

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

VOLUNTEER MOTIVATION AND RETENTION IN A NONPROFIT
ORGANIZATION

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF HUMAN RELATIONS

By

Thomas Minh Hong Pham
Norman, Oklahoma
2019

VOLUNTEER MOTIVATION AND RETENTION IN NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RELATIONS

BY

Dr. Jody Worley, Chair

Dr. Brenda Lloyd-Jones

Dr. Megan Meyers-Morgan

Dedication

“This thesis is dedicated to all the educators who provided me with the foundational tools and support necessary for me to embark my academic journey. You’ve all planted the seeds of wisdom in me and now I am ready to continue your legacy by striving to cultivate and nurture the learning spirit in future scholars.”

Acknowledgements

Elizabeth, Megan, Andrew, Tiffany, Hafsa, Cam Linh, Devin, Milan, Kyerence, Alice, Vanessa, Precious, Triston, Omni, Madacyn, Katy, Katie, Chantel, and Lyssa. You've provided me with nothing but unconditional support and everlasting love throughout my life. Thank you for always believing in me when I did not believe in myself.

Minh Trang Nguyen and Brian Urrutia for inspiring my love literature in all language, context, and form. You saw my potential as a student and empowered me to overcome my self-doubt because I already possess the skills of a brilliant scholar. Thank you both for your encouragement and wisdom.

Toneille Bent for your advice during my first session with City Year Tulsa. You talked about facing your fears and commit to challenging yourself. That memory inspired me to face my fear and commit to completing a master thesis. Thank you so much for being my mentor through my thesis journey.

My students from Webster High School and McClure Elementary. Your resilience, individuality, and endurance through adversity is an inspiration and reason to why I dedicate my life to public service. Because of you all, I am committed to building a better world through public service, one day at a time, to ensure you have resources to achieve your best life. Thank you for being my purpose in life.

Thank you, Reading Partners volunteers, fellow AmeriCorps members, and staffs, for showing me the heart and spirit of the Tulsa community. You showed me a beloved community that is committed to serving your own community to help others achieve greatness through your act of service.

Professors at the University of Oklahoma, Dr. Brenda Lloyd-Jones, Dr. Jody Worley, Dr. Meg Myers-Morgan, Dr. Roger Randel, and Dr. Paul Valentine for teaching me how to expand my mind, think critically, and find my voice of reason. I came into both programs, with low confidence and self-value, but now I am about to leave the program with a sense of purpose and idea of who I am, my values, and confidence in my ability to become anything that I put my mind to it.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Tables	vii
Abstract	viii
Chapter1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	3
1. Six Classification of Volunteerism	3
2. Foundational Theories to Motivation.....	4
a. Needs Motivator.....	4
b. Reasons Motivator	5
1. Unconscious Reasons	5
a. Achievement	5
b. Affiliation	6
c. Power	6
2. Conscious Reasons.....	6
a. Task and Access to Service Site	7
b. Client Focus	7
c. Personal Benefits	7
c. Benefits Motivator	7
3. Theories to Volunteer Motivation and Frameworks	8
a. Public Service Motivation Framework	8
b. Volunteer Function Framework.....	9
4. Barriers to Volunteer Retention	11
a. Hierarchical Model to Leisure Constraint Framework	11
1. Structural Constraint	12
2. Interpersonal Constraint.....	12
3. Intrapersonal Constraint.....	12
5. Nonprofit organization success on Volunteer Recruitment and Retention.....	13
Chapter 3: Methods	14
1. Participants.....	14
2. Measures	14
3. Procedure	14
Chapter 4: Results and Findings	16
1. Participant demographic	16
a. Table 1. Volunteer Demographic.....	17
2. Motivation to Volunteer Descriptive Statistics.....	19
a. Table 2. Volunteer Motivation Self-Report Descriptive Statistics	21
b. Table 3. Volunteer Function Inventory Reliability Statistics.	23
3. Hierarchical Constraint to Leisure Volunteer Descriptive Statistics.	23
a. Table 4. Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Survey Self-Report Descriptive Statistics	24
b. Table 5. Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Reliability Statistics.....	25
Chapter 5: Discussion, Recommendation, Conclusion, and Limitations	26
1. Discussion	26
a. Hypothesis one: Volunteer Function Inventory	26
b. Hypothesis two: Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Inventory	27

c. Cronbach’s Alpha for VFI and HLC	27
2. Recommendation and Implications.....	28
a. Functional inventory as a tool for recruitment	28
b. Matching functional motivation to functionally relevant benefits.....	29
c. Orientation trainings	30
d. Volunteer recognition program	31
3. Conclusion	31
4. Limitations	32
Reference	34
Appendice	37
A. Appendix 1. Volunteer Demographic	39
B. Appendix 2. Volunteer Function Inventory	41
C. Appendix 3. Hierarchical Leisure Constraints Inventory	43
D. Appendix 4. IRB of Initial Submission.....	44

List of Tables

Tables	vii
1. Table 1. Volunteer Demographics	17
2. Table 2. Volunteer Motivation Self-Report Descriptive Statistics	21
3. Table 3. Volunteer Function Reliability Statistics	23
4. Table 4. Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Survey Self-Report Descriptive Statistics	23
5. Table 5: Barrier Reliability Statistics.....	25

Abstract

This study examines the functional motivation to volunteerism behavior and hierarchical leisure to constraint of individuals volunteering in a public service education nonprofit organization. The study of motivation is grounded by the Public Service Motivation Framework and Volunteer Functional Motivation Framework, and the study of restriction of leisure activity is understood through the Hierarchical Model to Leisure Constraint Framework. The participants in our study are volunteers who actively provided service at a local public service education nonprofit organization during the period of our study. In our study, participants identified that they are functionally motivated by the values when engaging in volunteer behavior and volunteers are likely to be restricted by structural constraints to leisure when volunteering in a public service nonprofit organization.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Volunteer motivation and Retention in Nonprofit Organizations

