A Field Study Extending the Hobson-Heler Model to Assess Website "Volunteer-Friendliness" of the Top 200 Charities in the United States

Charles J. Hobson, Ph.D.
Professor, School of Business and Economics
Indiana University Northwest
3400 Broadway, Gary, IN 46408
Tel. 219-980-6903 * FAX 219-980-6916 * E-mail: chobson@iun.edu

Joshua J. Hobson
Research Associate
Hobson Associates
7069 Deer Valley Drive, South Haven, MI 49090
Tel. 269-214-2156 * E-mail: josh.hobsonmi@yahoo.com

Shelli Henry
Adjunct Faculty, School of Business and Economics
Indiana University Northwest
3400 Broadway, Gary, IN 46408
Tel. 219-980-6633 * FAX 219-980-6916 * E-mail: shenry@iun.edu

Susan M. Rouse, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, School of Nursing
Indiana University Northwest
3400 Broadway, Gary, IN 46408
Tel. 219-980-6726 * FAX 219-980-6522 * E-mail: surouse@iun.edu

Andrea E. C. Griffin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, School of Business and Economics
Indiana University Northwest
3400 Broadway, Gary, IN 46408
Tel. 219-980-6912 * FAX 219-980-6916 * E-mail: griffan@iun.edu

Jana Szostek, J.D.
Director, Assessment Center
Indiana University Northwest
3400 Broadway, Gary, IN 46408
Tel. 219-980-6910 * FAX 219-980-6916 * E-mail: jaszoste@iun.edu

Natalie Murillo
Research Associate
Hobson Associates
7069 Deer Valley Drive, South Haven, MI 49090
Tel. 616-405-3049 * FAX 616-582-5945 * E-mail: ngmurillo@yahoo.com

Abstract

Nonprofit organizations have been facing enormous pressure due to our current economic woes, resulting in a nationwide rise in agency closings and mergers and further exacerbating the shortage of needed health, human, and social services. One way to minimize the impact of this financial crisis and the increased demand for social services that has come with it is to effectively recruit and utilize volunteers. Recruitment procedures using the internet are a promising approach. This paper evaluates how effectively the 200 largest charities in the United States use their website for volunteer recruitment. Utilizing the Hobson and Hobson 24-item "volunteer-friendliness" assessment tool, the websites of the 200 largest U.S. charities, in terms of total revenue, were evaluated. The reliability of the assessment tool was assessed, and norms were formulated for the 200 charities in terms of overall scale scores. Results indicated that: (1) the 24-item checklist can be successfully used as an objective, reliable measuring tool, (2) overall scores for the 200 organizations were consistently quite low, and (3) only a small percentage of the charities put forth any effort on their websites to offer volunteer opportunities to those with disabilities. Several important recommendations for enhanced nonprofit administration are discussed, along with directions for future research.

Key Words: volunteering, volunteer-friendly, websites, charities

Introduction

Nonprofits in the United States have experienced especially tumultuous times since the Great Recession started in 2008. The unprecedented combination of three inter-related problems has had a staggering impact on the entire sector. First, as national unemployment topped 10%, there has been a significant surge in demand for services, particularly for social and human services agencies (Banjo & Kalita, 2010; Corporation for National and Community Service, 2010; Schramm, 2010).

Second, governmental budget deficits at the local, state, and federal levels have led to substantial cuts in funding for nonprofits. Finally, the third major problem confronting nonprofits has been the continuing decline in donations. Banjo (2010) reported that, following a 2% decline in 2008, donations fell an additional 3.6% in 2009.

The combined influence of these three problems has exerted enormous pressure on the nonprofit sector, resulting in a nationwide rise in agency closings and mergers, further exacerbating the shortage of needed health, human, and social services (Banjo & Kalita, 2010). As states began cutting their budgets in 2008 due to the recession, at least 46 states made budget cuts that resulted in reductions in services (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2011).

The one bright spot amid all of this negative news has been the surprising increase in the number of Americans who volunteer. Fox (2010) cited U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics figures indicating that the number of volunteers jumped from 61.8 million in 2008 to 63.4 million in 2009, a 2.6% increase – the largest single-year increase since 2003. Volunteering among the unemployed rose even more during the same period, from 2.2 million to 3.5 million, an increase of 59.0%.

