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Abstract

The number of volunteers required for sport events continues to rise each and every year because of the growing popularity of amateur and professional sports (Bae, Lee, & Massengale, 2011). As volunteers have become more and more important to national and international sporting events (Pauline & Pauline, 2009), there is a growth in the amount of research related to the motivation of volunteers or volunteering. Nevertheless, there has been a lack of investigation on volunteer motivation factors of the Korean population. The main purpose of the study reported here was to examine and identify the volunteer motivation factors of the Korean population and validate the Volunteer Motivation Scale (VMS). Participants of the study were 132 male and 142 female volunteers of the International Association of Athletics Federations World Championships. Results of the MANOVA analysis indicated the overall VMS model was marginal nonsignificant (Wilks' $\Lambda = 2.170$, $p = .058$). Univariate ANOVAs showed no gender differences in Networking and Social Interaction, but males had significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores than females in Work Experience, Self-Determination, and Volunteering Abroad. Results of the confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the revised 29-item VMS provided a good fit to the data (e.g., CFI = .97, SRMR = .061) and has sound psychometric properties that can be used to assess the motivation of volunteers in an international setting. It is concluded that males have a stronger belief than females that volunteering can give them opportunity for personal growth, and different strategies are necessary when recruiting volunteers.
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**Introduction**

Volunteering is a key component to make an event happen – successfully and smoothly. Sport organizations have long recognized the contributions of volunteers, mainly because of the additional support to their full-time staff and the reduction of their operation budget (Cemalcilar, 2009; Wong, Chui, & Kwok, 2011). Even without receiving any incentives from the sport organization, volunteers are willing to spend their valuable time in helping profit or nonprofit organizations whenever they are available (MacNeela, 2008). The number of volunteers required for sport events continues to rise each and every year because of the growing popularity of amateur and professional sports (e.g., Bae, Lee, & Massengale, 2011; Hayton, 2016). These events could not take place without the support of volunteers, particularly from their own local communities. For this reason, it is important for colleges and sport companies to continue recruit and train new volunteers to their programs. As volunteers have become more and more important to national and international sporting events (Pauline & Pauline, 2009), there is a growth in the number of research that is related to the motivation of volunteers or volunteering (e.g., Bae et al., 2011; Boraas, 2003; Chelladurai, 2006; Cho & Kwon, 2011; Costa, Chalip, Green, & Simes, 2006; Cuskelly, McIntyre, & Boag, 1998; Cunningham, Sagas, Dixon, Kent, & Turner, 2005; Green & Chalip, 1998; Hardin, Koo, King, & Zdriok, 2007; Hu & Jung, 2013; Kim, 2010; Kim, Chelladurai, & Trail, 2007; Kim, Trail, Lim, & Kim, 2009; Lee, 2011; Lee, Nam, Han, & Lee, 2010; Strigas & Jackson, 2003). The following section is a review of related literature that pertains to the motivations of volunteers.

**Motivations**

The motivations that drive individuals to volunteer an event vary from person to person. Meanwhile, the volunteers’ motivations could be focused differently depending on whether the involvement is a sporting event or non-sporting event. Clary, Synder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Meine (1998) as well as Omoto and Snyder (1995) found eight different volunteer motives (e.g., values, understanding, career, social, community concern, and esteem enhancement) from non-sporting events. Motivation of volunteering in sporting events can range from helping the community, helping others, social interaction, recognition, cultural norms, diversion, career advancement, and obligation (Dorsch, Riemer, Sluth, Paskevich, & Chelladurai, 2002) to a love for the sport, personal growth, and expression of values (Kim, Zhang, & Connaughton, 2010). Most volunteers feel a sense of accomplishment after volunteering and may choose to continue in the future (MacNeela, 2008).

Kim (2010) examined voluntary service activities based on metropolitan citizens in Korea and found that the motivation of Korean volunteers are based on the following reasons: self-satisfaction (about 23%), humanism (about 36%), world experience (about 22%), social interaction (about 13%), and work experience (about 7%). In examining the relationship between sport volunteerism and social capital of Korean university students, Cho and Kwon (2011) found that college student volunteers are able to develop networking and to improve their knowledge and skills, to have new social interaction, and to foster self-determination through sporting events. Moreover, Korean college students had established self-development during the volunteer activities for abled and disabled sporting events (Hu & Jung, 2013; Kang, Seo, & Cho 2010). A study from the International Year of Volunteers by Dorsch et al. (2002) noted that there were eight main motivational factors: helping the community, helping others, social interaction, recognition, cultural norms, diversion, career advancement, and obligation. Of those
factors, they found the highest rated motivational factor was “helping the community” whereas the lowest rated motivational one was “obligation.” MacNeela (2008) mentioned that volunteers are interested in their career development and that was a primary reason for becoming involved. Kim et al. (2010) applied six motivation functions to the Special Olympic volunteers. The motivation are values, understanding, social, career, enhancement, and protective functions. According to the results, the first and second highest ranked motivation factors were “value” and “understanding,” respectively, among four groups of volunteers in youth sports: Group 1 ($n = 515$); Group 2 ($n = 259$); Group 3 ($n = 224$); and Group 4 ($n = 98$).

So far, most studies concentrated on volunteerism in amateur or professional sporting events, and there is very little research on college sports. For this reason, Bae et al. (2011) developed the Volunteer Motivation Scale (VMS) to examine the motivation of volunteers in college sports. The VMS has five volunteer motivation factors: work experience, networking, self-determination, volunteering abroad, and social interaction. All these motivational factors are the driving force for volunteers who actually act on volunteering of sporting events (Bae et al., 2011). The following sections provide a brief description of these factors.

**Work Experience**

Work experience is one of the most important factors when applying for a job in sports (Bae & Miller, 2008). Work experience at job is able to influence an individual’s intentions and behaviors directed towards the occupation (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; Cunningham et al., 2005; Dorsch et al., 2002) as well as to improve a person’s skills, knowledge, and mental health (Becker, 1964; Clary et al., 1998). People want to be more marketable and improve their skills based on their work experience (Bae et al., 2011). Individuals are more likely to be hired by an organization based on their skills acquired and contributions made during their work experiences (Seibert & Sypher, 1989). According to Phillips and Phillips (2000) and Bae et al. (2011), employers are more likely to work with candidates who have responsibility, honesty, integrity, decision-making, initiative, and communication skills. Most employers select to interview applicants who have a minimum of two years’ experience with the required knowledge and skills that are related to the field (Bae & Miller, 2008; Holley, 1999). Because of those requirements, people prefer to gain or develop their job-related skills and personal development by means of different volunteer experiences (Wang, 2004). MacNeela (2008) found that most people who have been serving as volunteers are actually looking for career opportunities rather than just for the sole purpose of doing volunteer services. Volunteers are willing to serve a particular organization if they feel that their beliefs and values match well with the organization’s mission and values, and that their abilities are well-matched with the job requirements (Kim et al., 2009). MacNeela (2008) found that volunteers can benefit themselves while volunteering. For example, volunteering is associated with strong interpersonal development (Brehm & Rahn, 1997) and better mental health (Musick & Wilson, 2003).

**Self-Determination**

The motivation of volunteers can be explained by the self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to the SDT, there is a distinction between the autonomous motivation and controlled motivation of individuals (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Autonomously motivated individuals act with a sense of volition and choice on their intrinsic interests and fun with an underlying personal value. Such autonomy is positively related to self-actualization, private self-consciousness, ego development, interest and self-esteem (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and
greater work effort (Bidee, Vantilborgh, Pepermans, Huybrechts, Willems, Jegers, & Hofmans, 2013) as well as higher job satisfaction (Millette & Gagné, 2008). On the other hand, controlled motivated individuals act on feeling of external pressure and engage in activities to obtain reward or to avoid negative consequence or feelings of guilt (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Controlled motivation is positively related to the external locus of control, private and public self-consciousness, hostility and ego involvement (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Knee, Neighbors, & Vietor, 2001; Neighbors, Vietor, & Knee, 2002). Both autonomous and controlled motivations are intentional (Gagne & Deci, 2005) and consist of a series of behavioral regulations with different degree of internalization, varying along a continuum that reflects autonomous motivation (i.e., intrinsic motivation, integrated regulation, and identified regulation) on one end and controlled motivation (i.e., external regulation and introjected regulation) on the other (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Both autonomous motivation and controlled motivation indicate an individual’s intention to act; whereas amotivation indicates a lack of intention to act (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Research studies in the context of volunteering usually omitted amotivation since their focus is only on active and intentional types of motivation (Oostlander, Güntert, van Schie, & Wehner, 2014).

Networking

Being successful at networking is another critical factor when people are looking for a job. To be a successful networker, Haggerty (1999) emphasized four important factors: personal experience, process, place, and practice; and stressed that creating a good first impression is the most important factor when people start developing a strong relationship. It is likely that people are able to improve their professional working relationship with at least one member, and generally with two or more members, of that organization (Seibert & Sypher, 1989). Moreover, people within a network are able to share or provide favorite information on departments and companies (Demers, 2002). According to Seibert and Sypher (1989), volunteers and interns are interested in the work due to the networking with professional contacts. Dorsch et al (2002) found that young adults (the aged of 15 and 34) are more interested in meeting new people and making new friends. Furthermore, Cunningham and Sagas (2004) and Cunningham et al. (2005), college students who took part in an internship as an undergraduate had a greater career success than students who did not. Meeting the right people can help students gain jobs after graduating and develop a network with other areas (Dorsch et al., 2002).

Volunteering Abroad

People are interested in volunteer abroad although females manifested a greater tendency toward volunteer abroad than males (Bae et al., 2011). Traveling abroad to volunteer can be very beneficial since the individuals can learn new cultures and have new experiences that may not be found in their local communities. Such internships or volunteering opportunities are very common for international sporting events (Gregory, 2010). For example, Sochi 2014 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee had approximately 25,000 volunteers (Paralympic.org, 2014). Of those volunteers, around 2,000 volunteers were come from overseas such as the United States (10%), Ukraine (9%), Canada, UK and Kazakhstan (8%), and other regions like Japan, New Zealand, Cameroon, Congo, and New Zealand (Olympic.org, 2013). In 2003, Korean college students who participated in abroad volunteering had increased by 56% since the 1990s (Korea University Council for Social Service, 2006). Fairley, Kellett, and Green (2007) investigated the motives of people who volunteered in the 2004 Sydney Olympics and were planning to volunteer in the 2004 Athens Olympic Games. They discovered four main motivations to volunteer in two
different samples: Nostalgia (memories of all facets of a previous experience volunteering at the Olympics), Camaraderie and Friendship (relationships formed with fellow volunteers), Olympic Connection (a desire to be a part of the ultimate sporting event), and Sharing and Recognition of Expertise (repeat volunteers wanting to share their experience and acquired skills with new volunteers). Wearing (2001) examined the Youth Challenge International Program and found volunteers had the following motivations: altruism, travel and adventure, personal growth, cultural exchange and learning, professional development, and so on. Unstead-Joss (2008) emphasized two key values of international volunteer motivation: “one was the moral issue of earning a lot of money in a developing country” and the other one was “to learn about new culture and a different way of life” (p. 11).