According to The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, more than 60 million individuals participated in a form of volunteerism and brought an estimated \$184 billion worth of service to their given community in 2015 (Bureau, 2018). Volunteering is a significant benefit to the economy, indeed Hodgkinson et al. reported that 15 billion hours of formal volunteering is estimated to be \$182 billion dollars' worth of services (Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplin, 2005). Many nonprofit organizations that focus on social and community programs depend on the contribution and support of volunteers to provide service to the general public (Burns, Reid, Toncar, Fawcett, & Anderson, 2006). As volunteers are the main service providers of these organizations, a volunteer mobilization effort is necessary; however, many of these organizations are experiencing a decline in volunteer contributions (Bureau, 2018). Moreover, this decrease of volunteer participants creates higher demands for the remaining volunteers. As there is more competition amongst organizations that rely on volunteers for sustainability and service delivery with a decreased pool of volunteer resources, organizations need to identify ways to more effectively recruit and retain volunteers at their organization in order to provide the most necessary community services (Allison, Okun and Dutridge, 2002). Nonprofit organizations recruiting volunteers can improve recruitment and sustainability practices by studying motivational influences to volunteerism behavior; by understanding volunteer motivation, community engagement and volunteer coordinators can align organizational values and the

organization's mission with the individual motivation to volunteer in a public service organization (Clary, Snyder, and Ridge, 1992). In this research study, participants will be recruited from an public service education nonprofit organization that empowers local community members and organizations to provide students with foundational literacy skills through course work intervention and one-to-one mentorship to read on grade level. This research paper will first discuss foundational theories that ground the framework of individual motivation and what causes a person to want to volunteer. Second, this research paper will provide a review of literature regarding theories of volunteer motivation, public service motivation, generational cohorts, and volunteer function theory that will ground this research of volunteer motivation in nonprofit organizations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

What is a volunteer?

There are many definitions of volunteers due to the notion that there are many different forms of volunteerism depending on the context in which the volunteering takes place. A general definition proposed by Bussell and Forbes (2001) discusses volunteering on spectrum ranging from free choice or will to remuneration of stipends in exchange for volunteer work to obligatory volunteering. Complementarily, the fundamental characteristic of volunteering is that of a planned, helping behavior that is mutually beneficial to each the volunteer, the organization in which the volunteering takes place, and the community members that receive the organization's services (Penner, 2002; Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2009).

Six classification of volunteerism

Within the context of this research, there are six categories of volunteering: individual volunteering, involuntary volunteering, corporate volunteering, religious institution volunteering, private corporation volunteering, and nonprofit organization volunteering. As discussed earlier, individual volunteers will donate their time, money, or resources as a way to meet the needs of the community and satisfy the organizational needs (Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor, 2009). According to Johnson-Coffey (2016), involuntary volunteering occurs to individuals who are required to donate their time as mandated through a government's planned citizenship program or community service (Bussell and Forbes, 2002). Corporate volunteering are organization incentives in which an organization's employees are allowed to provide volunteer hours in the community through an organization as a way to boost that organization's public relations, address social issues, or

to provide professional development for their employees (Bussell and Forbes, 2002). In religious institution volunteering, members of a religious denomination can collectively provide volunteers to work with other volunteer based agencies to address community needs (Johnson, Cohen,& Okun, 2016). Lastly, there are federally funded governmental programs such as PeaceCorps, Americrops, and VISTA that recruit and utilize volunteer efforts to provide volunteer services in at-risk communities in exchange for a living stipend, education scholarships, course credits, and after service rewards (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Arthur, Haugen, & Miene, 1998).

Foundational theories to motivation

First, when discussing volunteer motivation, an understanding of the theoretical framework regarding motivation is necessary to fully comprehend the key principals used to explain the phenomena that influence an individual's motivation to want to volunteer. Summarized from the definitions of Kleinginna and Kleinginna (1981) and Boz and Palaz (2007), motivation is an internal state of mind derived from the individual's unconscious and conscious desires, needs, and wants to engage in a behavior that will satisfy those internal motives. Grounded on the Fisher and Cole (1993) study on volunteer motivation, Fiser and Cole contended that an individual's motivation consists of three main motivators: needs, reasons, and benefits (Fisher & Cole, 1993, p. 60).

Needs Motivator. The needs motivator theory derives from the Maslow (1970) theory on the hierarchy of needs, which suggests that individual motivations are a response to an individual's internal needs to reach their full potential. The basic needs are structured in a pyramid in ascending order with the lowest level needs stemming from an individual's physiological needs such as food, water, air, and shelter to survive. Next on

the hierarchy of needs are an individual's safety needs; these are characterized by the need for safety and protection. Following the safety needs, are social needs such as the desire to feel like a part of a system, a group, or an organization. The esteem needs are influenced by an individual's need to feel worthwhile and respected by others. The last need on Maslow's Hierarchy of needs is the need for self-actualization, which is an individual's goal to realize one's full potential. Based on this framework, Fisher and Cole (1993), conclude that motivation is fueled by the desire to satisfy one's internal needs and by volunteering time one can assuage one's needs.

Reason Motivators. Two primary factors in volunteer motivation are unconscious and conscious reasons and values that would prompt individuals to volunteer their time. McClelland (1992) suggests three major unconscious needs that motivate individuals to behave in volunteering manners: the need for achievement, the need for affiliation, and the need for power.

Unconscious reason motivators.

Achievement. According to McClelland (1992), achievement is fueled by the desire to accomplish a task. By accomplishing complex tasks and reaching goals and objectives placed upon the individual, it is their immediate need to keep up with the standard set by the organization, the individual, or the volunteer experience (Henderson, 1998,p. 62) as the conditions motivate individuals to seek feedback and engage in challenging tasks for the satisfaction of achieving their goals. Unconscious reasons for motivation behavior will be determined by the individual's potential in executing volunteer

activity, the client of the population which will invoke altruistic and self-interest responses to volunteer, and the values and benefits to volunteer providing the acts of volunteering (Boz & Palaz, 2007).

Affiliation. Fisher and Cole (1993) identified affiliation as another motivator to individual volunteering behavior. Fisher and Cole adapted this theory from Henderson's research of program volunteers. Henderson's research indicated individuals are motivated by their relationship with others (Henderson, 1980), which is displayed through actions such as seeking the company of others, desiring to be liked, being part of group, and enjoying stable relationships (Henderson, 1980, p. 63).

Power. Fisher and Cole (1993) discovered that volunteers are motivated to volunteer because of the rewards following the experience via socializing, helping the community, fulfilling a requirement based on work or internal values, and gaining experiences through volunteer efforts. When discussing power and influence, it is the extent to which an individual can establish authority or control over others with respect to ideas and influences versus the desire to seek dominance over others (McClelland 1992, p. 92, Veroff, 1992).

