip was my volunteer service with an organization that organized hockey camps for children and youth. Identifying with the mission of the organization and the vehicle used – hockey – an avenue was provided to be a positive influence in children's' lives and to give back to the game of hockey; first as a counselor, then as an on-ice hockey instructor. Participating as a volunteer proved highly positive, though in an organizational role, the management of the camps was not without its pains. My appreciation for all volunteers during this time grew exponentially, while intimately experiencing the dialectic of the struggles involved in finding and managing volunteers.

The experience of giving time to others through organizations is never ideal. People vary in terms of their personalities, strengths, weaknesses, and expectations. Still, volunteering allows one to experience a unique sense of well-being and purpose (Hunter & Linn, 1981). Martin Luther King Jr. once said, “Those who are not looking for happiness are the most likely to find

it, because those who are searching forget that the surest way to be happy is to seek happiness for others” (Goodman, T. (Ed.), 1997, p. 384). While there are a variety of reasons and motives for volunteering, some clearly involve the benefits derived and experienced by the volunteer.

Research by Thoits and Hewitt (2001) supports this supposition indicating that, results “showed that volunteer hours significantly increased happiness, life satisfaction, mastery, and physical health” (p. 122). A prominent historical figure, Albert Einstein, gives another suggestion:

“Whatever there is of God and goodness in the universe, it must work itself out and express itself through us. We cannot stand aside and let God do it” (Caprice, A., 2005). I fully agree with the need for our action as indicated, yet I believe that it is truly effective when that action seeks collaboration with the desires of God in a co-creative capacity – creating good in others’ lives. In the realm of volunteerism there is great opportunity for all to benefit from enhancing others’ lives, but action must be taken with the occasion provided and working towards appropriately and effectively communicating the need to others is integral to their involvement.

Many serve through the avenue of volunteering, but here the author strives to explore volunteer involvement by elite athletes, specifically professional and university athletes. Elite athletes have a unique platform to bring joy, excitement and learning to children in many forums. One forum that combines their notoriety with their skills and talents is athletic camps. Here the athletes perform multiple roles by fusing their experience with instruction, communicating as teachers while demonstrating with precision, and meeting the dreams of young people by being involved. Additionally, athletes may contribute through a variety of organizations or foundations that fulfill valuable purposes within society, affecting and enhancing peoples lives through simple interaction and shared time. It is the responsibility of organizations and society at large to encourage athletes to get involved – in any field – through fruitful, creative interaction. It is the

responsibility of the athlete to extend themselves into philanthropy where they can be most effective, bring meaning to their own and others' lives through enjoyable interaction, while also accounting for their time constraints, pressures, and family obligations. Thus, it is the researchers' responsibility to study and learn in order to serve through education the 'arms' (organizations) of the community, and the 'fingers' (volunteers) they attract to accomplish the goal.

Communication literature suggests that knowing and understanding the needs and goals of one's audience are a priority in communicating effectively. Freedman (1976) highlights that, "Because social movement leaders face numerous types of audiences, they cannot play the same role with every audience. They should adapt their rhetoric to suit particular audiences' needs, and because of their rhetorical adaptation, their role or image may change from audience to audience" (p. 170). Freedman uses the metaphor of each social leader being like an actor in a play, and as each audience changes, so to must the actor adjust and adapt his or her communication to that of the unique audience. The current research serves to argue that any actor seeking to promote social justice, action, or service must also understand his or her audience and implement said knowledge to effectively communicate and influence others to action.

Albers (2003) joins the discussion on the significance of audience analysis in relation to organizations' use of technology. He states, "As a major factor in supporting dynamic adjustment of document content, the audience analysis must clearly capture the range of user goals and information needs in a flexible manner" (p. 263). Although this statement addresses written communication that is conveyed to the user via websites on the World Wide Web, it also has implications with the written requests that organizations or individuals may submit via e-mail or letter to potential volunteers. Therefore, acknowledging the uniqueness of one's audience

and seeking to adapt one's message towards that population will serve to enhance the outcome and success of communication goals such as information sharing, influence, persuasion, compliance-gaining, or to meet and exceed their desires and expectations generating satisfying communication.

This perspective led to questions regarding a way to seek to understand elite athletes and their culture from a communication perspective that would help procure and enhance their involvement. What expectations, or motivations, do athletes have regarding volunteer communication and actual volunteer involvement? In this context, what are the main reasons elite athletes communicate with others – organizational leaders or other volunteers? Interaction Adaptation Theory (Burgoon, Stern & Dillman, 1995) provides the framework for this study and the questions submitted. The gist of the theory is that individuals enter dyadic (and group) interactions with general and idiosyncratic needs, expectations, and desires for the interaction. These components direct how one enters the interaction and influences how each interaction is evaluated. The theory postulates that one's evaluations may be positive or negative, and that individuals take into account the message, nonverbal behavior, communication partner, and overall context. Effective, productive communication occurs when each person meets or exceeds that which is required, expected, or desired by the other. Thus, working towards a greater understanding of these elements in elite athletes in a volunteer context will enhance organizations' abilities to communicate well with this population.

One can understand this audience to a degree through prior experience, previous research, and personal identification, but a gap exists in the literature concerning elite athletes and their experience of volunteerism. Before one can craft a message that moves a person to action through communicating according to his or her rules and norms, one must seek to comprehend

the individual. Interpersonal communication theory provides the groundwork to guide a study that seeks to understand unique audiences and their communication desires and expectations. Therefore, the research objective of the current study is to answer the following Research Questions (RQ) in the search for a general understanding of elite athletes and volunteerism:

- RQ 1. What are elite athlete's most prevalent motivations to volunteer?
- RQ 2. What are elite athletes' interpersonal communication motives in regard to volunteer communication?
- RQ 3. To what extent do motivations to volunteer correlate with interpersonal communication motives?

This explorative study, from a communication perspective, serves to better enable scholars and practitioners alike to understand elite athletes' motivations for volunteering (MTVs), athletes' underlying interpersonal communication motives and their unique expectations, and desires of organizations requesting their volunteer involvement. Results should enhance organizations' understanding of how to communicate and interact effectively with elite athletes. They will also contribute to the players', their unions', and university staffs' understanding of athletes' communication expectations and volunteer motivations. Matching players' expectations and desires with the appropriate volunteer organization, interpersonal communication, and action or role has the potential to increase satisfaction with each volunteer experience.

In seeking to understand the general volunteer interaction position of elite athletes, Chapter Two also serves to provide a context for the current research by peering deeper into the current state of volunteerism and sports philanthropy. The review then expands to spelunk the craters of volunteer motivations, interpersonal communication motives, and the communication

theory – Interaction Adaptation Theory – that frames this study. Based upon the review of prior research, the chapter concludes with the rationale for performing the study. Chapter Three involves the Methodology and research design, followed by the Results in Chapter Four. Finally, Chapter Five concludes the study, encapsulating the Discussion, Limitations of the study, Future Research, and Conclusion.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Volunteerism in North America has received voluminous attention from a variety of perspectives. Recent statistical surveys performed by the Canadian and US governments on multiple facets of volunteerism provide unique insight into the nuts and bolts of volunteer characteristics. The current research seeks to study the volunteer motivation and communication motives of elite athletes from two samples and levels of athletic attainment: professional athletes and university athletes. As we move in this direction it is important to first gain an understanding of recent statistics framing the overall condition of volunteering in the US and Canada.

Stephanie White (2006) summarizes the data resulting from the Bureau of Labor Statistics' (BLS) research in the essay, *Volunteering in the United States 2005*. It shows that volunteering in the US has remained the same from 2003 to 2005, with 29% of the population age 16 and older giving their time. In contrast, surveys performed and discussed by Independent Sector's (IS) *Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001*, indicates that in 2001, 44% of adults over the age of 21 volunteered their time with a formal organization. This percentage approximates the total number of individuals that gave of their time to be 83.9 million adults. The difference between these two reports may be attributable to the methodology employed by either organization. Additionally important is how each research organization defines volunteer. The BLS conducts monthly surveys, called the Current Population Survey (CPS), of approximately 60,000 households. Data on volunteering was collected through a supplement to the CPS (White, 2006). A press release by the United States Department of Labor BLS defines a volunteer as including people who performed unpaid volunteer activities through or for an organization, and did not include those who gave in an informal manner. Lending support to this

definition, Independent Sector defined volunteers as adults 21 years or older who had volunteered for a formal organization and did not include those with only informal volunteering or helping behaviors. IS conducted their study on 4,216 people, a large difference from the 60,000 contacted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In either case, results show that giving and volunteering in North America is an important civic activity in the 21st century. Key findings communicated by the BLS suggest approximately 65.4 million people volunteered over the 12 months prior to the study, of which women proved to out-volunteer the opposite sex by almost 8% no matter the demographic category: age, race, marital status, labor force status, or educational attainment. Results further reveal that individuals with children, those in the 35-44 year old bracket, persons with a college degree, or employed were all much more likely to volunteer their time to various organizations and in a wide array of activities than those not identified by those categories. One significant finding that relates directly to the current study is the type of volunteering activity men prefer to do. By all accounts men were more likely than women to “coach, referee, or supervise sports teams, engage in general labor, provide professional and management assistance, or be an usher, greeter, or minister” (White, 2006, p. 70). These findings begin to relate a general understanding of adult volunteers of those with a US heritage.

The 2004 Canadian Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (CSGVP) test a variety of factors concerning Canadian philanthropy. Hall, Lasby, Gumulka, & Tryon, (2006) provide the key findings produced by the study. In comparison to the US study, 11.8 million Canadians volunteered their time contributing approximately 2 billion work-hours to organizations. Though seemingly lower than US citizen volunteerism, this number represents a greater percent of the total population at 45%. While the people of Canada may have great hearts

toward volunteering, a portion of this difference may reflect the inclusion of mandatory service by the Canadian survey as part of volunteering. The study surveyed people 15 years of age and older, and defined volunteerism as “doing activities without pay on behalf of a group or organization, and includes mandatory community service” (Hall et. al, 2006, p. 10). This methodology and definition allow for a greater number of people to be included in the study than in those conducted by the BLS. However, the findings do reflect the volunteer percentages reflected by the Independent Sector study. Another aspect of the CSGVP showed that most volunteering in Canada is “directed toward four types of organizations... sports and recreation, social services... education and research organizations, and religious organizations” (Hall et. al, 2006, p. 33). At 18%, sports and recreation organizations received the greatest percentage of hours contributed by volunteers. Results also indicated that volunteer rates were highest among individuals in several categories: youth, those with university degrees, household incomes in excess of \$100,000, and those who attended religious services weekly. Ultimately, the key findings suggest some important considerations when studying volunteerism in North America. With preliminary understanding of the general factors, characteristics, and perspectives of volunteers today, the literature review extends to research indicating benefits of volunteering.

When considering how volunteering through an organization benefits the society, the initial reflection may tend to be on those who receive from the giving act. Understandably, there is much good that comes from volunteering that positively impacts those who are underserved. However, another angle vital to an overview of the benefits is to peer into how volunteering impacts the giver. As ancient wisdom predicts, “...he who refreshes others will himself be refreshed” (The Holy Bible, Proverbs 11:25). The literature promotes a perspective that suggests there inherently awaits great reward to those who think of others and give of themselves in

efforts to help them. As individuals involved benefit, it then extends out to communities and countries at large. De Toqueville (1835) noted this phenomenon occurring in the United States, believing that volunteers, their associations and actions, became essential intermediary communities between the mass of individuals and the institutions of government. It helped create “a generalized trust – a trust that extends beyond the boundaries of kinship and friendship – on which democratic political life depends” (Wilson & Musick, 1999, p. 142). Furthermore, Diana Aviv (president and CEO of Independent Sector, a Washington Research Group), lends credence to this thinking; “There’s nothing like giving to someone else and realizing you are strengthening the fundamental fabric of society... volunteering increases a person’s sense of responsibility and strengthens our political culture” (Marek, 2005, p. 84). In this context, volunteering is seen as action that communicates and promotes the essence of democratic culture.

In their rigorous work on *The Effects of Volunteering on the Volunteer*, Wilson and Musick (1999) investigated how volunteering impacts various populations: women, men, aged, young etc...in regard to effects in areas such as physical health, anti-social behavior, mental health, and occupational achievement. While they caution readers on cause and effect relationships, the authors conclude, “This review of the research on the effects of volunteering leaves little doubt that there are individual benefits to be derived from doing volunteer work that reach far beyond the volunteer act itself and may linger long after the volunteer role is relinquished” (p. 167).

Lawrence (2005) contributes to the literature communicating the positive results of volunteering as a teacher, “Volunteers develop experience in much sought-after skills; for example in management, leadership, cross-cultural working, curriculum development...” (p. 37). Volunteering may very well allow one to use unique knowledge or skills for a purpose he or she

believes in (Bernthal, 1994). It can also bring meaning to life as an older person through enhanced sense of purpose (helping others), personal growth (seeking out an interest), and continued productivity – generating structure to daily life (Bradley, 1999). Adults may volunteer to bring connection with other adults or their children (McCauley, 1976), and volunteer work “indeed enhances all six aspects of well-being (happiness; life satisfaction; self-esteem; sense of control over life, physical health; depression) and, conversely, people who have greater well-being invest more hours in volunteer service” (Thoits & Hewitt, 2001, p. 115).

Further research on the benefits of volunteering has demonstrated that youth are able to learn new skills, increase leadership skills and realistic perceptions of life and others (Mueller, 2005). Older adults who volunteer to mentor at-risk youth find they have renewed positive emotions and reinforced life meaning (Larkin & Sadler, 2005). Also, Shmotkin, Blumstein & Modan (2003) share results that suggest volunteering for older adults is related to positive psychosocial functioning, and potentially resulted in reduced mortality risk. From each account we see the mutuality of benefits derived, to both the recipient of good will and the individual volunteer.

Overall, there is strong evidence that volunteer action is a positive expression and results in benefits for both the giver and the receiver, promoting the necessity and importance to involve people at various levels of age, income, and ability through creative communication. The volunteer research discussed allows one to begin to understand and potentially predict whether elite athletes are likely to volunteer and to what cause their help will be designated. However, it does not allow us to understand their deeper motivations to volunteer, nor their interpersonal communication expectations or motives when communicating with volunteer organizations and their personnel before and during their involvement. Also, while volunteerism has been

extensively studied, only recently has sports philanthropy been a topic of interest and focus. The literature on sports philanthropy extends the research on corporate philanthropy, and is aimed at gaining insight into what it is, how it works, and what elements generate success within the various methods of giving implemented.

Sports Philanthropy

Philanthropy, as defined by Random House Webster's Dictionary, is "altruistic concern for human beings manifested by donations to institutions advancing human welfare," and occurs via a "philanthropic act or donation" (p. 538). One's goodwill in this sense may be accomplished by the giving of time or finances. For the purpose of this study, the focus of this review is specifically on the giving of time through volunteering, and the author is adhering to a combination of the definitions of volunteering accepted by the CSGVP and the US Bureau of Labor Statistics. Some professional sports teams and various educational institutions implement mandatory volunteer service opportunities for their athletes or students (Wade-Berg, 2005). Thus, the definition of volunteering adopted is, "doing activities without pay on behalf of a group or organization, and includes mandatory community service" (Hall et. al, 2006, p. 10), adding the qualification promoted by the BLS that a volunteer is one who gives through or for an organization, and not those who give in an informal manner. To distinguish informal with formal volunteering, Independent Sector (IS) states, "Formal volunteering is more structured in time and activity and takes place in an organization, while 'informal' volunteering involves helping individual (i.e. friends, families, or neighbors)...on an ad hoc basis"(Jalondini & Hume, 2001, p. 2). With the focus in the current study on formal volunteering as performed by professional athletes, further research serves to define and review how philanthropy has been studied within the sports world.

One organization that leads the way in the development and research of sports philanthropy is The Sports Philanthropy Project (SPP). The organization was established in 1998 to support the field of sports philanthropy. They exist to connect, focus, and enable professional sports teams, athletes, and leagues to be highly effective in their philanthropic efforts in order to promote and sustain strong communities. They work to accomplish this by uniting individuals and non-profit organizations with professional sports organizations in all major leagues. SPP accomplishes their goals through program development, social marketing campaigns, and capacity building (training seminars and conferences, technical assistance, etc...). In defining this type of corporate philanthropy, SPP states “Sports philanthropy is the emerging sector within corporate philanthropy through which professional sports organizations forge partnerships and strategically invest in the health and well-being of their communities by dedicating and leveraging both financial and in-kind resources to address local problems” (SPP, “FAQ”, para. 6). Those who are involved in sports philanthropy are proven as both sports teams and individual athletes. Robinson’s (2005) seminal study, *Sports Philanthropy: An Analysis of the Charitable Foundations of Major League Teams on Sports Philanthropy*, thoroughly engages and describes this unique reservoir of philanthropy highlighting the history, growth, and power of the industry. Robinson employed both qualitative and quantitative research methods to pursue the following research objective:

...to identify the primary, influencing factors that affect the success and development of major league team foundations. Success is evaluated on several different levels related to the foundation, including: financial sustainability, total dollars granted to charitable causes, fundraising effectiveness, and the impact of what is achieved through community programs. (p. 24)

Her purpose in performing the research is to further the understanding and knowledge of Sports Philanthropy by analyzing and underscoring the best, most successful types of foundations and fundraising events. Because of the unique needs that may be present but different in various cities or areas of the country, Robinson (2005) concludes that there is not one strategy that can be applied to every foundation and team to create successful philanthropy. However, she also suggests that by leveraging teams' and athletes' significant public appeal, combining resources with other local teams, collaborating at the league level, and cultivating relationships with larger organizations, professional sports teams will be strategically situated to provide great service and care to the underserved in their communities. Ultimately, "Sports philanthropy is a dynamic industry, with the potential to dramatically affect the greater public good through creative charitable endeavors fueled by the influence and clout of professional athletes and franchises" (Robinson, 2005, p. 1). Mobilizing this sought-after population [i.e., "Players are in such demand by charities that the Vikings get 300 requests a week, many more than they can fulfill" (Franklin, 2003)] is one of the strategic tactics used by the teams and their foundations. This begs the question of how sports teams gain the involvement of their athletes in philanthropic activity. While there is the natural tie to a foundation that typically carries the name of the franchise, and athletes are at times required to participate, are players influenced or persuaded to volunteer through targeted communication, or involved simply through mandated and non-mandated volunteer opportunities made available by team-linked foundations? Also, how do philanthropic organizations communicate and involve professional athletes in their activities without the same intimate connection to them that the team foundations provide? To briefly look into the context of volunteerism with elite athletes, the National Hockey League provides an excellent starting point.

The history of sports philanthropy within the four major sports leagues has been recorded and reported by the Sports Philanthropy Project (SPP). Perusing the Sports Philanthropy Timeline (SPP, “Timeline”) section reveals how philanthropy in the National Hockey League (NHL) developed. While giving and volunteering of athletes likely existed prior to this time, it became official in the NHL with the Vancouver Canucks in 1986. At this time they created the first team foundation in league history, named the Canucks for Kids Fund. The next two teams to come aboard, in 1993 and 1994 respectively, were the Chicago Blackhawks with Blackhawk Charities and the San Jose Sharks with the Sharks Foundation.

