

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS AND DECISIONS TO VOLUNTEER IN
THE FLORIDA PARK SERVICE

By

ROBERT SCOTT WILSON

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN RECREATIONAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2005

Copyright 2005

by

Robert Scott Wilson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of individuals have provided support and/or assistance leading to the completion of this project. I thank my wife Leslie and my daughter Olivia for their patience, understanding, and support during the late night typing sessions and hours spent away from home. I thank the graduate committee, particularly the committee chair, for guidance received throughout this process. I thank the departmental administrative staff, particularly Mrs. Nancy Struhs Gullic, for providing information and assistance. I thank Mrs. Jennifer Hawthorne, teacher and friend, for proofreading and helpful suggestions. I appreciate the formatting advice provided by Ms. Charlene Johnson and Ms. Michelle Lease, employees and friends. Finally, I gratefully acknowledge the information and support provided by the administrative staff of the Department of Environmental Protection, Florida Park Service.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Research Problem.....	5
Study Objectives.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Definitions.....	7
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Theoretical Approaches.....	9
Motivations among Volunteers.....	11
Characteristics of Volunteers.....	24
3 METHODS.....	28
Data and Sampling.....	28
Survey Design.....	28
Survey Instrument.....	29
Statistical Analysis.....	33
Treatment of Data.....	34
4 RESULTS.....	36
Response Rate and Nonresponse Bias.....	37
Sample Characteristics.....	37
Motivational Factor Response Patterns.....	38
Reliability of Efficacy and Competing Commitments Measures.....	40
Reliability of VFI and Co-production Measures.....	40
Serious Leisure.....	41
Relationship between Motivational Factors and Volunteer Participation.....	42

5 DISCUSSION.....	53
Summary of Results.....	53
Discussion of Results.....	53
Limitations of Study.....	60
Research Implications.....	61
Management Implications.....	62
APPENDIX	
A FLORIDA PARK SERVICE VOLUNTEER STUDY.....	67
B COVER LETTER.....	74
C POSTCARD.....	75
REFERENCE LIST.....	76
BIOGRPAHICAL SKETCH.....	79

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>page</u>
1	Organizational and demographic characteristics of FPS volunteers.....	45
2	Frequencies and percentages for efficacy and competing commitments...46	
3	Frequencies and percentages for VFI and co-production.....	47
4	Frequencies and percentages for Serious Leisure.....	48
5	Descriptive statistics for efficacy and competing commitments.....	49
6	Descriptive statistics for VFI and co-production scales.....	49
7	Factor analysis of serious leisure rewards.....	50
8	Analysis of variance results comparing motivational factors and level of participation.....	51
9	Relationship between level of participation and demographic characteristics.....	52

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Recreational Studies

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS AND DECISIONS TO VOLUNTEER IN
THE FLORIDA PARK SERVICE

By

Robert Scott Wilson

December 2005

Chair: Myron Floyd

Major Department: Tourism, Recreation, and Sports Management

Due to shortages in staff and funding, governmental park and recreation agencies are becoming increasingly dependent upon the services and donations of volunteers. The purpose of this study was to better understand volunteer behavior in park management. Four research objectives were addressed. These were to (1) examine key motivational factors of volunteers in park management, (2) determine whether elements of serious leisure exist in park volunteerism, (3) examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of participation in volunteer activities, and (4) examine the association between demographic characteristics of volunteers and level of participation in volunteer activities.

Data for the study were collected by a mail survey administered to 540 Florida Park Service volunteers during the summer of 2005. A systematic random sample was drawn from a list of volunteers provided by the Florida Park Service. The list covered four of the five Florida Park Service districts. Measures of volunteer motivations were

adapted from previous research. A new measure of serious leisure rewards was developed for the current study. Level of volunteering was measured as annual hours of volunteering. Respondents were classified as low, moderate, or high based on annual hours of volunteer activity.

The relative importance of the various motivations associated with volunteering was assessed in terms of item mean values. Important motivations for volunteering included personal fulfillment, opportunities to participate with other volunteers and be part of a group, opportunities to share knowledge gained from past experience, and feeling needed by a department or agency. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of volunteer participation. In general, the importance of motivational factors increased with increasing levels of volunteer participation. The relationship between demographic characteristics and level of participation was examined using chi-squared (χ^2) tests. Statistically significant associations were found between levels of volunteering and income, education, family size and employment status.

Study findings are discussed in terms of past studies and future research needs. Implications for managers of volunteers and ways to apply the study findings are also discussed.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The question of motivation to participate in a given leisure activity has a long history, dating at least to Aristotle's time. And, given its complexity, scholars are still at pains to fully answer it. (Stebbins, 2005, p. 4)

In recent years, park management has developed a growing dependency on volunteers. This is particularly true on the part of state and federal park management agencies whose budgets and resources often limit their ability to provide resource management, facility maintenance, and basic services to visitors. Volunteers often have two options for providing their services. Many volunteer in a direct relationship with the agency while others volunteer for nongovernmental organizations (NGO's), such as "Friends" groups that support parks and recreation areas. The growth in volunteerism in parks has captured significant attention from the media and outdoor recreation researchers.

Kenworthy (2005) writes that because of tight federal government budgets support groups of the national parks, who used to provide the extra services, are now called upon to provide basic and essential services. In many cases volunteers are responsible for operating visitor centers, providing funding for quality visitor services, and ensuring that trashcans are safe from marauding bears. Moreover, he states that over 200 private, non-profit groups provide millions of dollars in support of parks across the nation each year.

Since 1997, the basic operations budget of the National Park Service has grown an average of 5.7% annually. However, this same budget still remains an estimated \$600 million less than what the organization needs. In addition, an estimated \$6 billion construction and maintenance backlog exists. The NPS relies upon their volunteer groups to fill such gaps. Many members in these organizations believe that the national parks deserve to be supported through private funding, but many also question whether their efforts are discouraging the Congress and administration from providing full funding to the parks. According to a 2003 survey, charity offered by such groups is growing. Donations by park support groups increased from \$27 million in 1997 to more than \$47 million in 2001, with 90% of existing national parks deriving benefits (Kenworthy, 2005).

Research provides growing evidence of the importance of volunteering in park management. Government and organizations are increasingly looking to volunteers to provide key services and supports in areas such as recreation. Volunteers are involved in the governance and administration of organizations, the delivery of programs and services, and the development of grass roots community initiatives. Because of this, Arai and Smale (2003) point out that it is important for management, academics, and the volunteers themselves to know why volunteers participate and serve.

According to Scott (1996), volunteers play an integral role in many areas by providing labor and experience. The careful cultivation of a volunteer workforce is crucial due to the limited resources available to park management. Many planned projects and events could not be executed without the efforts of volunteers. A fully utilized

volunteer workforce can expand services, create or enhance ties with the community, increase the organization's opportunities, and provide much needed manpower.

Silverberg, Ellis, Backman, and Backman (1999) state that managers of public parks often lack the understanding and background necessary to effectively manage volunteers. More specifically, they note that little attention has been given to understanding the motives of volunteers. This information is as important to the management of volunteers as it is for paid staff, and for that reason, there is great need for more research on this topic.

More specifically, Yoshioka and Ashcraft (2003) point to the recent attention given to the provision of public services by non-profit groups and the social well-being fostered through these services. There has been an expansion in the services offered by these organizations in response to the downsizing of government offerings. Increasing the demands made upon these non-profit organizations has made their leadership and management of utmost importance. The same applies to the volunteers who are the focus of this study.

According to a recent article, volunteers often get as much out of their activities as those whom they are helping, including learning new skills and meeting new people. Five advantages that volunteers attribute to their efforts include improved self-esteem, new understanding, solidified community ties, affirmation of personal values, and personal development. The question posed was whether altruism really exists if the act of volunteering benefits the volunteer. The article goes on to say that the point of volunteering is the benefit to those helped and not the benefits to the helpers. Just because volunteers get something out of their work in no way diminishes the effects of their work

on others. In fact, the most selfish of volunteers may make the most altruistic contributions simply because they are so motivated (“Volunteers Give,” 1996).

In a brief, currently unpublished research update titled *Volunteers: Integral to Recreation and Parks*, Henderson and Silverberg (2004) point out that both governmental and non-profit organizations realize the social and economic benefits of volunteering. These organizations play a significant role in both advocating volunteers and enabling volunteers to supplement recreation services. They stress the importance of job satisfaction and the impact it has on volunteer commitment to the organization. Management implications include the need to provide substantial recruitment, training, supervision, and recognition to their volunteers. Key to successful volunteer management lies in understanding that the reasons people have for volunteering directly affects their need for supervision and training. The update concludes that increased knowledge about volunteers and the volunteers’ opportunities available to them can lead to a greater understanding of facilitating opportunities on the part of recreation and park managers such as those in the Florida Park Service.