Social Interaction

Social interaction is one of the important factors to make volunteers satisfied and to retain them volunteering for future sporting events (Clary et al., 1998; Cleave & Doherty, 2005; Doherty, 2006; Green & Chalip, 1998). Most repeated volunteers appreciate the social benefits associated with the events they work with (Fairley et al., 2007; Morrow-Howell & Mui, 1989). However, younger adults do not look at volunteering the same way as older adults do (Clary et al., 1998). The major social goal for youths and younger adults is to expand their horizon, whereas in middle and late adulthood, the first priority is to maintain their emotional well-being (Okun and Schultz, 2003). Dorsch et al. (2002) indicated that young volunteers (15-34 years old) show a strong motivation of “hand-on” volunteering and are more interested in meeting new people and making new friends as well as want to gain more recognition and status in the community. On the other hand, older volunteers (over 35 years old) are more likely to share their skills or help a case because someone close to them has personally been affected by the organization (Doherty, 2006). Musick and Wilson (2003) further explained that one of the goals for senior citizens to volunteer is to improve social connectedness, and social development is strongly embedded when they volunteer (Principi, Lindley, Perek-Bialas, & Turek, 2012). Nevertheless, older adults are more adept than younger adults at sustaining highly positive emotional state and are more skilled at maintaining the absence of negative affective states (Okun & Schultz, 2003). Okun and Schultz (2003) also predicted that older volunteers will have higher values than younger volunteers because of displaying strong leadership during volunteering.

Volunteerism has drawn the attention of most citizens in South Korea after the 1986 Asian Games, the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games, and the 2002 FIFA World Cup (Lee, 2011; Lee et al., 2010). Through these mega sporting events, volunteerism has been well-established and systematically managed by The Korea Society (Lee, 2011). Because of this Society, many Korean people have the opportunities to work as a volunteer in the areas of sports, environment, education, culture, art, or consumer protection. In spite of this, there has been a lack of investigation on volunteer motivation factors of the Korean population. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to examine and identify the volunteer motivation factors of the Korean population based on the 2011 International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) World Championships. Another purpose of this study was to validate the VMS, which was developed based on a sample from the United States.
METHODOLOGY

Participants
The participants for this study were defined as individuals who had volunteered during the 2011 Daegu World Championship in Athletics in Daegu, South Korea. Of the 300 participants, 274 volunteers (a response rate of 91%) completed the questionnaire and the data were deemed usable. The participants consisted of 132 males (48%) and 142 females (52%). Over 82% of the participants were 20-29 years old, approximately 7% each for those who were 30-39 or 40-49 years old, and the remaining were those who were 50-59 years old (2%) and 60 years and older (2%). Prior to distribution of the questionnaires, the participants were informed about the purpose of this study and explained how to complete the survey.

Instrument
The questionnaire consisted of two main sections. The first section focused on demographics. There were six questions pertaining to age, gender, employment, marital status, household income, and frequency of volunteers. The second section was the VMS, which was used to assess volunteer motivation using a 5-point Likert-type scale (e.g., 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree). The instrument was adapted and revised from the original instrument developed by Bae et al. (2011) that was used to measure the motivation of Korean volunteers. Originally, the instrument was composed of 32 items under 5 dimensions: Work Experience (5 items, \( \alpha = .85 \)), Networking (4 items, \( \alpha = .87 \)), Self-determination (10 items, \( \alpha = .90 \)), Volunteering Abroad (6 items, \( \alpha = .81 \)), and Social Interaction (7 items, \( \alpha = .74 \)).

The questionnaire was distributed between August 27 and September 4, 2011 during the IAAF World Championship. A professor and five trained doctoral students assisted with the administration of the study. Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires, participants were informed about the purpose of this study. Then, the trained assistants distributed the questionnaires to the participants and collected them upon completion. Participation in the survey was voluntary.

Statistical Analysis
The purposes of this study were to examine and identify the volunteer motivation factors of the Korean population and to validate the VMS. In order to compare the motivation factors between male and female participants, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine the mean vector of scores on the five dimensions of VMS. Wilks' Lambda was used as a test of significant difference between the vectors of means. Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare gender differences among each of the five dependent variables. To examine the psychometric properties of the VMS developed by Bae et al. (2011), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to confirm the factor structure of the scale. The PRELIS 2 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2006) program was utilized to test for the degree of skewness and kurtosis as well as multivariate normality; while the LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2006) computer program was used for data analysis. Because of its robust procedures, the Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation method was selected to conduct the CFA.

As suggested by Bollen and Long (1993), the application of the CFA includes: (1) model specification, (2) identification, (3) estimation, (4) testing fit, and (5) respecification. When doing model specification, an initial model is generated prior to estimation. The formulation of this model is based on theory or past research. Then the model is identified to see whether it is
possible to find unique values for the parameters of the specified model. Once a model is identified, an estimation method is selected. The selected estimation technique is based on the distributional properties of the variables being analyzed. After obtaining the estimates, the model is tested as to whether it is consistent with the data. If so, the process can be stopped; if not, the model could be improved through respecification. In doing so, steps (2) through (5) may be repeated, usually many times to achieve the final outcome (Bollen & Long, 1993). The entire procedures (i.e., from model specification to respecification) should be conducted with the same data set, and one way to improve model fit is to remove items with the lowest lambda values (Lam & Bae, 2014; Lam, Zhang, & Jensen, 2005).

The following fit indices were used to examine the fit of the models: the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; Steiger & Lind, 1980), the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and the relative normed chi-square ($\chi^2/df$; Wheaton, Muthén, Alwin, & Summers, 1977). As indicated by Steiger (1990) and Byrne (1998), values of the RMSEA less than .05 indicate a very good fit, and values up to .08 indicate reasonable errors of approximation in the population. Byrne (1998) commented that the SRMR ranges from zero to 1.00 and “in a well-fitting model this value will be small – say, .05 or less” (p. 115). Values of the CFI also range from zero to 1.00, with values larger than .90 indicating an acceptable fit, and values greater than .95 indicating a good fit (Bentler, 1990, 1992; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988, Steiger, 1990). West, Finch, and Curran (1995) further commented that the CFI has "only small downward bias (3% to 4%), even under severely nonnormal conditions" (p. 74). Since chi-square is too sensitive to sample size differences, especially when the samples sizes are large (e.g., N > 200). Therefore, a chi-square per degrees of freedom is used instead (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). On the other hand, the Expected Cross-Validation Index (ECVI; Browne & Cudeck, 1989) was used to measure the fit across models. The ECVI is used to assess, in a single sample, the likelihood that the model cross-validated across samples with similar size from the same population (Browne & Cudeck, 1989). When comparing different models, the ECVI index is computed for each model and the model having the smallest ECVI value denotes the largest potential for replication. Because it can take on any value, the ECVI has no predetermined range of values (Byrne, 1998).

RESULTS

A one-way MANOVA was used to examine gender differences in the mean vector of scores on the five dependent variables (i.e., Work Experience, Networking, Self-Determination, Volunteering Abroad, and Social Interaction). Results of the MANOVA analysis indicated the overall VMS model was marginal nonsignificant (Wilks' $\Lambda_{5, 269} = 2.170$, $p = .058$). The purpose of the MANOVA analysis was to provide an overall assessment of the five aforementioned variables as a group. However, the interest of this study is more on each individual factor. Therefore, univariate ANOVAs were also performed to examine gender differences in Work Experience, Networking, Self-Determination, Volunteering Abroad, and Social Interaction separately. Results indicated that there were no gender differences in Networking ($F_{1, 273} = 3.389$, $p = .067$) and Social Interaction ($F_{1, 273} = 2.515$, $p = .114$). However, significant gender differences were found in Work Experience ($F_{1, 273} = 9.829$, $p = .002$), Self-Determination ($F_{1, 273} = 5.630$, $p = .018$), and Volunteering Abroad ($F_{1, 273} = 4.981$, $p = .026$). Mean scores of the five factors between male and female participants are depicted in Table 1.
Table 1: Mean Scores of the Five Factors Between Male (n = 132) and Female (n = 142) Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Male Mean ±SD</th>
<th>Female Mean ±SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>4.19 ±.64</td>
<td>3.94 ±.68</td>
<td>9.829</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>3.93 ±.75</td>
<td>3.76 ±.75</td>
<td>3.389</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>3.94 ±.72</td>
<td>3.75 ±.60</td>
<td>5.630</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad</td>
<td>4.08 ±.69</td>
<td>3.89 ±.68</td>
<td>4.981</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>3.50 ±.58</td>
<td>3.38 ±.63</td>
<td>2.515</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01

In order to validate the VMS, LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2006) computer program was used to analyze the five-factor model. Maximum Likelihood estimation method was utilized since the distribution of data was not deviated from normal. Most researchers favor the Maximum Likelihood estimation method since it is almost always acceptable because of its robustness, even when data are nonnormally distributed (Harlow, 1985; Hoyle & Panter, 1995; Muthén & Kaplan, 1985; Tanaka & Bentler, 1985; West et al., 1995). Descriptive statistics of the 32 items is presented in Table 2. Results of the CFA indicated that the chi-square statistics of the model was significant (i.e., $\chi^2 = 1,414, df = 454, p < .01$). However, the goodness-of-fit indexes of the model were all acceptable (e.g., CFI = .96, SRMR = .066), indicating the model provided reasonable fit to the data. In order to improve the model, items with the lowest lambda values (i.e., less than .50) were eliminated from the model (Lam & Bae, 2014; Lam et al., 2005). Three items were removed during this process (the first item from Self-Determination, and the first and last items from Social Interaction). Then the revised model (29 items) was reanalyzed using the previous procedures. As a result, the 29-item model was significantly ($p < .001$) improved when examining the changes in chi-square and the changes in degrees of freedom (i.e., $\Delta \chi^2 = 277, \Delta df = 87, p < .001$). In addition, the ECVI also supported the 29-item revised model. The changes in the goodness-of-fit indexes and model-fit statistics of the nine-factor model from 32 items to 29 items are depicted in Table 3. The parameter estimates between the indicators and latent variables ranged from .52 (e.g., Social Interaction) to .87 (e.g., Work Experience). The interfactor correlations ranged from .70 (e.g., between Volunteer Abroad and Social Interaction) to .88 (between Work Experience and Self-Determination). The factor structure coefficients, errors of measurement, and inter-factor correlations estimated by the CFA are presented in Figure 1.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics, Skewness, and Kurtosis of the 32-Item Volunteer Motivation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience 1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-6.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience 2</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-4.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience 3</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience 4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-4.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience 5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking 1</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking 2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking 3</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking 4</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-5.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 2</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 3</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-4.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 4</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 6</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-5.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 7</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 8</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-4.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 9</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination 10</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-4.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad 1</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad 2</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad 3</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad 4</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-4.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad 5</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-5.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Abroad 6</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-7.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 2</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 3</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 4</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-4.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: A Comparison Between the 32-Item and the 29-Item Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>ECVI</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32-Item Model</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.086-.097)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.58-6.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Item Model</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>87$\phi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.084-.096)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.43-5.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\phi p < .001$
Figure 1: Factor structure coefficients and errors of measurement of the five-factor 29-item model.
Composite Reliability and Variance Extracted