Conscious Reasons Motivator

Conscious reasons are also classified into three categories: the emphasis on tasks performed and location of project site, the clients that are affected by the volunteer services, and the reasons that are beneficial to the volunteers themselves.

Task and access to services site. Boz and Palaz (2007) found that if the tasks are too complicated and the volunteer site requires more effort from the volunteers, the volunteers are less likely to volunteer because of personal barriers to the action of volunteering.

Client focus. Individuals are motivated to volunteer based on the clients that are receiving the services. The client population served can act as a catalyst to engage volunteer interest to serve and help the clients of particular value to the volunteer (Boz and Palaz, 2007).

Personal benefits. Fisher and Cole (1993) also identified that individuals are more likely to volunteer when they gain some sort of benefit from the volunteer experience, whether it is to help other people, satisfy the individuals' achievement through the volunteer activity, serve self-interest, gain a new understanding of the community, or gain additional skills for career-related experiences.

Benefit Motivators. In terms of benefits, Fisher and Cole (1993) posit that an individual's motivation to volunteer highly depends on the expectation of benefits or rewards from the act of volunteering. Fisher and Cole (1993) devised this motivational from the theories of the schram exchange theory that argues human activity and motivation is based on costs for benefits and the lawless expectancy theory that postulates: individuals engage in volunteer activity because they expect a system of reward at the end of the process (Schram, 1985; Lawless, 1997, p. 282). For example, a study conducted by Bussels and Forbes (2002) found that volunteers benefit from volunteer experiences as they gained new skills applicable to the work force, obtained employment by discussing

individual involvement in volunteerism and civic engagement, and potential career advancement by receiving academic credits from the volunteer experience. In summary, it is the need to excel and look good through achievement, needs, and benefits that motivate a volunteer to invest their time in an organization.

Theories to volunteer motivation and framework

Public service motivation framework

In this section, two theories of public service motivation and volunteer function theory are used to better explain the factors that influence an individual's behavior per acts of volunteerism. Public service motivation was theorized by Perry and Wise in 1990 which contextualize the motivation to volunteer specifically in public service organizations. In their study, they theorize that an individual's motivation to participate in volunteering behavior can be influenced by the public institution in which they are employed (Perry and Wise, 1990; Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2009). In their study, they found that individuals with high levels of public service motivation are more likely to volunteer in other organizations (Penny, Brudney, Coursey, & Littlepage, 2008). This theory is constructed from three influencing incentives that make up public service motivation: rational incentives, affective incentives, and normative incentives. The Rational Incentive is characterized by involvement in public service that can help address particular issues occurring in the community; the affective incentive is defined as the emotional attachment the volunteering individual has for the clients or group that receives the services provided through volunteer service delivery; and the normative incentive, which depends on the individual's sense of duty or desire to give back to the community (Perry and Wise, 1990).

Through the study of public service theory, researchers have found that organizations themselves have major influence on public service motivation, which indicates that a historical context of the organization is an important factor that influences an individual's likelihood to volunteer (Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). In the 1996 study also conducted by Perry, the researchers found individual demographic characteristics such as gender, levels of education, and income are great indicators of volunteerism behavior (Smith 1994), and, with additional research, they found that family socialization, youth volunteering, and religious activities have a positive influence on an individual's public service motivation (Perry, Brudney, Coursey, and Littlepage, 2008). As a way to better understand volunteer motivation, the public service motivation theory can assist volunteer recruitment managers develop better strategies to improve volunteer recruitment and retention and to form organization performance measures to fit that of the client and non-profit organization (Paarlberg, Perry, & Hondeghem, 2007; Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2009).

Volunteer function framework

The next approach to understanding volunteer motivation is through the Volunteer's Function Inventory, constructed by Clary and Snyder in 1991. A functional analysis is utilized to systemically identify personal and social functions that influence an individual's desire to volunteer; as a result of the functional analysis, Clary et al, (1991) identified 6 functions to volunteer motivation: values, understanding, career, social, protective, and enhancement.

Individuals that seek opportunities to address humanitarian concerns for others based on altruistic motives and personal self-interest are motivated through the values function (Clary and Sage, 1991). For example, research has shown people will go out of their way to help others because they have deep values and concerns for the people that are helped (Clary and Sage, 1991; Asghar, 2015).

The understanding function is characterized by the desire to gain new experiences and gain a better understanding of the world through their volunteer experience (Clary et al.). Papadakis, Griffin, and Frater (2004), reports many individuals volunteer to help them gain a better sense of the world and to practices skills they adapt from life experiences that they would not exercise in the daily aspects of their lives.

Other individuals may participate in volunteer activities as a means for self-development and career advancement as they learn new and transferable skills from their volunteer experience— these individuals are motivated by the careers function (Clary et al., Gidron, 1978; Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004).

Those volunteering to serve the social function satisfy their needs to interaction, build relationships, and assist individuals and social groups that are important to them (Clary et al., Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004). For example, civil rights activists will volunteer their time to participate in group advocacy efforts if they believe their volunteerism will influence change (Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004; Rosenhan, 1970).

Individuals who engage in civic actives may serve to satisfy their protection function as a way to alleviate or cope with intense feelings of guilt, feelings of inferiority, and general anxieties of the condition and welfare of others people — which serves as protection for the ego (Rosenhan, 1970; Clary et al., Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004).

Lastly, Clary and Snyder (1992) contended that individuals will participate in service activities as a means to enhance self-esteem and improve psychological growth through the enhancement of self-esteem function. Carlson, Charlin, and Miller (1998) and Jenner (1982) summarize that individuals will volunteer and help other people as a method to increase their own self-esteem through helping behaviors.

It is useful for an organization to gain a better understanding of the factors that motivate their volunteer pool to volunteer with the organization. An organization's utilization of the functions can serve as an effective marketing strategy to better recruit and retain individuals to serve with the program (Benson et al 1980; Clary & Orenstein 1991; Penner & Finkelstein 1998; Farmer & Fendorf 2001; Brussel & Forbes, 2002; Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004) .