The FPS consists of 159 state parks, encompasses over 720,000 acres, and hosts over 18,000,000 visitors annually. At the time of this study the Florida Park Service had more than 7,000 individuals who served as volunteers across the state. These volunteers contributed over 1,000,000 hours in the previous year, which resulted in an estimated savings to taxpayers of more than \$18.4 million. This contribution equals that of over 505 full-time employees, equivalent to nearly half the size of the paid state park work force. The Florida Park Service is the first state park system in the nation to reach 1,000,000 volunteer hours, emphasizing the importance and impact of volunteerism in this agency.

The FPS is divided into five geographic districts with a varying number of parks in each. Individuals become volunteers by submitting an application at the specific park where they are interested in serving. In addition to the statewide volunteer program, many Florida State Parks have their own Citizen's Support Organization (CSO), a type of "friends" group whose sole purpose is to support that particular park. CSOs engage in many activities in their efforts to achieve this goal including hosting special events, fundraisers, seeking grants, and providing visitor services. There are currently over 80 CSOs in the FPS. Volunteers typically maintain their CSO membership through periodic membership dues.

With increased knowledge of volunteer motivations and behaviors, park managers will be better able to manage all phases of their volunteer programs and CSOs, including recruitment, job placement, supervision, motivation, job satisfaction, and retention. The overall longevity of the volunteer program will be enhanced.

Statement of the Research Problem

Agencies that manage public parks are becoming increasingly dependent upon the services and donations of volunteers to accomplish their missions. Because this is a relatively new phenomenon, only minimal information is available on the behavior of volunteers in park management. Basic questions must be answered in order to advance the understanding of volunteerism in park management: What are the characteristics of volunteers? What motivates people to volunteer? Of those that do volunteer, why are some more active than others? The lack of research information in relation to park management serves as a constraint to more effective management of volunteer programs.

The purpose of this study is to examine volunteer behavior in park management through an examination of key motivational factors. This portion of the study will serve to partially replicate research conducted by Silverberg, Ellis, Backman, and Backman (1999) and Martinez and McMullin (2004). Replication is important to research because it provides a safeguard against errors such as overgeneralization. Such errors are exposed in previous studies and reduced in future studies. Replication ensures the reliability of previously utilized testing methods and may enhance the external validity of those methods. Practical applications of replication relate to the need for accurate, reliable information upon which to base management decisions. In addition to replicating previous studies, this study will extend previous studies of volunteer motivations by examining the importance of psychological rewards associated with serious leisure. According to Stebbins (2001), serious leisure refers to the steady pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or career volunteer activity that captivates its participants due to the complexity and challenges involved. Serious leisure is described as being profound, long lasting, and based to some extent on knowledge, skill, or experience. It is considered deeply satisfying and contributes to a full existence. Researchers are beginning to connect serious leisure and volunteering (Stebbins, 2005).

Study Objectives

This study was conducted in order to address the following research objectives:

- * Examine key motivational factors of volunteers in park management.
- * Determine whether elements of serious leisure exist in park volunteerism.
- * Examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of participation in volunteer activities.

- * Examine the association between demographic characteristics of volunteers and level of participation in volunteer activities.

Research Questions

This study addressed the need for more research by examining the following research questions concerning FPS volunteers:

- * What role do efficacy and competing commitments play in decisions to volunteer?
- * What are the key factors that motivate individuals to volunteer?
- * Are rewards associated with serious leisure present in volunteering?
- * What is the relationship between motivational factors and level of participation?
- * What is the relationship between volunteer demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and level of participation?

Definitions

Citizen support organization (CSO): a non-profit 501(c) (3) organization that operates with the sole purpose of supporting a particular Florida State Park.

Co-production: the active involvement of citizens, including volunteers in government agencies, in the creation and delivery of public goods and/or services (Silverberg, Marshall, & Ellis, 2001).

Prosocial behavior: voluntary helping behavior carried out to benefit others without the incentive of material rewards for helping or the threat of punishment for not helping (Gramann, Bonifield, & Kim, 1995).

Serious leisure: the steady pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or career volunteer activity that captivates its participants with its complexity and challenges (Stebbins, 2001).

Volunteer: someone who contributes time to helping others with no expectation of pay or other material benefit (Wilson & Musick, 1999).

To summarize, this chapter provided an introduction to the topic of volunteerism in park management. Literature was cited that emphasized the importance of the topic.

The chapter concluded with a discussion of research problems, study objectives, and definitions of key terms. Chapter 2 provides a more comprehensive discussion of the related literature. Chapter 3 describes the methods used in the study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the results, suggestions for future research, and managerial implications.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to examine volunteer behavior in park management through an examination of key motivational factors and psychological rewards associated with serious leisure. This chapter will describe the theoretical context of the study and will review previous studies of volunteering. Specifically, emphasis will be given to the discussion of factors that motivate volunteer behavior. The review is divided into three sections: overview of theoretical approaches, review of studies on motivational factors, and empirical research on characteristics of volunteers. At the conclusion of the chapter, the specific research objectives of the study are re-stated.

Theoretical Approaches

Prosocial Behavior and Volunteering

The concept of prosocial behavior provides a general theoretical context for this study. Gramann, Bonifield, and Kim (1995) define prosocial behavior theory as voluntary helping behavior that is intended to benefit others without the incentive of material rewards for helping or the threat of punishment for not helping. Gramann and Vander Stoep (1987) discuss the interchangeable use of the terms altruism and prosocial behavior. They contrast prosocial behavior with altruism, which is defined as purely selfless acts that enhance the adaptive fitness of the recipient at the expense of the fitness of the donor. The difference between altruism and prosocial behavior is that prosocial behavior requires no such cost and is not primarily motivated by the expectation of

tangible rewards. While prosocial behavior theory has been applied in the examination and reduction of inappropriate behavior among park visitors (e.g. Gramann, et. al., 1995; Gramann & Vander Stoep, 1987), it can serve as a reference point for understanding volunteer behavior. According to Gramann and Vander Stoep (1987, p. 248), the “predominant theoretical problem addressed by research on prosocial behavior is to explain why people do or do not help others who are in need.” Similarly, the issue addressed in the present study is to understand why individuals help or do not help by serving in a volunteer capacity.

Functionalist Theory and Volunteering

Another relevant theoretical perspective on volunteer behavior is functionalist theory. Functionalist theory focuses on individual motivations for volunteering (Finkelstein, et al. 2005). Clary and Snyder (1998, p. 156) reviewed four benefits of the functionalist perspective: (1) it brings attention to the psychological and social processes that initiate and sustain volunteer activity; (2) it recognizes that individuals engage in volunteer activities for different reasons, and that different individuals can undertake the same activity to fulfill different motives; (3) initiating and maintaining volunteer behavior depends on matching motives with situations or environments to support their fulfillment; and (4) a significant body of research supports functionalist orientation. In light of these considerations, the literature review will focus on identifying reasons for engaging in volunteer activity.

Motivations among Volunteers

Functionalist Approaches

Smith (1994) reports that the determinants of participation in volunteer activity have been of interest to sociologists and other social scientists for decades because of the effect of volunteerism on the larger society. His research has attempted to identify the motivations and characteristics of those who volunteer. In a review of the literature, he suggested that there are several categories of variables that operate in concert to influence decisions to volunteer. These include contextual variables such as territory or organization, social background, personality, attitudinal, situational, and social participation. He concludes that future studies of volunteerism should involve at least five of these categories and that they should include an international perspective (Smith, 1994).

According to Clary, Snyder, Copeland, and French (1994), volunteerism represents an important method for individuals to contribute to society. Their study focused on promoting regular participation in volunteerism. They point out that scholars from many different disciplines, such as communications and persuasion, human socialization, and society and culture, have addressed the question of volunteer motivations and promoting volunteerism. In this case, they question why those who do not participate choose not to volunteer. They mention that reasons for volunteering tend to be more abstract while reasons for not participating tend to be more concrete. They suggest that addressing these abstract reasons in promoting volunteerism will increase participation (Clary et al., 1994).

Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene (1998) applied functionalist theory to understanding the motivations of volunteerism. A central tenet of functionalist theory is that people can and do repeat actions in meeting different psychological functions, which they apply to volunteer motivations. Through their research, they assembled the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI), a series of six functions proven through factor analysis to be served through volunteering. The functions were labeled Values, Understanding, Social, Career, Protective, and Enhancement. Values was defined as the ability of participants to express values related to altruism and humanitarian concerns through volunteering. Understanding was defined as opportunities for new learning experiences. Social was defined as opportunities to be with friends or engage in an activity favored by significant others. Career was defined as experiences that might benefit the career of the participant. Protective was defined as being ego centered, especially relating to the chance to reduce guilt over being more fortunate than others through volunteer service. Enhancement was defined as positive strivings and personal development (Clary et al., 1998). An adaptation of the Clary et al. (1998) VFI is used in the present study.