The composite reliability (CR) for the final version of the five-factor 29-item VMS ranged from .895 (Social Interaction) to .93 (Work Experience) which were considered very good when CR > .70 was considered acceptable (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). On the other hand, reasonable variances were extracted by the constructs. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), variance extracted (VE) is the “amount of variance captured by the construct in relation to the amount of variance due to measurement error” (p. 45). The VE of the five constructs ranged from .64 (Social Interaction) to .73 (e.g., Work Experience) which were all greater than the acceptable standard (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The CR and VE of the scale are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Composite Reliability and Variance Extracted of the Five-Factor 29-Item Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Self-Determination</th>
<th>Volunteering Abroad</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Extracted</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to examine and identify the volunteer motivation factors of the Korean participants. According to the results of gender comparisons, male and female volunteers displayed similar motivations in Networking and Social Interaction. The finding was concurred with previous studies (Bae et al., 2011; Pauline & Pauline, 2009; Strigas & Jackson, 2003). However, male participants had higher mean scores than female participants in the following factors: Work Experience, Self-Determination, and Volunteering Abroad. This finding supported previous studies that male displayed different volunteer motivation for volunteer activities than females (Bae et al., 2011; Hardin et al., 2007; Helms & McKenzie, 2014; Pauline, Pauline, & Mulvihill, 2008; Taniguchi, 2006). According to Bae et al. (2011), males exhibited higher volunteer motivation than females on work experience and volunteer abroad. However, Helms and McKenzie (2014) found that females participated in more volunteer work than male because women were more likely to help neighboring households in both formal and informal ways than males. Moreover, females are exhibiting more strong motivation on enriching personal development, eliminating from negative feeling, adapting new skills, and expressing values than males (Burns, Reid, Toncar, Anderson, & Wells, 2008; Helms & McKenzie, 2014).

One of purposes of this study was to validate the VMS using confirmatory factor analysis. The original VMS has 32 items. After model respecification, three items were removed and the final VMS model included 29 items under five dimensions: Work Experience (5 items), Networking (4 items), Self-Determination (9 items), Volunteering Abroad (6 items), and Social Interaction (5 items). Overall, the CR of all five factors was above the .70 standard.
This indicated that all items collectively contributed a good overall reliability of each factor. Likewise, the VE showed that reasonable variances were extracted by each factor. In fact, the VE indicates the proportion of variance that is explained by an underlying factor in relation to that due to measurement error. For instance, the VE of the Work Experience factor was 0.73, meaning that 73% of the variance is explained by the Work Experience factor, while only 27% is due to measurement error. Nevertheless, the VE is a rather conservative estimate, it is sometimes acceptable even if the value is below .50 (Hatcher, 1994).

Based on the goodness-of-fit indices of the CFA, the 29-item modified VMS (see Table 2) provides reasonable fit to the data. In spite of this, the model is still not perfect; and there is room for improvement. Previous researchers indicated that the fit of a model is affected by, among other things, its complexity and specification (Bollen & Long, 1993; Gerbing & Anderson, 1993; Kaplan, 2000). Fan, Thompson, and Wang (1999) classified their four-latent-variable model (with three to four indicators per latent variable) as "moderate complexity" (p. 63). In fact, most researchers using structural equation modeling involved two to six latent variables, with about two to six indicators for each latent variable (Gerbing & Anderson, 1993). Based on this standard, the five-factor 29-item VMS model can be considered as high complexity, which may hamper its model fit. On the other hand, using too few indicators per latent variable is inappropriate. In their Monte Carlo study, Anderson and Gerbing (1984) found a greater chance of nonconvergence and improper solutions with two indicators per factor, especially with small sample sizes (e.g., N < 150). MacCallum (1995) pointed out that models with low numbers of parameters relative to the number of measured variable variances/covariances were highly disconfirmable, and that "for such models, bad fit to observed data is entirely possible" (p. 30). On the other hand, the structural parameters were unbiased when the models have three or more indicators per factor (Gerbing & Anderson, 1985). Viewing this, the revised VMS maintains at least three indicators per latent variable during the entire scale development process (Loehlin, 1998).

In conclusion, the results indicate that males are more motivated to become volunteers than females. Specifically, males agree more that volunteering can give them opportunity for personal growth and helpful to their education as well as their career than their counterparts. In light of previous research and the findings of this current study, different strategies are necessary when recruiting volunteers. The modified VMS has sound psychometric properties and can be used to assess the motivation of volunteers in an international setting. However, a fit model does not necessarily mean a correct or best model because there may be many equivalent models as determined by the fit indexes (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). This is true for the VMS model because it is only in its initial stage. Future researchers should reexamine the VMS with samples from different countries to further examine its factor structure and invariance across gender, race, etc. In addition, further examination of the psychometric properties, such as the convergent and divergent validity of the VMS is necessary. For example, the VMS could be compared to other similar motivation scales to see whether they were developed with the same degree of emphasis on scale construction and specificity for the volunteering setting (i.e., convergent validity).
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### Appendix A

**Modified Volunteer Motivation Scale**

#### Work Experience
1. Volunteering gives me opportunity to do meaningful work
2. Volunteering gives me opportunity for personal development
3. I feel a sense of accomplishment from my work
4. I enjoy interacting with other professionals
5. Volunteering helps me to succeed in my chosen profession

#### Networking
1. Volunteering can lead me to meet new contacts for future careers
2. I can make new contacts who might help my business or career
3. Volunteering helps me to explore different career options
4. Volunteering leads me to better opportunities for networking

#### Self-Determination
1. Volunteering enhances my abilities
2. Volunteering motivates me to interacting with new people
3. Volunteering helps me relieve the stress and tension
4. Volunteering makes me more marketable to other organizations
5. Volunteering gives me a better understanding of the organization
6. Volunteering is considered to be prestigious
7. Volunteering helps me with self-esteem
8. Volunteering activity energizes me
9. Volunteering makes me discover new interests

#### Volunteering Abroad
1. I could obtain an educational experience
2. Volunteering will help with my resume
3. Volunteering is required in my degree program
4. Volunteering introduces me to new cultures
5. Volunteering opens me up to new experiences
6. Volunteering helps me to improve my skills and abilities

#### Social Interaction
1. People I am close to share an interest in community service
2. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best
3. Volunteering makes me feel important
4. Volunteering makes me feel needed
5. Volunteering is a way to make new friends
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Abstract

Nonprofit organizations regularly measure and evaluate the structure and output of their direct service programs, but rarely pay such attention to their volunteer programs. This paper outlines the importance of data collection and evaluation of volunteer programs in order to better serve and cultivate support from various stakeholders. We present seven arenas in which different metric data about a volunteer program would be used to deliver messages to different audiences and for different reasons: 1) outputs and stories from volunteers presented to the wider public can promote the organization’s client advocacy; 2) outputs, outcomes, and anecdotes should be delivered to grantmakers and donors when seeking grants and contributions; 3) outputs and reports of volunteer satisfaction should guide volunteer administrative staff regarding future administrative decisions; 4) outputs and budget-related outcomes will support the organization’s decision makers during strategic planning; 5) outcomes, impacts, and volunteer and staff satisfaction reports can garner support from the Board and the top management team for improved program delivery; 6) expanded value-added calculations should be incorporated by the Board, donors, and watchdogs as a component of financial and social accounting; 7) all of the above information should be measured and reported to advocate for greater volunteer management capacity. While these efforts for measuring, tracking, and evaluating volunteer-related data require money, time, and expertise,
organizations that invest in them will reap benefits that include greater internal and public expression of their mission, stronger outputs, improved volunteer management, more effective program delivery, and increasingly robust impacts on our communities.

**Key Words:** Measurement, evaluation, management
Introduction

Socrates is said to have declared that the ‘unexamined life is not worth living,’ a maxim that underscores the value of never letting a day go by without reflecting on ways to improve our life’s walk. Were Socrates to spend time working or volunteering with modern nonprofit organizations, perhaps he would utter a corollary: The unexamined volunteer program is not worth volunteering for. Volunteer programs could become appreciably more effective by investing small amounts of time creating measurements and evaluating metrics. Whereas Chandler and Torbert (2003) outlined 27 ‘flavors’ of social action research, we note 7 different ‘arenas’ where measurement and evaluation can be powerful tools for operating, sustaining, and improving volunteer administration.

Safrit (2012) observes that the literature on volunteer administration has described, albeit superficially, the value of evaluation for nearly 50 years. This lack of focus on measurement and evaluation reflects the fact that many volunteer administrators do not have the time, resources, or expertise to examine their programs in a systematic way. Nonetheless, Safrit (2012: 389-90) argues that “evaluation is a critical, if not the most critical, component of managing an overall volunteer program and subsequently documenting the impacts and ultimate value of the program to the target clientele it is designed to serve as well as the larger society in which it operates.”

The purpose of this article is to outline the importance of data collection and evaluation in serving and cultivating an organization’s many different stakeholders. The goals include greater expression, stronger outputs, better volunteer management, a more effective organization, and increasingly robust impacts on our communities.

Arena 1: Messaging for Advocacy

- Audience: General public, potential stakeholders
- Type of information: Stories, counts, and outputs

Nonprofits advocate both for their own survival and for their broader social mission (Garrow & Hasenfeld, 2014). They variously advertise program strengths, staff accomplishments, fundraising efficiency, and community engagement, among other successes. Participation of volunteers in nonprofits reflects community engagement and the currency of mission. Stories of volunteer participation appear in speeches, reports, and social media. The number of volunteers and their aggregate hours are quick-hit statistics that advocate for the viability of program and mission. Where money talks, volunteer hours can be monetized and used in general advocacy campaigns.

Indeed, when monetized, volunteers represent a primary financial resource for many nonprofits. A widely used source is Independent Sector’s (2015) estimation of volunteer value, which is derived from the average hourly wage of nonagricultural workers plus 12 percent (to approximate the value of fringe benefits). In 2013, volunteers were valued at $22.55 per hour (Independent Sector 2015). Tracking volunteer hours and monetizing volunteer value enhances a nonprofit’s reputation, thereby augmenting advocacy efforts. One study, however, suggests that many nonprofits neither monetize volunteer hours, nor do they use this information for advocacy purposes. Mook, Sousa, Elgie, and Quarter (2005) reported that only about one-third of nonprofits in their study kept records of volunteer contributions to their organizations. Over 90 percent of nonprofits admitted to not estimating the financial value of volunteer contributions, citing that it did not apply to their messaging, that they had simply not considered it, or that the estimated value was not desirable (p. 408). Consequently, the tracking and reporting of
volunteer contributions can be an important tool for advocacy or community engagement, but only if decision-makers see the value and implement appropriate measures.