The first key year in the development of philanthropy in hockey was 1995 when the league created NHL Diversity which “...began providing support and unique programming to not-for-profit youth hockey organizations across North America that are committed to offering economically disadvantaged boys and girls of all ages opportunities to play hockey” (Sports Philanthropy Project, “Timeline”). Another integral development was in 1998 when the NHL partnered with the National Hockey League Players Association (NHLPA) to form the Hockey Fights Cancer initiative. Two further enterprises by the NHL are the Hockey All Star Kids Foundation that connects the NHL with young people suffering from cancer and other diseases, and the NHL A.S.S.I.S.T grant program that serves to defray the cost of hockey equipment, ice costs, and travel expenses in order for underprivileged youth to engage in the sport (Benton Parish, 2002). Over time this focus has sparked further interest from teams as multiple NHL organizations have since created their own foundations to give back to the communities in which they reside, leveraging the power of their players, facilities, and additional resources. In her case study of Denver Sports Teams, Wade-Berg (2005) reveals:

While each professional league has established some type of philanthropic program and

has participation from athletes and sports teams, only the National Basketball Association through the Collective Bargaining Agreement requires players to participate in philanthropic projects: seven individual and six team appearances. (p. 8)

The NHL, on the other hand, seemingly implements a policy that relegates this decision to each respective team and individual athlete. Supporting this proposition is the obligation of the Colorado Avalanche players to participate in three team community events (Wade-Berg, 2005). Whether players are sanctioned by their teams to donate time to volunteer activities through team foundations or not, their philanthropy has another outlet that has become popular – creating their own foundations.

For those competing at the top of their sport, the financial gains are significant, providing the means for donating time and giving financially. In 1994-95, NHL hockey players' average salary was \$572,000 and ten years later reached its height at \$1.83 million. This changed though with the NHL's new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) in 2005, as it has dropped somewhat to approximately 1.46 million (The Hockey News, Nov. 9, 2005). That being the case, players have begun to follow the lead of their league and teams by creating foundations of their own. This trend echoes those who write, speak, and teach on sports philanthropy. Spanberg (2001) provides three options for professional athletes who desire to be involved in philanthropy, whether giving time or money. Their options are: "create your own foundation; ask an existing community foundation to handle your charity; or join the list of athletes, entertainers, and others who work through a national foundation" (p. 55). The author then highlights the strengths and weaknesses of each, demonstrating that there are a variety of levels of efficiency and effectiveness. The success is dependent to a degree on the goals established and commitment by the teams, foundation(s), and the athlete(s) involved. Whatever choice an athlete may make, each

option allows players to augment and target the giving of their money and (time). While much is discussed in this article regarding the use of players' money in philanthropic activity, the core element in volunteering is commitment of time. Citing an interview, Franklin (2003) reveals, "it's not always about the money," Morash said. 'It's also about the commitment and the time you're willing to put into it, and networking the resources'" (n.d.). Giving of time interacting with others is essential to utilizing the attraction of star power that most professional athletes have.

Research by Robinson (2005) and Wade-Berg (2005) on sports philanthropy demonstrates the vital importance of professional sports teams, their foundations and collaborations in philanthropy, and the pivotal role this action plays in enhancing society. It also recognizes the strength of athletes as influencers within our society. Players' donation of time through direct involvement has significant ramifications for the success of all philanthropic activity that appropriates the athletes' adhesive-like star power as primary to the strategic alliances foundations seek. The organizations and teams that are able to generate involvement of (their) athletes in projects related to the teams' philanthropic pursuits are leveraging the status of the players to help promote and drive these endeavors. In doing so the teams are endorsing the good that is produced, and enabling the gift of giving to be experienced by each athlete. However, for the greatest positive outcome to be produced, one must strive to not only meet the goals of the organizations or the needs of the people they serve, but also effectively and appropriately manage the essential key component of the system – the volunteer athlete. Throughout the volunteer management process, informing, encouraging, and motivating athletes occurs through communication. Thus, it is vital to involve this essential element through an informed, general understanding of players' motivations to volunteer and their expectations

surrounding the communication they experience prior to, and during, the philanthropic activity (volunteering). The following three sections will peer further into previous literature on volunteer motivations, interpersonal communication motives, and interpersonal communication theory. This will provide a foundation upon which to build a general understanding of professional athletes and volunteerism from a communication perspective.

Motivations To Volunteer

Motivations to volunteer have been studied historically in the discussion of whether this philanthropy stems from altruistic and egoistic motives. However, recent inquiries into motivations have taken a greater focus on the variety of reasons that people may give for volunteering, most motivations having some element of altruism and egoism in its fabric. For example, the Canadian Survey on Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (CSGVP), demonstrates some of these results revealing, “The top three reasons for volunteering were: to make a contribution to the community, to use one’s skills and experiences, and being affected by the cause supported by the organization” (Hall et. al, 2006, p. 31). As a contrast, one must consider the reasons given for not volunteering by prior volunteers. There were three main reasons indicated in the US Department of Labor – Bureau of Labor Statistics December 2005 press release. Reasons given were, “lack of time (45.6 percent), followed by health or medical problems (15.2 percent), and family responsibilities or childcare problems (9.3 percent)” (p. 4). This research gives powerful insight into the general populations’ reasons or goals for participating in volunteering, as well as the obstacles to those who would otherwise volunteer, and prepares the reader for the discussion on the origins of motivations to volunteer.

The question of Altruism versus Egoism, and whether there is such a thing as absolute altruism, has been a matter of debate since the beginning of scholarly discussions about

individuals' motivation for volunteering or helping others. Altruism, as defined by Webster's Dictionary, is "unselfish concern for the welfare of others" (p. 21). Altruists International is an association of international, not-for-salary network of friends built around wanting to advance social change from an altruistic perspective (Altruists International, "About", para. 1). This association suggests that historically, the French philosopher Auguste Comte coined the word altruisme (self-sacrifice for the benefit of others [Italian: altrui others]) in 1851. It is purported that many considered his ethical system...to be rather extreme, so another meaning evolved – loving others as oneself (Altruists International, "Altruism", para. 1). Altruism as a motive is thus seen as something that moves a person to act in such a manner as to help or benefit one in need without thought for self. However, Churchill and Street (2004) "rule out as non-altruistic only helping behaviors that involve the expectation of 'external' rewards" (p. 90) and that there is possibility for altruistic behaviors that involve self-interest. Egoism, on the other hand, is understood as "helpfulness that is motivated by a selfish desire to benefit oneself" (Clary & Snyder, 1999, p. 157).

Debate over one's true motives, as stemming from selflessness versus self-centeredness, has been performed with vigor. Several scholars' research has revealed altruism is minimal as a motive for volunteerism (Kemper, 1980; Smith, 1982; Van Til, 1988). Similarly, Grieshop (1985) noted that although "volunteers give altruism as the reason for their wish to participate when asked directly...responses to a more in-depth questionnaire show (a) mix of incentives, with material incentives most prominent" (p. 226). On the other side of the equation are writers who promote altruism as a viable motive for volunteering. Results from Flashman and Quick (1985) demonstrate: "altruism has not been adequately recognized as an actual and potential motivating factor. Moreover, we believe that altruism is a central, and potentially the central,

impetus for volunteer activity” (pp. 155-156). Further, through her narrative analysis of six interviews, Bequette (1990) found that each person has results that correlate with altruism as a motivating factor. Some of the main themes or values she finds are, “donating one’s time and abilities helping people in need...building relationships with co-workers, empathic interaction with victims, and making a difference...team membership, responsibility, leadership...” (pp. 67-80). The rich information produced by her use of in-depth interviews make us privy to results that agree with and develop beyond simple altruism, revealing a compilation of motives for volunteering.

Research in recent years by authors Clary and Snyder (1999) reveal their development of the functional approach to researching the motivations. Through their study of the individual helper, the authors suggest that a volunteer’s actions may be guided by a variety of motives. Their review suggests that one component of the functional theory (value-expressive component) is a primary motivational factor, but state results also indicate that it is not the sole reason underlying volunteers’ actions. Rather, this function appears alongside other motivations, thus indicating the use of both altruistic motives and egoistic motives in combination as decisions are made in regard to: initial volunteering, to continue volunteering, to increase or decrease overall commitment to volunteer, and whether to stop one’s involvement. Clary and Snyder (1999) suggest, “just as one can question whether altruistic motives are purely altruistic, we can wonder whether egoistic constructs are themselves purely egoistic” (p. 142). The authors are proposing that both altruistic and egoistic constructs are not great measurements, but rather that a mix is evident through their identification of functions.

In his thorough work, *Altruism and Christian Ethics*, Grant (2001) joins the discussion on altruism suggesting it as a real motive. In response to the analysis and outlook that self-interest is

the fundamental fact of human life and that reported acts of altruism are met with suspicion, he submits that, “the fact that we notice altruistic behavior and that it does occur removes the possibility of dismissing the whole idea as a series of paradoxes,” because “altruism begins to be taken seriously when this self-interest vision is transcended by the level of moral vision” (p. 249). In the context of this study, one must therefore seek to leave altruism open as a potential motivation, something that the functional approach to volunteer motivation facilitates. Understanding altruism’s place, Clary and Snyder (1999) propose a functional approach that deals in more depth with the various components of motivation and the combination of motivations, highlighting the usefulness of this approach.

In an article *The Motivations to Volunteer: Theoretical and Practical Considerations*, Clary and Snyder (1999) make use of the functional approach to volunteerism. This approach incorporates four considerations that support this theorizing. The first one essentially seeks to explore personal and social activities that create, direct, and sustain volunteer service. The second consideration is that “people can and do perform the same actions in the service of different psychological functions (to fulfill different motives). Third...important psychological events...depend on matching the motivational concerns of individuals with situations that can satisfy those concerns” (p.156). A final reason Clary and Snyder (1991) give for functionalist theorizing, is that the “evidence is consistent with the fundamental tenets of the...approach, namely, that the same action may involve different motives and that different motivations will require different satisfactions” (p. 137). The analysis method developed and implemented was the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), a tool that enables the researcher to study six different functions or motivations potentially served by volunteering. The six functions are: Values, Understanding, Enhancement, Career, Social, and Protective (Clary & Snyder, 1999). With

direct interaction being primary to involvement in volunteerism, understanding and utilizing a volunteer motivation profile of the audience – educated by the functional system of analysis – will enable individuals to deliver the request effectively. Not only would this inform the initial request, but also the dialoguing and adapting during interaction that is required to effectively and appropriately communicate to motivate the target towards involvement and to attain overall satisfaction. In further review of research, scholars have also approached motivations in regard to what “forces” contribute to their helping actions, a system that lends credence to the functional approach.

Moving deeper into prior volunteer motivation research, Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1977) produced a system of analysis for volunteers’ motivation – based on theory developed by Lewin (1947) – to study group dynamics. Seeking to reveal the motivational dynamics of volunteerism, they approached the issue from both the volunteer and organizational standpoint. In so doing they created a methodology that sought to demonstrate the forces that, a) cause people to volunteer, b) inhibit them from volunteering, c) increase the likelihood of continued service, d) increase commitment, or e) cause them to drop out (pp. 47-54). In addition, the scholars indicated that, “the forces that influence and determine the decision to volunteer one’s time and energy are located both inside and outside the individual decider” (p. 46). Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt categorize the forces as “Own Forces,” those that originate from inside; “Interpersonal and Group Member Forces,” originating from outside the individual; and “Situational Forces,” which incorporate all forces that are dependant on the overall situation of the decider (pp. 47-48). Their study provides another system for searching out the depths of volunteer motivations, lending support to Clary and Snyder’s (1999) results and equipping the reader with the knowledge that not every force will be equally motivational for every individual.

Rather, individual differences in motivation occur across the spectrum of personalities studied. Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1977) conclude this chapter of study with nine generalizations about the motivations of volunteers. Key suggestions included: “the opportunity to participate in problem solving and significant decision making...the opportunity for self-actualizing personal development and meaningful service to the needs of others...motivation will be sustained best if there are regular mechanisms for supportive feedback...participation in meaningful training activities (e.g., conferences)” (pp. 61-62).

Systematically categorizing the forces or motivations involved in volunteerism will allow for individuals, organizations, and team foundations alike to try to “match” volunteers with roles that best fit each person. This consideration may direct persuasive volunteer communication. Additionally, the “forces” that affect and impact one’s choice to volunteer have been studied from another important perspective, prosocial behavior, continuing to lay the foundation of volunteer motivations.

Roland Bénabou and Jean Tirole (2004) discussed prosocial behaviors as producing variations of motives due to the fact that there are inherently a number of “important phenomena and puzzles...[that] cannot be explained by the sole presence of individuals with other-regarding [altruistic] preferences” (p. 1). They highlighted the use of rewards and punishments as possible motivators, and posit that people will react to them in a positive or negative fashion. A third motive may be found in the pressures and norms that society applies to the performance of good deeds while refraining from egoistic deeds. This “social signaling” (p. 6) occurs on a variety of levels that Bénabou and Tirole (2004) theorize occur through “prosocial actions that are undertaken both because a certain fraction of individuals are genuinely other-regarding and due to the fact, in many cases: people want to signal to others that they are generous, fair, public-

spirited...people strive to maintain a certain view of ‘what kind of person’ they are” (p. 3). The authors’ conclusions indicate that there is indeed a mix of motivations including variations of altruism, material self-interest (direct payoffs), and social signaling (from interaction with the rest of society) payoffs (p. 35). These forces give evidence of internal and external origins. In addition, the writers offered that the provision of incentives or rewards – whether direct or in connection with greater visibility of actions, and manipulating any of the three components – will produce a change in the meaning of their actions. This will in turn impact the “reputational incentive to engage in it” (p. 35). These outcomes lend proof to the multidimensional context in which volunteer requests are made and received, and evidenced by Benabou & Tirole’s statement; “People’s actions indeed reflect a variable mix of altruistic motivation, material self-interest, and social or self image concerns. Moreover, this mix varies across individuals and situations...” (p. 35).

Joining the examination of motivations to volunteer (MTVs) is the research of Michael Corrigan. In his thesis, Corrigan (2001) strived to create a descriptive profile of volunteers as framed by Roloff’s (1981) Social Exchange Theory (SET) through examining volunteers’ MTVs, and accompanied by a look into their interpersonal communication motives (ICM). SET essentially suggests that persons look for equitable exchanges throughout interactions with others, and assumes that people seek rewards for certain costs with the goal of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs. Some of the rewards or costs may be viewed from a reputational perspective as in prosocial literature, judged based on internal and external forces developed in methodology employed by Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1977), or considered in relation to goal-directed motives as evidenced in the functional approach. A standard of equitable exchange is set in the mind of the individual(s) according to prior experience and cultural norms, and based

on the actual exchange one then determines (consciously and sub-consciously) whether the rewards are worth the cost.

Corrigan (2001) directed his study to “gain additional insight into motivation to volunteer (MTV)” (p. 1), and provided useful data for applied use in the profit and non-profit organizational sectors by measuring the interpersonal communication motives most often identified in active volunteers. Corrigan suggested that even when considering whether a person’s motives for volunteering are due to situational forces or otherwise, “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” (p. 10). As interactions occur throughout the volunteer request and actual involvement, the actors involved are continually going through the process of judging whether their interactions are equitable – meeting or exceeding expectations of rewards and costs. If those exchanges are positive, then reinforcement occurs and it is likely that the volunteer will become more entrenched in his or her behavior. If the interactions are deemed un-equitable with the perceived costs outweighing the rewards, change is likely to occur with the possibility of the volunteer ceasing involvement. However, one of the results produced by Corrigan’s (2001) study acted counter to this assumption. He explored whether “Volunteerism is reliant upon comparison levels? Must rewards equal or exceed costs in order for volunteerism to be active?” and “Why would one continue to volunteer if costs outweigh rewards?” (p. 22). Results demonstrated that a majority of the volunteers (105 of 177) in this sample would commit to ongoing service even if costs outweighed the rewards gained. However, this was qualified by noting that this specific question had the most non-reports out of the whole survey, which might mean that “the subject of high costs associated with volunteering is a subject that many volunteers mentally choose not to consider” (Corrigan, 2001, p. 36). The

author surmises, “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” (p. 36). Targets’ responses to continuing in the face of un-equitable exchanges demonstrated various perspectives and belief systems that direct their behavior. Quotes such as: “The cause is greater than the costs,” “It is not about the costs,” “It’s the right thing to do,” “The church has to have volunteers-it’s my gift to God,” “Saving a child’s life is worth more than any cost,” or “Volunteering is volunteering!” (pp. 37-38) were reflective of the majorities’ sentiments.

Bolstering these findings are results from by Lao’s (1981) study, the *Effect Of Monetary Rewards On Subsequent Motivation*. While previous research had shown that monetary (extrinsic) rewards had produced a drop in the intrinsic motivation of volunteers, a chi square analysis backed her hypothesis, “if a task is truly intrinsically motivating then extrinsic rewards have little effect on subsequent motivation” (p. 41). Understanding that Lao is dealing only with one extrinsic reward and comparing the results to Corrigan’s (2001) findings enables the reader to surmise that truly intrinsic motivations will not be as greatly affected by the cost versus reward analysis. A volunteer who is driven by intrinsic values or motivations will more than likely not be affected by costs that outweigh rewards. In the same way, Corrigan’s (2001) evaluation of the attitudes and perspectives demonstrated by volunteers’ qualitative articulations draws him to postulate that no matter their origin – “higher power or internal guilt complex” (p. 38) – it seems that for many of the subjects there is no option of retreating from or quitting their volunteer post.

Upon further examination, six research questions helped to direct and develop Corrigan’s thesis. These six questions provide the foundation of three main concerns for the 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 [motivations to volunteer] MTVs. And the third is to measure and correlate the findings with interpersonal communication motives” (Corrigan, 2001, p. 25). Research Questions (RQ) One through Three were targeted at attaining an understanding of the rewards sought or expected, the costs associated, and how each of those factors weighed into active volunteerism. Research Questions Four to Six then sought to test the most prevalent MTVs and ICMs, with a focus on how each of those elements related to the other. Results were derived using the quantitative survey created by Rubin, Perse, & Barbato (1988) to test interpersonal communication motives (ICMs), and Cnaan & Goldberg-Glenns’ (1991) 28-item Likert-type motives-based volunteer survey.

Results demonstrate first the top three rewards and costs associated with the volunteer activity. Rewards were: 1). making friends, 2). personal satisfaction, and 3). helping others; while costs outlined were: 1). none (i.e. No costs), 2). transportation expenses, and 3). time (p. 28). Research Question 3 looked into whether volunteerism was reliant upon reward versus cost comparisons, whether rewards would have to equal costs in order for volunteerism to occur, and finally, whether one would continue to volunteer even when costs associated were greater. Responses were mixed, with approximately half of the respondents relaying the message that costs outweighing rewards would not stop them from volunteering, while the remainder split with about 25% indicating it would cause them to stop and the others not responding to the question. Research Question Four produced results showing the top three motivations to volunteer in his study: 1. Volunteering is an opportunity to do worthwhile, 2. I agree with this organization’s specific goals and want to assist, and 3. Volunteering creates a better society (see Table 3, Corrigan, 2001, p. 61). Volunteers revealed a focused desire to act in an altruistic, other-directed manner. Yet, further review of the top ten motivations broadens this focus to include

both self- and other-directed MTVs, a fact that offers support for the use of a multi-factored motivational typology. Finally, Research Question Five and Six highlight the relationship between MTVs and ICMs, results that will be discussed in the literature review on interpersonal communication motives (ICMs).