In their study on political activity, Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) note that in order to understand why some people volunteer, it is important to understand why others do not. The suggested three possibilities: lack of resources, lack of psychological engagement with politics, or lack of recruitment. They combined these factors into what they labeled as the Civic Voluntarism Model. Because participation can and does take place in the absence of recruitment, resources and engagement were their primary focus.

However, recruitment was thought to be a catalyst for those with the resources and capacity for involvement (Verba et al., 1995).

In their study of behavioral commitment to environmental protection, Manzo and Weinstein (1987) explored factors that produced a significant behavioral commitment to environmental education, and in doing so compared the responses of active and nonactive members of the Sierra Club. They found no differences between the two groups based on age, gender, length of membership, or home ownership. Variables that were most important included the perception of having experienced some type of environmental harm in the past, efficacy of their actions, and the social aspect of the organization (Manzo & Weinstein, 2002).

Hendee and Pitstick (1994) provide support for the growing importance of volunteering. They point to the dramatic growth of environmental organizations in size of membership, staff, and budget. These groups are voluntary associations that provide multiple functions including education of members and the general public, political activities, and organizing volunteer efforts. Although a diverse lot representing many different views, they are reported to have had a profound influence on America's forest policies and the protection of critical habitats and endangered species. This ability to influence public opinion and forest policy through volunteer efforts is emphasized (Hendee & Pitstick, 1994).

Volunteers in Park Management

More specific to the occurrence of volunteering in park management, Silverburg, Ellis, Backman, and Backman (1999) provide a typology of public parks and recreation volunteers that helps to further explain the motives behind the service of the volunteers.

The authors point out that public managers have often been found to lack the understanding and background necessary to effectively manage volunteers. They also discuss the lack of attention that has been given to the challenge of understanding motives of volunteers. Following Clary et al. (1998), the purpose of the study was to identify motivational functions as characteristics of volunteers in park management. Volunteer motives were analyzed through the use of functional analysis and co-production of public services. Functional analysis is a psychological method that examines mental and behavioral functions to understand how organisms adapt to their environment. While the work being performed by different volunteers may be similar, their motives can be entirely different. Volunteers motivated by co-production differ from altruistic volunteers in that they or their family members benefit directly or indirectly from their service. It was proposed that an underlying co-production motive is present in many parks and recreation volunteers.

The study population was made up of over 10,000 volunteers of the Phoenix, Arizona Parks, Recreation, and Library Department. The sample consisted of over 6,000 volunteers, with each district of the Department being represented. A self-administered questionnaire was utilized to collect the data. The study resulted in the identification of six motivational functions characteristic of individual volunteers. These were labeled Values, Understanding, Social, Career, Protective, and Enhancement. In addition, three co-production functions were identified. These were labeled as The Department and Community Need Me, Knowledge of Governmental Operations, and Benefits to People I Know. Co-production is noted as being far more important to agencies than typical volunteering because many programs literally could not be continued without the service

of the “co-producer”. The importance of co-production should not be lost upon state and federal agencies because of their dependence upon these volunteers. In addition, the study provided information that should help recreation and parks develop a better understanding of their volunteers and guide their future planning and recruitment efforts. It was suggested that this information would be particularly useful in identification of potential volunteers and in volunteer job placement.

Silverberg, Marshall, and Ellis (2001) identify job satisfaction of parks and recreation volunteers as a serious concern because it plays a key role in the retention of volunteers and directly affects the success and stability of many programs. Results of their study indicate that volunteer job satisfaction is a function of both job setting and psychological functions met by volunteering. An example given is that coaches in youth sports programs often volunteer so that their children can participate in the program. Study results confirmed that coaches experience high levels of job satisfaction when their children receive benefits for participating. The authors point out that retention of volunteers is crucial to the success and stability of many recreation programs, so it is important that recreation managers work to maintain high levels of volunteer satisfaction. It is suggested that this may be accomplished if management engages in frequent meetings with volunteers to discuss satisfaction and needs as well as ensuring that a match exists between volunteer job settings and their motives and psychological functions. Recognition of satisfaction concerns and setting-function mismatches may help managers minimize morale problems and avoid costly recruitment and training processes.

Silverberg, Ellis, Whitworth, and Kane (2003) expand upon the topic of volunteer job satisfaction through a functionalist approach. Traditional functionalist theory states

that a worker seeking recognition is expected to be satisfied in a work setting where recognition is provided. In other words, since expectations are being met satisfaction should result. The study intended to measure whether the volunteer is actually satisfied through this recognition. The three variables studied were organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and retention. Organizational commitment was defined as an attitude that reflects a desire for a long-term affiliation between an individual and the organization. Organizational commitment involves agreement with the goals and values of the organization, willingness to work towards those goals, and a desire to remain affiliated with the organization. Organizational citizenship behavior was defined as the existence of characteristics such as helping behavior on behalf of or in an effort to improve the organization. Retention was included in the study because the literature positively correlates it with job satisfaction. Implications are that managers should focus more on individual volunteer experiences rather than the work environment to ensure job satisfaction. In the event of dissatisfied volunteers, the nature of the work and the fulfillment of the motives of the individual should be considered.

The motivations of individual volunteers have been emphasized in much of the literature cited. Expanding upon this topic, Martinez and McMullin (2004) surveyed members of the Appalachian Trail Conference (ATC) to identify characteristics and assess motivations that distinguish between active and nonactive members of this nongovernmental organization. The three major questions addressed in the study focused on determining the motivations and characteristics of active nongovernmental organization members; the differences in motivations and characteristics between active and non-active members; and whether this knowledge can be used to better recruit and

retain active members. The ATC, formed in 1925, is a national, nonprofit organization that oversees the management and protection of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. The ATC has a strong history of volunteerism. In fact, the ATC was involved in the construction and maintenance of the Appalachian Trail prior to the federal government becoming involved in its management. In 1996, the ATC reported a membership of over 24,000. Martinez and McMullin defined active members as those who donated time to the ATC while non-active members were defined as those who simply paid their membership fees. Approximately 4,500 of these were categorized as active.

A random sample of 721 active and 900 non-active ATC members was obtained. An identical questionnaire was sent to both active and non-active members. The questionnaire was designed to measure the motivations of both groups. A Likert-type scale was used to measure the importance of the effects of six motivational factors developed through a review of the literature on volunteer motivations. A follow-up postcard and two additional mailings were sent to all non-respondents. In addition, brief phone interviews were conducted with a total of 40 non-respondents to assess non-response bias since the response rates fell below 60%. Completed questionnaires were received from 476 non-active members (52%) and 392 active members (54%). Four motivational factors were identified in the study: Efficacy, Competing Commitments, Social Networks, and Lifestyle Changes. The two groups differed significantly with regard to four of the factors measured that affected their decisions to participate in volunteer activities. Of those, efficacy and competing commitments were determined to be the most important. Efficacy weighed more heavily in decisions to participate for both active and non-active members while competing commitments was more important in the

decisions of non-active members. In essence, both groups felt that making a difference was important in their decision about whether to participate; non-active members were more likely to let concerns about competing commitments prevent them from volunteering. Family commitments were the greatest of the competing commitments mentioned.

The following conclusions were drawn from the study. It is believed that active ATC members are motivated primarily by their perception of efficacy in participating. Demographics and competing commitments were similar between active and non-active members. Finally, supporting the belief in the efficacy of one's actions and providing adequate information about volunteering commitments is crucial for successful volunteering experiences. Requests for people to participate in volunteer activities was noted as especially important, not because they significantly increase the likelihood of volunteering, but because they may provide the means to counteract the concerns of the individual about competing commitments with appeals to efficacy of their actions.

Volunteering as Serious Leisure

Serious leisure is an alternative yet related approach to understanding volunteer motivation that has been introduced by Stebbins (2000, 2005). According to Stebbins (1992, p.3), serious leisure refers to “the systematic pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or volunteer activity that participants find so substantial and interesting that, in the typical case, they launch themselves on a career centered on acquiring and expressing its special skills, knowledge, and experience.” Serious leisure is further defined as captivating its participants with its complexity and challenges (Stebbins, 2001). More broadly, the concept of serious leisure has been employed to understand progression in the

development of leisure careers. It is typically contrasted with casual leisure, which is immediately rewarding short-lived activity built on pleasure. Serious leisure is considered to be more substantial and offers the participant a career in the activity (Jackson & Burton, 1999).