The expanding pool of volunteers can potentially provide nonprofits with at least a partial solution to the three pressing problems discussed above. According to the Independent Sector (2011), the estimated

dollar value of a volunteer's time is $21.36 per hour.

The effective recruitment and utilization of volunteers could help nonprofits offset funding declines and meet the increased demand for services (Safrit & Schmiesing, 2005; Safrit, Schmiesing, Gliem, & Gliem, 2005). As Phillips and Phillips (2010, p. 19) have asserted: "Identifying, attracting, and retaining volunteers continues to be among the most difficult and time consuming tasks faced by not-for-profit organizations."

One promising approach to recruiting new volunteers capitalizes on continuing growth in internet access and use in the United States (Allen, Goh, Rogelberg, & Currie, 2010; Goh, Allen, Rogelberg, & Currie, 2009; Hackler & Saxton, 2007; McKee & McKee, 2007; Waters, 2007). While Hackler and Saxton (p. 483) noted that typical nonprofits had websites, they criticized most website content as "brochureware" and asserted that more sophisticated and interactive features were essential in meeting volunteer recruitment and other organizational goals. Goh et al. (2009) formulated a set of 14 volunteer-related best practices for nonprofit websites, derived from research and trade publication recommendations.

The researchers (Allen et al., 2010) subsequently used the 14 best practices in evaluating the websites of 93 animal welfare agencies. Major findings included: (1) the mean score was 9 of 14 best practices, (2) the most commonly used practices were providing a volunteer link (77/93, 83%) and an organizational mission statement (71/93, 77%), and (3) the number of practices used was significantly correlated with organizational size, total revenue, and the total number of volunteers at each agency.

Although not explicitly addressed in their study, Allen et al.'s findings suggest that the websites for the 93 nonprofits met some of the basic requirements of "volunteer-friendliness". This concept will be introduced and discussed in the next section.

Nonprofit "Volunteer-Friendliness"
The concept of nonprofit organization "volunteer-friendliness" was first introduced by Hobson, Rominger, Malec, Hobson, and Evans (1996). The researchers defined the construct as (p.29): "the extent to which an agency's staff, policies, and programs provide a positive, pleasant, and rewarding experience for volunteers and prospective volunteers." A conceptual model of "volunteer-friendliness" was formulated, consisting of four major components: (1) Volunteer Attraction and Recruitment, (2) Initial Personal Interaction with Agency Staff, (3) Volunteer Utilization and Assignment, and (4) Post-Volunteering Follow-Up.

Based upon this model, "volunteer-friendly" nonprofits interact with their volunteers in a positive way, leading to the development of favorable perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behaviors. Beneficial outcomes for "volunteer-friendly" organizations are predicted to include: (1) greater success in recruiting volunteers, (2) enhanced retention of volunteers, (3) increased volunteer productivity and hours donated, and (4) expansion of the financial donor base.

Research conducted with the Hobson et al. model has confirmed its value in understanding and assessing the interface between nonprofit organizations and prospective/current volunteers. In 1999, Hobson and Malec formulated a 15-item survey to evaluate the "volunteer-friendliness" of nonprofit responses to telephonic inquiries by prospective volunteers. Calls were made to 500 United Way affiliated agencies in a large Midwestern metropolitan area, and results

indicated that many nonprofits failed to deliver high quality, welcoming service to prospective volunteers.

Malec, Hobson, and Guziewicz (2000) developed and successfully field tested the Hobson & Malec "Volunteer-Friendly Index" as a comprehensive measure of all major components in the original "volunteer-friendly" model. Heler (formerly Malec) and Hobson (2002) also used their model to evaluate the quality of work assignments given to volunteers. In 2007, Hobson and Heler conducted an extensive field test of several model propositions and found that: (1) overall volunteer satisfaction was best predicted by the quality of initial job assignments and treatment by agency staff and (2) volunteer satisfaction was strongly correlated with continuation of volunteer work at the agency, likelihood of future volunteering, and likelihood of future financial contributions.