Whether studying from a Communication or Social Psychology perspective, the review of the literature on motivations to volunteer (MTVs) has exhibited there exists multiple motivations or forces that direct individuals' actions and behaviors. One cannot simply attribute to altruism or egoism the variety of reasons behind the generous volunteers that we have in our world, though both weigh heavily into the equation. There will always remain, within persons, the dialectical tension of seeking to act in ways that are considerate of both self and others, which often guide communication and interaction. Whether those tensions are viewed as influenced by social expectations as in prosocial behavior models, by forces both internal and external, by rewards and costs associated, or by goal-directed behavior as in the functional model, researchers and readers alike become aware of the highly complex, contextual nature from which people act and communicate. Unique audiences will have unique tendencies that may be organized by specific research targeting those areas of interest. Such research will provide rich understanding of that segment, allowing for educated volunteer communication and providing the opportunity for competent, appropriate, segment-specific interaction. For these reasons, this author seeks to create a general profile of both university and professional athletes' motivations to volunteer (MTVs) and interpersonal communication motives (ICMs) in the volunteer arena, framed by interpersonal communication theory – interaction adaptation theory (IAT).

Interpersonal Communication Motives

Interpersonal communication occurs in a variety of environments and is guided by a multitude of variables as rich in variety as the cultures, backgrounds, and experiences of the people interacting. Individuals' interpersonal communication can range from as intimate as those of lovers, to surface level exchanges between strangers or passers-by. The interactions may be used to accomplish a number of different goals or needs depending on the dyad or group interacting, and fulfill social, cultural, and relational expectations for that communication situation. Through communication people express their thoughts, feelings and emotions, monitor and manage relationships, perform work, share information and direct decision-making. The concept of communication innately implies the involvement of at least two people, the sender and the receiver, and occurs through both verbal and nonverbal messages. Therefore, people experience life and each relationship they engage in primarily as communicators. This perspective has led researchers to study and examine interpersonal communication from multiple perspectives directing their research objectives. One such direction is related to discovering and naming *why* people initiate and engage in communication with other people: interpersonal communication motives, and how that relates to other interpersonal communication variables.

Researchers Rubin, Perse, and Barbato (1988) are leaders in organizing and defining the motives that people have for communicating with others. Previous literature in this area focused more on *how* interpersonal communication takes place. Studies performed by Burgoon and Hale (1984), Schutz (1966), and Mehrabian and Ksionzky (1972) all organized and described relational communication according to significant themes or dimensions identified in everyday discourse. For example, Burgoon and Hale (1984) outlined seven major dimensions: control, intimacy, emotional arousal, composure, similarity, formality, and task-social orientation.

Rubin et al.'s (1988) research built upon that foundation, discussing the functional approach to interpersonal communication. This approach proposes that communication occurs to facilitate different functions or goals. These functions, as described by differing communication researchers included objectives such as: instrumental (problem solving), interpersonal (relationship development), and identity (impression management); inclusion, control, and affection as needs-fulfillment; or nonverbal communication functions – symbolic representation, expressive communication, structuring interaction, impression formation/management, metacommunication, and social influence (Clark & Delia, 1979; Schutz 1966; Burgoon, 1985).

Although Rubin et al. (1988) offer that functional analysis is useful, they suggest “there are some problems with a purely functional approach. First, communication behavior often serves more than one function...[this] confounds a functional scheme because it is difficult to tell which function is primary” (p. 606). Due to the problems found, and research suggesting “the perceptions of actor and target are probably more important in determining the course of an exchange than are the objective evaluations” (Patterson, 1983, p. 10), Rubin et al. (1988) promote an alternate method, working “to uncover the functions through examination of an individual’s motives” (p. 606). In this understanding, motives function to direct and guide communication behavior.

Officially, Rubin et al. (1988) set as their goal: to, “create and evaluate an Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) scale...” and “...provide initial evidence for the construct validity of the ICM scale” (p. 609). The result was the development of a 28-item tool used to ascertain individuals’ interpersonal communication motives (ICM), proof for its validity, and a demonstration of 6 main factors that accounted for 62.8% of the total variance. Each of these

were kept and deemed appropriate for use as ‘motives’ for communicating in interpersonal interaction. They are:

Factor 1: pleasure (eigenvalue = 8.57), accounted for 16.2% of the total variance. This factor reflected communicating because it was fun, stimulating, and entertaining.

Factor 2: affection (eigenvalue = 2.60), accounted for 11.5% of the total variance. This factor depicted a use of communication to express caring and appreciation for others.

Factor 3: inclusion (eigenvalue = 2.34), accounted for 10.3% of the total variance. This factor reflected a use of interpersonal communication to be with and share feelings with others and to overcome loneliness.

Factor 4: escape (eigenvalue = 1.89), accounted for 8.8% of the total variance. It reflected an avoidance of other activities and the use of communication to fill time.

Factor 5: relaxation (eigenvalue = 1.11), accounted for 8.5% of the total variance. It was made up of four relaxation items and depicted a use of interpersonal communication to rest, relax, and unwind.

Factor 6: control (eigenvalue = 1.06), accounted for 7.4% of the total variance. It included three control items that marked instrumental communication to gain compliance. (Rubin et al., 1988, pp. 615-617)

With the development of the ICM scale, the authors produced a reliable (Chronbach’s Alpha range = .75 to .89), valid method of testing why people communicate interpersonally in general situations. In their discussion of the results, Rubin et al. (1988) suggest the research, “not only yielded reliable 28- and 18-item scales, but provided information about how those uses of communication are related to socio-demographic characteristics, predispositions, and communication outcomes. It also provided support for past research analyzing interpersonal

behavior” (p. 620). They also promote the tool as revealing more salient motives of communication – their six factors – than does a purely functional approach. These results beg the question of how the ICM scale has been implemented over the last 19 years of research, and what results demonstrate.

In an interesting study by Javidi, Jordan and Prayately (1995), the researchers utilized an adapted ICM scale, applying it in a cross-cultural setting focusing on Japanese students. They work to find the relationships between the individual’s interpersonal communication motives and how they relate to compliance-gaining strategy selection. In doing so, they apply the scale to three different interpersonal situations used in prior research, “known to vary on the dimensions of intimacy, apprehension, long term consequences, resistance to persuasion, and negotiation” (p. 44). The results lead the authors to offer that, “Japanese who elect to engage in interpersonal persuasion apparently do so to control other people’s behaviors in situations...low in intimacy. Those who elect to negotiate demonstrate motivation characterized by pleasure and control, while those not electing to negotiate exhibited high situation general motives” (p. 46). Situation general motives in this study were a conglomeration of Rubin et al.’s (1988) motivation factors of inclusion, pleasure, relaxation, and escape, “suggesting (respondents were) communicating to satisfy a set of personal needs” (Javidi et al., 1995, p. 45). Further results of interest are the tactics or statements expected as evidenced by individuals’ communication acts within each situation. In situation one – seeking to obtain the payment of a small loan to a friend who was not paying back – simple statement and reason were chosen in order to gain compliance, while in situation two – where the person must approach a new neighbor about their dog that barks all night – the respondents demonstrated hinting, cooperation, and inaction as expected communication actions. Finally, in response to the third situation – where the actors were

directed to purchase an expensive rocking chair, at a discount, for a friend's birthday – the expected mode for gaining compliance through interpersonal communication was accomplished in one of two ways: by story-telling accompanied by strong feelings for their friend in a search for sympathy, or simply asking for the discount offering while indicating they would likely return should they receive a discount this time. While the study was performed in a different culture and the ICM tool modified to demonstrate its validity and reliability, the research shows the importance of the interaction setting and context for the “activation of particular motives” (Javidi et al., 1995, p. 47), and that individual motivations influence decisions concerning how to communicate in any situation. Ultimately, applying ICM to compliance-gaining communication indicated the following need, “functions to elicit control motives...” and “tends to be consistent with results reported for American culture” (Javidi et al., 1995, p. 47). Support for that conjecture lies in the research performed by Javidi, Jordan, and Carlone (1994) that “investigates relationships between individuals' motivation to communicate and compliance-gaining strategy selection across three different interpersonal communication situations” (p. 127). Once again, results manifested that the main motive for those who choose interpersonal persuasion was the control factor and existed across the interpersonal communication situations implemented. However, for those who elected negotiation tactics, the primary communication motive displayed was pleasure. The relevance of this research lies in regard to the situational variations that occur throughout volunteer communication. Depending on the situation at hand and who interacts, one might find a compliance-gaining/persuasion motive, information sharing, decision-making, or other task-related communication directing communication behaviors.

Acting to answer the question surrounding the relation of who interacts (dyad or group) and how it impacts interpersonal communication motives are researchers Graham, Barbato, and

Perse (1993). From a Uses and Gratifications paradigm (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974), Graham et al. (1993) attempted to “explain the use of interpersonal communication motives and to identify how interpersonal motives relate to other communication correlates,” anticipating “that motives for communicating with others may be reflected in who we talk to (relationship level), how we talk with others (communicator style), and what we talk about (self-disclosure)” (p. 173). The authors viewed these components as active within all interactions, and that motives do not exist independent of these factors. Hypothesizing that “Ratings of different interpersonal communication motives will be a function of relationship level” (Graham et al., 1993, pp. 174-175), they implemented an 18-item variation of the 28-item ICM scale. The mean scores attested to the fact that the pleasure motive was best fulfilled in communication by spouse/lover, family members or close friends, while this factor was least sought in conversation with strangers (though not statistically significant in difference to co-workers or those in a formal role). The affection motive demonstrated a similar outcome, though the formal role and co-worker were much more likely than a stranger to fulfill this motive. The inclusion and relaxation factors are best satisfied primarily in more intimate relational communication. The inclusion finding is supported in Step & Finucane’s (2002) study, where the authors advance that interpersonal communication motives function as antecedents to conversational climate (overall tone – in their study, an affective concept; p. 96) and outcome in everyday interactions. Lastly, interpersonal communication for escape and control motives was not impacted by the relationship level indicated. This study advances that motives for interpersonal communication *do* differ across the communication variables, promoting use of the ICM scale as it demonstrated sensitivity to relationship level, communicator style, and breadth and depth of disclosure.

Understanding that context and the relational dyad/group play significant roles in interpersonal communication, authors Anderson and Martin (1995a) forage into the realms of small group research. Their first work delved into studying task groups, working towards greater understanding of the “effects of three communication variables – motives, interaction involvement, and loneliness – on satisfaction” (p. 119). Their use of the Interpersonal Communication Motives construct garnered some interesting results. The authors tested interpersonal communication motives in correlation with other communication variables: interaction involvement dimensions (attentiveness, perceptiveness, and responsiveness), loneliness, and satisfaction. The interaction involvement variable has been seen as a key aspect of competence in communication (Cegala, 1981). Greater interaction involvement has been demonstrated in persuasive communication situations studied by Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman (1981), as targets utilized central route processing or critical thinking when issues had more personal affect. Thus communication competence – attentiveness, perceptiveness, and responsiveness – will likely be linked to ICM as individuals’ communicate more specifically to attain their innately ‘personal’ communication motives.

Anderson & Martin (1995a) discuss that motives for control and escape had direct effects in a negative manner on the three interaction involvement dimensions, suggesting those who communicate to fulfill those needs may use communication styles not conducive to task groups. On the other hand, positive direct effects were found for the pleasure motive on perceptiveness and responsiveness, with affection motive influencing only perceptiveness, drawing the conclusion that those who communicate for pleasure and affection in small groups will generally be highly involved. The relaxation communication motive did not figure significantly on any interaction involvement dimension inducing the thought that most task-group members do not

seek to fulfill this need in this context. A final intriguing outcome was the small but direct link between affection and group satisfaction. With support for this result in a needs theory framework and Rubin et al.'s (1988) findings within dyadic interaction, the authors propose, "Members are happiest when they are part of the social ritual and communicate concern for each other" (p. 131).

Stepping beyond the small group research setting, Anderson & Martin (1995b) advance organizational research from a communication perspective. While superior/subordinate communication has been frequently studied, less researched, yet as important, is that of the interaction between coworkers. Thus, focal to the study is implementation of the ICM scale to derive motives relative to employees' satisfaction with their superiors/coworkers, jobs, and organizations. A final aspect sought to identify the role gender plays in affiliation with those variables and the communication motives construct. Work relationships and work-place communication play a vital role in peoples' lives, as the majority of people spend approximately 33% of their daily hours at work. The interactions that occur have potential power to greatly enhance or diminish one's employment satisfaction. That stated, Anderson & Martin (1995b) employ the 18-item version of the ICM scale, though they add one dimension – duty – made up of three items "(e.g., because it's expected of me; because it would be rude not to do so; and because it's part of my job)" (p. 255). The authors found that employees "communicating with their superiors for pleasure, inclusion, and, to a slight degree, for affection, reported high satisfaction and to a lesser extent, commitment to their organizations and job satisfaction" (p. 256). Interestingly, employees did not communicate with coworkers out of relaxation, duty, control, and pleasure motives. Rather, those interacting from the affection need, and partly inclusion, reported high satisfaction with work. Another iteration of this outcome is employees'

communicate with coworkers to seek closeness. Not only will communication function to accomplish work within the organizational setting, but the findings “provide evidence that non-task oriented communication motives serve a valuable function” (p. 259). People interacting within organizational settings desire to have success in accomplishing tasks, but are further motivated to have meaningful relationships through appropriate interaction. This study provides strong support that fulfillment of the inclusion, pleasure, and affection interpersonal communication motives within the organizational setting is an important factor in attaining overall “satisfaction that cut across contexts” (p. 260). Therefore, volunteer or non-profit organizations would benefit greatly from creating and enabling a communication environment that draws volunteers into healthy, appropriate communication focused (at times) on interacting for pleasure, affection, and inclusion. Volunteer work centered on providing this may lead to greater satisfaction and higher commitment.

Diving back into the study performed by Corrigan (2001) guides us into the discussion on the relationship between motivation to volunteer (MTVs) and interpersonal communication motives (ICMs). One of the research questions centered directly on testing this relationship; “Do the interpersonal communication motives correlate significantly with MTVs” (Corrigan, 2001, p. 22)? Testing on a sample diverse in age, and assisting as volunteers through multiple avenues or organizations, Corrigan found that all sub-scale items of ICM (pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation, and control) correlated significantly with certain MTVs. Pleasure and Affection factors had the most significant correlations. With these two interpersonal communication motives already shown to factor significantly in satisfaction with work-place relationships (Anderson & Martin, 1995b), it is important to see how they relate with motivations to volunteer. Corrigan (2001) shares,

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. (pp. 39-40)

Inclusion also fulfilled expectations as the MTVs it correlated with most significantly had to do with "being part of prestigious organizations or career field, and occupying free time to eliminate loneliness" (p. 40). The other three ICMs (relaxation, control, and escape) also factored significantly in correlation to certain MTVs. For control and escape, the results revealed three MTVs: mandated volunteer service by employer/school, lonely, and nothing else to do.

A fascinating proposition was made relating to the ICM – MTV correlation tests. In the qualitative statements given by respondents, no one listed educational or work experience as a reward. However, the MTV typology identified this motive as relating to all six interpersonal communication motives. Thus, it seems the combination of these two scales may work to challenge self-report biases that potentially exist, and allow for a greater understanding of volunteers in general. In a final insightful comment regarding the use of information garnered, Corrigan (2001) said that organizations may choose to create and utilize a volunteer recruitment campaign that appeals "to the MTVs most prevalent and significantly correlating to ICMs" (p. 41).

In the volunteer context, one will find superior-subordinate, volunteer to volunteer, and volunteer-target relationships and interactions. There are a multitude of quality philanthropic organizations – targeting a variety of societal problems – that will only thrive and impact our society (you and I) for good if they are able to ascertain volunteer involvement. People will be

motivated by a variety of needs, desires, and expectations related to both the volunteer activity and the interpersonal communication that occurs in this setting. Interpersonal communication theories provide framework for organizing and understanding these interactions. One theory that applies well to the focus and goals of the current study, and will be used to direct it, is the Interaction Adaptation Theory.

Interaction Adaptation Theory

The Interaction Adaptation Theory (IAT) (Burgoon, Stern, & Dillman, 1995) is a broad interpersonal communication theory that helps frame how people communicate with one another, and how that communication affects behavior. It seeks to incorporate the many variables that influence and guide everyday human interactions, thus serving as a way to predict actual communication behavior. These variables are categorized into three main components: the requirements, expectations, and desires that individuals have for any given interaction.

Historically, IAT is an extended form of Expectancy Violation Theory (EVT), a theory that deals with proxemic (space) violations (Burgoon, 1978), further nonverbal expectancy violations (Burgoon & Hale, 1988), and is considered applicable to verbal behavior as well (Burgoon & Burgoon, 2001). The authors continue, stating that IAT incorporates “many of the same variables and explanatory mechanisms as EVT” (p. 34). Therefore, to gain a better understanding of IAT, one must revert to literature on EVT.

The expectations that individuals have for interactions are based on social context and norms, approach-avoidance behaviors in the drive to manage connectedness and privacy, uncertainty reduction, impression management, and interactants’ relational goals (Miczo, M., Allspach, L.E. & Burgoon, J. K., 1990). Expectancy Violations Theory (EVT) is focused exclusively on communication expectations. Expectation(s), as used in previous literature refers

to “the act or state of expecting” (Webster’s, p. 247). Burgoon & Burgoon (2001) discuss expectations as being both general – those based on current roles, rules, norms, and practices that apply to a given culture, community, or context – and particular – as being rooted in specific knowledge, experience, and understanding of another person’s typical communication practices. EVT is a theory pitched at the microscopic (interpersonal) level and “base predictions for a given individual, message, or transaction on a combination of generic expectancies and any individuating knowledge of how the actor’s behavior deviates from those general patterns” (p. 3). Thus, both EVT and IAT account for both widespread and context- and person-sensitive expectancies.

A further defining point surrounding expectations are whether they are prescriptive or predictive in nature. Predictive expectancies relate to those understood as typicality of behavior or regularity of occurrence. Prescriptive, on the other hand, demonstrate evaluation, revealing appropriateness or desirability of a communication behavior, and “pertain to idealized standards for conduct” (Burgoon & Burgoon, 2001, p. 4). This understanding can be seen in IAT as well, with “expectations capturing what is preferred from another and thus resemble prescriptive expectancies,” while the desired and required behaviors “represent the fact that some forms of adaptation are designed to satisfy basic needs such as safety and sensory stimulation” (p. 35). The authors highlight EVT characteristics along three lines: the actors or interactants, the relationship between them, and the communication context. The characteristics are also judged by each person as having positive or negative valences (evaluations), thus impacting the expectations that each individual has for and of the interaction. For example, one might judge the other person as having a high reward factor or positive valence based on perceived

attractiveness, and therefore attribute to them higher degrees of credibility or liking potentially leading to desired task-related interaction outcomes.

EVT then takes the evaluations a step further as the net outcome of all valences lead to judgment of whether there was a significant violation of one's expectations – going beyond the range of violation deemed acceptable. This violation can have a positive or negative valence as well, with reciprocity or compensation as the potential reaction on the part of the interaction partner. Burgoon et al. (2001) reveals the theory serves a unique predictive function deriving a pivotal proposition: “EVT makes the counterintuitive prediction that positive violations produce more favorable interaction patterns and outcomes than confirming expectations, whereas negative violations produce more undesirable results than confirming expectations” (p. 30). In definition, interpersonal reciprocity is, “the process of behavioral adaptation in which one responds, in a similar direction, to a partner's behaviors of comparable functional value,” and interpersonal compensation is, “the process of behavioral adaptation in which one responds with behaviors of comparable functional value but in the opposite direction” (Burgoon, 1993, p. 302). Ultimately, EVT predicts that when one experiences positively or negatively valenced interactions, there will be a heightened awareness with reciprocation or compensation as a response to direct the communication accordingly. The application of EVT is proposed as applying “more broadly to social as well as task, and dyadic as well as group, interaction” (Burgoon & Burgoon, 2001, p. 29). This discussion enhances our understanding of the second component of IAT – expectancies – and provides greater comprehension of the foundation of Interaction Adaptation Theory.