In his research on serious leisure, Stebbins (2000) discusses obligation as an aspect of the leisure experience. While it may seem contradictory, some leisure activities require some amount of obligation on the part of the participant. Individual leisure participants view this obligation and its effects, or lack thereof, on their perceptions of their leisure activities differently. Obligation occurs when people voluntarily do or refrain from doing something because they feel bound to do so because of a promise, convention, or circumstances. The term semi-leisure, which is an activity that begins as leisure but from which a certain amount of obligation develops, is used to describe this phenomenon. Obligation is further defined as being either agreeable or disagreeable. Agreeable obligations result from semi-leisure and serious leisure. Flexible obligation is a necessary trait of serious leisure. In other words, if the current role of the volunteer became disagreeable, he or she could and would abandon it for another more acceptable role. Freedom of choice is very important in determining whether leisure exists in such situations.

Serious leisure is made up of six distinct qualities which are found among all participants (Jackson & Burton, 1999). First is the occasional need to persevere, as in the case of coping with a dangerous situation or overcoming the fear of public speaking. Second is the attempt to find a career in the activity, such as accepting a leadership position on the board of directors of a non-profit volunteer organization. Third involves

making a significant personal effort based upon their specially acquired knowledge, training, and/or skills, such as providing first-person historical re-enactments at a state historical site. Fourth is that a number of rewards occur from participation in the activity. Fifth, participants tend to identify strongly with their pursuits. In other words, they are proud of their involvement in the serious leisure activity, viewing it as substantial and having meaning. Finally, a special social world develops over years of pursuing the serious leisure activity, as may be the case with a long-term park volunteer. Essentially, a lifestyle develops around the activity.

Stebbins (2001) expanded upon the term serious leisure. Serious leisure is described as the steady pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or career volunteer activity that captivates its participants due to the complexity and challenges involved. Serious leisure is described as being profound, long lasting, and based to some extent on knowledge, skill, or experience. It is considered deeply satisfying and contributes to a full existence. Those who pursue these activities often feel as if they are pursuing a career, except for the fact that they are not paid for their efforts. Serious volunteers are said to help others for a variety of reasons, both personal and altruistic. They are said to be different from casual volunteers due to the complexity and challenge of their pursuits. Serious leisure generates many personal rewards while providing some fun and pleasure for participants. The rewards typically outweigh any costs involved. The social world involved is also attractive to many participants, especially those who do not have to work full time and therefore do not have the social interactions typically associated with the work environment. Serious leisure activities are of primary importance to participants.

Stebbins (2005) further examines the topic of serious leisure, in particular the motivation to participate in serious leisure activities involving grassroots associations and volunteer organizations, as well as the lifestyle involved with either. He describes grassroots organizations as being of local origin, autonomous, formal nonprofit organizations operated by volunteers. On the other hand, volunteer organizations are described as those having a significant dependence on volunteers but lacking a focus on serious leisure activity. Participants in such serious leisure activities are said to experience similar rewards, regardless of the activity being pursued. In addition, the desire to achieve the fulfillment of these rewards is said to drive participation in the activity. The meaning of the activity and the motivation for participation are one and the same. Stebbins (2005) identified ten rewards and categorized them as either personal (7) or social (3). They are labeled Personal Enrichment (cherished experiences), Self-actualization (developing skills, abilities, and knowledge); Self-expression (expressing skills, abilities, and knowledge already possessed); Self-image (known to others for being a particular kind of serious leisure participant); Self-gratification (combination of superficial enjoyment and deep satisfaction); Re-creation (regeneration of oneself); Financial Return (profit); Social Attraction (associating with others in the social world of that activity); Group accomplishment (helping or being needed by a group); and Contribution to the Maintenance and Development of the Group (again, the sense of helping or being needed). These rewards were identified through a review of Stebbins' own previous work and through interviews with participants. For the purposes of the current study, these ten rewards were operationalized utilizing a series of statements for each item.

Level of Commitment

Cuskelly, Harrington, and Stebbins (2003) took a serious leisure approach to explore changes in the level of commitment of a group of sport volunteers over time. The study categorized these volunteers as being either marginal or career volunteers based on their reasons for volunteering. Variations in the levels of commitment were related to both the initial decision to volunteer and the subsequent decision (or lack thereof) to continue volunteering. Previous studies of commitment predominantly focused on its occurrence in large, structurally complex organizations with paid employees. This study differed in that the local community sports clubs studied were neither large nor complex, and unlike paid employees the volunteers are not compensated for their services. It was determined that reasons for volunteering and changes in commitments levels are very dynamic by nature and are re-evaluated over time. Commitment is said to be an important construct in understanding volunteering, particularly career volunteering. The study concluded that for some people volunteering is a form of serious leisure, while to others it is a form of obligation. In essence, it is not always possible to neatly compartmentalize volunteers as either career or marginal.

Elder and Youth Volunteers

Stergios and Carruthers (2002/2003) examined the motivations of elder volunteers to volunteer with youth programs. They suggest that volunteer motives may not always occur singularly, but may occur as a compilation of multiple motives. In addition, it is suggested that volunteer motives may lie upon a continuum ranging from altruism to egoism, and may contain elements of both. They point out that the environmental circumstance surrounding decisions to volunteer may play a major role in those

decisions. It was found that the volunteers who participated in the study had many reasons for volunteering. There was strong support in the responses for the functionalist theory espoused by Clary, et al (1998) in all categories except career. The use of these factors to recruit and retain volunteers is emphasized in the discussion. In addition, it is important to match volunteers to assignments that will satisfy one or more of their motivational factors. Finally, the vast majority of these volunteers were asked to volunteer. This is thought to be an important factor in the decision to volunteer.

The literature previously cited has indicated that park management has many needs that are not fulfilled by the managing agencies, and help is certainly needed in many areas. Volunteers often provide assistance in order to fill these gaps. From a research perspective, researchers are beginning to explore and understand the motivational factors associated with volunteering in park management. Much of the attention has been focused on the underlying management issues, the factors that motivate individual volunteers, the occurrence of prosocial behavior, and the existence of serious leisure. Given the increased dependency on volunteers in park management more research is clearly needed.

Sundeen and Raskoff (1994) examine the characteristics of teenage volunteers. They cite the increased attention given this activity by schools, churches, governmental agencies, and other organizations. They point out the significance of this activity because of the large percentage of American youths who participate, but also because of its relevance to national policy discussions about community service and good citizenship. Their study applied variables believed to be indicative of adult participation in volunteerism to youth volunteerism. Their conclusions were that volunteers represent

mainstream society more than nonvolunteers. Higher socioeconomic status higher achievement, living in smaller communities, and the family/school/church environments play large roles in determining youth volunteer participation. They conclude that future studies should distinguish between youth and adult volunteers because of the different concerns and conditions that lead to volunteering activity (Sundeen & Raskoff, 1994).

Characteristics of Volunteers

While national level statistics on volunteering participation vary, a substantial number of volunteers exist in the population. According to Clary et al. (1998), millions of people devote a substantial amount of their time and energy to volunteering in provision of many services. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (2004), almost 65 million Americans volunteered in 2004. This amounts to 28.8% of the civilian population age 16 and over. One-fourth of all men and one-third of all women volunteered. Persons between 35 and 44 years of age were most likely to volunteer. More employed people volunteered than either retired or unemployed. The median annual hours volunteered was 52, with men volunteering 52 hours and women volunteering 50 hours.

An article in Parks and Recreation (2003) presented additional statistical information that helps identify some characteristics of volunteers. About 59 million people participated in volunteer work in 2002. A majority of volunteers were women. Employed persons were more likely to volunteer than unemployed. Most people who volunteered had dependent children. Married people were more likely to volunteer than unmarried. College graduates were four times more likely to volunteer than high school dropouts. People between the ages of their mid-twenties through their early sixties

represented the largest age bracket of volunteers. They were followed by teenagers, those age 65 and over, and those in their early twenties. Volunteers spent a median of 52 hours volunteering in 2002. The most popular places to volunteer were those that focused on religion, education, or youth services (Parks and Recreation, 2003).

Independent Sector (2001) reported that 44% of adults over the age of 21 volunteered with some formal organization in 2000, averaging 24 hours per month. Of those, 63% volunteered on an annual basis. This amounted to an estimated 83.9 million adults volunteering a total of 15.5 billion hours. Women were again found to be more likely to volunteer than men. Interestingly, 60% of respondents utilized the Internet to search for volunteer opportunities.

Independent Sector (1999) conducted a national study to report trends in volunteering and other charitable behavior for the year of 1998. At that time it was reported that 56% of adults aged 18 or over volunteered a total of 19.9 billion hours. It was estimated that 109 million people volunteered during that time period. A higher percentage of women volunteered than men, but men gave slightly more of their time than did women. Those who volunteered only once or who volunteered sporadically accounted for 41% of volunteers. Those who volunteered on a regular basis accounted for 39%. Only 1% of respondents learned about volunteering opportunities via the Internet. Volunteers learned of volunteer opportunities in three ways: being asked by someone, through participation in an organization, and through a family member or relative. They point out the need to assess what retirement will mean to future retirees, and the fact that people are drawn into volunteering at different stages of their lives by different means. The study concludes by suggesting that social entrepreneurship by those in their 40's who

have time and money to invest in a cause may be a possible key to the future of volunteering.