**Arena 2: Messaging for Soliciting Grants and Contributions**

- Audience: Foundations and individual donors
- Type of information: Stories, any available measures

In recent decades, grantmakers have solicited impact reports as a condition of funding (Cordery & Sinclair, 2013). An organization with an established track record of collecting and reporting on various metrics of a successful volunteer program might prove more qualified for funding than one that does not. Funders value both the organization’s capability to track volunteer program metrics as well as the meaning and impact of those metrics.

Hotchkiss, Unruh, and Fottler (2014) note that “a significant proportion of nonprofit-generated value is a product of volunteer contributions and therefore should be documented to accurately reflect the nonprofit performance” (p. 1115). If a grantmaker seeks to fund nonprofits with the greatest reach and impact, it may prefer to support an organization that has demonstrated an effective use of volunteer resources; one that can illustrate the cost savings as well as the value that its volunteer program adds to its overall mission. Additionally, a well-managed and well-documented volunteer program may attract funding because of the implication that a successful volunteer program translates to other successful programs within that organization.

Organizations that track volunteer metrics also tend to be more successful at soliciting corporate funding. Perry (2006) observed that the American branch of Credit Suisse decided “that instead of selecting charities that had a particular mission, it would favor those that relied heavily on volunteers to accomplish their goals” (p. 14). In 2005, most of the corporation’s $5 million in grants “…went to charities with active volunteer programs” (Perry, 2006, p. 14). Failure to track the accomplishments of a volunteer program will automatically preclude an organization from receiving funding from corporations that have adopted Credit Suisse’s funding philosophy.

Lastly, organizations that commit to recording volunteer metrics will be stronger candidates for funding from individuals. Volunteers develop attachments to the organizations for which they volunteer, and those “who fondly remember their experiences are highly likely to be motivated to offer financial aid to an organization to assure its future within their community even when they are no longer able to volunteer” (Hotchkiss et al., 2014, p. 1119). Long-term donations, however, are best sustained when the organization maintains regular contact with its former volunteer, a practice that is often neglected (Hotchkiss et al. 2014, p. 1120). Without continued contact, volunteers may not feel valued by the organization, and may reciprocate by withholding their financial support. Regular and ongoing communication with active and former volunteers can only be accomplished with proper management of volunteer data.

**Arena 3: Metrics for Improved Volunteer Administration**

- Audience: Volunteer administration staff
- Type of information: Outputs, satisfaction
Hager and Brudney (2011) report that two in three U.S. charities have difficulty recruiting sufficient numbers of volunteers. Nonprofits can improve their volunteer recruitment by adequately tracking metric data about current volunteers. By understanding who their volunteers are, volunteer managers can “tailor volunteer pitches to the volunteer's stage of life. Is the volunteer still working? Does he or she have kids at home? What about duties caring for older family members?” (Nelson, 2009, p. 32). Tailoring the message when asking individuals to volunteer will ensure a more attractive request to the volunteer and a better match with the organization’s needs.

Many adults volunteer in hopes of making social connections, and they will be more inclined to volunteer with an organization that can prove that it has a robust volunteer program (Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008). A dynamic volunteer program will also inspire confidence in potential volunteers who might correlate the large number of volunteers with a perception that the nonprofit treats its volunteers respectfully, and provides fulfilling roles.

Volunteers “often can't see the connection between their activities and the mission of the organization” (Blum, 2008, p. 21). Failing to track volunteer inputs “denies volunteers a full appreciation of their contributions” and this disconnect between volunteer activities and mission fulfillment can lead to turnover (Salamon, Sokolowski, & Haddock, 2011, p. 220). Tracking and reporting volunteer contributions, on the other hand, can help to retain volunteers by showing them the outcomes of their work, which will also inspire a high quality of volunteering work ethic (King, 2010). Another mechanism to improve volunteer retention involves tracking volunteer job satisfaction, which “increases the likelihood of predicting retention-related outcomes, namely turnover potential,” and responding accordingly (Galindo-Kuhn & Guzley, 2001, p. 46).

Finally, maintaining volunteer data can mitigate risk both to the volunteer and the organization. For example, to minimize risk in situations where volunteers are charged with collecting cash donations or who are allowed to work unsupervised shifts, a database containing volunteer data could be used to evaluate and track volunteer assignments, performance, training skills, concerns, etc. (c.f., Moore 2004, p. 27).

**Arena 4: Metrics for Broader Organizational Strategic Planning**

- **Audience:** Decision makers
- **Type of information:** Outputs, outcomes tied to budget

Nonprofits should consider implementing measuring and reporting protocols of its volunteer program when it engages in the strategic planning process, which guides the organization to prepare for the creation, development, and/or expansion of programs and services. Volunteer management teams provide an essential stakeholder’s viewpoint in this process that is both introspective and forward-looking. Pivotal to the successful implementation of a strategic plan are metrics and measurements; without them, the strategic plan “is a group of intentions always on the verge of greatness” (Talley & Fram, 2010: p. 52). During planning, the volunteer management team should consider what functions volunteers carry out, how many and what types of volunteers will be needed, and what skill-sets are required for achieving strategic goals. When planning to expand a volunteer program, the volunteer management team’s effective planning will depend heavily upon the valuation and measurement of previous outputs.

Effective strategic planning also relies upon the development and measurement of outcomes. Outcomes differ from outputs in that outputs are the nonprofit’s activities and
services, while outcomes are the results or impact of those activities and services on the community (Lynch-Cerullo & Cooney, 2011). Volunteers are often directly involved in the program delivery or outputs; if properly measured and documented, those outputs will reveal the volunteers’ contributions to the organization’s outcomes. To facilitate the forward-looking vision of the strategic plan, the volunteer manager must utilize measurements and metrics to create quantifiable validation that fosters the nonprofit’s ability to create an achievable strategic plan. This visioning allows the nonprofit to conceptualize, through its strategic plan, expanded services and programs to meet the needs of its service area.

**Arena 5: Metrics for Improved Program Delivery**
- Audience: Board, top management team
- Type of information: Outcomes, impacts, satisfaction

Volunteers bring countless benefits to a nonprofit organization and its clients, including increased levels and quality of services, increased public support, improved community relations, services that otherwise would not have been provided, and more attention to clients (Handy & Mook, 2011). Measuring and tracking volunteer inputs and corresponding outputs will help demonstrate the impact volunteers have on program delivery. These data can guide and encourage the board and administration to better incorporate the organization’s volunteer program to contribute to stronger program development and service delivery. A stronger volunteer program that measures and evaluates metrics about its volunteers can effectively translate to better program and organizational capacity.

One important metric that easily corresponds with improved program delivery is that of volunteer satisfaction. As was mentioned above in Arena 4, tracking volunteer satisfaction is important for better administration of volunteers, but volunteer satisfaction has other consequences for the organization. A satisfied volunteer will be much more likely to do a better job serving the clients than a disgruntled volunteer (Dwyer, Bono, Snyder, Nov, & Berson, 2013). Volunteers tend to be more satisfied when they know their efforts positively impact the organization’s mission and program delivery. “Impact may be considered the ultimate effects and changes that a volunteer-based program has brought about upon those involved with the program (i.e. its stakeholders), including the program’s targeted clientele and their surrounding neighborhoods and communities, as well as the volunteer organization itself and its paid and volunteer staff” (Safrit, 2012, p. 392). Any data that can be used to explain the quality of program delivery will benefit future organizational and program planning and administration.

**Arena 6: As a Component of Financial and Social Accounting**
- Audience: Board, donors, watchdogs
- Type of information: Expanded value-added calculations

‘Social accounting’ aims to expand the parameters of traditional financial accounting by including “a systematic analysis of the effects of an organization on its communities of interest or stakeholders…for the accounting statement” (Mook and Quarter, 2006, 248). This topic is particularly relevant for the volunteer management team because it involves establishing a dollar value for non-monetized assets, such as volunteer labor.

More funders, shareholders, creditors, and governmental agencies are recognizing nonprofit “value-added” statements, including accounting regulatory bodies such as the Financial
Accounting Standards Board (Mook, Richmond, and Quarter, 2013). The inclusion of volunteer value represents social resources that differentiate the value-added statement from a conventional income statement (Mook & Quarter, 2006). The volunteer manager’s reporting of volunteer value benefits the nonprofit overall by more accurately reflecting the value of the organization to the community and displaying the impact of funders’ investments on the organization. Measuring the value-added volunteer’s efforts increases the chances of receiving funding dollars from the short list of donors, foundations, and governmental agencies (Mazzioni, Sculz, and Klann, 2014).

By creating a social accounting, expanded, value-added measurement, the volunteer manager reflects the nonprofit’s social and financial responsibility. Since conventional accounting methods do not measure the impact of volunteer’s services, the social impact is often segregated from the economic, relegating social impact to a secondary status (Mook, Handy & Quarter, 2007). The volunteer manager’s measurements of volunteer’s efforts can contribute to a social accounting model that expands the vocabulary of efficiency, effectiveness, and social impact. The volunteer manager’s efforts at measuring volunteer worth for social accounting also enables the nonprofit to be forward-looking by focusing attention on the aspects of the organization’s operations that can project future profitability.

**Arena 7: Metrics for Internal Advocacy for (More) Volunteer Management Capacity**

- **Audience:** Board, internal decision-makers
- **Type of information:** All of the above

Finally, a volunteer program depends upon support from all organizational staff in order to maximize volunteer contributions to the organization’s success and growth. Not all staff have experience working with volunteers, and not all staff consider volunteers to be valuable members of the organizational team. Involving staff in the creation of measurement metrics can both calm resistance to and garner support for volunteer involvement. While Hager and Brudney (2005) report that resistance to volunteers is reportedly low among surveyed organizations, multiple sources suggest that staff resistance to volunteers is borne of: 1) a concern that volunteers will replace paid staff; 2) a belief that working with volunteers is time-consuming; 3) an expectation that volunteers cannot do tasks that require advanced skills; 4) a fear that the quality of service will be diminished; and 5) an uncertainty of how or where volunteers will ‘fit’ into the organization (McCurley & Lynch, 2011). These concerns may be allayed by sharing with staff metric data similar to that suggested above for other audiences. Staff who are skeptical of a volunteer’s contribution might be swayed by learning data that enumerate the number of hours worked by volunteers, or the range of volunteer skills and the tasks performed by volunteers. Sharing a volunteer program’s qualitative and quantitative outputs and outcomes to staff could explain the complementary and supportive role that the volunteer program can have in advancing the organization’s mission. Staff might be more willing to embrace the volunteer program if they know that it lightens their own workload, improves the organization’s reputation with the public and with donors, and improves its overall effectiveness. If a volunteer program has collected this data for its other audiences or purposes, it would be readily available for a poster or presentation at an organization’s all-staff meeting, or in an area where it would be visible to staff.
Conclusion

At a minimum, volunteer administrators should consider collecting and maintaining information about volunteer demographics, skills, interests, and assignments; that data can be maintained on paper or electronically in spreadsheets or databases. Administrators are further encouraged to report on the outputs of the volunteer program and to evaluate those outcomes in relation to program and organizational outputs and outcomes. Every nonprofit’s volunteer program should be monitored and evaluated for its effectiveness and its contributions to the larger organization in which it sits.