There are five key concepts offered that form Interaction Adaptation Theory. Burgoon et al. (1995) categorize these into three primary elements, “which are interrelated, are the *required*,

expected, and *desired* level of any given functional set of interaction behaviors” (265), and two related components. The elements, (“R,” “E,” “D”) perform the function of accounting for the many different variables that must be taken into consideration when dealing with interpersonal interaction. Combining them generates the fourth concept, which is the interaction position (*IP*). The actual communication behavior (*A*) is the fifth concept discussed.

The *R*, or required element (needs), is directed by the individual’s core needs as they stem from biological, innate factors (Miczo et al., 1990), and “refer to what a person believes is necessary at a given point in the interaction” (Floyd & Burgoon, 1999, p. 221). For example, if the person is hungry or tired, has children to monitor, pressing issues, or must gain critical information from the interaction, all potentially impact their communication behavior. As discussed in relation to Expectancy Violation Theory, the expectations category of IAT, *E*, generates both predictive and prescriptive anticipations of communication behaviors. These are derived from social norms, the context of the situation, the specific relationship, and the cultural communication rules for both sender and receiver (i.e. if the two people are meeting for the first time, their meeting behavior – shaking hands, smiles, slight nod – would be dictated by what they have learned is acceptable and even preferred).

The third component – desired behavior, *D*; “is highly personalized and includes personal goals, likes, and dislikes, which often originate from one’s basic temperament, but may also be shaped by social and cultural influences...person-specific behaviors” (Burgoon, Stern & Dillman, 1995, pp. 266-67). As an example, an athlete may have had a family member or close friend who battled cancer and thus they desire to work toward the eradication of cancer and to volunteer in areas that contribute to helping cancer patients. Or, depending on their experience and overall context, the athlete may desire to protect themselves from any contact with the

disease due to the personal nature or hurtful memories invoked. His or her desire(s) will often dictate how and why they communicate, and thus how the interaction is judged. In fact, studies have shown that preinteraction expectancies are not as powerful as once assumed (Burgoon, Le Poire & Rosenthal, 1995a), and desires play a greater role in actual communication behavior (Floyd & Burgoon, 1999).

The fourth concept is created by the combination of the first three, and identified as *interactional position* (IP). Thus, as the person's interactional requirements, expectations, and desires (goals) are combined, one may propose that the IP will direct or guide projected initial behavior for either interactant. Essentially, this is the overall context from and within which both interactants communicate. The *IP* "represents a net assessment of what is needed, anticipated, and preferred as the dyadic interaction pattern in a situation" (Burgoon et al., 1995b, 266).

Once the behavior is performed, the fifth concept is revealed. This is the actual communication behavior (A) of those interacting. With this information, the model serves to help predict adaptation, or patterns of reciprocity and compensation that are both intentional and unintentional (Burgoon et al., 1995a) as the IP is compared to the A. Considering the communication when there is a large discrepancy between the interaction position and the actual behavior, one will be moved to act in a reciprocal or compensating way. This will depend upon the valence assigned to the interaction violation, and according to Floyd and Burgoon (1999), we see that interaction adaptation responses are predicted "based on (a) the magnitude of discrepancy between the IP and A, and (b) the valence (positivity or negativity) associated with each" (p. 221).

When a communicative act is deemed negative, compensation occurs and the resulting communication will serve to change the communication pattern initiated by the primary actor. If

this communication is reciprocated, the interactants will have converged in their behaviors and interaction will continue. Here it is important to define convergence. Burgoon (1993) states convergence “occurs when one adopts behavior that is increasingly similar to that of the partner” and in regard to divergence says, “(it) entails adopting dissimilar behaviors from that of the partner” (pp. 302-303). Reciprocity, convergence, and even compensation and divergence may lead to successful in communication and interaction through appropriate and skillful adaptation. However, lack of skill and ability to act or respond appropriately based on the other’s needs, expectations, and desires will lead to a negative discrepancy that motivates the person to compensate. Compensation here may lead to eventual termination of the interaction, or other less intense reactions.

For example, if one were to make a phone call to someone in order to ask if they are able and willing to help move furniture, each person would be interacting within their particular context. Our interaction position as formed by prior experience(s), relationship to the person, and the current communication context, would guide our interaction. If at a certain point in the polite, conventional conversation one yelled at the target and said, “You have to help me!” the actual behavior would be judged as a negative discrepancy or violation of our interaction position (what we expect and desire from the interaction). The other person may then either reciprocate, by yelling back, or compensate, by maintaining a calm tone or getting quieter and possibly withdrawing from the conversation. Either way, the communication process following the violation would likely not yield a beneficial result for the one seeking help in moving furniture. Working towards a general understanding of the targets’ IP will help the actor to attain the productive communication needed to enhance likelihood of involvement.

One of the central tenets of IAT stipulates there exists preinteraction goals and expectancies that guide interaction partners during the initial stages of interaction. This IP then gives way to mutual influence by the partners as they communicate, demonstrating adaptation through reciprocity or compensation in the need to fulfill their desires, expectations, and needs of the interaction. Burgoon et al. (1995a) applied IAT to study preinteraction expectancies and target communication within dyadic interaction. Interestingly they found that preinteraction expectancies did not have as dominant a role as proposed. Rather, the “target’s interactional behavior and that behavior’s disconfirmatory status relative to preinteraction expectancies as being the more salient and powerful contingencies” (p. 309). Furthermore, the results seemed to imply:

(A) universal orientation toward starting the conversation off on a pleasant footing, regardless of prior expectancies. Moreover, instead of matching the behavior they anticipated from targets, perceivers matched targets’ actual behavior. Expectancies exerted their primary impact by virtue of defining targets’ enacted behavior as a positive or negative expectancy violation. (p. 311)

These findings demonstrate that while there are expectations that serve to influence interaction, IAT theory submits there also exists desires and requirements that act as influential components in communication. Also, the actual communication behavior is seen to hold greater value when predicting communication adaptation than that of anticipated behavior.

Floyd & Burgoon (1999) implemented the theory in a study aimed at predicting when nonverbal expressions of liking will be reciprocated. An interesting result of the study demonstrated that while expectations exerted some influence, “the results implicate individuals’ desires to be liked or disliked as a primary antecedent of their behavioral responses to such

expressions” (p. 232). The authors found that one’s desires will carry more weight when moving to actual communication. Participants who desired and expected liking enacted the most liking behavior, while those who desired and expected disliking incorporated minimal liking behavior. Both used compensating or reciprocating behaviors to manage the interaction based on their interaction position. The results gave several important implications for IAT. First, results lend direct support for IAT, demonstrating “(there exists) direct relationships between the expectations and desires with which individuals enter interactions and their eventual behavioral responses to their partners’ behaviors” (Floyd & Burgoon, 1999, p. 232). Understood then, is that people will generally act and communicate according to their desires and expectations for an interaction. A second issue is the conceiving of “behavior valence (positive or negative) as being a function of one’s desires” (p. 235). The authors suggest that behavior valence has important predictive application within IAT and EVT. Interactions may be highly influenced by whether the actual behavior is evaluated as meeting or positively violating (exceeding) one’s desires. “This conceptualization of valence can add specificity and predictive power when considered in tandem with other conceptual definitions” (p. 235).

Researchers Chen & Isa (2003) bring up cultural adaptation that occurs as “strangers” leave familiar situations and move into new, unfamiliar environments (76). The process involves transitioning from initial interest and excitement to being overwhelmed, and then on to adaptation. Applying this to a volunteer context, one can propose that this process is likely to occur on a smaller scale as athletes first arrive at the site where they will be volunteering. If they are being involved for the first time, they may find themselves in a brand new environment – from the physical surroundings to the individuals that they must interact with. Understanding this aspect of the athlete’s experience would serve to enhance the interaction experience, as

organizational staff would be better prepared to make proper use of positive immediacy behaviors and appropriate verbal communication to compensate for any discrepancies. Also, taking into account the individual's perceived IP would enable preliminary communication that educates, and in turn prepares and develops the person's interaction position of the helping event by detailing the location, environment, and role expectations. The goal would be to enable quick and smooth adaptation to the experience and open up lines of communication.

In summary, the essence of IAT shows us that people come into their interactions with personal requirements, expectations, and desires for communication behavior that are directed by their culture, social context, the situation, goals, experiences, and personal knowledge of the partner: also known as preinteraction factors (Burgoon et al., 1995a, p. 312). From this paradigm the initial interaction between the participants occurs, and each communicative act is met with adaptive behaviors of reciprocity or compensation, generating negotiation of interaction patterns that facilitate communication. Evaluative judgments are made about the interaction (actual behavior) and communication partner throughout the interpersonal communication. Either component may be deemed to have negative or positive valences, and the weight attributed to each all combine to determine the overall evaluation of the interaction. "IAT predicts that reciprocity is the normative response, but that compensation occurs when a partner's behavior is more negative than one needs, expects, or wants it to be" (Floyd & Ray, 2005, p. 4). Important within the theory is also the understanding that positive violations will produce better communicative results than simply meeting a normative measure or expectation. IAT creates a paradigm from which to study interactions from differing standpoints and account for multiple variables, and prepares the researcher for a deeper look into peoples' interaction position surrounding volunteer request communication and helping behavior itself.

Rationale

Volunteering is a vital aspect of North American society, contributing millions of man-hours, representing billions of dollars through a plethora of foundations – non-profit and profit companies – to an astounding variety of purposes. Organizers and volunteers play pivotal roles in bridging the divide between action and non-action, with the typical difference that volunteers do not get paid. Truly, volunteers function as the lifeblood of the organizations they serve. A great number of studies have been done on volunteer motivations and perspectives from different academic disciplines, and while scholarly research on sport's philanthropy has recently been blossoming, there has been little focus on the volunteer behavior of elite athletes. Rather, more research has been focused on, and committed to understanding the corporate practices involved in effective, proactive philanthropy. The majority of research has been performed at the professional level of sports and does not consider the volunteer paradigm of another group of elite athletes on the cusp of potential professional careers – those playing NCAA or other high-level university sports. This research serves to fill the gap in the literature by studying both professional and university athletes' motivations to volunteer and explaining their interpersonal communication motives from a communication perspective as framed by the Interaction Adaptation Theory. Communication is the link between individuals that enables shared meaning and understanding, and is thus vital to successful volunteer recruitment and ongoing participation that promotes satisfaction with the experience.

Communication occurs in a transactional process where individuals affect each other simultaneously during communication. This process can be observed or demonstrated in dyadic interaction or group interaction as mutual influence takes place throughout the interaction. Communication occurs via verbal and nonverbal messages and may be sent at any point during an interaction (Burgoon et al., 1995a; Burgoon & Burgoon, 2001; Burgoon, 1993). Based on the

perceived meaning of any communication act, individuals choose to respond or act through goal-directed, functional communication in a number of ways. For these reasons the author has chosen the interpersonal communication theory, Interaction Adaptation Theory (IAT), to frame the current study. Integral to IAT are the three components of one's interaction position (IP): requirements, which are the genuine needs a person has for an interaction; expectations, which reflect anticipated behavior; and desires, or the person's goals and preferences for the communication. These three components – as dictated by the situation, the relationship to target(s), cultural and social norms, and previous experience – perform to direct one's evaluations of the interaction. These evaluations then serve to direct interaction behavior in the transactional process of communication, with IAT predicting reciprocity and compensation as potential responses to each communicative act (Burgoon et al., 1995b). Through this elaborate process, the interactants negotiate communication behavior seeking productive, appropriate, positively valenced communication. Thus, a person's requirements, expectations, and desires function to influence their interaction in any interpersonal situation. Here IAT works to prepare the individual communicator to understand and function throughout the interaction – from initial contact and request communication, to interaction during the volunteer endeavor, and then to post-involvement. One can gain a practical and insightful understanding of the perspective that the volunteer is coming from by cultivating a mindset that thinks of the receiver's motivational communication context, or interaction position (IP).

Motive(s) perform as underlying reasons driving why and how people act and communicate. In relation to interpersonal interaction, strong research exists from the interpersonal communication motives (ICM) construct. Rubin, Perse & Barbato (1988) defined and operationalized the Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale that provides a systematic

way of determining individuals' communication motives. Their research and scale grew out of Schutz's (1966) work, that stipulated interpersonal communication was driven from a needs-based perspective comprised of three basic interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. Rubin et al. (1988) built upon this foundation revealing an instrument that added three more interpersonal (communication) needs to the paradigm: pleasure, escape, and relaxation. Their construct is derived from an understanding that interpersonal communication serves a variety of functions to satisfy certain goals and needs, and that "examining the motives for interactional communication should enhance understanding of interpersonal communication choices and outcomes" (Rubin et al., 1988, p. 607). Scholars have researched a variety of topics involving ICM, applying the scale to various situations in either verbal or nonverbal dimensions (Javidi et al., 1995, 1994; Anderson & Martin, 1995; Step & Finucane, 2002; Myers & Ferry, 2001). With the understanding that motives function to influence communication outcomes, one may sensibly postulate that ICMs mesh with the components put forth in IAT: the requirements (needs), expectations, and desires (goals) that also influence communication interaction. In the functional tradition one's needs and goals are integrated directly into the theorizing. Step & Finucane (2002) make a motion to also include one's expectations, stating "motives can be understood as expectations for an interaction that guide behavior" (p. 105). Therefore, utilizing the functional approach set forth in the Interpersonal Communication Motives scale, one may effectively study and ascertain the key motivations of elite athlete volunteers for communication within a volunteer context.

IAT postulates that the interaction position is made up of a global (societal and cultural norms) perspective of the communication context, as well as more individuated knowledge of the target. Flowing naturally from this perspective and the rationale put forth for use of ICM is the

focus on studying the motivations to volunteer (MTVs) of the sample population. Information gained through the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary & Snyder, 1999) will reveal volunteers' reasons for performing volunteer work, benefiting researchers and practitioners alike in providing greater understanding to the unique general interaction position held by elite athlete volunteers. Prior research has debated the role of altruism and egoism as primary motives for volunteering and contributed to further understanding of MTVs (Churchill & Street, 2004; Clary & Snyder, 1991, 1999; Bequette, 1990; Grant, 2001). Clary & Snyder's (1999) research demonstrated that MTVs are more than just altruistic or egoistic. Rather, people have a variety of motives for volunteering, and the VFI works to test and name those motivations. Relating to IAT, MTVs will require different satisfactions (Clary and Snyder, 1991), just as an individual's requirements, expectations, and desires will have different satisfactions in interpersonal interaction depending on the overall context. The motivations to volunteer may thus be seen as functioning alongside interpersonal communication motives to create the volunteers' interaction position, which then influences one's interaction behaviors. For this reason, it makes sense to study volunteers MTVs as part of the IAT paradigm. Lastly, support is given for the current study's implementation of MTVs and ICMs because it builds upon prior research by Corrigan (2001) that applied this focus to the volunteer context from a communication perspective.

Organizations, foundations, and individuals seeking the help of volunteers must communicate their need to potential volunteers at some point. Interaction Adaptation Theory and audience analysis have guided the rationale, suggesting that working to understand an individual's general interaction position is the first step to knowing one's audience. A person's motivations will influence their actions, and those actions are accomplished through communication. Therefore, this study seeks to identify elite athletes' motivations to volunteer

(MTVs) as well as their interpersonal communication motives (ICMs). The study of MTVs drives at a deeper understanding of the reasons elite athletes give of their time in volunteering – the motives fulfilled. The examination of ICMs dives into why athletes talk to other people in relation to volunteer activity. The purpose is to create greater comprehension to generate involvement, and to provide stimulating, satisfying interaction that further motivates the volunteer. The researcher implements slightly modified versions of two reliable tools, the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) Scale (Rubin et al., 1988), and the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary & Snyder, 1999), in order to answer the following Research Questions (RQ). This serves the purpose of gaining insight into a general motivational communication profile of elite athletes to volunteer.

RQ 1. What are elite athlete's most prevalent motivations to volunteer (MTVs)?

RQ 2. What are elite athletes' interpersonal communication motives (ICMs) in regard to volunteer communication?

RQ 3. To what extent do motivations to volunteer correlate with interpersonal communication motives?

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Sample

The survey sample was drawn from approximately 400 athletes on the campus of a moderately sized, private, Christian, liberal-arts university on the east coast, as well as from professional hockey players associated with the Professional Hockey Players Association (PHPA). The professionals were sought from the National Hockey League (NHL), American Hockey League (AHL), and (formerly) East Coast Hockey League – now simply the ECHL (Matlosz, 2007). These represent the three top professional hockey leagues in North America with the NHL being the top, the AHL a AAA feeder league, and the ECHL – the premier AA hockey league. The sample consisted of ninety-seven individuals who completed surveys over the course of 3 weeks. Sixty-seven percent (65) of the respondents were university student-athletes, while professional athletes accounted for thirty-three percent (32). The student-athlete population was composed of athletes from various sports: soccer (11), volleyball (9), baseball (3), football (11), track & field (6), wrestling (3), tennis (3), cheerleading (1), and hockey (18). With the inclusion of the professional hockey players in the overall population, 51.5% of the total population surveyed was comprised of ice hockey players. The participants were not required to have volunteered within the past year, however almost 8 out of 10 respondents indicated having volunteered. In the student-athlete segment, 73.8% had volunteered in the last 12 months, and the pro players were slightly higher with 87.5%.

Further demographics reported by the athletes showed the majority (67.7%) of student-athlete respondents were between the ages of 18-20, 27.7% were 21-22, and all indicated not being married. Unique to the student-athlete sample was the ability to include females due to the

variety of sports available at the university. Contributing to the study were 18 females, representing 18.6% of the total segment studied. The student-athlete population also reported scholarship level, with 49.2% not receiving any scholarship funding; at the other end of the spectrum, 35.5% reported receiving full scholarships. Freshman and sophomores were the greatest respondents to this survey at 47, and 18 upperclassmen were involved.

In contrast, the professional athletes who responded ranged in age from 21-45, with the majority (46.9%) composed of 26-30 year olds, and the minority (6.3%) being between 36-45 years old. Half of this segment indicated being married/common law, and nearly half were single, while only 6.3% designated being divorced. Americans and Canadians represented 87.5% of professional hockey players, with only a small amount being from other countries. Respondents indicating full-time employment constituted 83.9% of this segment, and overall incomes ranged from \$15,000 to \$500,000, though a significant amount (45.2%) were in the \$51,000 - \$100,000 pay scale. A unique aspect of this population was that it included those who were former players. Seventy-eight percent said they are current players; 48% indicating having played 1-4 years, 36% were at the 5-10 year mark, and 16% had played more than 11 years. Lastly, frequency statistics revealed 59.4% of the professional hockey players surveyed had a high school education, almost 20% more than those who had a college level degree.

Procedure

Participants completed a multiple scale survey designed to assess their motivations to volunteer and interpersonal communication motives, along with a demographic section. The typologies implemented were the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) and the Interpersonal Communication Motives construct (ICM). Research participants were instructed as to the nature of the study with specific instruction that involvement was voluntary and completely

anonymous. This designation followed guidelines for research with human participants given by the Institutional Review Board (of the institution involved) and the American Psychological Association. Unique to this study was the target population as the researcher desired to obtain data from elite athletes at both the university and professional level. Thus, surveys were distributed in two methods in order to best ascertain involvement of both samples.