Given the growing use and importance of web-based communication in the United States discussed above, Hobson and Hobson (2009) sought to extend the "volunteer-friendly" model to the interface between prospective volunteers and nonprofit websites. Building upon the two measurement instruments used in previous research (the 15-item telephone contact checklist and the Hobson-Heler "Volunteer-Friendly" Index), the researchers operationally defined nonprofit website "volunteer-friendliness" in terms of a 24-item (100-point) evaluation tool and pilot tested its use in assessing the websites of 75 environmentally-focused nonprofits.

There were two major findings. First, the 24-item (100-point) tool proved to be a useful, objective way to operationally define and measure the "volunteer-friendliness" of nonprofit websites. Second, overall scores (out of a maximum possible of 100) for the 75 environmentally-focused

nonprofits were poor, ranging from 0 to 49, with a mean of 10.5 and standard deviation of 11.1. Other than consistently providing basic contact information for the organization (one of the 24 items on the assessment tool), the overwhelming majority of websites failed to address the remaining 23 items. For example, 50 of 75 agencies (66.7%) failed to include a volunteer link/option on their homepage. These disappointing results provided further confirmation of Hackler and Saxton's (2007) contention that the content of most nonprofit websites could be characterized as "brochureware", with minimal effectiveness in recruiting volunteers.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to address the following three issues.
1. Expand use of the Hobson and Hobson (2009) 24-item (100-point) scale to assess website "volunteer-friendliness" for the largest 200 U.S. charities.
2. Formulate norms for the 200 organizations, in terms of overall scale scores.
3. Calculate inter-rater reliability for the 24-item scale.

Methodology

Sample Identification

An internet search was conducted to locate the 200 largest nonprofits in the United States. Forbes.com, described as "the home page for the world's business leaders", provided a ranked list and brief description of the 200 largest U.S. charities, as a function of total revenue. The top five and total revenue in billions were: Mayo Foundation ($5.6), YMCA's ($4.8), United Way ($3.8), Cleveland Clinic Foundation ($3.6), and Catholic Charities USA ($3.2).

At the Forbes.com website, clicking on the name of a charity resulted in linking to the agency's home page. The 200 home

pages were visited in late 2010 and evaluated using the checklist described below.

Assessment Tool and Utilization

As mentioned in the Introduction above, Hobson and Hobson (2009) formulated and field-tested a 24-item assessment tool, initially designed to evaluate the "volunteer-friendliness" of 75 environmentally-focused nonprofit websites (the instrument is attached as Appendix A). This tool was based upon measurement protocols developed in earlier research to assess volunteer attraction and recruitment in the Hobson et al. (1996) conceptual model of nonprofit organization "volunteer-friendliness". One hundred possible points are available on the instrument, with the 24 items weighted to reflect their hypothesized importance in attracting and recruiting volunteers. Given the successful use of the tool in the Hobson and Hobson study and its general applicability to any nonprofit, it was utilized in this research to evaluate the 200 largest charities in the United States.

Two research assistants were oriented to the content of the 24-item checklist. They were then trained in how to specifically use the checklist to evaluate information contained at agency websites. The goal was to provide an objective assessment methodology in order to achieve the minimum inter-rater reliability coefficient recommended by Berk (1986) of .90 or higher. Upon completion of their training, the two raters independently assessed the 200 nonprofit websites using the 24-item tool.

Analysis of Assessment Information

Completed assessments were entered into a computer database and analyzed using SPSS. Three major analyses were conducted. First, in order to assess the reliability of the 24-item scale, the Pearson product-moment correlation (r) was calculated between overall agency scores computed for each of the two raters, across the 200 agencies (Coaley, 2009). This inter-rater reliability coefficient provides an index of the consistency with which the 24-item checklist can be used in assessing nonprofit websites.

Second, descriptive statistics were calculated for overall agency scores on the 24-item checklist. This included measures of central tendency (mean and median) and dispersion (standard deviation and range), and percentile scores for use in defining scale norms.