Many organizations use software specifically designed to track volunteer recruitment, skills and task preferences, engagement, and performance reviews. Cravens (2015) maintains a list of many available programs and their specifications; she also offers guidelines for choosing the appropriate program for an organization. An organization’s methodology for measuring and evaluating volunteer input and outcomes should be guided by that organization’s mission and by established goals for the volunteer program, which will be unique for each organization. By maintaining records of volunteers’ successes, nonprofits have steady access to motivational stories that advance advocacy, and promote funding solicitation. Since grantmakers are more often opting to fund nonprofits that successfully control costs by utilizing volunteers, the maintenance of volunteer data can be directly related to continued solvency. Because volunteer contentment is pivotal to retention, volunteer management programs should create a metrics for measuring volunteer satisfaction. Fulfilled volunteers not only provide long-term service, they are also more likely to donate funds to the nonprofit. Measurement of a nonprofit’s volunteer program is crucial when developing a doable strategic plan for the future, and when improving program delivery. Considering the enormous fiscal asset that volunteers represent, nonprofits should adopt financial and social accounting methods that incorporate the value-added of volunteer efforts.

Finally, metrics that quantify volunteer contributions will enable staff, the board of directors, and internal decision-makers to more fully appreciate the benefits created by the organization’s volunteers. The more mindfully a nonprofit examines its volunteer program, and the more thoroughly a nonprofit maintains a metrics of volunteer contributions, the more effectively that organization can strengthen its infrastructure, program design and delivery, and mission.
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Abstract

Volunteer legal guardians accept responsibility for decision-making on behalf of people who are cognitively incapacitated. Recruiting volunteers to act as legal guardians for incapacitated older and disabled adults may be critical in meeting the increased demand in light of the growth of these populations in the community and reduced agency funding. This volunteer task may be unique requiring a high degree of responsibility for critical decisions made on behalf of another. Moreover, volunteer guardian programs are relatively uncommon. The research reported here sought to understand why people accept this task, and how they may be similar to and different from a sample of volunteers engaged in more generalist volunteer tasks (hospitals, schools, etc.). This exploratory research builds upon an existing research base on reasons for volunteering using a sample of guardians from a mid-Atlantic guardianship agency. Qualitative data indicates volunteers who are motivated to help the ‘unbefriended,’ those who have no one to help them, and the opportunity to give back to their community. In addition, the respondents valued learning skills to navigate the aging and disability service systems. Quantitative data using a validated measure of volunteer motivation indicate guardians scored higher on altruistic factors (values) and lower on more egoist factors (career and enhancement) than indicated in studies of generalist volunteer endeavors. Implications include increased understanding of the task to inform providers that may choose to include a volunteer guardian component, and the potential need for targeted recruitment in volunteer guardian programs and in public programs serving older and disabled adults.
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Introduction
Recruitment and retention of volunteers are always issues in practice (Eisner, Grimm, Maynard, & Washburn, 2008; Hager & Brudney, 2004a; 2004b). The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) estimated that Americans contributed 7.7 billion hours of volunteer service in 2013 (CNCS, 2015). Independent Sector (2015) reported that the average dollar value of an hour of volunteer service was $23.07 in 2014, and that the total estimated value of volunteer service in 2013 was $173 billion. Volunteers are important, and may become increasingly important, in providing service in the community during times of economic stress. Yet, between 2009 and 2010 when this research was conducted, fewer volunteers contributed more volunteer hours (CNCS, 2011a). CNCS noted that 36.5% of Americans who volunteered in 2009 did not return to contribute volunteer hours in 2010 (CNCS, 2011b). Unfortunately, this decline continues (1.1% decline in 2013 as per U.S. BLS, 2014). Some volunteer positions are known to require the deft hand of volunteer resource managers and program administrators with regard to recruitment and retention, because of the nature of the task itself (Hager & Brudney, 2011). In the absence of qualified family or professionals, many older and disabled adults who are no longer able to make important decisions on their own behalf require the assignment of a legal guardian. Few municipalities have the resources or financial capacity to assign trained professionals. An uncommon solution, training community members to act as volunteer legal guardians, may be a critical resource to the aging/disabled services continuum of care. The purpose of this study is to explore reasons why people volunteer to become legal guardians, and to compare these reasons to a sample of traditional volunteers using a validated measure of motivation to volunteer.

In the United States, the age group comprised of people who are 65 years old is growing at an unprecedented rate. The Census Bureau reported that as of 2010, 13% of the population (40.3 million Americans) were 65 and older (Werner, 2011). The Alzheimer’s Association estimates that as of 2014, 5.2 million Americans are living with Alzheimer’s Disease or a related dementia (Alzheimer’s Association, 2014). Dementias and a configuration of other issues, such as poverty, lower education, and living alone may be predictive of a decrease in ability to care for oneself and the potential need for guardianship services (Dyer et al., 2008; Pavlou & Lachs, 2008; Reynolds, 2001). Situations involving older adults who are no longer able to make decisions on their own behalf are common in aging services. Older adults who are unable to be safely discharged from a hospital admission, or may have been referred to an adult protective services unit of an area agency on aging due to complaints of abuse or neglect, may become adjudicated as incapacitated by a local court system. In some circumstances, a friend or loved one is able to accept the assignment of legal guardian. Often, no one is available. Community level resources to provide this type of assistance are uncommon. Volunteer legal guardians step in to accept the assignment to make legal decisions on behalf of their ‘wards.’ These decisions may include discharge from or admission to a hospital or nursing facility, support regarding remaining at home, supervised responsibility for finances and end-of-life decisions. Understanding why volunteer guardians chose to be and remain at this task may inform our ability to provide a vital and needed service in the community.

Theory and Research on Motivation to Volunteer
Volunteerism has been the subject of considerable research over the past 30 years (Wilson, 2012). Much of the research since the 1990s has sought to understand individuals’ reasons or motivations for volunteering. Early research on volunteerism generated an
overarching functionalist theory regarding motivation to volunteer (MTV): people will seek out and engage in volunteer tasks that fulfill a personal motive or need. Therefore, different individuals may pursue the same opportunity for different reasons, and these reasons may be subject to change over time. While the first introduction of this theory produced a unidimensional model of MTV (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991), Clary and colleagues developed a more nuanced, multi-dimensional model of MTV that identified six important reasons or ‘factors’: (a) ‘values,’ to express humanitarian and altruistic concerns toward others, (b) ‘understanding,’ to learn more about something new and/or practice skills that might otherwise not be used, (c) ‘enhancement,’ to support one’s ego or self-esteem, (d) ‘protective,’ to mitigate guilt about the circumstances of those less fortunate, and/or to address personal negative affect, (c) ‘career,’ to learn new career skills and/or support current career responsibilities, and (f) ‘social,’ to spend time with friends and to engage in an activity viewed favorably by society (Clary & Snyder, 1991; Clary, Snyder, & Stukus, 1996; Clary et al., 1998; Mannino, Snyder, & Omoto, 2011). This six-factor model of MTV was developed from a validated instrument of MTV, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI; Clary et al., 1998). Research has been conducted to test this model at different times in the volunteer process including research by the original authors and others (Finkelstein, 2008a; 2008b; 2010; 2011, Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Houle, Sagarin, & Kaplan, 2005; Okun, Barr, & Herzog, 1998).

Much of the aforementioned research on volunteerism describes and defines an individual’s motivation to volunteer. The intense nature of volunteer guardianship and the requirements for a volunteer’s level and length of commitment may make this kind of volunteer task different from other volunteer opportunities. Therefore, through extensive interviewing this exploratory research sought to understand more fully why members of a community would volunteer to become the legal guardians for incapacitated older adults and disabled members of their community.

Methodology

This exploratory study employed a mixed method approach to studying the motivations of volunteer legal guardians, using semi-structured interviews and the administration of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary & Snyder, 1991; Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1996; Clary et al., 1998).

Sample

The study sample for this article drew from the agency master email list of 33 volunteer guardians. The final sample includes 12 volunteers, including 9 active, 2 inactive, and 1 past volunteer not currently interested in helping. This sample consisted of 3 men and 9 women with a mean age of 53.8 years ($SD = 11.02$; range = 34-70 years). Nine volunteer guardians (75%) were employed full or part-time. Five of the 12 (42%) respondents were human service professionals (social workers, social service agency administrators, and clergy). All 12 volunteers reported both formal and informal volunteering histories. Table 1 contains information describing this sample.
Table 1
*Descriptive Characteristics of the Sample (N = 12)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Human Service Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Volunteer Experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Human service professional is defined as engagement in a job with a not-for-profit organization including social service administration, disabilities administration, clergy, and social work direct practice.

**Procedure**
Following approval from the University Institutional Review Board, letters of invitation were sent to the agency master mailing list of 33 volunteer guardians from a not-for-profit volunteer guardianship agency in a mid-Atlantic state. Nineteen were active volunteers, 8 were inactive, 4 were past volunteers not currently interested in helping, and two were willing to volunteer for the agency but not in a guardian capacity. Each person received a letter of invitation to participate by mail, which included contact information for the interviewer, and an opt-out postcard. Six volunteers (five active, one inactive) returned opt-out postcards. Interviews were conducted and analyzed in groups of two to three interviews to allow for purposive sampling relative to developing themes and the deliberate inclusion of negative cases to improve trustworthiness (Padgett, 2008). Of the 27 respondents who did not opt-out, sets of 2-3 potential participants were contacted by phone in the following manner: (a) an attempt was
made to enlist a representative number of men and women across each of the four status
categories (active, inactive, past, and other volunteer capacity), (b) new calls were made
following the interview, transcription, and analysis of each set of two to three interviews.

Upon establishing interview time and location, informed consent was obtained.
Interviews were audio taped and lasted approximately 45 to 85 minutes. Respondents completed
a brief demographic questionnaire and the VFI (Clary et al., 1998) at the conclusion of the
interview. Following the analysis of the qualitative data, 3 respondents from the original set of
12 respondents were contacted for a second interview. This provided an opportunity to further
address important issues and to member-check, a strategy of qualitative methodology that seeks
to verify data analysis results with respondents (Padgett, 2008). All interviews were conducted
between June 2011 and March 2012.