Barriers to Volunteer Retention

Hierarchical model to leisure constraint framework

Volunteer retention protocols are critical and necessary for any public service organization that significantly relies on volunteer efforts for the delivery of social services. Many nonprofit organizations, serving as agents of the state and federal government, are assigned with the task to provide public services that are essential to citizens who depend on the services delivered (S. R. Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2009). A major concern regarding the government contracting of nonprofit organization is the increase in numbers of organizations that also rely on finite numbers of volunteers to recruit from the same community (Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2009). Additionally, a nonprofit organization that heavily relies on the mass mobilization of volunteers needs to continuously replace and recruit additional volunteer members to sustain the operation of

the nonprofit organization. As a way to understand barriers and constraints on individual volunteer motivation, this study will consider Crowrod, Jackson, and Gedbey (2001) research on hierarchal models to leisure constraints. The hierarchical constraint dimension determines three major barriers to volunteerism: Structural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal constraints.

Structural constraint. Structural barrier limitations include the individual's lack of time to volunteer, distance to volunteer site, unawareness of other or additional volunteer actives, and limitations on personal spending budgets (Gage and Thapa, 2012; Crawford, Jackson, & Gedbey, 2001). In other words, volunteers are limited by external constraints that physically prevent individuals with enough information for volunteer involvement such as enough personal time to engage in volunteer activity whether it be from personal, school, or work schedule and physical access to the volunteer site without major disruptions to the individual's life (Gage and Thapa, 2012).

Interpersonal constraint. Interpersonal constraints are associated with the disconnect between the organization and the volunteer. Volunteers need to have a sense of belonging within an organization by building new relationships and connections with other volunteer members within the organization. Research has found that when volunteers have a personal connection with a member already volunteering within the organization, there is an increased likelihood that, when asked by the friend already in the organization, the new volunteer will make the same commitment. (Gage and Thapa, 2012).

Intrapersonal constraint. Lastly, external barriers such as personal safety, health, physical, and mental capacity limitations, and unintended disruption to employ-

ment or personal convenience of life through the action of volunteering contributes to interpersonal barriers to volunteering. A summary of Gage and Thapa (2012) study on volunteer and motivation constraints amongst college students, found that individuals are more likely to express structural and intrapersonal barriers to volunteering because college students tend to have many other obligations and do not have the energy to keep up with their daily functions in addition to committing to volunteer activities. Similarly, a study conducted by Sudeen, Raskoff, & Garcia (2007) on constraints in volunteer retention reports that ill health, lack of time, and lack of interest are common barriers to a volunteer returning to the organization.

Nonprofit success on volunteer recruitment and retention. It is essential that nonprofit organizations understand the current intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural barriers that prevent individuals from volunteering in the organization. With this in mind, those organizations need to create systematic changes to the organization's recruitment and sustainability practices to better retain and maintain volunteers year after year. Research conducted by Berlin et al., 2004 concludes that the success of volunteer and nonprofit organizations relies extensively on the positive relation and mutual satisfaction of both the organization and the volunteer. Moreover, numerous studies have indicated that individuals motivated by altruism will not only display a higher satisfaction with their volunteer service but will increase the likelihood of the volunteer returning the following year (Anderson, 2003; Tidwell, 2005.) Therefore, the practice of matching volunteer motivation to volunteers and researching the hierarchical structures that prevent current volunteers from committing to volunteer can better help volunteer organizers improve ways retaining, recruiting, and persuading new individuals to volunteer.

Chapter 3: Methods

Participants

The participants in the study are individuals volunteering in a public service education nonprofit organization during the time this research was conducted. Any volunteers that categorized under the six classifications of volunteerism was included in the research. In this study, we recruited and assessed 108 participants who identified as a volunteer to understand their functional motivation to volunteer for the organization and potential barriers that could prevent volunteers from continued participation in the future.

Measures

The instrument used for the study is the Volunteer Functions Inventory self-reporting scale with 30 questions rating on a 5-point Likert Scale, ranging from 1 being not at all important/accurate for you to 5 being extremely important/accurate for you, to measure volunteer motivation. Additionally, for assessing the constraints to volunteering, the hierarchical model of constraint is used. This model was developed by Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey (1991) and will include a 15-question survey rating on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 being no influence for you to 5 being a very strong influence. Participants will be provided with a brief overview of study and instruction to choose to participate in the study. Participants are reassured that their identity and responses will be kept confidential and used only for research purposes.

Procedure

Participants are asked to participate in this study via distribution of the survey at volunteer sites, and current volunteers are asked to participate in the study by the researcher. An online survey was created through Qualtrics Survey Software and sent out to

online nonprofit organizational social media sites or electronic participants with the permission from organization executives. The participation survey/packet consists of 4 sections. The first section addresses volunteer participation and the scope their participation or volunteer declination to participate in the study. The second section of the packet asks sociodemographic questions regarding age, gender, race/ethnicity, birth-year, highest level of education completed, and academic major if the participant attended college. The third session consists of the volunteer function inventory study that measures volunteer motivations. Finally, the fourth section contains the constraint to volunteerism survey.

Chapter 4: Results and Findings

Results

Participant Demographic

The dominant gender of the respondents was female (85.2%) whereas 13% of respondents identified as male. On average, volunteers ages 55 and over (32.4%) and participants between the ages of 25-34 (25%) are more likely to volunteer in public service nonprofit organization as indicated from research. A majority of respondents were primarily White/Caucasian (78.7%) and the next largest group of respondents were Hispanic/Latino (8.3%). Over half of the respondents attained their bachelor's degree or 4-year degree, while 22.2 percent of respondents earned their master's degree. Additionally, half of the volunteer samples were employed full-time (50.9%) whereas 19.4% of respondents were retired. A large number of respondents, 72.2%, noted that they volunteered at their service site for less than a year and 13% noted that they have volunteered for at least a year (See table 1).