Martinez and McMullin (2004) compared active and inactive members of the ATC. They found that most respondents were full-time employees or retirees, highly educated, and ranged in age from 36-55 years. Most respondents were married. There was not a significant difference based upon gender in ATC participants.

Silverberg, Ellis, Whitworth, and Kane (2002/2003) measured volunteer job satisfaction using a functionalist approach. They found that most respondents were male. They describe the typical respondent as having completed almost three years of college, averaging 57 years of age, retired, and having an average annual income of \$51,000. Further, the typical volunteer donated 36 hours per month.

Finally, Cuskelly, Harrington, and Stebbins (2002/2003) measured changing levels of commitment in volunteers. They found that most respondents were male, had completed post-high school education, and were either married or living with a partner. Further, most were employed outside the home, primarily in white-collar occupations.

Based on this information a possible profile of a typical volunteer might be described as being well-educated, middle-aged, and female. She will most likely be married and will have a relatively high annual household income.

The purpose of this study is to examine volunteer behavior in park management through an examination of key motivational factors and the occurrence of serious leisure. This chapter described the theoretical context of the study and reviewed previous studies of volunteering. In the review of literature, emphasis was given to factors associated with volunteer motives and behavior. From this review, it appears that several demographic

factors are centrally important in understanding volunteer motives and behavior, including age, gender, marital status, and education level. Among motivational factors the efficacy of one's actions and competing commitments have been shown to be important. Research following the functionalist perspective is also important, including Volunteer Function Inventory factors such as Career, Enhancement, Social and others, as well as co-production factors such as The Park Needs Me and others. In pursuing the research objectives, this study will partially replicate studies by Martinez and McMullin (2004) and Silverburg (1999). In addition, this study will serve as an extension by examining for evidence of serious leisure in volunteer motivations. Chapter 3 will describe the methods utilized to conduct the study.

CHAPTER 3 METHODS

This research study examined the key motivational factors of volunteers identified by Martinez and McMullin (2004) and Silverberg (1999). In addition, the study sought for evidence of serious leisure in volunteer motivations as identified by Stebbins (2001). This chapter describes the data and sampling methods, the survey instrument, the survey method, and analysis of the data.

Data and Sampling

Data for this study were obtained from a survey of Florida Park Service (FPS) volunteers listed on a statewide database. This database included information for four of the five FPS districts. The population to be studied included all Florida Park Service volunteers. The sampling frame consisted of names of Florida Park Service volunteers that were provided by the Florida Park Service. Individuals surveyed were selected through systematic random sampling. The sampling interval (nine) was determined by dividing the population (4882) by the desired sample size (540). The 11th name on the list was randomly chosen as the starting point, and every ninth name thereafter was included in the sample.

Survey Design

A modified Dillman (1978) total design method was used in the mailing and distribution of the questionnaire. Potential respondents were mailed a questionnaire along with a cover letter with instructions for completion and a self-addressed stamped

envelope to be sent directly to the researcher. In addition, in the same mailing, each potential respondent received a letter of introduction and support from the Florida Park Service Statewide Volunteer Coordinator. A reminder/thank you postcard was mailed to all potential respondents one week following the initial mailing. Two weeks later, a reminder was sent from the office of the FPS Statewide Volunteer Coordinator to each of the district and park volunteer coordinators asking them to remind all potential respondents of the importance of completing the questionnaire.

Survey Instrument

Data were collected through a mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to measure motivations associated with volunteering, volunteer experience, and demographic characteristics. The survey consisted of three specific areas of concern: 1) motivational factors associated with volunteering, 2) volunteer experience as relate to serious leisure, and 3) characteristics. Demographic information collected included age, gender, income, employment status, education, and race and ethnicity.

Motivational Factors

Motivational factors to be measured were based on a compilation of those indicated by Martinez and McMullin (2004) and Silverberg, Ellis, Backman, and Backman (1999). Each factor had a corresponding set of questions or statements and was measured using a four-point Likert scale to determine the level of importance or agreement with each statement. The entire list of statements are included as part of the survey instrument in Appendix A.

Silverberg (1999) utilized the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al., (1998) to measure volunteer motivations. The VFI focused on the reasons,

purposes, plans, and goals underlying the decision to volunteer. It was suggested that acts of volunteerism that appear to be quite similar on the surface might stem from entirely different motivations. In addition, the functions served by volunteerism become evident through the process of volunteering. The authors identified the six factors labeled Career, Enhancement, Protective, Understanding, Social, and Values as being those that evidence being served by volunteering. The reliability of these functions was confirmed by Silverberg et al., (1999).

In the same study, Silverberg also measured co-production of public services as a motivation for volunteering. Three factors were identified: The Department and Community Need Me; Knowledge of Governmental Operations; and Benefits to People I Know. Co-production motives are considered to be present among individuals who provide voluntary services that also serve to directly or indirectly benefit themselves and family members. These motivations are in contrast to altruistic motivations that were the focus of previous literature, the majority of which focused around the provision of law enforcement and public safety in communities (Silverberg et al., 1999).

All of these factors were modified for use in the current study to determine motivational factors of volunteers. Survey respondents were asked to indicate the level of importance of 24 statements such as 1) Volunteering can help me "get my foot in the door" at a park where I would like to work, 2) I volunteer because my friends volunteer, and 3) I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself. A four point scale anchored by 4 (Extremely Important/Accurate for You) and 1 (Not at all Important/Not accurate for You) was the response format. The response format followed Silverberg et al (1999).

A score was computed for each factor by summing the items associated with each of the factors identified by Silverberg et al. (1999).

Measures were also derived from Martinez and McMullin's (2004) study of volunteering in nongovernmental organizations. They measured factors that affected decisions to volunteer in a non-governmental organization, and how such factors varied between active and inactive volunteers. Using factor analysis, they identified the following factors as being important in decisions to volunteer: Efficacy, Competing Commitments, Social Networks, Lifestyle Changes, and Personal Growth. Of these, Efficacy and Competing Commitments were found to be the most relevant factors. Questionnaire items representing these two factors were used in the current study. Efficacy and Competing Commitments items were modified for use in the current study to determine motivational factors of volunteers. Survey respondents were asked to indicate the level of agreement with eight statements such as 1) Through my service as a volunteer I am able to help protect the park and 2) I would volunteer more but I do not have time. The responses were coded as follows: Strongly Agree (+2), Agree (+1), No Opinion (0), Disagree (-1), and Strongly Disagree (-2). As described above for VFI and co-production, these factors were also scored using a summated scale.

Serious Leisure

Rewards associated with serious leisure are based on qualitative research conducted by Stebbins (2005). They were designed to represent the ten rewards that he suggested are associated with serious leisure among members of voluntary membership groups. All of these factors were modified for use in the current study to determine motivational factors of volunteers. Survey respondents were asked to indicate the level of

importance of 28 statements such as 1) Fond memories of my experience as a volunteer, 2) Personal growth, and 3) Giving of myself to a group effort. The responses were coded as 1) Not important, 2) Somewhat Important, 3) Important, and 4) Very Important. Summated scales were derived from factors identified with the aid of a factor analysis of the 28 statements. The outcome of this analysis is reported in Chapter Four.

Participation level associated with volunteering was measured by asking respondents to indicate the number of volunteer hours donated annually using the following responses: 0 hours, 1 -100 hours, 101 -300 hours, 301 - 500 hours, 501 – 1000 hours, 1000 – 1500 hours, and 1501 hours or more. In order to examine the relationship between participation and motivational factors, responses were re-coded as “Low” (i.e., 0-100 hours, “Moderate” (101- 500 hours) and “High” (more than 500 hours). The cut points for creating the low, moderate, and high groups were determined after observing the frequency distribution of the number of volunteer hours. Regarding other demographic variables, age, number of years of service as a volunteer, zip code, and occupation were measured using open-ended questions. Age was recoded into three categories for further analysis: up to 35, 36-55, and over 55. Education was measured by asking respondents to indicate the highest level of education that they had completed from the following choices: less than high school, high school/ged, some college, associate degree, college (4-year) degree, master degree, professional degree, and other. Income was measured by asking respondent to choose from the following categories: less than \$15,000; \$15,000 - \$19,999; \$20,000 - \$24,999; \$25,000 - \$34,999; \$35,000 - \$49,999; \$50,000 – \$74,999; and \$75,000 and above. To simplify crosstabulations,

education was recoded as “noncollege graduate” and “college graduate”. Income was recoded as income “below \$50,000” and “\$50,000 and above”.