Qualitative Interview Guide
Consistent with our interest in exploring why volunteer guardians choose and continue in
this specific volunteer task, the interview guide was designed to elicit the volunteers’ perceptions
beginning with the broadest possible question, ‘please tell me about your experience as a
volunteer guardian.’ Probes included questions about how they found this specific opportunity,
their perception of their day-to-day experiences as a guardian, their first assignment, and their
sense of the changes in the task over time. Other questions included asking about their
perceptions with regard to a difficult situation and a satisfying situation. In terms of retention,
volunteers were asked what they felt helped them continue as guardians and included probes
related to training and family support. In addition, perceptions of how this experience had
affected and/or changed them were elicited. The second interviews asked more specific follow-
up questions based on the first interviews with these specific respondents, and solicited their
feedback regarding the salience of qualitative findings at that point in the research process.

Quantitative Data Collection
As noted earlier, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary & Snyder, 1991; Clary,
Snyder, & Stukas, 1996; Clary et al., 1998) examines six motivational factors (MTV). A 30-item
inventory of motivation to volunteer, the VFI uses a seven point Likert scale with anchors
ranging from 1 = not at all important/accurate for you to 7 = extremely important/accurate for
you. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for each of the factor subscales range from .89 (‘career’) to
.80 (‘values’) with an average interscale correlation of .34 (Clary et al., 1998). Clary and
colleagues (1998) also reported sample means for each of the six factors ranging from high to
low are: ‘values’ ($M = 5.82, SD = 1.00$), ‘understanding’ ($M = 4.91, SD = 1.32$), ‘enhancement’
($M = 4.27, SD = 1.43$), ‘career’ ($M = 2.74, SD = 1.54$), ‘protective’ ($M = 2.61, SD = 1.37$), and
‘social’ ($M = 2.59, SD = 1.30$). ‘Values’ and ‘understanding’ are considered to be more other-
focused as opposed to self-focused factors (Mannino, Snyder, & Omoto, 2011). The VFI has
been validated by other researchers on diverse populations of volunteers with similar results
(Allison, Okun, & Dutridge, 2002; Okun, Barr, & Hertzog, 1998).

Demographic data
Respondents also were asked their sex, year of birth, marital status, employment status
(full-time, part-time, self-employed, retired), current volunteer status, and formal and informal
volunteering history.
Data Analysis

Qualitative data were analyzed using the generic inductive qualitative method (GIQM), a technique that employs elements of grounded theory, but is prescribed when small samples prohibit theory development (Hood, 2007). Interviews were conducted and analyzed in groups of two to three interviews. Open coding using constant comparison and an iterative process permitted early thematic development, which then informed sampling choices for the next set of interviews. The purpose of GIQM is to develop sustentative themes. Categorical saturation may be achieved, but is not required. GIQM also allows for the comparison to existing models or theories, such as the functionalist model underlying the VFI. GIQM may be best employed with unexplored topics in exploratory situations.

In order to ensure trustworthiness and reduce researcher subjectivity and bias, a number of methods were employed (Padgett, 2008). In regard to sampling, with each set of interviews transcription and coding informed choices regarding subsequent interviews, and all efforts were made to seek negative cases and choose as representative a sample as possible. As qualitative data were collected, an open coding process, which included interview data, field notes, and memos began with initial transcription by the researcher. This permitted consideration regarding the thickest descriptions possible, essential to transferability of results (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). A reflexive research journal was maintained to serve as an audit trail and to decrease subjectivity and researcher bias (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A code book was developed and revised. Transcripts were reviewed by two independent coders, one of whom had significant experience in social work and in qualitative research, and another who was a naive reader. Codes were discussed, transcript documents were reviewed and findings were incorporated into the next round of interviews. Moreover, selected transcripts and thematic development at the project level were reviewed periodically by two researchers with many years’ experience in qualitative and quantitative research. On several occasions, the researcher had an opportunity to discuss the research with a research interest group who offered peer debriefing. With regard to member checking, three respondents were asked to participate in a second interview process, specifically to develop emergent themes and check on perception of the validity of the findings. In addition, rigor was established using methodological and data triangulation by analyzing qualitative and quantitative data relative to the same research questions (Padgett, 2008).

Quantitative data were analyzed using one sample t tests. A t test allowed us to compare average scores of the respondents in this study on the VFI to the average scores from hundreds of respondents in the study by Clary and colleagues (1998). Therefore, this t test provided an opportunity to examine how volunteer guardians may be similar to and different from other volunteers. Although the sample size for the quantitative data analysis is small (n=12), it provides comparison points for the qualitative results and helps develop existing theory or new themes and theories vis-à-vis qualitative data analysis. The study has very good power (.93) to detect a difference of one standard deviation from the mean, and .79 to detect a .8 standard deviation from the mean on the VFI. Although this is a large effect, it was hypothesized that this sample of volunteer guardians would be demonstrably different from the larger population of volunteers used to validate the VFI, as volunteer guardians may be motivated by factors other than those found among generalist volunteers.
The quantitative findings are also used to frame the qualitative results illuminating similarities and differences between volunteer guardians and the volunteer population used to validate the VFI. The quantitative data served as methodological triangulation, specifically to reduce researcher and methodological bias and contextualize the guardians’ motivations (Creswell, 2003).

Results

Several motivational themes were identified in this exploratory research including ‘helping the unbefriended,’ which described why many of the volunteers chose this task, and ‘learning skills,’ an interest expressed by many of the respondents relative to the information they learned as they worked with clients. In addition, ‘giving back/paying forward’ seemed related to ‘helping the unbefriended’ in that it described in a larger sense how many of the volunteers felt they were supporting their community. These themes are explored below, with illustrative quotes from participants, who are identified using a number system (e.g., respondent one is ‘1’). Reflections on relationships between these themes and the quantitative factor model are discussed in the final section of this article.

Helping the Unbefriended

All of the respondents spoke often about their strong desire to help those they perceive to be unable to adequately help themselves. Several of the respondents saw their mission as volunteer guardians as an individual task. As one guardian noted, “I just make sure that he, you know, is happy; that he’s content…I try to make sure that he’s got the best quality of life that he can” (5). Many had known older adult neighbors who were isolated in the community, or had volunteered for agencies, such as Meals on Wheels, and had personally experienced individuals in the community who had no one to help them. At times, the guardians would express a sense of frustration that their clients had been forgotten by families or neighbors, and saw their mission as champions of the ‘unbefriended.’

…but how about all the other little grannies who don’t have anybody to get their groceries. (1)

…you think about these other people who just don’t have any support – don’t have anyone. And I think that’s kind of, you know, the hardest part of the story – that they just don’t have anyone. There’s no family. There’s no friends who are around or can look in on them. (5)

…a lot of people are always willing to help out with all the animals, pets… People are always willing to help out pets and children. I just kind of felt like, you know, that's [helping older adults who need guardians] not like an area where people generally put their time to be to. That's not cute and cuddly…. The hardest part of the story - is that they don't have anyone. There's no family. There's no friends who are around or can look in on them. (6)

In one specific situation, a guardian (2) noted that one of her clients, who was an unpaid family caregiver most of her life, had not been adequately financially prepared for old age. Initially, the family had responded to inquiries to participate in this woman’s care, but their interest seemed to wane when it was made clear that there would be no financial windfall for the family.
This theme was noted by several guardians.

Most of my wards have been - and I've had four - have been kind of wards of the state because they had no money, and nobody really wants to take care of them basically. That's the bottom line, right? It's sad to say that, because if there was money involved probably somebody would step forward… (2)

The guardians repeatedly talked about “advocating,” and viewed themselves at times as the champions of their clients. They became accomplished problem solvers and relationship experts on behalf of helping their clients get what they needed. One guardian described designing an incontinence undergarment for her client to preserve her client’s level of placement. Another told of advocating on behalf of her client to undergo cataract surgery and hired a companion against the advice of the facility staff.

When families are involved, the guardians receive support and advice from the Agency with regard to advocating for clients in potentially complicated and difficult collaborations. Often, families have been accused of malfeasance and may be resentful of the presence of a legal guardian. One guardian, who had strongly advocated to create a discharge plan that would support his client in the client’s own home, chaired a family mediation session complete with a professional mediator and documentation (5). Each of these examples was preceded by strong suggestions of advocating for the rights and liberties of those who cannot speak on their own behalf.

Several of the guardians expressed an interest in advocating in service of just one person and seemed quite comfortable to be working at an individualist task as opposed to group task with other volunteers.

I’m looking for maybe just one person that I can make a difference in their lives… I found it to be one of the more meaningful things that I’ve ever done. Really. Just to journey with another person, and to be responsible for that person. (3)

However, despite this focus on one individual – a micro perspective – many of the volunteers returned repeatedly to the idea that advocacy for the unbefriended is actually a task of civic responsibility.

And it struck me that there’s two things in this world that make me very, very angry - and that's people that take advantage of kids, and people who take advantage of the elderly and those that are needing help. (5)

I firmly believe that there’s those of us who are put on earth who can’t take care of themselves for whatever reason. It could be mental health, it could be, you know, maybe we’re not the brightest person God ever put on the face of this earth or whatever. And I do believe those of us who do have a brain—we can walk, we can hear, we can talk, we can think—have some responsibility for taking care of the people. (12)

Many of these volunteers reported being active in several civic tasks. Again, this sense of civic or societal responsibility was voiced, “Do something. Leave it better than you found it” (9). Another volunteer who was involved in several community volunteer projects noted, “And that’s part of the reason why I decided to do the guardianship – to kind of extend the humanitarian part of my life, to give back to the community” (10). Some of the volunteers noted their interest in involving their family members, friends, and other community members in their volunteer tasks.
in order to model positive civic behavior and spread the word to others.

One of the most beautiful things that happened at the last nursing home was I was the Girl Scout leader, and we chose that nursing home as being our place where we were going to make friends. And each girl was given a particular person to like be their grandparents. And we did many service projects. We’d come and sing for them. We work with them, and so forth. And, to me, just seeing that, and also for the parents to see that as well, how their girls could really directly improve the life by doing something small was very powerful. (2)

Learning Skills

Many of the guardians professed an interest in learning skills to assist their own families. So, you know, the best thing about this whole thing is that I really got an education – Social Security, going to the doctors, doing all the tests, selling the mobile home, which I never thought in all my life I’d ever do. (3)

Other guardians noted that volunteering as a guardian offered an opportunity in self-growth.

Part of what they now think is Alzheimer’s, and since I had a mother and a father that died of it, I have to watch out for it, is the more new stuff you learn how to do, you build new paths in your brain. (12)

Although several of the guardians are human service professionals, none of the guardians indicated that they brought skills to the task as a result of having cared for others. More often, they expressed a desire to acquire skills for the future. “And also at the same time I was learning a great deal of how to care for my own elderly parents and so forth” (2).