Table 1. Volunteer Demographic		Fre- quency	Per- cent
Age	18-24 years old	21	19.4
	25 - 34	27	25.0
	35 - 44	15	13.9
	45 - 54	10	9.3
	Over 55 years old	35	32.4
Gender Identifica- tion	Male	14	13.0
	Female	92	85.2
	Gender Variant/Non-conforming	1	.9
	Prefer Not to Answer	1	.9
Ethnicity	White/Caucasian	85	78.7
	Hispanic or Latinx/Latino	9	8.3
	Black or African American	3	2.8
	Native American or American Indian	6	5.6
	Asian/Pacific Islander	3	2.8
	Other	2	1.9
	Asian/Pacific Islander	3	2.8
	Other	2	1.9

Table 1. Volunteer Demographic continued		Fre- quency	Per- cent
Education Attainment	High school degree or equivalent	9	8.3
	Vocational (e.g. vocational certificate)	1	.9
	Associate's degree (e.g. AA, AS)	10	9.3
	Bachelor's degree (e.g. BA, BS)	56	51.9
	Master's Degree (e.g. MA, MS, MEd)	24	22.2
	Professional (e.g. JD, MD)	5	4.6
	Doctorate (e.g. PhD, EdD)	3	2.8
Employ- ment Status	Employed full-time (40+ hours a week)	55	50.9
	Employed part-time (less than 40 hours a week)	8	7.4
	Unemployed (currently looking for work)	3	2.8
	Student	7	6.5
	Retired	21	19.4
	Self-Employed	2	1.9
	Corporation for National and Community Service (e.g. AmeriCorps, VISTA, NCCC)	12	11.1
Duration of Service	<1 Year	78	72.2
	1 Years	14	13.0
	2 Years	5	4.6
	3 Years	7	6.5
	4 Years	1	.9
	5 Years	3	2.8

Motivation to volunteer descriptive statistic

A descriptive analysis with mean scores of each item was conducted. Questions with the highest means were “I feel it is important to help others” (M=4.68), “I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving” (M=4.61), “I can do something for a cause that is important to me” (M=4.36), “I feel compassion toward people in need” (M=4.35), and “I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself” (M=4.34). Items with the lowest means were “Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems” (M=1.54), “Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others” (M=1.65), “Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles” (M=1.68), “My friends volunteer” (M=1.72), and “People I am close to want me to volunteer” (M=1.72).

Each dimension was checked for internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha. Career ($\alpha=.927$) value composed of five items that related to development of skills or network for the purpose of furthering career advancements. The Enhancement ($\alpha=.777$) composed of questions that address personal growth and development. The Protective ($\alpha=.758$) dimension consisted of five items that dealt with using volunteerism as a way to escape from one’s own trouble. The Social ($\alpha=.737$) dimension is composed of five items that involved social interaction and doing something that was seen as important to the volunteer’s social group. The Understand value ($\alpha=.850$) is composed of five items that relate to helping others. Lastly, the Value function comprises five items ($\alpha=.794$) related to expanding one’s own perspective on an issue important to the volunteer. The mean values of the items were computed to devise a single composite index score for each of the six dimensions. The Value function scored the highest value among respondents

(M=4.47), seconded by the Understand function (M=3.38), Enhancement function (M=2.51), Social function (M=2.31), Protective function (M=1.99), and Career function (M=1.98) (see Table 2).

Table 2. Volunteer Motivation Self-Report Descriptive Statistics	Mean
Enhancement	
1. Volunteering makes me feel important.	2.40
2. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.	2.65
3. Volunteering makes me feel needed.	2.65
4. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.	2.62
5. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.	2.23
Total Mean Value	2.51
Career	
6. Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work.	1.91
7. I can make new contacts that might help my business career.	1.90
8. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.	2.04
9. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.	1.90
10. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.	2.15
Total Mean Value	1.98
Protective	
11. No matter how bad I have been feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it.	3.07
12. By volunteering, I feel less lonely.	1.99
13. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.	1.65
14. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.	1.54
15. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.	1.68
Total Mean Value	1.99

Table 2. Volunteer Motivation Self-Report Descriptive Statistics continued

Social

16. My friends volunteer.	1.72
17. People I am close to want me to volunteer.	1.72
18. People I know share an interest in community service.	3.14
19. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.	2.70
20. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.	2.29
Total Mean Value	2.31

Understand**Mean**

21. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.	3.31
22. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.	4.01
23. Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands-on" experience.	3.44
24. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.	3.03
25. I can explore my own strengths.	3.10
Total Mean Value	3.38

Value

26. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.	4.34
27. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.	4.61
28. I feel compassion toward people in need.	4.35
29. I feel it is important to help others.	4.68
30. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.	4.36
Total Mean Value	4.47

Table 3. Volunteer Function Reliability Statistics

Functional Motivation Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Career	.927	.928	5
Enhancement	.777	.775	5
Protective	.758	.764	5
Social	.737	.732	5
Understand	.850	.852	5
Value	.794	.806	5

Hierarchical constraint to leisure volunteer descriptive statistics.

A descriptive analysis with mean score of each constraint to volunteer was conducted. It is important to note that this scale was written in reverse order compared to the descriptive statistic for the volunteer function inventory data point. On constraints to volunteering, items were scored from 1, Extremely Accurately, to 5, Not Accurate at all. Items with the highest mean were “I have no time to volunteer” (M=3.94), “I have too many other commitments” (M=3.81), and “My friends do not volunteer” (M=4.06). The items with the lowest means were “I do not feel safe at the volunteer site” (M=4.39), “I think it will negatively affect my grades” (M=4.86), and “I do not have transportation to volunteer site” (M=4.84). Each dimension was checked for internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha. The interpersonal constraint ($\alpha=.600$) composed of five items which dealt with the perception of constraints to other individuals. The intrapersonal constraint ($\alpha=.807$) composed of five items which that represented potential barriers that involved

only the individual in question. Finally, structural constraint ($\alpha=.534$) composed of five items that reflected external barriers to participation (See table 4.). The mean values of the items were computed to devise a single composite index score for each of the three dimensions, the structural constraint scored the highest among respondents (M=4.28), then Interpersonal constraint (M=4.35), and Intrapersonal constraint (M=4.73)

Table 4. Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Survey Self-Report Descriptive Statistics	Mean	Total Mean Index
Interpersonal Constraint		M=4.35
1. My friends do not volunteer.	4.06	
2. I do not know anyone that volunteers.	4.68	
3. I have no one to volunteer with.	4.40	
4. No one has asked me to volunteer.	4.53	
5. My family does not volunteer.	4.12	
Intrapersonal Constraint		M=4.73
6. I have an injury, handicap, or ill health.	4.75	
7. I do not have the necessary skills.	4.69	
8. I do not feel safe at the volunteer sites.	4.93	
9. I think it will negatively affect my grades.	4.86	
10. I do not have enough energy to volunteer.	4.42	
Structural Constraint		M= 4.28
11. I have a limited budget.	4.29	
12. I have no time to volunteer.	3.94	
13. I have too many other commitments.	3.81	
14. I am unaware of other opportunities to volunteer.	4.54	
15. I do not have transportation to volunteer sites.	4.84	