Results

Assessment Tool Reliability

The calculated inter-rater reliability (two raters) for overall agency scores was .99. It thus exceeded the minimum recommended by Berk (1986) of .90. Differences between the two raters were observed in the overall scores for 7 of the 200 charities, or 3.5% (7/200). Members of the research team visited these seven websites and resolved the scoring differences, resulting in a single overall score for each organization.

In a similar manner, differences in individual item scoring between the two raters were resolved by research team members revisiting the websites. This resulted in a set of single scores on the 24 tool items for each organization.

Overall Scores

Overall scores for the 200 organizations ranged from 0 to 30 (out of a possible 100 points), with a median of 16. The mean overall score and standard deviation were respectively, 13.5 and 7.49. These values are generally similar to those obtained in the Hobson and Hobson (2009) study with 75 environmentally-focused nonprofits. For example, the mean overall agency scores in the two studies were both quite low: 10.5 (with n=75) and 13.5 in the present research. It appears that Hackler and

Saxton's (2007) call for more sophisticated and interactive nonprofit websites to better attract and recruit volunteers applies to the largest 200 nonprofits.

Norms for the assessment tool, formulated in terms of selected percentiles and associated overall scores, are provided below.

Percentile	Overall Score
10th	3.0
20th	4.0
30th	5.3
40th	12.0
50th	16.0
60th	17.0
70th	18.0
80th	20.0
90th	21.9
99th	29.0

The nonprofits with the highest overall scores on the website evaluation tool are listed below, along with their individual scores. The top ten include 13

organizations, due to a 4-way tie for 10th place.

Nonprofit	Score
American Cancer Society	30
American Lung Association	29
Planned Parenthood Federation of America	28
Habitat for Humanity International	27
Heart to Heart International	26
Campus for Crusade for Christ	25
Greater Chicago Food Depository	25
Rotary Foundation of Rotary International	25
Smithsonian Institute	25
American Red Cross	24
Doctors Without Borders USA	24
St. Jude Children's Research Hospital	24
St. Mary's Food Bank Alliance	24

Item Scores

The scores for the 24 items in the assessment tool are summarized in Table 1. Individual items are listed, followed by the number and relative percentage of "Yes" and "No" ratings.

Table 1

Response Frequencies and Relative Percentages (rounded to nearest whole percentage) for Nonprofit Website "Volunteer-Friendliness" Evaluation Items

Evaluation Items	Yes	No
1. Volunteer Link/Option on Agency Homepage	147 (74%)	53 (26%)
2. Appreciation Expressed for Considering Volunteer Opportunities after Clicking on Volunteer Link	27 (13%)	173 (87%)
3. Statement of Value and Importance of Volunteers to Agency	99 (49%)	101 (51%)
4. FAQ Option Concerning Volunteering	30 (15%)	170 (85%)
5. Skills/Interests Survey for Prospective Volunteers	29 (14%)	171 (86%)
6. Skills/Interests Survey Results Matched with Appropriate Volunteer Assignments	5 (2%)	195 (98%)
7. Online Application for Volunteering	82 (41%)	118 (59%)
8. Descriptions of Available/Potential Volunteer Assignments	122 (61%)	78 (39%)
9. Wide Variety of Volunteer Options Available:		
a) Online	16 (8%)	184 (92%)