The first sample, professional hockey players, was administered the survey with the involvement of the Professional Hockey Players Association (PHPA). This association oversees two of the minor pro leagues in professional hockey: the American Hockey League (a triple A league), and the ECHL (a double A league), both of which feed the National Hockey League (NHL). The PHPA was contacted via email and phone to obtain permission for the study and to define how to distribute the survey. With permission granted, the result was that the Association worked hand in hand with the researcher to develop the survey and administer it via the PHPA's website (www.phpa.com). Only current members and alumni were allowed to enter the members' only section of the website via a password protected identification system. Thus, no individuals other than those already determined to currently or formerly play professional hockey were able to respond. The PHPA then sent out a brief informational email to all the current members and alumni highlighting the study and inviting all to participate. The first page of the survey provided a letter of introduction and greater explanation of the study to the respondents, followed by the survey (see Appendix A). As results came in, the researcher was informed and provided data via the Professional Hockey Players Association's web technical specialist.

The second sample included elite athletes at the university level. The surveys were distributed at a moderately sized, private, liberal arts university on the east coast. The researcher invited two university staff to be involved in procuring willing participants. Both staff agreed to

help, were trained, and through ongoing contact with the university's athlete population, administered the survey under the previously discussed procedures. The researcher was also involved in the process, conducting the survey with a group of athletes after a team meeting as permitted by the coach. Upon completion, all surveys were collected by the three distributors, given to the primary researcher and kept in a locked room.

Instrument

Surveys are the method of data collection used in this study due to the fact they are able to perform multiple functions across a large population. Statistics supported by surveys and reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor show about 64.5 million people volunteered at least once from September 2003 to September 2004, and the percentage of the population who volunteered during the year held steady at 28.8% (www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm). Similarly, the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (NSGVP) in Canada highlights information on volunteers and their motivations for volunteering, indicating that 23% of the population served in this manner and did so with a primary motive of belief in the cause supported by the organization (www.givingandvolunteering.ca). The questionnaire designated for this study incorporated general demographic questions and two multiple scale instruments that will perform the function of data collection.

There are three main foci of the current study that facilitated obtaining the goal to provide a general motivational profile of elite athletes towards volunteerism and volunteer communication. The first Research Question (RQ1) is to determine the populations' motivations to volunteer. RQ2 works to identify their interpersonal communication motives in volunteer communication. Finally, RQ3 works to establish if and how MTVs and ICMs correlate with one

another significantly. Following the lead of Corrigan (2001), this research is driven by combining two survey instruments that have demonstrated statistical reliability: the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) that determines MTV, and the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) Scale (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Rubin et al., 1988). While Corrigan (2001) used a 28-item likert scale survey created by Cnaan & Goldberg-Glenn (1991) to test MTV, the current motivations to volunteer research implemented a modified version of Clary & Snyder's (1999) 30-item VFI Likert scale survey and Rubin et al.'s (1988) 28-item ICM, 6-factor, Likert scale survey.

The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) stood out as a valuable measurement ($\alpha = .83$) tool because it allowed for the identification of multiple motivations to volunteer work, and acknowledgement of the role of altruism within its scheme. While altruism here is not seen as its own function, this definition depicts it as being integral to an individual's motivation. The VFI can also be adapted to best fit this specific study. The six components within the functional theory are: a) Values, b) Understanding, c) Enhancement, d) Career, e) Social, and f) Protective (Clary & Snyder, 1999, Table 1, p.157). Assumptions that form the foundation of the construct include:

1. People are purposeful, plan full, goal-directed – Volunteers engage in volunteer work in order to satisfy important personal goals.
2. Different people may do similar things for different reasons – Volunteers performing the same volunteer activity for the same organization may have different reasons for volunteering.
3. Any one individual may be motivated by more than one need or goal – An individual

volunteer may be attempting to satisfy two or more motives through one activity at your organization.

4. Outcomes depend on the matching of needs and goals to the opportunities afforded by the environment – Successful volunteer recruitment, satisfaction, and retention is tied to the ability of the volunteer experience to fulfill the volunteer’s important motives. (Clary & Snyder, see Appendix C)

These assumptions led to the development of the six functions originally defined and organized in research by Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, et al. (1998). Each function demonstrated the following reliability scores: Career ($\alpha = .89$), Enhancement ($\alpha = .84$), Social ($\alpha = .83$), Understanding ($\alpha = .81$), Protective ($\alpha = .81$), and Values ($\alpha = .80$). A review of each component of the VFI reveals that none allow for or draw out a religiously oriented motive. While the values-expression function invokes similar concepts (i.e. humanitarianism and helping the less fortunate: Table 1, Clary & Snyder, 1999), in the current form it does not incorporate religious ideals and the questions on the survey do not indicate anything in regard to religious faith or affiliation. Research by Cnaan, Kasternakis & Wineburg (1993) sought to link religious beliefs and volunteerism, with results indicating, “no significant relationships between religious beliefs and volunteerism, when volunteer activity is considered apart from congregational auspices” (p. 48). On the other hand, Reed and Selbee (2001) conducted a study on the civic core in Canada with outcomes highlighting the unique characteristics of the volunteers studied. Characteristics generally high among elites were, “elevated levels of occupational status, education, and income,” and those not associated with the elite class, “a strong religious orientation, multiple forms of personal generosity and supporting a common good, and explicit commitment to the community” (p. 775).

In a more recent study, Berger (2006) shared results that lend further credence to the impact of faith and/or religion on philanthropic behavior. “Religious affiliation and self-perceived religiosity appear to be important as influences on philanthropic variance. Those who are non-religiously affiliated are the least philanthropic, while those who identify themselves as conservative Protestants are the most philanthropic” (p. 131). Such research strengthens the motion of adding a Religious Dimension to the VFI, and led to declaring a seventh conceptual definition accordingly:

VFI Religious: Individuals may operate in a religious, faith-based paradigm from which Biblically oriented values are expressed through volunteering.

An adapted, highly reliable ($\alpha = .815$) Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) scale that incorporates a Religious Factor executes as an excellent model for understanding overall motivations for volunteering. The addition of five items to the 30-item scale allowed for the testing of religious-oriented motivations. They included both general and specific spiritual statements, allowing for a greater universal application to those of different faiths:

1. Volunteering allows me to share my faith in God.
2. It is important to follow the ‘Golden Rule’ – to treat others as I want to be treated.
3. Serving others is a way for me to put my faith into action.
4. I desire to show God’s love to others.
5. It is important to put others’ needs before myself.

In their participation, respondents demonstrated how important or accurate each item was for them with regard to volunteering. The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) utilized a 7-point Likert scale for each item response (i.e. 1 = not at all important/accurate for you, 4 = somewhat important/accurate, and 7 = extremely important/accurate for you). Reliability tests were

performed on each VFI factor, with Chronbach's Alpha demonstrating a range from .705 as a low to the high of .857. Specifically, the new item VFI Religious proved its reliability with a score of .796.

The second portion of the survey was created using Rubin et al.'s (1988) Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale (ICMS). Building off of a needs-based theory by Schutz (1966) that named three components of the future ICM scale, the authors added three factors to the mix. The motivations that communication functions to fulfill are pleasure (communicating because it was fun, stimulating, and entertaining), affection (to express caring and appreciation), inclusion (to be with and share feelings with others & overcome loneliness), escape (avoidance of some activities and using communication to fill time), relaxation (communication to relax, rest, unwind), and control (instrumental communication to gain compliance) (Rubin et al., 1988, p. 617). The authors tested each factor with varying numbers of items. In order, the total items for each factor were 8, 5, 4, 4, 4, and 3 respectively. Rubin et al. (1988) and other researchers have envisioned implemented varying versions of the ICM scale. Graham et al. (1993) activated a modified 18-item variation of the 28-item ICM scale, and Anderson & Martin (1995b) also employed the 18-item version of the ICM scale, but go further adding one dimension – duty – made up of three items “(e.g., because it's expected of me; because it would be rude not to do so; and because it's part of my job)” (p. 255).

With the support of prior research, and since one of the goals of this study was to determine the interpersonal communication motives in a volunteer setting, a modified form of the ICM scale facilitated data generation. The instrument had 28 items, providing 7 factors or motivations for communication. The new interpersonal communication motivation factor is termed “Information”, as giving and receiving information, or reducing one's uncertainty, is a

significant component in all interpersonal interaction (Berger and Calabrese, 1975), as well as of volunteer communication. Each ICM factor had four items after the modification, with four being removed from Factor 1 (pleasure) based in part on redundancy; one item removed from affection; the inclusion, escape, and relaxation factors remained the same; one item was added to control (item 25: to let others know my needs and desires); and four produce the final communication motive “Information” (i.e. in order to understand what is expected of me, in order to clarify information and directions, in order to coordinate action with others, in order to facilitate planning and organization). Rubin, Perse, and Barbato (1988) reported the reliability of the scale with the six items ranging from $\alpha = .75$ to $.89$ (Table 2, p. 618). The ICM “Information” subscale was added by this researcher. Reliability analysis (SPSS 15.0, 2007) indicated Cronbach's alpha of $.866$ for that subscale, which is comparable to the reliability of the other scales of this instrument, thus worthy of inclusion in the results of this investigation. Furthermore, reliability tests performed on the current seven-item ICM scale using Chronbach's Alpha measures and demonstrated scores ranging from $\alpha = .725$ to $.926$. The Interpersonal Communication Motives construct implemented a 5-point Likert type scale. Respondents indicated how similar to their own reasons each item was for communicating, with number 1 = not at all like my own, and number 5 = exactly like my own.

Finally, the survey finished with an optional qualitative question that was aimed at garnering further insight into participants' expectations and desires of individuals and organizations that seek their involvement. The question was: “If an organization contacted you to volunteer with them, what do you expect and desire from them concerning the communication, and the volunteer activity? A total of thirty-nine of the ninety-seven respondents replied to this question, with 10 of the professional hockey players contributing, and 29 from the university

athlete population: 45% of the male athletes and 44% of the female athletes responded. The process of analyzing the data began with reading through the athletes' responses and then re-reading, looking this time for specific themes. The next step was to categorize theme statements into broader categories, color-code them, and highlight them using different colored highlighter pens. Once this step was completed, the researcher tallied up the theme statement categories that were found. In doing so the highlighted themes were counted, but if the same theme appeared twice in one sentence it counted only for one. However, if different themes were evident – either separately or intertwined – each statement was recorded as one for that specific question and the informant who was responding. The purpose in this was to gain a better understanding of the amount of times each theme showed up in each subject's response. The results helped indicate the themes that were of greatest importance across the population. Five themes appeared at varying frequencies: 1. Care – statements that speak of respondents' desires and expectations of the organization to care, take care of, or value the volunteer; 2. Details – words and statements that reflect importance on knowing time, place, who working with, who for, contact information; 3. Clarity – any statement that indicated desires and expectations for explicit communication regarding the volunteer activity and openness in communication; 4. Role – Statements and works that demonstrate a need or desire to be prepared, told, and understand what they will be doing and what is expected of them; and 5. Meaning – statements of a more global nature that indicate expectation and desire to provide meaningful help and have strength of purpose. Guided by the Interaction Adaptation Theory, this study implemented the Volunteer Functions inventory, Interpersonal Communication Motives, and a qualitative question on volunteering that provided the results needed to answer the three Research Questions enlisted.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

There were four demographic questions aimed at gaining further perspective on the volunteering efforts of elite athletes. Participants reported on how often they volunteered, the amount of time they would give, when they would give (in-season, off-season, or both), and if they were involved in sports camps for kids. The pros were more likely to be involved on a monthly basis or a few times per year as both entries represented 37.5% of their population. The majority (62.5%) indicated they gave 1-3 hours/ week when volunteering. There was not much preference of this group when it came to volunteering in-season or during the off-season, as only one person indicated he would volunteer only during the off-season. Additionally, almost 70% of the pros also showed a willingness to work with kids and youth in sports camps. The university athletes' results demonstrated similar findings for how often they would volunteer. Over half indicated that volunteering a few times per year was typical, while 25% of them said they volunteered weekly. Half also indicated that they would give 1-3 hours per week, with only 5% willing to give 2-5 days per week. Regarding when they would volunteer during the year, university athletes were different than the pros, with 44.6% indicating they gave only during their off-season. On the other hand, half of the population was willing to volunteer at any time of the year.

There were three research questions guiding this study and aimed at understanding elite athletes' motivation to volunteer and interpersonal communication motives. Research Question One (RQ1) inquired as to what were elite athletes' motivations to volunteer (MTV), and to determine those most prevalent to this population. The researcher implemented the modified Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) scale to ascertain this information, the scale having been

previously established to hold a high degree of internal consistency (Clary & Snyder, 1999), and currently demonstrating strong reliability ($\alpha = .818$). The seven items within the construct ranged in alpha scores from .705 to .857. Research Question Two (RQ2) was directed at finding the participants interpersonal communication motives (ICM). The ICM scale was implemented in a slightly modified form, demonstrating construct reliability ($\alpha = .756$). Descriptive statistics were performed on the 35-item VFI and 28-item ICM typologies, and data was ascertained from two main populations: professional hockey players and university athletes.

Professional Athletes

Results from the descriptive statistics (see Table 1) indicated three significant motivations of professional hockey players to volunteer, though one main motivation stood out. The VFI Values Function was the greatest motivator among this group with a Mean (M) score of 29.19, Median of 30.00, and Standard Deviation (SD) registering 4.73. Clary and Snyder (1999) define this function as: “The individual volunteers in order to express or act on important values like humanitarianism” (p. 157, Table 1). There were two motivations identified as being least likely for this group: VFI Social (M=15.25, SD=6.25) and VFI Protection (M=15.35, SD=6.35). VFI Social captured motivations to volunteer as fulfilling needs and goals of individuals to strengthen social relationships, while VFI Protection caught all those volunteer motives that reflected the need or desire to eliminate negative feelings (feelings of guilt), or to reduce loneliness. There was one non-report for VFI Functions of Career, volunteering to gain career related experience; Enhancement, volunteering to develop psychologically; Protect; and Religious, volunteering out of a religious, faith-based paradigm that expressed biblically based values, while Understanding, volunteering driven by seeking to learn more about the world and implement unused skills, had two non-reports.

Table 1. Descriptive Stats on VFI subscales for Pro Athletes

| | VFI Career | VFI Social | VFI Values | VFI Understd | VFI Enhance | VFI Protect | VFI Religious |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| N | 31 | 32 | 32 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 31 |
| Mean | 18.00 | 15.25 | 29.19 | 22.97 | 17.39 | 15.35 | 22.06 |
| Median | 18.00 | 15.50 | 30.00 | 24.00 | 18.00 | 14.00 | 21.00 |
| Mode | 19.00 | 10.00 | 35.00 | 26.00 | 22.00 | 14.00 | 17.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 6.91 | 6.25 | 4.73 | 5.97 | 7.36 | 6.35 | 6.80 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Interpersonal communication motive(s) (ICM) were then tested with results (see Table 2) providing three main reasons for communication in a general volunteer context. These were ICM Affection (M=16.53, SD=2.30), Information (M=16.06, SD=2.95), and Pleasure (M=14.72, SD=3.23). On the other end of the spectrum, this segment demonstrated communicating for Escape motive (Median=6.00, range=4.00-16.00) and ICM Inclusion (Median=9.00, Range=4.00-20.00) were the least likely reasons for their interpersonal communication.

Table 2. Descriptive Stats on ICM subscales for Pro Athletes

| | ICM Pleasure | ICM Info | ICM Affection | ICM Inclusion | ICM Escape | ICM Relax | ICM Control |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| N | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 |
| Mean | 14.72 | 16.06 | 16.53 | 9.13 | 7.23 | 10.56 | 10.13 |
| Median | 15.00 | 16.00 | 16.00 | 9.00 | 6.00 | 11.50 | 10.50 |
| Mode | 15.00 | 16.00 | 16.00 | 9.00 | 4.00 | 12.00 | 7.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 3.23 | 2.95 | 2.30 | 3.22 | 3.53 | 4.02 | 3.26 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Pearson Correlations were performed on the subscale items for the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) Construct and motivations to volunteer (tested by the Volunteer Functions Inventory – VFI) to answer Research Question Three (RQ3). This was aimed at

determining what motivations to volunteer interact significantly with interpersonal communication motives, and results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3. VFI and ICM Subscales Correlations for Pro Athletes

| | | ICM Pleasure | ICM Info | ICM Affection | ICM Inclusion | ICM Escape | ICM Relax | ICM Control |
|------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| VFI Career | r | .075 | .327 | .140 | .402* | .279 | .300 | .196 |
| | p | .688 | .078 | .451 | .025 | .135 | .101 | .291 |
| | n | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 |
| VFI Social | r | .268 | -.187 | .190 | .482 | .587* | .434* | .271 |
| | p | .139 | .315 | .297 | .005 | .001 | .013 | .134 |
| | n | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 |
| VFI Values | r | .188 | .092 | .450 | -.065 | -.118 | .318 | -.234 |
| | p | .304 | .624 | .010 | .723 | .527 | .076 | .198 |
| | n | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 |
| VFI Understd | r | .198 | .050 | .240 | .444* | .167 | .198 | .088 |
| | p | .303 | .801 | .211 | .016 | .395 | .303 | .649 |
| | n | 29 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 29 | 29 |
| VFI Enhance | r | .061 | -.171 | .005 | .543* | .287 | .232 | .267 |
| | p | .745 | .366 | .980 | .002 | .124 | .210 | .147 |
| | n | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 |
| VFI Protect | r | .158 | -.352 | -.018 | .523* | .199 | .251 | .123 |
| | p | .395 | .056 | .924 | .003 | .284 | .174 | .511 |
| | n | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 |
| VFI Religious | r | -.123 | .106 | .457* | .325 | .250 | .012 | .156 |
| | p | .508 | .578 | .010 | .075 | .183 | .949 | .402 |
| | n | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 |

* Denotes a significant correlation

In the professional athlete sample, only four of the seven ICM Factors correlated with the motivations to volunteer, while all the MTV Functions correlated significantly with at least one ICM Factor. The ICM Inclusion was positively related with four MTVs: VFI Understanding ($r(31)=.444, p<.016$), VFI Enhance ($r=.543, p<.002$), VFI Career ($r=.402, p<.025$), and VFI Protect ($r=.523, p<.003$). Communicating for Escape ($r(30)=.587, p<.001$) and Relaxation (r

(31)=.434, $p<.013$) motives correlated significantly with VFI Social: volunteering with the goal of strengthening his or her social relationships. Lastly, the VFI Religious (motivated to volunteer from a religious, faith-based perspective, $r=.457$, $p<.010$) and Values motivation (expressing or acting on important individual values, $r(31)=.450$, $p<.010$) to volunteer Functions were most significantly related to one interpersonal communication motive, Affection. This ICM Factor reflects the desire to communicate to express and receive caring and appreciation from others.

University Athletes

Elite university athletes contributed greatly to the study with 65 responding to the survey invitation. Descriptive statistics of this segments' motivations to volunteer (see Table 4) reveal two main motivations, though two follow close behind.