Table 5. Barrier Reliability Statistics

Functional Motiva- tion Items	Cronbach's Al- pha	Cronbach's Al- pha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Interpersonal	.807	.813	5
Intrapersonal	.600	.637	5
Structural	.534	.526	5

Chapter 5: Discussion, Recommendation, and Conclusion

Discussion

The focus of this study is to understand the motivation of individuals who presently volunteer in public service nonprofit organization and potential barriers of leisure constraint that could prevent individuals from continuous service in the future. The purpose of this research was to assess current volunteers of a public nonprofit organization and their motivation to volunteering measured by the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), assess current volunteers' potential barriers to returning to the organization the following year through the Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Inventory, analyze the participant results, and propose recommendation to increase volunteer recruitment and retention and suggestion to further research.

Hypothesis one: Volunteer function inventory

The first hypothesis posited current volunteers serving in public service nonprofit organization are motivated by the values function. The results from this study support the claim that individuals volunteering in a public service nonprofit organization are highly likely motivated by the values function, followed by understanding function with the second highest mean and enhancing function with the third highest mean (Table 2). Consistent with previous research, the value function scored the highest value amongst the respondents who volunteer (Clary et al. 1998; Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004). The present research is supported by Chacon et al. (2017) systematic review of 48 studies that utilize the VFI to measure volunteer motivation, whose result indicated that the value factor obtained the highest mean score amongst the participant in their research. Similar to other studies, the understanding function is the second highest value among respondents

then enhancement function (Clary et al. 1998; Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004; Chacon et al. 2017) and the career function is the factor with the lowest mean score (Chacon et al. 2017).

Hypothesis two: Hierarchical leisure constraint inventory

The second hypothesis predict that a current volunteer will likely to be constricted on continuation of service due to interpersonal barriers. These findings are not supported through the present study as participates indicated that structural constraints are potential preventative constraints to continuation of volunteerism. In our study conducted on volunteers currently volunteering in a public service organization, volunteers were asked to identify potential barriers to continued participating with the program and participants reported the structural constraint scored the highest mean out of three dimensions, followed by interpersonal constraint, then intrapersonal constraint with the lowest means. This finding supports the hierarchal model of constraints found in the Gage and Thapa (2012) study of constants amongst college students, in which they found college students are first likely to be stropped by the structural dimension, the interpersonal constraints, and finally interpersonal constraints.

Cronbach's alpha for VFI and HLC

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each of the subscale indicated a high reliability for both the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) and the Hierarchical Leisure Constraint (HLC) Questionnaires. This reliably finding is supported by a study conducted by Asghar in 2017 that assessed the validity of VFI and HLC question items to ensure reliability and consistency with the survey instrument. The results of multiple regressions in-

licated that the six factors assessed by VFI are significant predictor variables for the criterion variable in the model. Widjaja (2010) proposed that organizations should utilize the VFI to determine the motivations of volunteers and attempt to match the type of roles they fill with their personal motivations.

Significantly, Gutierrez and Sauto's study also reported that the Career function was least likely motivation to volunteer, in which volunteers currently serving in the public service nonprofit organization reported the career function to have the lowest mean value amongst the six volunteer functions. This low value can be understood in terms of altruism and its relationship with the six functional values from Gage and Thapa (2012); Burns, Toncar, Fawcett, and Anderson, (2006); Boz and Balaz (2007) and their research signify that items that address the value, understanding, and social contain themes of altruism and altruism plays a huge factor in individual motivation to volunteer. Altruism is observed to play a role in each of the motivation (Burns et al., 2006), but functions such as the career and protective function are naturally weak in altruism motives, so more than likely, individuals are going to be motivated to volunteer in public service nonprofit organizations by altruistic themed functions such as value, understanding, social, and enhancing.

Recommendations and Implications

Functional inventory as tool for recruitment.

Bussell and Forbes (2002) argues that the key to organization success is contingent on the recruitment and retention of volunteers based on the interest of the prospective volunteer group. The functional approach to recruitment is a useful due to the validity and reliability of the scale that predict volunteer behavior based on personal motivation to volunteer in public service nonprofit organizations. Recommended by Clary,

Snyder, Ridge, and Copeland (1998) in their study of understanding and assessing the motivation of volunteer, their research suggests that individuals be recruited into volunteering by appealing to prospective volunteer functions and motivators. Additionally, Clary et al (1998) found that participants judge recruitment advertisement and persuasive messages to the extent that it matched their personal motivation to volunteer, meaning if the recruitment message aligns with their motivation to volunteer, they are more likely to be satisfied with their volunteer experience, which in turns increases the chance of continued volunteer service in the immediate or close future. Similarly, the results of our present study that found the value function to be the popular motivation to volunteer that is supported by similar studies, which indicate that value plays as the largest motivator to volunteers, especially in woman and service-oriented individuals (Clary et al, 1998). Volunteer recruitment messages for potential volunteers should include value statements especially since value plays a huge role in motivating volunteers currently serving in a public service nonprofit organization (Papadakis, Griffin, & Frater, 2004).

Matching functional motivation to functionally relevant benefits.

Snyder, Clary, Stukas (2000) and their study of the functional approach to voluntarism posit the role of individual motivation for volunteering and the benefit individuals receive for volunteering can influence their decision to continue involvement with the same organization. Other studies that measure volunteer experience and matching benefit found that when individuals are performing volunteer tasks that satisfy their volunteer motive, these individuals tend to report more positive volunteer experiences and intend to continue volunteering in the same organization and in the long-term future (Clary et al., 1998; Houle, Sagarin, Kaplan 2005). It is critical that volunteers receive the benefit that

is related to their primary functional motivation so they can be satisfied with their service and potentially continued service with the organization. This notion also implies that if volunteers are not satisfied with their service because the impact of their service does not satisfy their initial motivation to volunteer in the organization, they are less likely to return to continue volunteer services (Snyder, Clary, Skukas, 2000).

Orientation trainings.