b) At Home	27 (13%)	173 (87%)
c) At Agency	104 (52%)	96 (48%)
d) At Field Location	72 (36%)	128 (64%)
e) Individual	125 (63%)	75 (37%)
f) Group/Team	51 (25%)	149 (75%)
g) Interact/Work with Client	97 (48%)	103 (52%)
h) Short Term	117 (59%)	83 (41%)
i) Long Term	113 (57%)	87 (43%)
j) Daytime	115 (58%)	85 (42%)
k) Evening	106 (53%)	94 (47%)
l) Weekend	105 (53%)	95 (47%)
10. Pictures of Volunteers on the Volunteer Webpage	97 (48%)	103 (52%)
11. Quotes from Volunteers on the Volunteer Webpage	49 (24%)	151 (76%)
12. Information Concerning how Volunteering can Lead to Exciting/ Rewarding Jobs or Careers	12 (6%)	188 (94%)
13. Volunteer Orientation/Training Available	69 (34%)	131 (66%)
14. Agency Commitment to Providing Meaningful Volunteer Assignments	10 (5%)	190 (95%)
15. Commitment to Exceptional Treatment of Volunteers by Agency Staff	4 (2%)	196 (98%)
16. Accommodations Provided for Volunteers with Disabilities:		
a) Hearing	4 (2%)	196 (98%)
b) Visual	4 (2%)	196 (98%)
c) Physical	5 (2%)	195 (98%)
d) Mental/Emotional	2 (1%)	198 (99%)
17. Volunteer Coordinator Contact Information Available	49 (24%)	151 (76%)
18. Variety of Ways to Contact the Agency:		
a) Telephone	192 (96%)	8 (4%)
b) Fax	58 (29%)	142 (71%)
c) Email	191 (96%)	9 (4%)
d) Postal Mail	175 (88%)	25 (12%)
19. Description of Agency Use of Volunteer Satisfaction Surveys	4 (2%)	196 (98%)
20. Description of Average Satisfaction Survey Scores for Volunteers	3 (1%)	197 (99%)
21. Final Thank You at the Bottom of the Volunteer Webpage	19 (9%)	181 (91%)
22. Agency-Offered Links to Other Affiliated Nonprofit Websites if no Matching/Appropriate Volunteer Opportunities are Available	24 (12%)	176 (88%)
23. Agency Response Within 24 Hours to Questions Posed via Email	49 (24%)	151 (76%)
24. Agency Response Within 24 Hours to a Request or Application to Volunteer	21 (10%)	179 (90%)

The top five items, in terms of frequency of "yes" responses, along with the actual frequencies and associated percentages were:

1. Item #18, Variety of Ways to Contact Agency
   (a) Telephone – 192 (96%)
   (c) Email – 191 (96%)
   (d) Postal Mail – 175 (85%)

2. Item #1, Volunteer Link – Option on Agency Homepage – 147 (74%)
3. Item #9e, Individual Volunteer Options – 125 (63%)
4. Item #8, Descriptions of Available/Potential Volunteer Assignments – 122 (61%)
5. Item #9h, Short Term Volunteer Options – 117 (59%)

The findings confirm the "brochureware" criticism of nonprofit websites, first noted by Hackler and Saxton (2007).

The five items with the lowest frequencies of "yes" responses and associated percentages were:

1. Item #16, Accommodations Provided for Volunteers with Disabilities
    (d) Mental/Emotional – 2 (1%)
    (a) Hearing – 4 (2%)
    (b) Visual – 4 (2%)
    (c) Physical – 5 (2%)
2. Item #20, Description of Average Satisfaction Survey Scores for Volunteers – 3 (1%)
3. Item #15, Commitment to Exceptional Treatment of Volunteers by Agency Staff – 4 (2%)
4. Item #19, Description of Agency Use of Volunteer Satisfaction Surveys – 4 (2%)
5. Item #6, Skills/Interests Survey Results (for individual prospective volunteers) Matched with Appropriate Volunteer Assignments – 5 (2%)

Discussion and Conclusions

Three major conclusions can be reasonably drawn from the results obtained in this study.

First, the 24-item checklist proved to be an objective, reliable measurement tool. It offers a straightforward methodology to assess volunteer-friendliness as applied to nonprofit websites.

Second, overall scores for the 200 largest U.S. charities were consistently quite low, with the highest score being 30 out of 100 possible points. All of the nonprofits could thus significantly benefit from targeted improvements to their websites.

Third, fewer than 5% of the 200 nonprofits offered accommodations at their website for volunteers with disabilities. The overwhelming majority of websites did not specifically address volunteer opportunities for people with disabilities.

Implications

Nonprofit Administration

Based upon the findings of this research, there are several important implications for nonprofit administrators. First, the 24-item tool can be easily and objectively used to evaluate the current volunteer-friendliness of an organization's website, identifying major strengths and areas for improvement.