Giving Back/Paying Forward

Several of the guardians felt motivated to volunteer at this task in order to return a kindness shown to a family member. One guardian noted that he was unable to provide assistance to his father who lived at a distance, but felt secure that care was provided by a family member. He saw volunteer guardianship as an opportunity to ‘pay back’ this kindness. On another occasion, a volunteer offered a similar scenario, but one that included a community effort.

My parents are deceased 10 or 11 years now, and while they lived in Pennsylvania, about 50 miles away and there were people – friends of ours – they kind of looked after them. Not in any official capacity, but just looked in on them and everything. And, I said, that was nice. (5)

Several of the guardians tending toward the older end of the age range for the sample, seemed to identify with their clients on a very personal level. For these volunteer guardians, disability and helplessness seemed less of an abstraction. One guardian, a 68 year old woman, noted,

And, you know, I can remember saying this to the judge - you know someday I'm going to be in that situation where somebody's going to have to help me. So, I guess it's like you pay it forward. (8)
Quantitative Results

Analysis of the quantitative data from the Volunteer Functions Inventory compared average scores for respondents in this study to the respondents in the study by Clary and colleagues (1998) on each factor (career, enhancement, protective, social, understanding, and values). Volunteer guardians in this study scored significantly lower on the ‘career’ subscale ($t(11) = -3.45, p = .005$), and the ‘enhancement’ subscale ($t(11) = -3.27, p = .007$) than the volunteers described in Clary and colleagues 1998 sample.

In addition, two other subscales (values and protective) approached statistical significance at $p < .10$ and may be worthy of further investigation. Of particular interest with regard to qualitative findings, the guardians scored higher on the ‘values’ factor ($t(11) = 2.07, p = .062$) than the general population of volunteers. Volunteers guardians also scored lower on the ‘protective’ factor ($t(11) = -2.04, p = .066$). Table 2 depicts these results by factor.

Table 2
Volunteer Functions Inventory Subscale Means for 1998 Sample and Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Clary et al., 1998 Sample $M(SD)$ ($n = 467$)</th>
<th>Study Sample $M(SD)$ ($n = 12$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>2.74 (1.54)</td>
<td>1.83* (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>4.27 (1.43)</td>
<td>2.93* (1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>2.61 (1.37)</td>
<td>2.13** (0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>2.59 (1.30)</td>
<td>3.18 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>4.91 (1.32)</td>
<td>4.60 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>5.82 (1.00)</td>
<td>6.28** (0.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The mean age for the population is 40.9 years. The mean age for the sample is 54.4 years. $*p < .05$, two-tailed. $**p < .10$, two-tailed. aClary, E., Snyder, M., Ridge, R., Copeland, J., Stukas, A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1516-1530. The VFI uses a one to seven point likert scale *(not at all important/accurate for you to extremely important/accurate for you.)*

Discussion

These findings suggest that the volunteer guardians are less motivated to learn career skills or to enhance their self-esteem than the general volunteer population. Furthermore, it should be noted that the highest mean score among the six factors on the VFI for Clary and colleagues’ (1998) sample is ‘values’ ($M = 5.82$) indicating an interest in helping others.
Volunteer guardians may be even more motivated than others to volunteer for these reasons ($M = 6.28$). Indeed, the guardians’ interviews strongly highlighted their need to help the unbefriended and those who could be or had been victimized. Many respondents routinely voiced a certain amount of frustration with a society that ignores older adults, and used terms, such as ‘advocate,’ to demonstrate their strong interest in championing those who the guardians perceive cannot protect themselves.

It seems consistent with the original research on the VFI that the guardians would most likely not be motivated by an interest in gaining knowledge about a new career or forwarding their own career objectives; a factor usually attributed to a younger cohort of volunteers (Clary & Snyder, 1991; 1996; 1998; Hustinx et al., 2010). None of the qualitative findings of this study indicate that volunteer guardians are motivated to learn about new careers. Indeed, several of the guardians are already employed as human service professionals.

However, some of the guardians indicated an interest in acquiring knowledge at this task in order to assist their own older adult relatives and friends. This qualitative theme, ‘learning skills,’ seemed more consistent with the VFI factor ‘understanding,’ which is defined by Clary and colleagues (1998) as a knowledge function, specifically, “…the opportunity for volunteerism to permit new learning experiences and the chance to exercise knowledge, skills, and abilities that might otherwise go unpracticed” (p. 1518). Clary and colleagues’ (1998) mean (4.91) and the mean for this sample (4.60) are comparable indicating that ‘understanding’ may be of some importance to both cohorts of volunteers.

In the VFI literature, factors such as ‘enhancement’ and ‘protective,’ are known as more egoistic or self-focused than ‘values’ and ‘understanding,’ which trend toward the more altruistic end of the scale continuum (Clary & Snyder, 199; Clary et al., 1998; Mannino, Snyder, & Omoto, 2011). Indeed, the guardians scored below the comparison sample’s already low mean on the ‘protective’ factor (i.e., volunteers are less motivated to volunteer in order to address their own depressive feelings). Moreover, the guardians scored significantly below the comparison sample’s mean on ‘enhancement,’ a factor indicative of a need to bolster one’s self-esteem or mitigate one’s sense of guilt about their own good fortune. These lower scores on self-focused factors may mirror higher scores on ‘values.’

An important theme among the guardians, ‘giving back/paying forward,’ seems absent from the VFI factor definitions. It is difficult to say whether this theme represents an emergent new factor specific to volunteer guardians. However, it does seem to be relevant in keeping with the strength of the qualitative findings associated with the ‘values’ factor (‘helping the unbefriended’). All of the guardians spoke strongly of their interest in helping the unbefriended individuals in their community, as well as holding a more global construct of helping the unbefriended in society as important. Indeed, in research conducted by Omoto and Snyder (1995) indicating additional and different VFI factors specific to AIDS volunteers, the authors noted an emergent factor titled ‘community concern.’ Essentially, AIDS volunteers in their research seemed strongly motivated to help in a community, in this case a virtual community, devastated by a deadly disease. The theoretical model of motivation to volunteer may be further supported by the addition of these new and varied reasons for volunteering. Although themes arose from the qualitative data that were comparable to the quantitative factor model, several reasons for volunteering that arose from this research may be viewed as emergent factors.
Limitations and Strengths

There are several limitations to this research. It uses cross-sectional data representative of a small sample in one geographic area. Moreover, the participants volunteer for an agency that uses a specific model of training and service provision based on a legal perspective. Other agencies may have different models of volunteer guardianship delivery, and could conceivably use techniques to manage volunteers differently. These factors make generalizability of the findings of this study to other populations difficult. In addition, the VFI is not the only instrument used in volunteer research, and it, too, represents a specific model of MTV; one perhaps not sensitive enough to measure more specific motivations, such as ‘giving back.’ As it was tested with a small sample in this research, additional testing or a different measure may be indicated. Other research has sought to explore different theories and models, such as role identity, etc., which could be considered for further research (Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Haski-Leventhal, 2009; Hustinx, Cnaan, & Handy, 2010; Penner, 2002). Volunteer guardianship programs are common. The opportunity to conduct research in this area was constrained by the ability to find a program and respondents. However, the strength of this study was its ability to gather data descriptive of this interesting and unique sample, which may inform our ability to recruit and retain volunteer guardians going forward.

Implications

The setting for this research, an agency committed only to providing volunteer guardianship services within the framework of a legal perspective, makes it qualitatively different from guardianship provided under the aegis of a social service agency with a multifaceted mission or a faith-based not-for-profit organization. Additional research on this type of volunteerism could be conducted using larger samples in other areas of the country, and in other agency settings. A purely qualitative approach may lend itself to an exploration vis-à-vis a framework, such as life course perspective, as a history of volunteer behavior may predict future volunteerism. In addition, new quantitative measures could be employed that may offer an opportunity to measure volunteer motivations developed among the qualitative themes of this research.

Implications for practice include an improved understanding of how to recruit and retain volunteers, especially volunteers who are interested in serving as legal guardians. Qualitative findings related to ‘helping the unbefriended,’ ‘giving back/paying forward,’ and ‘learning skills,’ have implications with regard to what may be important to potential volunteer guardians. Seeking volunteers with human services training may be of particular interest in practice as 5 of 12 respondents had been trained as human service professionals. This may be a critical point with regard to targeted recruitment efforts. Improved knowledge should help to drive an increased understanding of volunteerism on the regional and the national levels.

Increased knowledge about specific volunteer tasks, such as volunteer guardianship, should inform policy, both local and national, with regard to provision of service to older adults in the community. Volunteer guardians provide a very special and specialized service. To the extent that our society feels compelled to provide assistance to older adults in their community, we may become more reliant upon volunteers to provide these services.
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Abstract

In the field of sport and recreation, instructors often emphasize the importance of experience as students seek their first position within the field. This experience comes from a variety of opportunities including internships, volunteer experiences, service learning, and paid positions. Barr and McNeilly (2002) found internships, part-time work, and leadership positions provided better opportunities for potential employability than classroom experience. Research also shows volunteerism can strengthen a resume and support other traits sought by employers (Cole, Feild, & Giles, 2003). The exploratory investigation reported here examined the impact of volunteer experience on an applicant’s chance of receiving an entry-level position at the YMCA. The researchers surveyed hiring officials at Y’s across the Southeast and Midwest regions of the United States. Results showed 88% of the respondents felt volunteer experience mattered in their decision to offer the candidate an interview. Other important characteristics for entry-level employment were also identified.

Key Words: Volunteerism, entry-level sport and recreation
Introduction

Making sure students are prepared to enter the workforce upon graduation should be the focus of any academic program. Along with a strong academic background, students need other skills to set them apart in the current job markets. In the field of sport and recreation, instructors and guest presenters often emphasize the importance of gaining experience as students prepare to seek their first position within the field. This experience comes from a variety of opportunities available to students during their college career including internships, volunteer experiences, service learning, and paid positions within the field. While recruiters and employers consider many variables, this exploratory investigation seeks to understand the impact of volunteer experience on an applicant's chance of receiving an interview for an entry-level position in recreation and sport management fields. The findings of this research may guide faculty working to prepare future professionals, as well as, volunteer program administrators seeking to recruit college-age volunteers for their programs and services.

The first section of the article describes the desired skills and competencies identified by employers. The second section identifies the impact of resume content on employment perceptions. The third section discusses the role of volunteerism and employment. Finally, the methodology, data collection and analysis, results and discussion complete the article.

Desired Skills and Competencies

Internships, part-time work, and leadership positions in student and campus organizations often lead to better opportunities for employment than classroom experience (Barr & McNeilly, 2002). Researchers examining competencies and skills sought by recruiters have found that multiple variables influence whether an applicant is a strong job candidate (Hansen & Hansen, 2010; Barr & McNeilly, 2002). Hansen and Hansen (2010) examined competencies and skills sought by recruiters and found that multiple variables influence whether an applicant is a strong job candidate. They suggest a combination of soft and hard skills. Hard skills include computer and other field specific technical skills. Soft skills generally refer to verbal and written communication, analytical, and the ability to effectively address conflict and work as a team. Furthermore, recruiters reported an applicant's GPA as a consideration only after the other variables were examined (Barr & McNeilly, 2002).