Marital status was measured by asking respondents to choose from the following choices: never married, married, separated, divorced, and widowed. It should be noted that the choice labeled divorced was accidentally included twice. In the data analysis, all answers labeled divorced were reported together. Gender was determined by asking respondents to select either male or female. Family size was measured by asking respondents to choose from the following: 1 member, 2 members, 3 members, 4 members, and 5 or more members. Membership in other organizations and CSO membership status were measured by asking respondents to choose between yes and no. Employment status was measured by asking respondents to choose from the following categories: employed full time, employed part-time, unemployed but not retired, retired, and other (please specify). Ethnic and racial background were measured by two separate items. The first asked whether the respondent was of Spanish, Latino, or Hispanic background. A second item measuring racial background asked respondents to choose from: American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, or Other (please specify). Finally, respondents were asked how satisfying their volunteer experience had been so far on a scale of one to four as follows: (4)very satisfying, (3)satisfying, (2)somewhat satisfying, or (1)not satisfying.

Statistical Analysis

Frequencies and percentages were used to analyze responses to all questionnaire items reported used in the study. Because VFI and co-production items were confirmed

through factor analysis in previous studies by Clary et al. (1998), Silverberg et al. (1999) measured the reliability of each factor. In addition, Efficacy and Competing Commitment items were factor analyzed by Martinez and McMullin (2004). Likewise, the present study measures the reliability of each factor. Cronbach's alpha measurements were determined for each motivational factor. In the present study, factors with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.50 or higher were used in subsequent analyses (Nunally, 1967). Given that the serious leisure measures were being used for the first time, the items were factor analyzed using varimax rotation. Factors with eigen values of one or higher were retained for subsequent analyses and individual items with factor loadings of .40 or higher were retained for subsequent analyses (Kim & Mueller, 1978).

Treatment of Data

The following section indicates the methods of analysis for each research question.

* What role do efficacy and competing commitments play in decisions to volunteer? The importance of efficacy and competing commitments was assessed using item means. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of efficacy and competing commitments measures.

* What are the key factors that motivate individuals to volunteer? The importance of VFI and Co-production items was assessed using item means. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of VFI and Co-production measures.

* Are rewards associated with serious leisure present in volunteering? Exploratory factor analysis using varimax rotation was conducted to determine whether the serious leisure items represented common factors. The importance of serious leisure rewards

factors was assessed using item means. The reliability of measures based on serious leisure factors was assessed by Cronbach's alpha.

* What is the relationship between motivational factors and level of participation?

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of volunteer participation. Motivational factors served as independent variables and level of participation served as the dependent variable.

* What is the relationship between volunteer characteristics and level of participation? In order to determine the relationship between demographic characteristics and level of participation, these items were examined using chi-squared (χ^2) tests.

Demographic characteristics served as independent variables and level of participation served as the dependent variable.

In summary, the relative importance of the various motivations associated with volunteering were assessed in terms of item mean values. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of volunteer participation. The relationship between demographic characteristics and level of participation was examined using chi-squared (χ^2) tests. Chapter 4 presents the outcomes of these statistical methods.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

This research study examined the key motivational factors of volunteers identified by Martinez and McMullin (2004) and Silverberg (1999). In addition, the study explored evidence of serious leisure in volunteer motivations as identified by Stebbins (2001). The specific objectives of the study were:

- * Examine key motivational factors of volunteers in park management.
- * Determine whether elements of serious leisure exist in park volunteerism.
- * Examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of participation in volunteer activities.
- * Examine the association between demographic characteristics of volunteers and level of participation in volunteer activities.

This study addressed the need for more research by examining the following research questions concerning FPS volunteers:

- * What role do efficacy and competing commitments play in decisions to volunteer?
- * What are the key factors that motivate individuals to volunteer?
- * Are rewards associated with serious leisure present in volunteering?
- * What is the relationship between motivational factors and level of participation?
- * What is the relationship between volunteer characteristics and level of participation?

This chapter provides an overview of response patterns (i.e., frequencies and percentages) to questions used in the study and it reports the results of statistical analyses used to address the study objectives.

Response Rate and Nonresponse Bias

The original sample consisted of 540 possible respondents. Completed questionnaires were received from 235 FPS volunteers. A total of 61 questionnaires were returned marked as undeliverable. The formula used to calculate the response rate was to subtract the number of undeliverable questionnaires (61) from the original sample (540): $540 - 61 = 379$. The total number of responses received (235) is then divided by 379 and computed as a percentage value: $235/379 = .4906 * 100 = 49.1\%$. It is believed that this low response rate occurred due to the survey being conducted during the summer, a time when many people, including volunteers, vacate the state of Florida for cooler regions. In addition, a large number (61, or 11%) of the questionnaires were returned due to incorrect addresses.

Sample Characteristics

Organizational Characteristics

The mean period of time that participants reported volunteering was eight years and the vast majority (69%) volunteered between one and 300 hours per year. The majority of respondents were not CSO members (64%), but many did volunteer for other organizations (45%). Most respondents reported that their volunteer experience had been very satisfying (60%) (Table 1).

Demographic Characteristics

Most respondents (95%) were white and relatively well educated, with 78% of respondents having at least some college background. Respondents ranged from 14 to 88 years of age, with women slightly outnumbering men (52% vs. 48%, respectively). Most respondents (69%) were married. Most families (nearly 56%) consisted of two people and had an income range from \$25,000 to \$34,999 (Table 1).

Motivational Factor Response Patterns

This section will provide general response patterns for each motivational domain included in the study. These include Efficacy and Competing Commitments, VFI and Co-production, and Serious Leisure Rewards. Frequencies and percentages for the items are shown in Tables 2 – 4.

Efficacy and Competing Commitments

Efficacy appeared to be very important to the majority of respondents, while the competing commitments were as important (Table 2). Respondents tended to strongly agree that their volunteer service helps protect park resources, and helps ensure the existence of park resources. Across efficacy statements, more than two-thirds of respondents agreed with such statements. In contrast, among competing commitments, there was more disagreement. Respondents tended to disagree that having enough money, work commitment, and family commitments affected their volunteering. On the other hand, about 66% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they “would volunteer more but do not have enough time”.

VFI and Co-production

Overall, the majority (61%) of respondents volunteer because it was very important to them to help others and because they had a genuine concern for their volunteer group (47% indicating very important) (Table 3). Most felt it was very important to do something for a cause that was important to them (59%) and to contribute to the community (61%). Helping parks offer high quality programs (45%) was very important among the respondents. Finally, contributing to the success of the volunteer program (50%) and taking the role of a responsible citizen (46%) were important motivations for volunteering. In terms of scale mean rankings (Table 6), the five top ranked factors were values (9.89), The Department Needs Me (9.09), Understanding (8.17), Knowledge of Park Operations (6.58), and Enhancement (5.66).

Serious Leisure Rewards

Frequencies and percentages for serious leisure items are shown in Table 4. Most (53%) respondents felt it was very important to contribute to the well-being of the park. Contributing to the accomplishments of the park was also very important to many (51%) respondents. In addition, many (44%) felt it was very important to be able to give freely to help the park. Other noteworthy rewards were having fond memories, learning something new, being able to share knowledge, and being a valued member of the park volunteer staff. About one-third of respondents rated each of these as very important. In terms of scale mean rankings, the five top ranked factors were Group Accomplishments (8.85), Self-gratification (8.81), Contributing to

the Maintenance and Development of the Group (8.79), Self-expression (8.62), and Self-actualization (8.05).

Reliability of Efficacy and Competing Commitments Measures

In the study by Martinez and McMullin (2004), a number of scales were identified that determined willingness to volunteer. Of these, Efficacy and Competing Commitments were the most influential (Table 5). In the present study, these two scales were analyzed for alpha reliability. Each scale was comprised of four items. The number of cases used for these analyses was 226 for Efficacy and 217 for Competing Commitments. As shown in Table 5, alpha coefficients ranged from .62 for Competing Commitments to .83 for Efficacy. The item means were 1.08 for Efficacy and -0.08 for Competing Commitments. These results lead to the conclusion that these two factors found in Martinez and McMullin's (2004) study are reliable for this sample of FPS volunteers, with Efficacy being substantially more important based on item means.

Reliability of VFI and Co-production Measures

As pointed out by Silverberg (1999), the Volunteer Function Inventory had been subjected to empirical testing in six different studies (Clary, et al., 1998). For that reason Silverberg did not conduct another factor analysis. Because of the previous reliability of the VFI, this study included a check of alpha reliability that was conducted on the scales to measure each of the six previously determined VFI functions, as well as the three co-production functions. Alpha reliability coefficients were calculated on those scales. In the present study, five of the six VFI scales and one of the three co-production scales were comprised of three items. The other VFI

scale and the two co-production scales were comprised of two items each. The number of cases used for these analyses ranged from 206 to 219. As shown in Table 6, alpha coefficients for VFI scales ranged from a low of .54 for Career to a high of .79 for Understanding. Alpha coefficients for co-production scales ranged from a low of .39 for Benefits to People I Know to a high of .81 for The Park Needs Me. Based on item means, the most important VFI item was Values (3.30), followed by Enhancement (2.83), Understanding (2.72), Social (1.77), Protective (1.73), and Career (1.43). Based on item means, the most important Co-production item was Knowledge of Park Operations (3.29), followed by The Department Needs Me (3.03) and Benefits to People I Know (1.85). Based on these results, the conclusion is that the VFI and co-production scales, except for Benefits to People I Know, identified with other populations, are reliable for this sample of FPS volunteers.