Second, based upon assessment results, a comprehensive improvement strategy can be formulated and implemented, focusing initially on easy-to-make, high-impact areas (e.g., including a volunteer link on the homepage, developing an online volunteer application, and insuring responses to email inquiries within 24 hours). A recent *Wall Street Journal* article, Hodges (2009), can be very helpful in identifying "best practices" in web-based recruitment and utilization/assignment of volunteers. Four popular sites for recruiting volunteers and matching them with appropriate nonprofit assignments were analyzed and compared, including usaservice.org, volunteermatch.org, idealist.org, and 1-800-volunteer.org. Visits to each of these sites can assist nonprofits in identifying specific ways in which to improve their website recruiting effectiveness. Administrators could also consider registering volunteer opportunities at their agencies with these sites.

It is important for nonprofits to monitor and document the impact of website enhancements on their volunteer recruitment efforts, in order to assess the return on the time and money invested. Outcome variables of interest include: (1) website visitor counts, (2) the amount of website visitors that click on volunteer opportunities, (3) the amount of website visitors that inquire about volunteer opportunities, (4) the amount of volunteer applications submitted online, (5) the amount of volunteers recruited through the website, (6) the number of hours worked by volunteers recruited through the website, (7) the amount and value of financial donations made by volunteers recruited through the website, and (8) the amount of volunteers recruited through the website who go on to fill part-time or full-time positions at the agency.

A third practical implication involves the importance of obtaining professional IT services in order to formulate and operate an effective website for volunteer recruitment. While many nonprofits do not have the financial resources to hire an IT professional as an employee or consultant, several low-cost or no-cost options are available. These include: (1) using a current board member or volunteer with IT expertise, (2) recruiting a board member or volunteer with the necessary expertise, (3) negotiating donated services from an IT firm in exchange for acknowledgement at the agency website and other promotional considerations, and (4) seeking assistance from local universities in the form of service learning projects or internships for students in computer, business, or nonprofit management classes.

Future Research

The results of this study suggest that future research would be helpful in the following five areas. First, while the inter-rater reliability of the 24-item tool was established in the present study, research is needed to confirm the scale's validity. A large sample, cross-sectional design could be used to correlate scale scores with the total number of agency volunteers. Multiple regression could be utilized to empirically assess the weights assigned to individual items in the scale and principal components analysis could be used to assess the underlying factor structure of the tool. In addition, longitudinal designs could be employed to determine if targeted website improvements result in predicted increases in volunteers recruited, and to compare the relative efficacy of different improvement strategies.

Second, research with the 24-item tool would be of interest using a larger, more representative (random, if possible) sample of nonprofits. This would allow for the generalization of the findings to the entire sector.

Third, given the widespread lack of attention to opportunities for disabled volunteers, research in this area would be helpful in engaging this under-represented population.

Fourth, more research is needed on the ways in which nonprofits can upgrade and improve their website capabilities. Particular attention is needed on identifying the most cost-effective approaches for financially challenged agencies.

Finally, research would be useful in addressing how increasingly popular social media can be integrated into a comprehensive IT strategy for volunteer recruitment.

Study Limitations

The two primary limitations of the present study involve the nature and size of the sample utilized. First, the non-random sample consisted of the 200 largest charities in the United States, in terms of total revenue, with substantial financial resources

unavailable to other organizations. Thus, generalizations to the population of U.S. nonprofits must be made cautiously.

Second, the size of the non-random sample is quite small compared to the total number of U.S. nonprofits, estimated by the National Center for Charitable Statistics (2011) to be 1,014,816. Two hundred represents approximately .02% of the total. Again, caution must be exercised in generalizing from the findings of this study to the population of nonprofits as a whole.

References

Allen, J., Goh, A., Rogelberg, S., & Currie, A. (2010). Volunteer web site effectiveness: Attracting volunteers via the web. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 27*(1), 1-11.

Banjo, S. (2010, June 9). Donations slip amid anxiety. *Wall Street Journal*.

Banjo, S., & Kalita, S. (2010, February 1). Mergers, closings plague charities. *Wall Street Journal*.