Research focusing on sport management and recreation produce similar findings. Case and Branch (2003) found facility managers look for communication and computer skills, problem solving ability, decision-making skills, time management skills and the ability to recognize potential facility hazards and risks. Hurd (2005) found park and recreation competencies include communication, community relations, interpersonal skills, leadership and management, and professional practice. Schneider, Stier, Kampt, Haines, and Wilding (2006) concurred with the need for communication skills and emphasized prior experience, neat appearance, and holding a graduate degree. A common theme in the research on employability in the sport and recreation field is the need for a combination of soft interpersonal skills, communication ability and technical professional practice related skills are important for entry-level jobs in sport and recreation. Research also supports a combination of various skills leads to potential employability.
Resume Content and Employability Perceptions

Researchers have examined perceptions of employability based on resume content and applicant personality traits (Cole, Feild, & Giles, 2003; Cole, Feild, Giles & Harris, 2004; Cole, Rubin, Feild, & Giles, 2007). While researchers have not solely reviewed sport and recreation management candidate resumes those examining resumes from business colleges have direct application to sport and recreation management. Cole et al. (2003) found that when reviewers examined the resumes of seniors within a business college they associated volunteer involvement with an extrovert personality trait. Continuing this examination Cole et al. (2004) found that recruiters emphasize certain traits based on type of position. Those applicants interested in enterprising positions, such as marketing, are viewed extraverts and highly employable. This finding has application for those sport management entry-level professionals seeking positions in sport marketing areas such as professional or collegiate team ticket offices and/or sport promotion. Cole et al. (2004) also noted a well-rounded candidate based on academic qualifications, work experience and extracurricular activities positively related with perceptions of employability. In cases where the quality of information was highly rated in one content area but lacking in the others, recruiters may perceive the applicant excelled only within a content area. However, one resume content area (i.e. academic qualifications, work experience or extracurricular activity) is not the only contributing factor to recruiter perceptions of employability. Cole et al. (2007) found it is an assessment of all areas that contributes to recruiter employability assessments.

Extending our understanding of recruiter perceptions associated with resume content Chen, Huang and Lee (2011) found both educational background and work experiences related positively with recruiter perceptions of person-job fit (P-J Fit), person-organization fit (P-O Fit) and person-person fit (P-P Fit). These positive associations also related with recruiter recommendations to hire potential candidates. For instance, a candidate's work experience positively associated with recruiter perceptions of perceived P-J Fit and perceived P-O fit. These positive associations also related to recruiter recommendations in the hiring process (Chen et al., 2011).

Role of Volunteerism in Employment

For young adults several motives facilitate their volunteer involvement. These range from a desire a) to help other, i.e. values motives; b) to improve skills currently not utilized, i.e. understanding motives, c) to enhance their resume, i.e. career motives, or d) to volunteer because their friends do, i.e. social motives, (Clary et al., 1998). Fletcher and Major (2004) found that female medical students placed more emphasis on enhancement, social, career and protective motivations for their volunteer involvement. Using a sample of undergraduate student volunteers Gage and Thapa (2012) found the highest functional motivations included values and understanding. Recently, Handy et al. (2010) concurred that volunteer motivation is not the result of one aspect but rather several working in concert. Furthermore, motivation to volunteer it not solely based on career building motives. Exploring only volunteers within a sport and recreation setting, an examination of motivation factors of youth sport coaches revealed value motives as the most important factor contributing to a coaches’ desire to volunteer (Busser & Carruthers, 2010).

Research focusing on motivation to volunteer suggests many things contribute to these decisions. Young professionals may be motivated by a desire to help others, feel better about themselves, or to learn and/or utilize skills that may contribute to future professional success. Additionally, research suggests recruiters assess a candidate's employability based on their
resume content. This assessment is not based on a single area but on an assessment of several content areas. The review of literature leads to the following research questions:

RQ1: Will volunteer experience serve as a suitable substitution for paid experiences in the eyes of those screening potential candidates for entry-level recreation and sport professionals?

RQ2: Does a candidate’s volunteer experience impact decisions to offer the candidate an interview?

RQ3: How does volunteer experience affect your decision to offer a candidate an interview?

Methodology

The YMCA, known simply as the Y, is a leading nonprofit organization for youth development, healthy living and social responsibility (YMCA of the USA). In the United States, there are more than 2,700 Y’s with an estimated 19,000 fulltime staff and 600,000 volunteers in 10,000 communities across the country. The Y hires many employees with a background in sport and recreation administration. The researchers surveyed hiring officials at Y’s across the Southeast and Midwest regions of the United States. The authors randomly selected individuals in positions to hire entry-level sport and recreation professionals from the YMCA of the USA’s homepage. The authors developed a database of potential participant email addresses from two sources. First, the authors reviewed vacant entry-level positions posted on the Y’s national website collecting email addresses of those collecting resumes for vacant positions. These entry-level positions included Youth Sport Director, Assistant Youth Sport Director, Aquatic Director, Program Director, and Assistant Program Director. The authors next used the “find your Y” function of the national website to add to the database. This function allowed the authors to find additional email addresses from the individual or association Y’s website.

A total of 200 email addresses were collected for potential survey participants. The Y professionals included served as Senior Program Directors, Associate Executive Directors, Executive Directors, Branch Directors, Center Directors, Human Resource Directors, President/CEO, and Vice President of Human Resources within their Y’s and associations. Y’s from Kentucky, Tennessee, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri were included in the sample database.

Upon Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval data collection occurred from June 17 through July 8, 2014 using Qualtrics survey software. Through the software program, each potential participant received an invitation to participate with the survey link attached. To increase the response rate two follow-up emails were distributed (Dillman, 2007). These emails thanked those who already participated in the investigation and encouraged others to take the survey. Of the 200 surveys distributed a total of 58 Y professionals participated in the study representing a 29% response rate.

Respondents were asked to select from a pool of three candidates for potential interviews and describe why they selected the candidate. For this selection process, candidates were differentiated by five criteria including GPA, Work Experience in the field, Volunteer Experience in the field, Maintaining Professional Memberships, and Maintaining Professional Verifications. Next, the survey asked respondents to rank the five criteria in order of importance in their applicant screening process. The final two open-ended questions sought to determine the importance of volunteer experience in the applicant screening process. This section included the following research questions:

RQ1: Will volunteer experience serve as a suitable substitution for paid experiences in the eyes of those screening potential candidates for entry-level recreation and sport professionals?
RQ2: Does a candidate's volunteer experience impact decisions to offer the candidate an interview?

RQ 3: How does volunteer experience affect your decision to offer a candidate an interview?

Data Analysis

The survey collected demographic information including gender and respondents position within their Y. This data revealed that 64% of the sample was male and 36% of the sample was female. Individuals representing President and CEO and Executive Director positions within the Y made up a combined 56% of the survey's respondents. Additional results of the analysis of the respondents' role within their Y or association are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President and CEO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Executive Director</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Program Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Respondents ranked the five criteria (GPA, Professional Certifications, Professional Memberships, Volunteer Experience in the Field, and Work Experience in the Field) in order of importance in the hiring decision. The data indicated working experience in the field and volunteer experience in the field ranked first and second respectively. The results showed that 88% of the respondents felt volunteer experience mattered in their decision to offer the candidate an interview. Additional results of the criteria ranking are presented in Table 2.
Table 2. Criteria Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work in the field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Experience in the field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Certifications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Memberships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 58

The researchers used qualitative methods to analyze the open-ended responses on the survey. An inductive analysis of this data provided further insight into the opinions of the employers on the criteria important in the hiring process, specifically the impact of volunteerism. The researchers individually reviewed all 58 responses line by line for commonalities. After the individual coding of data, the team collectively reviewed, analyzed, and discussed the findings. An agreement was reached on three consistent themes, 1) Experience, either paid or volunteer is the most important criteria considered during the hiring process, 2) A student’s GPA is rarely considered unless used in conjunction with other criteria, and, 3) The Y employers consistently looked for key personality traits that fit their organizational goals. Each of these themes support the data ranked from the previous questions.

The first theme supports previous research and efforts by faculty to encourage students to seek opportunities for experience. It is important that students work and/or volunteer in jobs within their field of study. The majority of the respondents mentioned the “value” of having experience and that “it got their attention.” The second theme also supports prior research, showing it is important to maintain a quality GPA, but without the experience, it may not be enough to secure a job upon graduation. Respondents often referred to the GPA as a “lesser factor” in their hiring decision and as long as it was “acceptable” it did not impact hiring decisions. The third theme is interesting in that several key characteristics and personality traits were described consistently by the respondents. The majority of the employers spoke about “passion”, “commitment”, “dedication” and “enthusiasm” for the field. They looked for these traits while reviewing the criteria and many indicated that volunteer experience was an indication of passion and commitment.

Discussion and Conclusion

There are several implications from this study for both volunteer program administrators and faculty of programs that train future sport and recreation professionals. First, there is a need for collaboration among organizations like the Y that seek volunteers and sport and recreation department students who need this experience to enhance their educational experience. Volunteer program administrators should seek opportunities to work with faculty and students in their area. Many times faculty encourages involvement and discusses those concepts that can be put into practice with real life work experiences and volunteer opportunities provided by local agencies. These relationships provide a win-win for both the agency and the student. Students are young
and excited about a future career and provide a large and qualified pool of volunteers. Creating such partnerships between schools and volunteer organizations provides opportunities to the student/future professional, support for the faculty and the organization. Also, the volunteer administrators and agencies can build a network of future employees, while the student is building their resume and learning about future employment. Finally, study findings suggest those in positions to screen resumes view volunteer experience as representing important personality characteristics of potential employees. These personality characteristics (i.e. passion, commitment, dedication, enthusiasm, and work ethic) cannot necessarily be taught in the classroom but may be developed or enhanced via involvement in profession related volunteer opportunities.

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of the investigation is the study's sample of only individuals seeking entry-level professionals at YMCAs. The study's sample selection limits the ability of the researchers to generalize the findings to this organization or similar organizations. Future research may expand the sample to include other park, recreation, sport and non-profit organizations. A second limitation of the investigation is the criteria examined. The researchers only sought information relating to volunteer and/or work experience, professional membership, GPA, and professional certifications. Future research may also explore whether volunteer program administrators consider the same personality characteristics as potential employers do when they recruit for their volunteer pool. Future research may also expand on additional benefits students gain from volunteer experiences and their relationship to future employment. Finally, a pedagogical question may focus on what activities, experiences, and opportunities can faculty provide to help enhance personality qualities (i.e. passion, dedication, drive, work ethic) that future employers seek. It is at times easier to teach technical skills needed to be successful in the field but sometimes more difficult to develop soft skills or personal characteristics that contribute to success.
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