Serious Leisure

Serious leisure questions were developed based on the work of Stebbins (2005). Scales of three items each were developed for nine of the ten rewards identified by Stebbins. A single item was developed for the tenth variable identified by Stebbins. The number of cases analyzed for each item ranged from 206 to 216. The alpha coefficients for Serious Leisure scales ranged from a low of .72 for Contribute to the Maintenance and Development of the Group to a high of .87 for Social Attraction. These results lead to the conclusion that the factors identified in the first nine scales are reliable for this population of FPS volunteers. Alpha reliability for the single item developed for the tenth reward was unable to be determined.

In addition, a factor analysis was conducted to determine whether the scaled items represent common factors. The results would indicate the usefulness of these items as a measure of volunteer motivations. Using a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation, four factors were identified. A scree plot was used to make the final determination of four factors. As shown in Table 7, the factors were labeled as: Personal Enjoyment (Factor 1), Social Interaction (Factor 2), Giving (Factor 3) and Sharing Knowledge (Factor 4). The first factor included strongly loaded (>0.40) items such as “Mental refreshment through volunteer activities, Having opportunities to rejuvenate myself, and Participating in activities that are deeply fulfilling.” The second factor included items such as “Social involvement with others, Social involvement with other volunteers, and Meeting new people through volunteer activities.” The third factor included items such as “Contributing to the accomplishments of the park, Contributing to the well being of the park, and Being able to give freely to the park.” The fourth included items expressing rewards received through sharing knowledge. These included items such as “Use my knowledge from other jobs or experience, Being able to share my knowledge with others, Reaching my potential, and Being creative in my volunteer activities”. These items appeared to exhibit acceptable face validity for the purposes of this study.

Relationship between Motivational Factors and Volunteer Participation

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of volunteer participation. As shown in Table 8, statistically significant relationships were observed between level of participation and 9 of the motivational factors. Significant differences were associated with

Efficacy, and among VFI factors, Protective, Enhancement, and Understanding. The only co-production factor significantly associated with volunteer participation was “The department needs me.” All four serious leisure rewards differed across participation levels. A Student-Newman-Keuls post-hoc test was conducted to determine where differences occurred among factors. Generally, motivational scores increased as levels of participation increased. More specifically, as shown in Table 8, two patterns resulted for these factors. In the first pattern, low and moderate level of participation categories were similar while high level of participations categories were statistically significantly different. Efficacy, Protective, Enhancement, Understanding, The Department Needs Me, and Personal fell into this pattern. For example, the high participation group exhibited a mean score of 5.71, while the low and moderate participation means were 3.88 and 4.37 respectively. In the second pattern, there are significant differences between all three levels of participation. Social Interactions, Giving, and Sharing Knowledge and Growth fell into this pattern. The overall pattern of results suggests that the importance attached to several motivational factors described above increases with increasing levels of participation.

Relationship between Volunteer Characteristics and Volunteer Participation

In order to determine the relationship between demographic characteristics and level of participation, these items were examined using chi-squared (χ^2) tests. As shown in Table 9, these tests found significant associations between income and participation ($\chi^2=33.62$, $p=0.000$). Respondents with annual incomes below \$50,000 were more likely to exhibit moderate (301 – 500 hours) or high participation (500 hours and above). Respondents with incomes above \$50,000 were more likely to

exhibit low participation. There was also a significant association between education and volunteer participation ($\chi^2=76.43$, $p=0.000$). Respondents with college degrees reported greater numbers of volunteer hours. Family status was also significantly associated with level of volunteer participation ($\chi^2=21.28$, $p=0.046$), as were marital status ($\chi^2=19.36$, $p=.080$) and employment status ($\chi^2=28.42$, $p=.000$). There were no statistically significant associations between level of participation and age or gender. These results suggest that education level, income level, family size, marital status, and employment status are key demographic indicators of volunteer participation in this study.

This chapter presented the results of this study on Florida Park Service volunteers. Chapter 5 presents discussion and management implications of these results.

Table 1
Organizational and demographic characteristics of FPS volunteers

Organizational Characteristics		<u>Total</u>
Mean length of service (years)		6.4
Total CSO members		84
Total who volunteer with other organizations		105
Annual hours donated:	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
0-100 (Low)	41.1	93
101-500 (Moderate)	48.3	109
501 and above	10.7	24
Satisfaction with volunteer experience:		
somewhat satisfying	8.5	19
satisfying	31.3	70
very satisfying	60.3	135
 Demographic Characteristics		
Highest education level completed:		
less than high school	1.3	3
high school/ged	21.0	48
some college	26.2	60
associates	6.1	14
4year degree	21.4	76
masters degree	13.5	31
professional	5.2	12
doctorate	3.5	8
other	1.7	4
Family size:		
1 member	21.0	48
2 members	55.9	128
3 members	7.4	17
4 members	9.2	21
5 or more members	6.6	15
Age (years):		
Under 25	3.5	8
26-35	2.1	5
36-45	6.6	15
46-55	14.5	33
56-65	30.4	69
66-75	30.3	69
76 or older	12.2	28
Gender:		
male	48.0	110
female	52.0	119
Marital status:		
never married	11.0	25
married	69.3	158
divorced	10.9	25
widowed	8.8	20
Income level:		
less than \$15,000	4.3	9
\$15,000 to \$19,999	7.2	15
\$20,000 to \$24,999	10.1	21
\$25,000 to \$34,999	19.3	40
\$35,000 to \$49,999	17.4	36
\$50,000 to \$74,999	15.9	33
\$75,000 or above	25.6	53
Spanish/Hispanic/Latino volunteers:		
Yes	4.0	9
No	96.0	218
Racial category:		
American Indian/Alaska native	2.2	5
Asian	0.4	1
Black or African American	0.4	1
White	95.1	214
other	1.8	4

Note: Due to rounding, percentages for variables may not sum to 100.

Table 2
Frequencies and percentages for efficacy and competing commitments

Statement	Scale:	SD %	D %	NO/NA %	A %	SA %	Overall Mean
<u>Efficacy</u>							
Through my service as a volunteer:							
I am able to help protect the park.		.9(2)	3.5(8)	16.6(38)	49.1(111)	29.6(67)	1.03
I am able to ensure the existence of the park for future generations.		0(0)	2.7(6)	9.7(22)	50.9(115)	36.7(83)	1.22
I can ensure the future of the park for my enjoyment.		.9(2)	1.3(3)	17.3(39)	50.0(113)	30.5(69)	1.08
I am able to contribute to the management of natural resources.		.9(2)	2.2(5)	19.5(44)	50.4(114)	27.0(61)	1.00
<u>Competing Commitments</u>							
I would volunteer more but:							
I do not have enough time.		2.3(5)	13.2(29)	19.5(43)	45.5(100)	19.5(43)	.67
I do not have enough money.		19.8(44)	30.6(68)	36.0(80)	9.9(22)	3.6(2)	-0.53
I have too many family commitments.		9.9(22)	31.8(71)	29.1(65)	24.2(54)	4.9(11)	-0.17
I have to spend too much time at work.		17.2(38)	24.0(53)	36.2(80)	17.2(38)	5.4(12)	-0.30

Note: Item frequencies are in parentheses.

SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, NO/NA=No opinion/Not applicable, A=Agree, and SA=Strongly Agree.