Berk, R. (1986). Minimum competency testing: Status and potential. In B.S. Plake & J.C. Witt (Eds.), *The Future of Testing* (pp. 123-124). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2011, February 9). *An update on state budget cuts: At least 46 states have imposed cuts that hurt vulnerable residents and the economy*. Retrieved August 26, 2011, from http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=1214.

Coaley, K. (2009). *An introduction to psychological assessment and psychometrics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Corporation for National and Community Service. (2010, June). *Volunteering in America 2010: National, state, and city information*. Office of Research and Policy Development, Washington, DC.

Fox, A. (2010, June). Pave the way for volunteers. *HR Magazine*, 70-74.

Goh, A., Allen, J. A., Rogelberg, S. G., & Currie, A. (2009). Using the web to attract volunteers: An examination of best practices and base rates. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 26*(3), 55-65.

Hackler, D., & Saxton, G. D. (2007). The strategic use of information technology by nonprofit organizations: Increasing capacity and untapped potential. *Public Administration Review, May/June*, 474-487.

Heler, K. C., & Hobson, C. J. (2002, March). *Evaluating volunteer jobs: Using the Job Characteristics Model*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Business Administration Association, Chicago, IL.

Hobson, C. J., & Heler, K. (2007). The importance of initial assignment quality and staff treatment of new volunteers: A field test of the Hobson-Heler Model of nonprofit agency "volunteer-friendliness". *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 24*(6), 47-56.

Hobson, C. J., & Malec, K. L. (1999). Initial telephone contact of prospective volunteers with nonprofits: An operational definition of quality and norms for 500 agencies. *The Journal of Volunteer Administration, Sum-Fall*, 21-27.

Hobson, C. J., Rominger, A., Malec, K. L., Hobson, C., & Evans, K. (1996). Volunteer-friendliness of nonprofit agencies: Definition, conceptual model, and applications. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing, 4*(4), 27-41.

Hobson, J. J., & Hobson, C. J. (2009). Harnessing environmental activism via the internet – Assessing and enhancing the volunteer-friendliness of environmental nonprofit organization websites. *International Journal of Business and Public Administration, 6*(2), 128-141.

Hodges, J. (2009, February 12). A virtual matchmaker for volunteers. *Wall Street Journal*. Independent Sector. (2011). *Value of volunteer time*. Retrieved June 1, 2011, from http://www.independentsector.org

Malec, K. L., Hobson, C. J., & Guziewicz, J. (2000, March). *A field application of the Hobson-Malec Model of nonprofit agency volunteer-friendliness*. Paper presented at the annualmeeting of the Midwest Business Administration Association, Chicago, IL.

McKee, J., & McKee, T. W. (2007). *The new breed: Understanding and equipping the 21st century volunteer*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

National Center for Charitable Statistics. (2011). *Number of public charities in the United States*. Retrieved June 6, 2011, from http://nccsdataweb.urban.org.

Phillips, L. C., & Phillips, M. H. (2010). Volunteer motivation and reward preference: An empirical study of volunteerism in a large, not-for-profit organization. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, Autumn*, 12-19, 39.

Safrit, R. D., & Schmiesing, R. J. (2005). Volunteer administrators' perception of the importance of and their current levels of competence with selected volunteer management competencies. *The Journal of Volunteer Administration, 23*(2), 5-10.

Safrit, R. D., Schmiesing, R. J., Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2005). Competencies for contemporary volunteer administration: An empirical model bridging theory with professional best practice. *The Journal of Volunteer Administration, 23*(3), 5-15.

Schramm, J. (2010, October). New ways of doing good. *HR Magazine*, 120.

Waters, R. (2007). Nonprofit organizations' use of the internet: A content analysis of communication trends on the internet sites of the Philanthropy 400. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 18*(1), 59-76.

About the Authors

Dr. Charles J. Hobson has an active research program on volunteerism, has published and presented papers in the field, and is co-developer of the Volunteer-Friendly Index for nonprofits. Dr. Hobson has been a volunteer board member for the Visiting Nurse Association and the Lake Area United Way, as well as board member and President of the Northwest Indiana Wellness

Council. He has also volunteered with the LEAD Initiative in Indiana to prevent youth substance abuse.