A recommendation provided by Boz and Palaz (2007) who studied volunteer retention in nonprofit organization found that when providing orientation courses before individuals work as a volunteer is useful not only for motivating individuals support the organization mission but to orient the volunteer on best practices and prepare volunteer to be successful in their services. By providing orientation training to volunteers, the training can help volunteers comprehend with the volunteer organization's mission, philosophy, and principles of the organization and how the contribution and investment of the volunteers can help the organization achieve its public service goals (Boz & Palaz, 2007). These trainings can help individuals overcome potential interpersonal constraints when providing group orientation trainings with other individual by building comradery and friendship as they learn more about the organization mission and volunteer activities. These orientation trainings can also be utilized to reinforce volunteer functional motivation to volunteer and provide additional clarification on how their individual contribution to the program will mutually benefit their reason their reasons for volunteering, the organization itself, and the target population that the volunteer activity direct affects. Additionally, these training programs can help build and promote certain motivational values

in individuals as they learn more about the organization and potentially reorient their reasons to volunteer with the organization and increase their chance of satisfaction with their volunteer experience.

Volunteer recognition programs.

A study by Gage and Thapa (2012) on volunteer motivation and constraint amongst college students posits that recognition and appreciation programs can help overcome individual barrier to overcome interpersonal barriers by providing volunteers with public recognition and acknowledgement for their volunteer service and increase continual participation with the program. Additionally, structural constraint can be overcome because it brings to fruition the impact of the individuals volunteer serves and reinforce the importance of their participation in the organization, thus, allowing the volunteer to feel that they contribute to the organization. The study supports that social relationship from recognition and organization are significant predictors of continued participation, so it is imperative that organizations engage the current volunteer database to influence and recruit individuals from their social group to volunteer alongside their peers and family. Additionally, the contrast between Boz and Palaz's and Gage and Thapa's study highlight that the Volunteer Function Inventory and individual values and responses can be shaped by environmental factors and results of the VFI can differ across different cultures with different values.

Conclusion

In summary, the average person to volunteer in public service nonprofit organizations can be white/Caucasian female, over the ages 55, who works fulltime and has volunteered with the organization for less than a year. The average volunteer will often be

functionally motivated by values function indicating that it is important to help others and they are likely to be constrained by structural barriers, such as lack of time to volunteer for the next year. Overall, the VFI and HLC have proven to be reliable tool when examining present volunteer and their motivation to serve in public service nonprofit organization. Nonprofit organization leaders and volunteer recruitment managers can utilize and synergize the volunteer function inventory and organization mission to attract prospective volunteers according to the functional motivation that attract individuals towards committing public service. For example, if volunteers are motivated by careers function, then the nonprofit organization can recruit volunteers by advertising benefits from volunteer experience can include volunteer service hours for schools or work and potential career advancement within the organization. Clary et al (1998), propose that continued participation depends on the alignment of the individual volunteer's functional motivation to volunteer and the functional benefit they receive as a result of volunteer efforts. Ongoing investment in volunteer motivation and engagement, personal development, and benefit satisfaction has the ability to reduce turnover in an organization.

Limitations

The VFI and HLC surveys were all self-reported, so there is a chance for participant bias if participants want to be perceived as an altruistic and helping individual. Additionally, extending the survey to get former volunteer to participate in study to better assess hierarchical leisure constraint that contributed their cessation of volunteerism with the nonprofit organization to measure actual hierarchical leisure constraint to returning to volunteer. It is also important to consider updating additional functional values to the VFI because there are other contributing factors to motivating individuals to volunteer such as

religious ideology, which is a consideration recommended by Boz and Palaz (2007), Asghar (2015), and Perry, Brudney, Coursey, and Littlepage (2008) because the VFI is contributed by western values and influences that is not the same throughout other cultures, so these scales are reliable when studying groups in western civilizations. Another limitation pertains to the HLC survey, as the structural and interpersonal constraints tends to be used interchangeably because of how the dimensions are categorized. An updated version of the HLC survey needs to be explored to better and accurately identify specific constraints to volunteerism. It is also recommended that the study functional motivation variables are compared by individual factors such as demographics and test correlation between the variables to identify significant groups of individuals to recruit to volunteer.

References

- Andersen, K. (2003). Student volunteers: why hospitals must invest in their futures. *Leadership in Health Services*, 16(2), 6–13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13660750310474517>
- Asghar, H. M. (n.d.). The Volunteer Functions Inventory: Examination of Dimension, Scale Reliability and Correlates, 3, 14.
- Beerli, A., Díaz, G., & Martín, J. D. (2004). The behavioural consequences of self-congruency in volunteers. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9(1), 28-48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.231>
- Boz, I., & Palaz, S. (2007). Factors Influencing the Motivation of Turkey's Community Volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(4), 643–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764006298364>
- Burns, D. J., Reid, J. S., Toncar, M., Fawcett, J., & Anderson, C. (2006). Motivations to volunteer: The role of altruism. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 3(2), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02893621>
- Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2002). Understanding the volunteer market: the what, where, who and why of volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(3), 244–257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.183>
- Chacón, F., Gutiérrez, G., & Sauto, V. (2017). Volunteer Functions Inventory: A systematic review. *Psicothema*, (29.3), 306–316. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psico-thema2016.371>
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Ridge, R. (1992). Volunteers' motivations: A functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 2(4), 333–350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.4130020403>
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, Arthur. 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. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516>
- Clerkin, R. M., Paynter, S. R., & Taylor, J. K. (2009). Public Service Motivation in Undergraduate Giving and: Volunteering Decisions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 39(6), 675–698. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074008327512>
- Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 13(4), 309–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409109513147>