Table 4. Descriptive Stats on VFI subscales for University Athletes

| | VFI Career | VFI Social | VFI Values | VFI Understd | VFI Enhance | VFI Protect | VFI Religious |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| N | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 63 |
| Mean | 24.27 | 19.44 | 27.67 | 25.30 | 20.77 | 17.89 | 28.71 |
| Median | 25.00 | 20.00 | 28.00 | 26.00 | 21.00 | 17.00 | 30.00 |
| Mode | 27.00 | 14.00 | 26.00(a) | 29.00 | 13.00(a) | 12.00 | 35.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 5.36 | 5.79 | 4.65 | 5.22 | 5.87 | 7.03 | 5.20 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

The primary motive was VFI Religious ($M=28.71$, $SD=5.20$) with a Median score of 30, and range of 11-35. The VFI Values Function ($M=27.67$, $SD 4.65$) also proved to be important as a motivation to volunteer for university athletes. The least motivating factor was VFI Protecting ($M=17.89$, $SD=7.03$), an item on the scale that suggests people use volunteer behavior to reduce negative feelings or to address personal problems.

Research Question Two answered what most prevalent interpersonal communication motives (ICM) university athletes' have (see Table 5). Descriptive analysis demonstrated ICM

Factors Information (M=15.91, SD=3.21), Affection (M=15.60, SD=3.99), and Pleasure (M=14.12, SD=4.04) the top three reasons for interpersonal communication in the volunteer setting. However, all items but Information had a responses with a range of minimum (4) to maximum (20). For the Information Factor the minimum was 9, the maximum of 20, and the Median score 16.00. On the lowest end of the scale were two ICM Factors: the Control motive (M=10.40, SD=3.41), and the Escape motive (M=10.65, SD=3.92).

Table 5. Descriptive Stats on ICM subscales for University Athletes

| | ICM Pleasure | ICM Info | ICM Affection | ICM Inclusion | ICM Escape | ICM Relax | ICM Control |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| N | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| Mean | 14.12 | 15.91 | 15.60 | 11.38 | 10.65 | 11.55 | 10.40 |
| Median | 14.00 | 16.00 | 16.00 | 11.00 | 10.00 | 11.00 | 10.00 |
| Mode | 20.00 | 18.00(a) | 20.00 | 9.00 | 13.00 | 10.00(a) | 8.00 |
| Std. Deviation | 4.04 | 3.21 | 3.99 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.57 | 3.41 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Research Question Three was answered through performing Pearson Correlation tests on the MTV and ICM subscale data. All the VFI Functions correlated significantly with at least one Interpersonal Communication Motive (see Table 6). The motivations to volunteer (MTVs) that were most positively related to ICM Inclusion were: 1. VFI Protect ($r=.556, p<.000$), 2. VFI Enhance ($r=.555, p<.000$), 3. VFI Career ($r=.445, p<.000$), 4. VFI Social ($r=.415, p<.001$), and 5. VFI Religious ($r=.341, p<.006$). The MTVs that correlated most significantly with ICM Affection were VFI Religious ($r=.561, p<.000$), VFI Understanding ($r=.044, p<.000$), and VFI Values ($r=.490, p<.000$). ICM Relaxation demonstrated significance correlation to four MTVs: VFI Enhance ($r=.424, p<.001$), VFI ($r=.371, p<.003$), VFI Social ($r=.298, p<.018$), and VFI Career ($r=.293, p<.020$). The MTVs found to most positively relate to ICM factor Information were VFI Career ($r=.395, p<.001$) and VFI Understanding ($r=.392, p<.001$). ICM Control also

correlated with two MTVs: VFI Social ($r=.319$, $p<.011$) and VFI Career ($r=.266$, $p<.035$). The final two interpersonal communication motives were Pleasure and Escape, and each related most positively to two MTVs respectively: VFI Religious ($r=.283$, $p<.024$), and VFI Protect ($r=.258$, $p<.041$).

Table 6. VFI and ICM Subscales Correlations for University Athletes

| | | ICM Pleasure | ICM Info | ICM Affection | ICM Inclusion | ICM Escape | ICM Relax | ICM Control |
|------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| VFI Career | r | .043 | .395 | .235 | .445 | .221 | .293 | .266 |
| | p | .741 | .001 | .064 | .000 | .082 | .020 | .035 |
| | n | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| VFI Social | r | .122 | .111 | -.030 | .415 | .201 | .298 | .319 |
| | p | .341 | .388 | .813 | .001 | .115 | .018 | .011 |
| | n | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| VFI Values | r | .216 | .220 | .490 | .186 | .002 | .139 | .160 |
| | p | .089 | .083 | .000 | .145 | .985 | .279 | .209 |
| | n | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| VFI Understd | r | .076 | .392 | .544 | .300 | -.021 | .059 | .093 |
| | p | .552 | .001 | .000 | .017 | .868 | .645 | .468 |
| | n | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| VFI Enhance | r | .153 | .169 | .155 | .555 | .157 | .424 | .077 |
| | p | .236 | .189 | .228 | .000 | .224 | .001 | .552 |
| | n | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| VFI Protect | r | .151 | .042 | .173 | .556 | .258 | .371 | .153 |
| | p | .238 | .746 | .176 | .000 | .041 | .003 | .233 |
| | n | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| VFI Religious | r | .283 | .200 | .561 | .341 | -.011 | .189 | -.067 |
| | p | .024 | .116 | .000 | .006 | .929 | .137 | .601 |
| | n | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |

* Denotes a significant correlation

The final results to report on are those garnered from the optional qualitative question. Of the 97 survey respondents, 39 chose to share their expectations and desires surrounding both the volunteer communication and the actual volunteer activity. A theme analysis was performed on

each response with five themes showing forth for each segment of the sample: Care, Details, Clarity, Role, and Meaning. Taken corporately, the three most important themes as determined by their frequencies were that of Details (f=35), Role (f=30), and Clarity (f=26). Respondents provided 14 statements that were categorized in the Meaning theme, and six statements in the Care theme. Combining the results generated by researching elite athletes' motivations to volunteer, their interpersonal communication motives, and qualitative answers lead now to stimulating discussion on elite athlete volunteers, and a greater understanding of their interaction position.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The research implemented surveys as the mechanism for data collection. This method provided the best instrument option with regard to the specific goals of the study, and built upon previous research. Five components of the survey contributed to the overall purpose of the research: motivations to volunteer (MTV), demographics on giving, an open-ended question on expectations and desires of volunteer communication and actual involvement, interpersonal communication motives (ICM), and statistical correlations for MTVs and ICMs. The following includes the analysis of elite athletes' Motivations To Volunteer, Interpersonal Communication Motives, and general expectations and desires of volunteer communication. The researcher then discusses the limitations of the study, suggestions for future research, and conclusion.

Motivations To Volunteer

As a first step, Research Question One (RQ1) asked: What are elite athletes' most prevalent motivations to volunteer? Respondents to the survey came from two sources representing two levels of athletic achievement: semi-professional hockey players and university athletes. Results (see Table 1, p. 65; Table 4, p. 67) to the modified Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) typology indicated the Values Motivation Function was of primary importance for the professional athletes. Essentially, this indicates they were likely to be motivated to volunteer in order to act on or express important personal values, such as humanitarianism. Further, they were somewhat motivated by wanting to learn more about their world, exercise unused skills, and to express religious-based values. These findings demonstrate agreement with prior research by Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1977) that views motivations as forces, and reveals a key motivation to volunteer for self-actualizing personal development and meaningful

service to others. Therefore, organizations and volunteer leaders alike would be wise to implement initial communication with this population that is aimed at getting to know their individual values, as well as being able to share specific values held by the organization. Providing information on espoused organizational values may generate further interest leading to agreement and identification with the purposes held, potentially influencing the athlete(s) to volunteer. Corrigan (2001) suggests, "To know what motivates a volunteer is to know what attracts a volunteer" (p. 39). Thus, as Robinson (2005) promotes leveraging teams' and athletes' significant public appeal in order to generate greater philanthropic impact, of utmost importance is how one communicates and attracts this unique population.

On the other hand, results demonstrated that the athletes were much less likely to use volunteer behavior to reduce negative feelings or guilt, to strengthen social ties, to develop psychologically, or to gain career-related experience. Thus, constructing persuasive messages aimed to meet these motivations and goals would likely not prove very influential to this group. There are several dynamics of a professional athlete's life that may lead to this outcome. First, other than superstar athletes, most players have many ongoing pressures, not the least of which is the unknown commitment of their respective teams. Trades may loom, and the next day could mean a player's social ties are broken. This fact may work to limit their use of volunteering to meet the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) Social motivation. Also, being part of a team may facilitate accomplishing, in a large part, the social need in their lives, thus having less need for it to be met elsewhere. Secondly, professional athletes are an accomplished group that have met a relatively high level of success by normal standards, and generally have a healthy level of self-confidence. It follows, then, that volunteering will not likely be sought to serve esteem needs, to reduce guilt, or to address personal problems, although individuals vary in motivation. Career-

oriented motivations are more likely to be met by increased performance and greater responsibility on one's respective team, than through a volunteer opportunity. However, this might be somewhat dependant on the length of one's career. Those moving on from the sport in the near future could be motivated to a greater degree by the desire or need to change and advance their work life into other areas. Future research would do well to consider length of career or age of the athlete in relation to whether career-oriented motivations are sought or met through volunteering.

Another consideration with regard to professional athletes, communication, and volunteerism, is to anticipate the role of social signaling as discussed by Bénabou and Tirole (2004). The authors discussed the use of this type of prosocial behavior being used to signal to others that the individual is generous, kind, and public-spirited, in order to show that he or she is a good person. Applying this understanding to generating the interaction position held by elite athletes, one might implement communication that highlights the importance of what they are doing and how they are serving to improve the lives of others. The organization may also suggest that the athlete invites others to join them in the volunteer endeavor, talk about their experience with peers, or provide media coverage to share with the world the good performed. However, in light of interaction adaptation theory (Burgoon et al., 1995), one must be careful to consider how publicity might be received, because negative interpersonal violations may be produced if the exposure is deemed overbearing. In the long run, this may end up reducing the likelihood of ongoing service. Yet, addressing and matching reputational concerns through appropriate recognition and feedback will produce positive results and serve to enhance an organization's ability to attract elite athlete volunteers.

The university athletes studied had similar orientations as to what motivated them to volunteer, though they were moved to a greater degree by religious-based values than the professional players (see Table 4, p. 67). As previously discussed, this portion of the participants was drawn from a moderately sized, private, Christian, liberal arts university, and the difference could be largely attributed to the fact this population is predisposed to have a greater religious orientation. However, it serves to highlight the need for volunteer recruiters to contemplate their target audience, and consider whether they might have religiously oriented volunteer motivations. If recruiting for religiously based philanthropy, searching faith-based universities would provide a large population to approach with volunteer opportunities. Also, one may get even more specific by focusing on the educational path being pursued by the athlete, and work toward matching that with a volunteer role that would allow the student-athlete to use career-related skills. Interaction adaptation theory (Burgoon et al., 1995) predicts that doing so during the interaction would serve to meet and exceed the person's requirements, expectations, and desires, (the underlying influences) leading to profitable communication patterns that enhance credibility and potentially persuasion.

Similar to the professional athletes, personally held values played a significant role as a motivating factor with the university athletes. In contrast to the professional athletes, this population also held the goal of attaining career-related experience through volunteering as moderately motivating. Two demographic factors provide insight to this difference. First, age definitely plays a role, further supporting evidence provided by Clary & Snyder (1999). The university athletes were predominantly younger: almost 70% 18-20 years old and another 27.7% either 21 or 22, whereas approximately 75% of the professional athletes were between 26 and 35 years old. The university group is still exploring and expanding their interests, and volunteering

may provide opportunities for them to gain invaluable career related experience. Secondly, although 51% of this segment indicated receiving varying levels of athletic scholarship, they have not yet reached the level at which they are fully paid professionals. This places them in a position where being a professional athlete may still be a dream or goal. Volunteering may help them attain that goal or facilitate career development in another field. It would be prudent for volunteer-based organizations to consider university level athletes as an excellent source, as they are more likely to be flexible with what they are asked to do because they are still exploring, and trying to develop and use skills they have been learning. Implementing communication for recruiting volunteers from this segment would mean looking to provide faith-based, value-oriented volunteer opportunities that also allow them to test and use developing talents. For example, an organization could target university athletes in sport management programs to seek involvement in planning and running of youth sports leagues, camps, or fund-raising events.

Expectations & Desires

According to interaction adaptation theory (Burgoon et al., 1995), a person's desires, needs, and expectations of volunteer activities will influence volunteer motivation, acting like underlying motivations, through the interpersonal interaction that occurs from initial contact through to involvement. Several demographic questions, and an optional open-ended question facilitated research aimed at further understanding the populations' expectations and desires for volunteer communication and action. Results to the demographic questions revealed several interesting tendencies that gave insight into patterns of volunteering by this population. Both the university athletes and the professionals had a majority of individuals indicate that they tend to volunteer a few times per year, though they differed slightly in volunteering on a monthly or weekly basis. Additionally, the participants were asked about how much time they generally

would give in volunteering. Approximately 52% of the university athletes and 62% of the professionals indicated they would give 1-3 hours per week. This result reflected the majority for both groups, and is important to account for because it demonstrates the general desires and preferences of elite athletes with regard to their time. The question allowed for respondents to also choose whether they would give 2-5 days to volunteer service. Of the ninety-seven respondents, only four indicated a willingness to give of their time to such a degree. This mindset might produce problems for those organizations that seek involvement for prolonged periods of time. Asking elite athletes to give of themselves in this way may also produce a negative evaluation of the interaction and organization, if organizations are not willing to negotiate time commitments. However, as noted earlier, if the values of the organization meshed with those of the athletes, it may lead to positive evaluation of the opportunity and willingness of the athletes to adapt, embracing the cause even if it requires more than they desire or expect to give. Results from previous research (Corrigan, 2001) support this proposition, actually reflecting that volunteers associate costs with volunteering, and that it is both expected and accepted.

Another aspect to consider when attempting to attract elite athletes to volunteer, is whether being in-season or not is of importance to them. Of great interest to the researcher was that the professionals (31%) in this sample indicated serving in-season, with approximately 66% more revealing a willingness to serve in either context. The reason for this outcome may be that professional athletes have a relatively high percentage of “free” time during the season. Though much travel occurs, actual work-time is minimal compared to the normal 40-50 hour work week in North America. Furthermore, this may be initial evidence that points to a developing association by elite athletes toward volunteering through team-directed philanthropic work. Understanding the effect of team-driven philanthropy on athletes’ motivations could prove to be

fertile soil for future research. From these results, organizations may enhance professional athlete participation by anticipating the effect of amount of time required to a greater degree than whether the athlete is in-season or not.

In comparison, the university athletes deviated from these results with a good portion (44.6%) indicating they volunteer (only) during their off-seasons, though half also indicated being willing to volunteer at any point of their year. Such results may reflect the time constraints on student-athletes as they strive to accomplish multiple goals and requirements of their educational experience. Therefore, if seeking this segments' involvement, it would be prudent to recognize and account for when they are in-season so time constraints will not eliminate them from the pool of volunteers. Generating creative ways for them to manage their commitments could enhance the likelihood of involvement (i.e. provision of travel to and from events, or smaller time commitments).

Greater depth to the population's motivations was analyzed from the understanding that individuals' expectations and desires serve to influence overall behavior. They perform in the same way motivations act. To gain insight into the athletes' expectations and desires, the study implemented an open-ended question: If an organization contacted you to volunteer with them, what do you expect and desire from them concerning the communication and the volunteer activity? Slightly more than 40%, from both segments studied, responded to this survey question, and great emphasis was placed on three of the five themes identified by the researcher. Consistently, the respondents suggested the desire for and expectation of clear communication; description and definition of their role, or what was needed and expected of them; and all details surrounding the volunteer activity. Such results serve to enforce and echo prior studies that produced similar findings on volunteers' important expectations: "to be notified of my specific

duties” (Andrew, 1996, p. 22). Implementing IAT (Burgoon et al., 1995) to direct message creation in light of these findings would allow one to predict that the more explicit one is regarding role, expectations, time commitments, and willingness to negotiate, the more likely elite athletes will be to acquiesce or even get excited about serving. However, it is important to remember that Burgoon et al. (1995[a]) found preinteraction expectancies are not as powerful as once assumed, and desires factored significantly, playing a greater role in actual communication behavior (Floyd & Burgoon, 1999).

The professional athletes’ desires were reflected largely in one athlete’s sentiments; “I would hope they would voice a clear need and way for me to volunteer and fill a role that is useful. Often, I am contacted for help and it is broad and general. Provide me dates or events that you need help with or offer me a few ways I can help and then it makes it easy to say ‘yes’” (Pro, Survey 3). Similar expectations were demonstrated in the university sample. One male athlete shared, “Give me as much info as possible about what I’m doing. Keep lines totally open for communication” (U. athlete, Survey 51); another, “Clear explanation of what is expected...” (U. athlete, Survey 43); and a female athlete related, “I expect organization. I also expect clarity and the purpose and agenda” (U. athlete, Survey 12). It is important to note that some of the expectations the athletes had were prescriptive in nature, or suggested their idealized standards, though at other times demonstrated a predictive or anticipated quality, based on prior experience. While redundant, the overall population studied forcefully expressed their expectations and desires that organizations respect and value the volunteers’ time and need to have clear, open communication. Some went even further to indicate that one of the responsibilities of the organization is to cater to their desires. Statements such as, “I would expect a ride to the locations...” or, “tell (me) where to be – with a map,” reveal explicit prescriptive expectations.

Additionally, two other themes also leaped out from the qualitative answers, though frequencies were less than the initial three. The statements echoed the expectation for care of the volunteer, as well as meaning in the volunteer activity. Athletes shared: “I expect them to be honest in communication and fair in activity;” “Something that would benefit me and the people I’m volunteering with;” “To not take you for granted and expect you to do certain things;” “My expectation would be that I was doing something that would help or enhance an organization for the needy/less fortunate.” The athletes clearly desire to be more than just promotional attractions at benefit events, and to have a sense of being valued by the organization through providing meaningful help. The drive for details, defined roles and expectations, and honest, direct, clear communication may have their root in the sub-culture of athletics. In this realm, elite athletes are provided structure where explicit expectations and directions exist for their benefit and that of the team. Athletes are educated on what to eat, when, how to train, where to go or be at certain times with regard to road trips and practices. It follows that their desires and expectations of other organizations will flow from these experiences that make up a significant part of their lives. Thus, to facilitate involvement of this population in volunteer activity, organizations must respect and account for the athletes’ expectations and desires, as well as understand what type of communication is motivating to this sample.

Interpersonal Communication Motives

Research Question Two (RQ2) was directed at eliciting elite athletes’ interpersonal communication motives. The study applied the use of the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) scale (Rubin et al., 1988), adding one Factor to the list – ICM Information – which suggested that people communicate out of a need or desire to gain information about the overall situation and context. This portion of the survey produced results demonstrating both the

professional and university athletes held the same communication motives as important (see Table 2, p. 65; Table 5, p. 68). Three motives or factors topped the scale: ICM's Affection and Information were the dominant communication motives, with ICM Pleasure at a moderate level. At the lowest reported level for the athletes was ICM Escape and Control. One difference was evident however with ICM's Relaxation and Inclusion factoring as slightly motivating for the university athletes. In essence, the elite athletes studied reported that they communicate primarily to express caring and appreciation for others (Affection), because it is important to gain information regarding the overall volunteer opportunity (Information), and because it was fun, stimulating, and entertaining (Pleasure). Due to the nature of the specific communication act (in the volunteer context), it is understandable that athletes will communicate to fulfill those three motives. First, as evidenced in the qualitative responses previously discussed, elite athletes desire and expect explicit details or information. Not only so, their statements also revealed a desire to give in a meaningful, purposeful way which can be enacted through caring and appreciative communication. Finally, the sub-culture athletes enjoy tend to elicit fun, playful communication as teammates interact, and this may produce the expectation and desire to have that fulfilled in their volunteer interactions. Volunteer organizations should be encouraged to provide specific settings and opportunities for volunteer athletes to meet those interaction needs.