Joshua J. Hobson works as a research associate and is currently an undergraduate student at Grand Valley State University, majoring in Allied Health Sciences. He has previously authored one professional publication.

Shelli Henry works for Berlin Metals in marketing and inside sales. She has been an adjunct professor for several years, teaching courses in organizational behavior and introduction to business. Shelli remains very active in a variety of volunteer efforts through her church.

Dr. Susan M. Rouse is an advisory board member for Area Health Education Centers, which focuses on preparing youth for health-related careers. She has volunteered in leadership positions for Girl Scouts of Calumet Council, American Heart Association, and American Cancer Society. She has also worked with area schools to provide Junior Achievement programming.

Dr. Andrea E. C. Griffin's research program is diverse. One overarching theme involves examining how organizations and individuals present themselves to each other. She has served as President of the Board of City Ballet Theatre in Milwaukee, Wisconsin for several years. In addition, she has volunteered with the United Performing Arts Fund and the United Way of Greater Milwaukee, the YWCA of Greater Milwaukee, and the YMCA of Northwest Indiana.

Jana Szostek is actively involved in community service through her church. She implemented and directs a ministry in her church designed to increase the involvement of church members in outreach ministries. Through this ministry, her church has supported several local needs, including abuse shelters, youth programs, and food programs. She also serves as a Trustee. In addition to her work with her church, Jana is an active member of the Indiana Patient Preferences Coalition, a task force working to propose legislation that gives individuals the power to make healthcare decisions in advance of incapacity.

Natalie Murillo works as a research associate and data analyst. She enjoys volunteering for animal welfare and children's causes, and is actively involved in the children's ministry at her church. She is also a frequent volunteer in the daily activities and special programming at her son's school.

Appendix A

Nonprofit Website "Volunteer-Friendliness" Evaluation Checklist			
Evaluation Items	Available Points	Evaluation	
		Yes	No
1. Volunteer Link/Option on Agency Homepage	8		
2. Appreciation Expressed for Considering Volunteer Opportunities after Clicking on Volunteer Link	2		
3. Statement of Value and Importance of Volunteers to Agency	6		
4. FAQ Option Concerning Volunteering	6		
5. Skills/Interests Survey for Prospective Volunteers	6		
6. Skills/Interests Survey Results Matched with Appropriate Volunteer Assignments	6		
7. Online Application for Volunteering	6		
8. Descriptions of Available/Potential Volunteer Assignments	6		
9. Wide Variety of Volunteer Options Available:	(12)		
a) Online	1		
b) At Home	1		
c) At Agency	1		
d) At Field Location	1		
e) Individual	1		
f) Group/Team	1		

g) Interact/Work with Client	1		
h) Short Term	1		
i) Long Term	1		
j) Daytime	1		
k) Evening	1		
l) Weekend	1		
10. Pictures of Volunteers on the Volunteer Webpage	2		
11. Quotes from Volunteers on Volunteer Webpage	2		
12. Information Concerning how Volunteering can Lead to Exciting/Rewarding Jobs or Careers	2		
13. Volunteer Orientation/Training Available	4		
14. Agency Commitment to Providing Meaningful Volunteer Assignments	4		
15. Commitment to Exceptional Treatment of Volunteers by Agency Staff	4		
16. Accommodations Provided for Volunteers with Disabilities:	(4)		
a) Hearing	1		
b) Visual	1		
c) Physical	1		
d) Mental/Emotional	1		
17. Volunteer Coordinator Contact Information Available	4		

18. Variety of Ways to Contact the Agency:	(4)		
a) Telephone	1		
b) Fax	1		
c) Email	1		
d) Postal Mail	1		
19. Description of Agency Use of Volunteer Satisfaction Surveys	2		
20. Description of Average Satisfaction Survey Scores for Volunteers	2		
21. Final Thank You at the Bottom of the Volunteer Webpage	2		
22. Agency-Offered Links to Other Affiliated Nonprofit Websites if no Matching/Appropriate Volunteer Opportunities are Available	2		
23. Agency Response Within 24 Hours to Questions Posed Via Email	4		
24. Agency Response Within 24 Hours to a Request or Application to Volunteer	4		