- Dennis, M. K., Scanlon, E. T., & Sellon, A. M. (2017). "It's a generosity loop": Religious and spiritual motivations of volunteers who glean produce to reduce food insecurity. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, 36(4), 456–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15426432.2017.1284633>
- Einolf, C., & Chambré, S. M. (2011). Who volunteers? Constructing a hybrid theory. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4), 298–310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.429>
- Gage, R. L., & Thapa, B. (2012). Volunteer Motivations and Constraints Among College Students: Analysis of the Volunteer Function Inventory and Leisure Constraints Models. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(3), 405–430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011406738>
- Hill, J. P., & den Dulk, K. R. (2013). Religion, Volunteering, and Educational Setting: The Effect of Youth Schooling Type on Civic Engagement. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 52(1), 179–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.12011>
- Houle, B. J., Sagarin, B. J., & Kaplan, M. F. (2005). A Functional Approach to Volunteerism: Do Volunteer Motives Predict Task Preference? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27(4), 337–344. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp2704_6
- Johnson, K. A., Cohen, A. B., & Okun, M. A. (2016). God is watching you...but also watching over you: The influence of benevolent God representations on secular volunteerism among Christians. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 8(4), 363–374. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/10.1037/rel0000040>
- Katz, D. (1960). The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24(2), 163–204.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2010). The Big Question for Performance Management: Why Do Managers Use Performance Information? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(4), 849–866. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muq004>
- Papadakis, K., Griffin, T., & Frater, J. (2004). UNDERSTANDING VOLUNTEERS' MOTIVATIONS, 6.
- Penner, L. A. (2002). Dispositional and Organizational Influences on Sustained Volunteerism: An Interactionist Perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00270>
- Perry, J. L., Brudney, J. L., Coursey, D., & Littlepage, L. (2008). What Drives Morally Committed Citizens? A Study of the Antecedents of Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 68(3), 445–458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2008.00881.x>

- Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). Building Theory and Empirical Evidence About Public Service Motivation. *International Public Management Journal; Stamford*, 11(1), 3–12. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/10.1080/10967490801887673>
- Shields, P. O. (2009). Young Adult Volunteers: Recruitment Appeals and Other Marketing Considerations. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 21(2), 139–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495140802528658>
- Swanson, G. E. (1956). [Review of *Review of Opinions and Personality*, by M. B. Smith, J. S. Bruner, R. W. White, D. F. Aberle, S. G. Estes, E. Hanfmann, & S. J. Korchin]. *American Sociological Review*, 21(3), 390–391. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089306>
- Tidwell, M. V. (2005). A social identity model of prosocial behaviors within nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15(4), 449–467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.82>
- Tschirhart, M. (1998). Understanding the Older Stipended Volunteer: Age-Related Differences among AmeriCorps Members. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 22(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3380588>

Appendix A

Volunteer Demographic

Demographic Questions:

1. What is your age?
 - Under 18
 - 18-24 years old
 - 25-34
 - 35-44
 - 45-54
 - Over 55

2. To which gender identify do you most identify?
 - Male
 - Female
 - Transgender Female
 - Transgender Male
 - Gender Variant/Non-conforming
 - _____ not listed
 - Prefer not to answer

3. What is your ethnicity?
 - White/Caucasian
 - Hispanic or Latinx/Latino
 - Black or African American
 - Native American or American Indian
 - Asian/Pacific Islander
 - Others

4. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?
 - Less than a high school diploma
 - High School degree or equivalent
 - Vocational (e.g. vocational certificate)

- Associate's Degree (e.g. AA, AS)
- Bachelor's Degree (e.g. BA, BS)
- Master's Degree (e.g. MA, MS MEd)
- Professional (e.g. JD, MD)
- Doctorate (e.g. PhD, EdD)

5. What is your current employment status?

- Employed full-time (40+ hours a week)
- Employed part-time (less than 40 hours a week)
- Unemployed (currently looking for work)
- Student
- Retired
- Self-Employed
- Unable to work
- Corporation for National and Community Service (e.g. Americorps, VISTA, NCCC)

6. How long have you volunteered in this organization?

- >1 year
- 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- 6 years

Appendix B

Volunteer Function Inventory

Using the 5-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you in doing volunteer work at this organization. Record your answer in the space next to each item. Items are rated from not at all important on a scale from one to five with five being extremely important.

1. Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work __
2. My friends volunteer. __
3. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself. __
4. People I'm close to want me to volunteer. __
5. Volunteering makes me feel important __
6. People I know share an interest in community service. __
7. No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it. __
8. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving. __
9. By volunteering, I feel less lonely. __
10. I can make new contacts that might help my business career. __
11. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others. __
12. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working. __
13. Volunteering increases my self-esteem. __
14. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things. __
15. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options. __
16. I feel compassion toward people in need. __
17. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service. __
18. Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands on" experience. __
19. I feel it is important to help others. __
20. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems. __
21. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession. __
22. I can do something for a cause that is important to me. __
23. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best. __
24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles. __

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

Appendix C

Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Inventory

For each of the statement below, please indicate how accurate each of the following reasons for potential barriers to volunteering with this organization the following year. Record your answer in the space next to each item. The item will be rated from one to five with one being extremely Accurately and five being not accurate at all.

1. I have no time to volunteer. ___
2. My friends do not volunteer. ___
3. I have an injury, handicap, or ill health. ___
4. I have too many other commitments. ___
5. I do not know anyone that volunteers. ___
6. I do not have the necessary skills. ___
7. I have a limited budget. ___
8. I have no one to volunteer with. ___
9. I do not feel safe at the volunteer sites. ___
10. I am unaware of other opportunities to volunteer. ___
11. No one has asked me to volunteer. ___
12. I think it will negatively affect my grades. ___
13. I do not have transportation to volunteer sites. ___
14. My family does not volunteer. ___
15. I do not have enough energy to volunteer. ___

Appendix D



Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Approval of Initial Submission – Exempt from IRB Review – AP01

Date: April 01, 2019

IRB#: 10549

Principal Investigator: Thomas Minh Hong Pham

Approval Date: 04/01/2019

Exempt Category: 2

Study Title: Volunteer Motivation and Retention in Nonprofit Organization

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed the above-referenced research study and determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review. To view the documents approved for this submission, open this study from the *My Studies* option, go to *Submission History*, go to *Completed Submissions* tab and then click the *Details* icon.

As principal investigator of this research study, you are responsible to:

- Conduct the research study in a manner consistent with the requirements of the IRB and federal regulations 45 CFR 46.
- Request approval from the IRB prior to implementing any/all modifications as changes could affect the exempt status determination.
- Maintain accurate and complete study records for evaluation by the HRPP Quality Improvement Program and, if applicable, inspection by regulatory agencies and/or the study sponsor.
- Notify the IRB at the completion of the project.

If you have questions about this notification or using iRIS, contact the IRB @ 405-325-8110 or rb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ioana A. Cionea'.

Ioana Cionea, Ph.D.
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board