Initial interactions may occur in order to give and receive information and to gain the athletes' involvement. Thus, compliance-gaining communication must be considered in relation to how it correlates with interpersonal communication motives. In applying ICM to compliance-gaining communication, Javidi et al. (1995) revealed this communication served to elicit control motives. Contrasting this to the desire of elite athletes to fulfill ICM's Affection, Information, and Pleasure – while not seeking communication for Control or Escape motives – reveals that

organizations communicating with volunteers should steer clear of control-seeking interactions. Research by Anderson and Martin (1995[a]) demonstrated similar results indicating that motives for control and escape had direct effects in a negative manner in small group, task-directed communication. In light of interaction adaptation theory, communicating to control would likely negatively violate the athletes' interpersonal communication motives or desires, and work against any attempt at compliance. Focusing on the positives, the authors conclude that communicating in lines with ICM Pleasure and Affection will generate high involvement. This may increase the likelihood of positive interaction evaluations, and enable influential interaction to occur. Furthermore, Anderson and Martin (1995[b]) found that satisfaction in interpersonal communication between superiors, subordinates, and coworkers was high when they communicated to fulfill ICM factors Pleasure, Inclusion, and Affection. Since organizations often implement paid employees to organize and lead volunteers, this research provides strong support that communicating according to athlete volunteers' most prevalent ICMs (Affection, Information, and Pleasure) will help in garnering satisfaction throughout their volunteer experience, potentially leading to ongoing volunteer commitment.

Interaction Adaptation Theory (Burgoon, Stern, & Dillman, 1995) predicts that when an interaction has met or matched a person's needs, expectations, and requirements for that interaction, the person will reciprocate accordingly and smooth communication will occur. With the aim to generate interest and action in volunteering by a specialized population such as elite athletes, it would be expedient for volunteer organizations to implement opportunities that meet valued volunteer motivations and communicate to meet the interpersonal communication motives most prevalent in this population. Driving at finding a general, yet highly targeted

communication strategy to influence athletes to action, the research sought the extent to which motivations to volunteer correlated with interpersonal communication motives.

ICM & MTV Correlations

Descriptive analysis of the survey results to Research Question One and Research Question Two produced the most prevalent motivations to volunteer and interpersonal communication motives of this sample. Research Question Three (RQ3) then directed the study to search out what MTVs and ICMs would correlate significantly with each other (see Table 3, p. 66; Table 6, p. 69). An additional purpose was to determine if any or all of the most prevalent MTVs and ICMs also correlated. Pearson Correlation analysis was performed on all subscale factors for the total sample, revealing a number of significant positive relationships. The results lend support to previous research on this dynamic by Corrigan (2001), in which multiple significant positive correlations between MTVs and ICMs existed.

Results for the professional athletes indicated ICM Inclusion was most positively related to five MTV Functions (Enhancement, Protect, Social, Understanding, and Career), ICM Affection correlated significantly with MTV Values and Religious, and ICM's Relaxation and Escape both correlated significantly with MTV Social. Important to note is that ICM Pleasure, Information, and Control had no significant correlations with any motivations to volunteer for this segment. Results for the university athlete population paralleled those of the professionals, with Inclusion correlating significantly with six MTVs, Affection with three MTVs (Values, Understanding, and Religious), and ICM Information (with MTVs Career and Understanding) and Relaxation (with MTVs Social and Enhance), each showing positive relationships with two MTVs. The impact of interpersonal communication motive Affection in a volunteer context supports Corrigan's (2001) study where ICM Affection and Pleasure both had the most

significant correlations with motivations to volunteer. Additionally, the current study depicted ICM Pleasure to be an important interpersonal communication motive but did not show significant relationships with any motivations to volunteer by the professional athlete sample, and only correlated significantly with one MTV (Religious) in the university athlete sample. It may be that athletes naturally implement entertaining, witty, enjoyable interaction no matter the setting and that volunteer organizations should focus on recruitment efforts that implement matching other areas of motivations, while cultivating an atmosphere of fun interactions.

At initial glance, one may interpret the results of ICM Inclusion correlations to signify it would be vital to provide opportunity for athletes to be with and share feelings with people in the volunteer context, and to overcome loneliness. However, the descriptive analysis demonstrated that ICM Inclusion was not a priority that drove their communication. The strong correlation between the Inclusion communication motive and almost all of the MTV Functions causes several considerations. One reason the athletes did not report Inclusion as a prevalent motive may be that they do not want think about or to admit their need to be with and share feelings with others, or to overcome loneliness. To do so may portray weakness, and this mindset may be avoided by a sample that must continually be self-assured and confident in themselves and their abilities. Corrigan (2001) suggested that the combining and correlating of the ICM Scale and motivations to volunteer (VFI Construct for this study) actually might have worked to challenge any self-report bias that may exist. In the same way, one may surmise from this result that there is a self-report bias evidenced by a low mean score for ICM Inclusion among elite athletes. On the other hand, it may also be that they simply do not use the volunteer context to implement communication for this purpose. Yet one cannot overlook the sheer number of times that ICM Inclusion is correlated to many of the motivations to volunteer. Organizations seeking athlete

volunteers must consider this as an important communication motivation to fulfill and do so through giving opportunities for those athletes to connect with others, share stories, and have down time together. This would serve to enhance their overall experience through generating greater identification with the values and people involved. Further research is needed to produce greater understanding of the effects and use of the Inclusion communication motive in this context. Such research will help determine if and how this ICM can be implemented with initial and ongoing volunteer communication by volunteer organizations.

While multiple positive relationships were indicated to exist between ICMs and MTVs, it is prudent to dig deeper using the correlations to find potential gems of insight. The overall results demonstrated that VFI functions Values, Understanding, and Religious were volunteer motivations considered to be important due to prevalence. Unique to student athletes was VFI Career. The most prevalent interpersonal communication motives were Affection, Information, and Pleasure for the total sample. Analysis of the positive correlations and the most prevalent MTVs and ICMs produced a stimulating result. One prevalent communication motive, Affection, using communication to show care and give appreciation, correlated significantly with two of the top motivations to volunteer, Values and Religious. Volunteer opportunities centered on these primary motivations would mean meeting three of the six top motives in the volunteer context for the professional athletes, and four of six motives for the university athletes because ICM Affection also correlated significantly for MTV Understanding – the third most prevalent MTV for the university sample.

Integrating Interaction Adaptation Theory (Burgoon et al., 1995), one may postulate that each of the primary motivations perform as underlying influencers of volunteer action. In essence they act to create the athletes' interaction position. Primary to having elite athletes

volunteer would be to communicate in such a way that meets their expectations and desires. Therefore, in the arena of sports philanthropy, a main priority of sports teams and foundations should be to provide opportunities for athletes to give and receive meaningful, caring, and appreciative communication with others. Furthermore, organizations must know, communicate, and link their own values with the volunteers' individually- and religiously-based values. Matching opportunities that align with athletes' most prevalent motivations to volunteer and interpersonal communication motives will likely produce improved communication and overall satisfaction for the volunteer, potentially increasing their willingness to volunteer and commitment to ongoing service.

Findings of Research Questions One, Two, and Three – combined with the demographics on volunteering and answers to the open-ended question provided – produce potentially powerful results that if implemented serve to direct practitioners towards developing highly creative and influential communication targeting the recruitment and commitment of elite athletes to volunteer. Accordingly, the challenge is to create a campaign and general volunteer experiences that provide opportunities for mutually caring and appreciative communication. Volunteer requests should enlist clear, open interactions that specify roles and expectations, and provide choice within volunteer service that espouses and provides meaningful, value-oriented philanthropic behavior. Additionally, the age and level of elite the athlete, touting the benefits of personal growth and career-oriented experience while providing opportunity for sharing life-stories, will generally enhance the overall experience.

All types of giving behavior can be both altruistic and egoistic in nature, and ultimately serve to accomplish a variety of different functions for different people as previous research has demonstrated (Bequette, 1990; Clary & Snyder, 1999). Targeted communication is not simply

self-serving to the end goals of the organization, but ultimately benefits the athlete volunteer because organizations can meet and exceed athletes' interpersonal communication needs, expectations, and goals for the volunteer experience. That type of communication demonstrates a radical commitment to volunteers, to care for and treat them with respect. Ultimately this will enhance the likelihood that the individual, the organization, and those being helped will all be satisfied and have positive experiences associated with volunteerism.

Limitations & Future Research

There are several limitations that should be noted about the current study. First, the sample of those considered elite athletes were drawn from two sources and represented players at two levels of their development: university athletics and professional athletics. A second limitation was that the overall population of predominantly ice hockey players (50 of the 97) might generate results slanted toward that sub-culture. This duly noted, the results did provide for provocative analysis and relative consistency in findings across the population studied. Future research applying the survey instrument and methodology across a uniform sample would contribute greatly to the development of volunteer communication strategies for that specific group. For example, future research may strive for uniformity by targeting only one sport for research (i.e. football, hockey, soccer, or basketball), one level of athletic accomplishment (i.e. only the top level – National Football League), or studying only male or females in the sample. It may also be applied to samples of a different nature (i.e. business professionals, teachers, or race car drivers). Future research may also seek to analyze the communication motives and volunteer motivations based on age, as there may be unique desires and tendencies for differing styles of communication that are age related. Nuances in results from such research would serve to

advance the current results from a general understanding of elite athletes to disparate evaluations of their volunteer motivations and interpersonal communication motives.

Lack of funding may have created limitations as well. In order to obtain involvement of professional athletes, the researcher contacted the various players' associations for the three top levels of professional hockey. The limited ability to have personal, face-to-face contact with the two players' associations may have influenced the denial of access to the top level of professional hockey. It also reduced any ability to have personal contact with the professional players or provide incentives to participate in the study for any potential respondent.

Additionally, timing may have worked as a limitation to attaining professionals' involvement. Surveys were placed online throughout March, and in professional hockey, this is late in the season. The trade deadline is in early March, with change and unrest a potential reality. Also, March is when the playoff push is of great importance. Despite the instrumental and vital support of the Professional Hockey Players Association (PHPA), the aforementioned reasons contributed to the small sample size of professional players (32 of 97 respondents).

It should be noted that the majority of the total population surveyed (67%) came from a religiously oriented institution. In retrospect, the researcher might have gained valuable insight from having a wider university sample, from secular academic institutions, to enable enhanced comparison analysis between secular and religious populations. Future research should seek a sample that is heterogeneous in nature. Employing varying research techniques along with the current survey instrument for future research would also provide valuable insight into this population. For example, in-depth interviews of elite athletes, centered on discussing experiences and stories of volunteering, would provide invaluable qualitative data from which to glean insights into their expectations and desires of the volunteer organization and event itself.

Furthermore, it would be fascinating to implement the VFI and ICM scales to study cross-cultural motivations to volunteer and interpersonal communication motives of those who are elite athletes from other cultures. Applying a cross-cultural lens to volunteerism would produce rich opportunities for comparing and contrasting elite athletes from around the world. Results demonstrating volunteer motivations, stemming from those cultures and unique tendencies of culturally related communication, would further educate researchers and practitioners to the goals, needs, and expectations that may be sought in the volunteer context.

Conclusion

Volunteering is a highly valuable and important component of civic life. The subject has been studied from multiple perspectives, and specific attention has been given in recent years to the niche of Sports Philanthropy (Robinson, 2005; Wade-Berg, 2005). The researcher argued that a gap in the literature exists with regard to research on one unique volunteer reservoir targeted by sports philanthropy organizations: elite athlete volunteers. This study serves to bridge the gap by placing the emphasis not on understanding the system, but rather the individual contributors. Interaction Adaptation Theory (Burgoon et al., 1995) describes that individuals have interpersonal requirements, expectations, and desires for others before and during interactions. People that seek athletes to volunteer, and the athletes (who then interact with the organizations, other volunteers, and those being helped) all enter the communication exchange from this need-expectation- and goal-based paradigm, and they serve as underlying influences or motivations throughout interactions. These motivations may or may not be met through the transactional, mutually influential communication process. Success of the interaction, and eventual involvement of the potential volunteer, depends largely on understanding both general and

individual idiosyncrasies, their culture, and underlying motivations. Doing so births a fertile opportunity for productive, satisfying communication in which both individuals benefit.

The research implemented the survey mechanism for data collection. This method provided the best option with regard to the specific goals of the study, and built upon previous research. Two reliable survey tools were integrated and modified to study the motivations to volunteer and interpersonal communication motives of elite athletes in the volunteer context. Due to the explorative nature of the study, three research questions were asked with the aim of generating greater understanding of elite athletes and volunteerism, and to help various philanthropic organizations know better how to attract, manage, and care for this unique population. The research builds upon the conclusion by Corrigan (2001) that it is important to pay close attention to the most prevalent motivations to volunteer (MTVs) and interpersonal communication motives (ICMs). A further distinction is to seek to implement the most prevalent ICMs that correlate with the most prevalent MTVs. In so doing, one is best able to meet and possibly exceed – through communication – the expectations and desires of those they seek to enlist in volunteer service. To do so shows that you care about the volunteers' perspective and desires, those of the organization, and as importantly those of the wonderful people who are being served. To work to this end will facilitate the experience of joy that comes from helping others, and as age-old wisdom declares, "It is more blessed to give, than to receive" (The Holy Bible, Acts 20:35).

References

- Albers, Michael J. (2003). Multidimensional audience analysis for dynamic information. *Journal Of Technical Writing and Communication*, 33(3), pp. 263-279. Retrieved October 11, 2006, from EBSCOHost database.
- Altruists International [Association], www.altruists.org, Retrieved January 29, 2007.
- Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995a). The effects of communication motives, interaction involvement, and loneliness on satisfaction: A model of small groups. *Small Group Research*, 26, pp. 118-137.
- Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995b). Why employees speak to coworkers and bosses: Motives, gender, and organizational satisfaction. *Journal of Business Education*, 32 (3), pp. 249-265. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Andrew, J. (1996). Motivations and expectations of volunteers involved in a large scale sports event – a pilot study. *Australian Leisure*, 7 (1), pp. 21-24. Retrieved January 18, 2007 from SIRC database.
- Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2004). *Incentives and prosocial behavior*, Retrieved March 8, 2007, from <http://www.econ.princeton.edu/seminars/BEHAVIORALECO/BEHAVIORAL%20ECO/BE%20Seminar%20Fall%202004/Fall%202004-05%20papers/ipsb6new.pdf>
- Benton Parish, N. (2002). *NHL philanthropy*. Retrieved March 5, 2007, from <http://iml.jou.ufl.edu/projects/Spring02/Parish/dreamweaver/NHLPHILANTHROPY.htm>
- Berger, I. E. (2006). The influence of religion on philanthropy in canada. *Voluntas*, 17 (2), pp. 115-132.
- Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explanations of initial interaction and beyond:

- Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, 1, pp. 99-112. Retrieved May 3, 2007, from Periodicals Archive Online.
- Bernthal, J. E. (1994). Why serve? *American speech-language-hearing association*, 36 (9), pp 38-39. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Bequette, C. (1990). *Volunteers on volunteering: A narrative analysis of interviews with red cross disaster volunteers*. [Thesis].
- Bradley, D. B. (1999). A reason to rise each morning: The meaning of volunteering in the lives of older adults. *Generations*, XXIII (4), pp. 45-50. Retrieved February 22, 2007, from http://www.asaging.org/publications/dbase/GEN/Gen.23_4.Bradley.pdf
- Burgoon, J. K. (1978). A communication model of personal space violations: Explication and an initial test. *Human Communication Research*, 4, pp. 129-142.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Adaptation in dyadic interaction: Defining and operationalizing patterns of reciprocity and compensation. *Communication Theory: CT: a journal of the International Communication Association*, 3 (4), pp. 295-316.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Burgoon, M. (2001). Expectancy Theories. In P. Robinson & H. Giles (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology* (2nd Ed., pp. 79-101), Sussex, England: Wiley & Sons.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J.L. (1984). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51, pp. 193-214. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from EbscoHost database.
- Burgoon, J., & Hale, J. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communications Monographs*, 55 (1), pp. 58-79. Retrieved October 12, 2006, from EBSCOHost database.

- Burgoon, J. K., LePoire, B. A., & Rosenthal, R. (1995[a]). Effects of preinteraction expectancies and target communication on perceiver reciprocity and compensation in dyadic interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, pp.287-321.
- Burgoon, J. K., Stern, L. A., & Dillman, L. (1995[b]). *Dyadic adaptation: Dyadic interaction patterns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Caprice, A. (2005). *The quotable Einstein*. The Princeton University Press and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Retrieved, October 7, 2006, from Motivational Quotes.com.
- Cegala, D. J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communicative competence. *Communication Education, 30* (2), pp. 109-121. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Chen, L., & Isa, M. (2003). Intercultural communication and cultural learning: The experience of Japanese visiting students in the U.S. *The Howard Journal of Communication, 14*, pp. 75-96. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from EBSCOHost database.
- Churchill, R. P., & Street, E. (2004). Is There a Paradox of Altruism? In J. Seglow (Ed.). *The ethics of altruism*, London: Frank Cass.
- Clark, R. A., & Delia, J. G. (1979). Topoi and rhetorical competence. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 65*, pp. 187-206. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Clary, G. E., & Snyder, M. (1991). A Functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. In Margaret S. Clark (Ed.), *Prosocial Behavior*. SAGE Publishing, Inc.
- Clary, G. E., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8* (5), pp. 156-160.

- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A.A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, (6), pp. 1516-1530. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Cnaan, R.A., & Goldberg-Glenn, R. S. (1991). Measuring motivation volunteer in human services. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27, pp. 269-285.
- Cnaan, R. A., Kasternakis, A., & Wineburg, R. J. (1993). Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human services: Is there a link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 22 (33), pp. 33-51. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from <http://nvs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/22/1/33>
- Corrigan, M. W. (2001). *Social exchange theory, interpersonal communication motives, and volunteerism: Identifying motivation to volunteer and the rewards and costs associated*. [Thesis]. Retrieved January 27, 2007, from http://kitkat.wvu.edu:8080/files/2022/corrigan_michael_thesis.pdf
- De Tocqueville, A. (1835). *Democracy in America*. In J. P. Mayer (Ed.), (1969). The George Lawrence translation: Harper & Row.
- Flashman, R., & Quick, S. (1985). Altruism is not dead: A specific analysis of volunteer motivation. In L. F. Moore (Ed.), *Motivating Volunteers* (pp. 155-168). Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Volunteer Centre.
- Floyd, K., & Burgoon, J. K. (1999). Reacting to nonverbal expressions of liking: A test of interaction adaptation theory. *Communication Monographs*, 66, (3), pp. 220-239. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from EBSCOHost database.
- Floyd, K., & Ray, G. (2005). *Adaptation to expressed liking and disliking in initial interactions:*

- Nonverbal involvement and pleasantness response patterns*. International Communication Association, pp. 1-39. Retrieved March 16th, 2006, from EBSCOHost database.
- Franklin, R. (2003). *Sports and charity: High visibility, low bucks*. Star Tribune, 7/13/2003. Retrieved March 5, 2007, from <http://www.sportsphilanthropyproject.com/resources/details.php?id=187>
- Freedman, M. (1976). Studying the rhetoric of social movement leaders: Methodological innovations. *Communication*, 5, (1), pp. 170-184. Retrieved October 7, 2006, from EBSCOHost database.
- Goodman, T. (Ed.) (1997). *The forbes book of business quotations: 14,173 thoughts on the business of life*, New York, NY: Black Dog & Leventhal Publishers, Inc.
- Graham, E. E., Barbato, C. A., & Perse, E. M. (1993). The interpersonal communication motives model. *Communication Quarterly*, 27, (2), pp. 172-186. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Grant, C. (2001). *Altruism and Christian ethics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Grieshop, J. I. (1985). How art thou motivated? Let me count the ways. In L. F. Moore (Ed.) *Motivating volunteers*, pp. 215-228. Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Volunteer Center.
- Hall, M., Lasby, D., Gumulka, G., & Tryon, C. (2006). *Caring Canadians involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2004 Canada survey of giving, volunteering, and participating*. Statistics Canada, pp. 31-49. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://www.givingandvolunteering.ca/pdf/CSGVP_Highlights_2004_en.pdf
- The Hockey News.com, (2005). *Pucks and bucks*. The Hockey News

- Corporation, Transcontinental Inc. Retrieved March 6, 2007, from
<http://www.thehockeynews.com/en/newsroom/news.asp?idNews=20062>
- The Holy Bible, New International Version®. Grand Rapids, MI: International Bible Society,
Zondervan™
- Hunter, K. I., & Linn, M. W. (1981). Psychosocial Differences between Elderly
Volunteers and Non-Volunteers. *International Journal of Aging and Human
Development*, 12, (3), pp. 205-213.
- Independent Sector (2001). *Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001: Key
findings*. Retrieved February 19, 2007, from
<http://www.independentsector.org/PDFs/GV01keyfind.pdf>
- Jalondini, N.T., & Hume, K. (2001). *America's informal volunteers*, Independent Sector,
Retrieved February 19, 2007, from
<http://www.independentsector.org/pdfs/informalvols.pdf>
- Javidi, M., Jordan, W., & Carlone, D. (1994). Situational influences on the selection or
avoidance of compliance-gaining strategies: A test of motivation to communicate.
Communication Research Reports, 11, pp. 127-134. Retrieved March 16, 2007, from
EBSCOHost database.
- Javidi, M. N., Jordan, W. J., Prayatly, M. (1995). Communication motives as predictors of
compliance-gaining behavior in Japan. *World Communication*, 24, (2) pp. 43-49.
Retrieved January 29, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the
individual. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communications: Current
perspectives on gratifications research*, pp. 19-32. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Lao, R. C. (1981). Effect of monetary reward on subsequent motivation. *The Journal of Psychology*, 107 (1), pp. 41-43. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Larkin, E., Sadler, S. E., & Mahler, J. (2005). Benefits of volunteering for older adults mentoring at-risk youth. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 44 (3-4), pp. 23-38. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Lawrence, P. (2005). Teachers making poverty history. *Education Review*, 18 (2), pp. 36-42. Retrieved February 22, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method, and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1, pp. 5-41.
- McCauley, A. (May, 1976). Volunteers? Yes! *School Library Journal*, 22, pp. 29-33. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=RecordDetails&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ136555&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=eric_accno&objectId=0900000b800dcbb5
- Matlosz, F. C. (2007). Falcons reflect enthusiasm, passion of Tull. *The Fresno Bee*. (January 29, 2007) Retrieved February 21, 2007, from http://www.echl.com/cgi-bin/mpublic.cgi?action=show_news&id=9869
- Marek, A. C. (2004). Volunteer. *US News & World Report*, 137 (23), p. 84. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Mehrabian, A., & Ksionzky, S. (1972). Some determiners of social interaction. *Sociometry*, 35, (4), pp. 588-609. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from JSTOR database.
- Mueller, A. (2005). Antidote to learned helplessness: Empowering youth through service.

- Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 14 (1), pp. 16-19. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Miczko, N., Allsop, L. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (1990). Converging on the phenomenon of interpersonal adaptation: Interaction adaptation theory. In L. Guerrero, J. DeVito and M. Hecht (Eds.), *The Nonverbal Communication Reader: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Myers, S. A., & Ferry, M. F. (2001). Interpersonal communication motives and nonverbal immediacy behaviors. *Communication Research Reports*, 18 (2), pp. 182-191. Retrieved March 12, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Patterson, M. L. (1983). *Nonverbal behavior: A functional perspective*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41 (5), pp. 847-855. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Reed, P. B., & Selbee, L. (2001). The civic core in Canada: Disproportionality in charitable giving, volunteering, and civic participation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30, pp. 761-780. Retrieved March 26, 2007, from <http://nvs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/30/4/761>
- Robinson, R. (2005). *Sports philanthropy: An analysis of the charitable foundations of major league teams*. [Thesis]. Retrieved February 16, 2007, from http://www.sportsphilanthropy.com/assets/147_ananalysisofthecharitablef.pdf
- 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* (4), pp. 602-628.
- Schindler-Rainman, E., & Lippitt, R. (1977). *The Volunteer Community: creative use of human resources*. 2nd Edition. University Associates, Inc.
- Schutz, W. C. (1966). *The interpersonal underworld*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Shmotkin, D., Blumstein, T., & Modan, B. (2003). Beyond keeping active: Concomitants of being a volunteer in old-age. *Psychology and Aging, 18* (3), pp. 602-608. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Spanberg, E. (2001). Giving back: Three paths to giving. *Street & Smith's Pro*, 2 (1), pp. 55-59. Publisher: Carl Wooten.
- Sports Philanthropy Project. "Timeline." Retrieved March 5, 2007, from <http://www.sportsphilanthropy.com/content/index.php?pid=56>
- Step, M. M., & Finucane, M. O. (2002). Interpersonal communication motives in everyday interactions. *Communication Quarterly, 50* (1), pp. 93-109. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from EBSCOHost database.
- Thoits, Peggy A., & Hewitt, Lyndi N. (2001). Volunteer Work and Well-Being. *Journal of Health And Social Behavior, 42* (2), pp. 115-131. Retrieved November 13, 2006, from JSTOR database.
- United States Department of Labor. (2005). *Volunteering in the United States*. Bureau of Labor Statistics Press Release. December 9, 2005. Retrieved February 16, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/volun.pdf>

Wade-Berg, J. (2005). (*Understanding sports philanthropy: The case of Denver sports teams.*)

Association of Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action Conference.

Retrieved March 6, 2007, from

http://www.sportsphilanthropy.com/assets/154_denversportsteamsandsport.pdf

Webster's Dictionary: 3rd Edition. (1998). Random House, Inc. Published by Ballantine

Publishing Group.

White, S. B. (2006). Volunteering in the United States. *Monthly Labor Review*, pp. 65-70.

Retrieved February 15, 2007, from www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2006/02/ressum.pdf

Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1999). The effects of volunteering on the volunteer. *Law &*

Contemporary Problems, 62 (4), pp. 141-168. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from

LexisNexis database.

APPENDIX A

Dear Research Participant,

Thank you in advance for your participation in my study. My name is Jeff Boettger and I am currently working towards the completion of my Master of Arts in Communication. As a comparison, I feel like I am now going into the playoffs of my degree – exciting, somewhat nervous, and focused all at the same time. I am also a former ECHL (97-99) and CHL (99-2000) player and truly appreciate your time and help.

To honor your time, I will be brief. Volunteering has significant benefits for both the volunteer and the one receiving. Therefore the purpose of this study lies in finding out what motivates you – professional and university athletes – to volunteer, and your expectations regarding interpersonal communication. Our goal is to help elite athletes who volunteer, and the organizations that rely upon their volunteer assistance. Your participation in this study is strictly confidential and purely voluntary.

Please answer all of the questions to the best of your knowledge and understanding. It will likely take between 10-20 minutes of your time. When it is completed online, simply click the submit icon and it is finished. If you are filling it out directly in the email, please send to the PHPA (survey@phpa.com) and they will keep it confidential by only sending the results. If you are filling out a hard copy, please do not write your name on it, and once complete return directly to the researcher.

Thank you again for your participation. If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me (number & email below), or my advisor Dr. Bill Mullen (434-582-2111) in the Communication Studies Department.

Sincerely,

Jeff Boettger
jkboettger@liberty.edu
434-841-7429

VOLUNTEER QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1 University Athletes

Demographic Questions:

1. Age: 18-20 21-22 23-25 26+
2. Sex: Male Female
3. Marital Status: Single Married
4. Have you volunteered in the last 12 months? Yes No
5. How often do you volunteer?
 Weekly Monthly Bi-monthly Few times/year
6. When volunteering, I give:
 1-3 hrs/week 4-8 hrs/week 1 day/week 2-5 days Other
7. Do you volunteer: In-season Off-season Both
8. Do you volunteer with sports camps for kids? Yes No
9. Current Student Status: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior
10. Approximate Scholarship level:
 Non-scholarship $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ Full
11. My sport at university is:
 Soccer Volleyball Basketball Baseball Football
 Softball Track & Field Wrestling Hockey Tennis Golf

VOLUNTEER QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1 Professional Athletes

Demographic Questions: *Modified Section 1 for this sample

12. Age?
 18-20 21-25 25-30 30-35 35-45 45+
13. Marital Status:
 Single Married/Common Law Divorced Widowed
3. Nationality:
 American Canadian Russian Czech Swedish Other
4. Have you volunteered in the last 12 months? Yes No
5. How often do you volunteer?
 Weekly Monthly Bi-monthly Few times/year
6. When volunteering, I give:
 1-3 hrs/week 4-8 hrs/week 1 day/week 2-5 days Other
7. Do you volunteer: In-season During Off-season Both
8. Do you volunteer with sports camps for kids? Yes No
9. Current Employment Status: Full-Time Part-Time Unemployed
10. Are you a current Pro Hockey player? Yes No
11. Are you a former Pro Hockey player? Yes No
12. What was the highest level of education achieved?
 Jr. High High School College Graduate Graduate Degree
13. How long have, or did, you play Pro Hockey?
 1-2 yrs 3-4 yrs 5-6 yrs 7-10 yrs 11+ yrs
14. What level of professional hockey do you currently play?
 ECHL AHL NHL

Section 2

Reasons for Volunteering

Using the 7-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you in doing volunteer work/Christian service at this organization. Record your answer in the space next to each item.

Not at all important/ accurate for you 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely important/ accurate for you

Rating: **Bracketed numbers are used for scoring and can be adapted to any # of demographic questions.

- ___ 1. (12) Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work.
- ___ 2. (13) My friends volunteer.
- ___ 3. (14) I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
- ___ 4. (15) People I'm close to want me to volunteer.
- ___ 5. (16) Volunteering makes me feel important.
- ___ 6. (17) Volunteering allows me to share my faith in God.
- ___ 7. (18) No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
- ___ 8. (19) It is important to follow the 'Golden Rule' - to treat others as I want to be treated.
- ___ 9. (20) By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
- ___ 10. (21) Serving others is a way for me to put my faith into action.
- ___ 11. (22) Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
- ___ 12. (23) I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
- ___ 13. (24) Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
- ___ 14. (25) Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
- ___ 15. (26) Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
- ___ 16. (27) I feel compassion toward people in need.
- ___ 17. (28) Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
- ___ 18. (29) Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands on" experience.
- ___ 19. (30) I feel it is important to help others.
- ___ 20. (31) Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
- ___ 21. (32) Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.

not at all important/ accurate for you 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely important/ accurate for you

- ___ 22. (33) I can do something for a cause that is important to me.

- ___ 23. (34) Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
- ___ 24. (35) Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
- ___ 25. (36) I desire to show God's love to others.
- ___ 26. (37) Volunteering makes me feel needed.
- ___ 27. (38) Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
- ___ 28. (39) Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
- ___ 29. (40) Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
- ___ 30. (41) I can explore my own strengths.
- ___ 31. (42) People I know share an interest in community service.
- ___ 32. (43) I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
- ___ 33. (44) I can make new contacts that might help my business career.
- ___ 34. (45) I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
- ___ 35. (46) It is important to put others needs before myself.

VFI Function Modifications

VFI Religious (Seventh Function): Individuals may operate in a religious, faith-based paradigm from which Biblically oriented values are expressed through volunteering.

Five Items test this Function:

1. Volunteering allows me to share my faith in God.
2. It is important to follow the 'Golden Rule' – to treat others as I want to be treated.
3. Serving others is a way for me to put my faith into action.
4. I desire to show God's love to others.
5. It is important to put others' needs before myself.

Section 3

Communication Motives

Here are several reasons people give for why they talk to other people in various settings, including communication in the volunteer context. For each statement, provide the number that best expresses your own reasons for talking to other people. Use the following scale and mark or circle the number that applies:

Not at all like my own 1 2 3 4 5 **Exactly like my own**
Somewhat

“I talk to people...”

- ___ 1. (47) because it is fun.
- ___ 2. (48) because it is stimulating.
- ___ 3. (49) because it is entertaining.
- ___ 4. (50) because I enjoy it.
- ___ 5. (51) in order to understand what is expected of me.
- ___ 6. (52) in order to clarify information and directions.
- ___ 7. (53) in order to coordinate action with others.
- ___ 8. (54) in order to facilitate planning and organization.
- ___ 9. (55) to help others.
- ___ 10. (56) to let others know I care about their feelings.
- ___ 11. (57) to show others encouragement.
- ___ 12. (58) because I am concerned about them.
- ___ 13. (59) because I need someone to talk to or be with.
- ___ 14. (60) because I just need to talk about my problems sometimes.
- ___ 15. (61) because it makes me feel less lonely.
- ___ 16. (62) because it’s reassuring to know someone is there.
- ___ 17. (63) to put off doing something I should be doing.
- ___ 18. (64) to get away from what I’m normally doing.
- ___ 19. (65) because I have nothing better to do.
- ___ 20. (66) to get away from pressures and responsibilities.
- ___ 21. (67) because it relaxes me.

Not at all like my own 1 2 3 4 5 Exactly like my own
Somewhat

“I talk to people...”

- ___ 22. (68) because it allows me to unwind.
- ___ 23. (69) because it is a pleasant rest.
- ___ 24. (70) because it makes me feel less tense.
- ___ 25. (71) to let others know my needs and desires.
- ___ 26. (72) because I want someone to do something for me.
- ___ 27. (73) to tell others what to do.
- ___ 28. (74) to get something I don't have.

(Optional) Final Question:

If an organization contacted you to volunteer with them, what do you expect and desire from them concerning the communication, and the volunteer activity?

VFI SCORING SHEET UNIVERSITY

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| VFI Career | Item | 12 | 26 | 32 | 39 | 44 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| VFI Social | Item | 13 | 15 | 28 | 34 | 42 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| VFI Values | Item | 14 | 27 | 30 | 33 | 43 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| VFI Understd | Item | 23 | 25 | 29 | 41 | 45 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| VFI Enhance | Item | 16 | 24 | 37 | 38 | 40 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| VFI Protect | Item | 18 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 35 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| VFI Religious | Item | 17 | 19 | 21 | 36 | 46 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |

ICM SCORING SHEET UNIVERSITY

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| ICM Pleasure | Item | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| ICM U-Reduction | Item | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| ICM Affection | Item | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| ICM Inclusion | Item | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| ICM Escape | Item | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| ICM Relaxation | Item | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |
| ICM Control | Item | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____(SUM) |

APPENDIX B

The Functional Approach to Volunteers' Motivations

*Original Version

Gil Clary **and** **Mark Snyder**
College of St. Catherine **University of Minnesota**

Assumptions

1. People are purposeful, planful, goal-directed – Volunteers engage in volunteer work in order to satisfy important personal goals.
2. Different people may do similar things for different reasons – Volunteers performing the same volunteer activity for the same organization may have different reasons for volunteering.
3. Any one individual may be motivated by more than one need or goal – An individual volunteer may be attempting to satisfy two or more motives through one activity at an organization.
4. Outcomes depend on the matching of needs and goals to the opportunities afforded by the environment – Successful volunteer recruitment, satisfaction, and retention is tied to the ability of the volunteer experience to fulfill the volunteer's important motives.

The Motivations for Volunteering

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <u>Values function</u> | the person is volunteering in order to express or act on important values, such as humanitarianism and helping the less fortunate |
| <u>Understanding function</u> | the volunteer is seeking to learn more about the world and/or exercise skills that are often unused |
| <u>Enhancement function</u> | the individual is seeking to grow and develop psychologically through involvement in volunteering |
| <u>Career function</u> | the volunteer has the goal of gaining career-related experience through volunteering |
| <u>Social function</u> | volunteering allows the person to strengthen one's social relationships |
| <u>Protective function</u> | the individual uses volunteering to reduce negative feelings, such as guilt, or to address personal problems |

VOLUNTEERISM QUESTIONNAIRE

Reasons for Volunteering

Using the 7-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you in doing volunteer work at this organization. Record your answer in the space next to each item.

| <u>Rating</u> | not at all important/ accurate for you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | extremely important/ accurate for you |
|---------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| — | 1. | Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work | | | | | | | |
| — | 2. | My friends volunteer. | | | | | | | |
| — | 3. | I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself. | | | | | | | |
| — | 4. | People I'm close to want me to volunteer. | | | | | | | |
| — | 5. | Volunteering makes me feel important. | | | | | | | |
| — | 6. | People I know share an interest in community service. | | | | | | | |
| — | 7. | No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it. | | | | | | | |
| — | 8. | I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving. | | | | | | | |
| — | 9. | By volunteering, I feel less lonely. | | | | | | | |
| — | 10. | I can make new contacts that might help my business career. | | | | | | | |
| — | 11. | Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others. | | | | | | | |
| — | 12. | I can learn more about the cause for which I am working. | | | | | | | |
| — | 13. | Volunteering increases my self-esteem. | | | | | | | |
| — | 14. | Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things. | | | | | | | |
| — | 15. | Volunteering allows me to explore different career options. | | | | | | | |
| — | 16. | I feel compassion toward people in need. | | | | | | | |
| — | 17. | Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service. | | | | | | | |
| — | 18. | Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands on" experience. | | | | | | | |
| — | 19. | I feel it is important to help others. | | | | | | | |
| — | 20. | Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems. | | | | | | | |
| — | 21. | Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession. | | | | | | | |
| — | 22. | I can do something for a cause that is important to me. | | | | | | | |
| — | 23. | Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best. | | | | | | | |

- ___ 24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
- ___ 25. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
- ___ 26. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
- ___ 27. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
- ___ 28. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
- ___ 29. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
- ___ 30. I can explore my own strengths.

SCORING SHEET

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| VFI Career | Item | 1 | 10 | 15 | 21 | 28 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____ |
| | | | | | | | (SUM) |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| VFI Social | Item | 2 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 23 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____ |
| | | | | | | | (SUM) |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| VFI Values | Item | 3 | 8 | 16 | 19 | 22 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____ |
| | | | | | | | (SUM) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| VFI Understd | Item | 12 | 14 | 18 | 25 | 30 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____ |
| | | | | | | | (SUM) |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| VFI Enhance | Item | 5 | 13 | 26 | 27 | 29 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____ |
| | | | | | | | (SUM) |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| VFI Protect | Item | 7 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 24 | |
| | Response | ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | + ___ | = _____ |
| | | | | | | | (SUM) |