Table 3
Frequencies and percentages for VFI and co-production

Statement	Scale:	1	2	3	4	Overall Mean
		%	%	%	%	
1) Volunteering can help me "get my foot in the door" at a park where I would like to work		69.4(150)	14.4(31)	7.4(16)	8.8(19)	1.56
2) I volunteer because my friends volunteer		66.0(140)	20.8(44)	9.4(20)	3.8(8)	1.51
3) People I'm close to want me to volunteer		68.1(145)	18.8(40)	8.0(17)	5.2(11)	1.50
4) I volunteer because a family member benefits from my service to the park		75.9(161)	12.7(27)	4.2(9)	7.1(15)	1.42
5) No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it		36.6(78)	23.0(49)	23.5(50)	16.9(36)	2.21
6) I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving		9.1(20)	12.3(27)	31.5(69)	47.0(103)	3.16
7) I volunteer because I directly benefit from the service that I help provide		40.3(87)	16.7(36)	16.7(36)	26.4(57)	2.29
8) Doing volunteer work relieves me of the guilt of being more fortunate than others		71.1(150)	17.1(36)	8.1(17)	3.8(8)	1.45
9) I volunteer because it helps the park offer more programs		18.1(39)	16.2(35)	27.8(60)	38.0(82)	2.86
10) Volunteering allows me to explore different career options		72.8(155)	13.6(29)	8.0(17)	5.6(12)	1.46
11) I feel it is important to help others		5.9(13)	10.0(22)	22.3(49)	61.8(136)	3.40
12) Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems		66.2(139)	17.1(36)	8.1(17)	8.6(18)	1.59
13) Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession		82.1(174)	11.8(25)	4.2(9)	1.9(4)	1.26
14) I can do something for a cause that is important to me		7.8(17)	6.4(14)	26.0(57)	59.8(131)	3.38
15) Volunteering makes me feel better about myself		12.7(28)	15.4(34)	30.3(67)	41.6(92)	3.01
16) I volunteer because it enables me to contribute something to my community		4.5(10)	8.6(19)	25.7(57)	61.3(136)	3.44
17) Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things		12.9(28)	18.9(41)	31.8(69)	36.4(79)	2.92
18) Volunteering is a way to make new friends		17.1(37)	26.4(57)	28.7(62)	27.8(60)	2.67
19) I can explore my own strengths		29.0(62)	24.8(53)	22.0(47)	24.3(52)	2.42
20) I can learn more about the cause for which I am working		16.7(36)	17.2(37)	27.4(59)	38.6(83)	2.88
21) I volunteer because it helps the park offer higher-quality programs		13.3(29)	13.8(30)	27.5(60)	45.4(99)	3.05
22) People I know share an interest in community service		26.5(57)	30.2(65)	24.7(53)	18.6(40)	2.35
23) My volunteering contributes to the success of the program for which I volunteer		6.4(14)	14.5(32)	28.6(63)	50.5(111)	3.23
24) I volunteer because volunteering is the responsibility of a good citizen		9.0(20)	14.9(33)	29.4(65)	46.6(103)	3.14

Note: Item frequencies are in parentheses.

1=Not Important 2=Somewhat Important 3=Important 4=Very Important

Table 4
Frequencies and percentages for serious leisure

Statement	Scale:	1	2	3	4	Overall Mean
		%	%	%	%	
1) Fond memories of my experience as a volunteer		13.8(30)	20.3(44)	26.3(57)	36.6(86)	2.92
2) Learning something new		5.5(12)	20.5(45)	36.8(81)	37.3(82)	3.06
3) Being able to share my knowledge with others		7.0(15)	22.4(48)	32.2(69)	38.3(82)	3.02
4) Being known as a committed volunteer by my community		41.3(90)	28.4(62)	15.6(34)	14.7(32)	2.04
5) Participating in volunteer activities that are deeply fulfilling		10.6(23)	21.2(46)	33.2(72)	35.0(76)	2.93
6) Having opportunities to rejuvenate myself		23.9(51)	26.8(57)	24.4(52)	24.9(53)	2.50
7) Personal financial benefit (where applicable)		82.4(168)	10.3(21)	3.9(8)	3.4(7)	1.28
8) Social involvement with other volunteers		17.0(37)	31.7(69)	34.9(76)	16.5(36)	2.51
9) Contributing to the accomplishments of the park		4.1(9)	11.3(25)	33.0(73)	51.6(114)	3.32
10) Contributing to the well-being of the park		2.7(6)	8.6(19)	35.1(78)	53.6(119)	3.40
11) Opportunities to become a better person		19.1(41)	20.9(45)	29.3(63)	30.7(66)	2.72
12) Developing a new skill		22.1(48)	27.2(59)	24.0(52)	26.7(58)	2.55
13) Being creative in my volunteer activities		15.9(34)	22.0(47)	34.6(74)	27.6(59)	2.74
14) Being known by other volunteers		36.2(79)	33.5(73)	17.9(39)	12.4(27)	2.96
15) Participating in volunteer activities that are deeply satisfying		10.0(22)	21.4(47)	32.3(71)	36.4(80)	2.95
16) Mental refreshment through my activities		15.0(32)	21.0(45)	35.5(76)	28.5(61)	2.78
17) Meeting new people through volunteer activities		15.6(34)	26.6(58)	31.2(68)	26.6(58)	2.69
18) Being a valued member of the park volunteer staff		16.3(36)	22.2(49)	24.4(54)	37.1(82)	2.82
19) Contributing to the planning of volunteer activities		33.6(73)	27.2(59)	18.9(41)	20.3(44)	2.26
20) Personal growth		22.1(48)	29.5(64)	22.6(49)	25.8(56)	2.52
21) Reaching my full potential		27.8(60)	20.8(45)	27.8(60)	23.6(51)	2.47
22) Use my knowledge from other jobs or experiences		13.2(29)	18.7(41)	32.9(72)	35.2(77)	2.90
23) Being known by park staff as a committed volunteer		23.6(50)	23.1(49)	22.2(47)	31.1(66)	2.61
24) Participating in volunteer activities that give personal enjoyment		8.5(19)	22.0(49)	34.1(76)	35.4(79)	2.96
25) Change in my routine through volunteer activities		19.0(41)	31.5(68)	25.9(56)	23.6(51)	2.54
26) Participating in volunteer projects with other members.		17.4(38)	27.5(60)	34.4(75)	20.6(45)	2.58
27) Giving of myself to a group effort		15.0(33)	22.7(50)	33.2(73)	29.1(64)	2.76
28) Being able to give freely to help the park		6.7(15)	16.1(36)	32.7(73)	44.4(99)	3.15

Note: Item frequencies are in parentheses.

1=Not Important 2=Somewhat Important 3=Important 4=Very Important

Table 5
Descriptive statistics for efficacy and competing commitments

Scale	N Cases	Scale Mean	Scale SD	Item Mean	N Items	Alpha
Efficacy	226	4.33	2.56	1.08	4	.83
Competing Commitments	217	-0.35	2.88	-0.08	4	.62

Note: Items were measured using a 5-point agreement scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

Table 6
Descriptive statistics for VFI and co-production scales

Scale	N Cases	Scale Mean	Scale SD	Item Mean	N Items	Alpha
Protective	206	5.17	2.17	1.73	3	.63
Values	213	9.89	2.13	3.30	3	.64
Career	210	4.27	1.80	1.43	3	.54
Social	208	5.30	2.03	1.77	3	.60
Understanding	209	8.17	2.76	2.72	3	.79
Enhancement	215	5.66	1.75	2.83	2	.55
The Department Needs Me	211	9.09	2.66	3.03	3	.81
Knowledge of Park Operations	219	6.58	1.62	3.29	2	.73
Benefits to People I Know	210	3.71	1.70	1.85	2	.39

Note: Items were measured using a 4-point importance/accuracy (I/A) scale ranging from Extremely I/A (4) to Not At All I/A (1).

Table 7
Factor analysis of serious leisure rewards

Variable	Factor 1 Personal	Factor 2 Social Interactions	Factor 3 Giving	Factor 4 Sharing Knowledge & Growth
Mental refreshment thru my activities	.779			
Having opps to rejuvenate myself	.756			
Participating in vol activities that are deeply fulfilling	.666			
Participating in volunteer activities that are deeply satisfying	.661			
Opportunities to become a better person	.609			
Developing a new skill	.561			
Learning something new	.487			
Participating in volunteer activities that give personal enjoyment	.362			
Social involvement with other volunteers		.812		
Participating in volunteer projects with other members		.743		
Meeting new people through volunteer activities		.676		
Giving of myself to a group effort		.515		
Change in my routine through volunteer activities		.472		
Being a valued member of the park volunteer staff		.441		
Personal financial benefit (where applicable)		.405		
Being known by other volunteers		.337		
Contributing to the well-being of the park			.852	
Contributing to the accomplishments of the park			.824	
Being able to give freely to help the park			.643	
Being known by park staff as a committed volunteer			.364	
Being known as a committed volunteer by my community			.190	
Use my knowledge from other jobs or experiences				.796
Being able to share my knowledge with others				.658
Reaching my full potential				.597
Personal growth				.593
Being creative in my volunteer activities				.567
Fond memories of my volunteer experiences				.382
Contributing to the planning of volunteer activities				.363
Number of Items	8	8	5	7
Eigenvalue	12.98	2.02	1.31	1.26
Percentage of explained variance	46.17	7.22	4.69	4.50
Cumulative variance explained	46.17	53.39	58.08	62.57
Cronbach alpha	.898	.872	.819	.881

Note: Analysis used varimax rotation of factors.

Table 8
Analysis of variance results comparing motivational factors and level of participation

<u>Motivational Factors</u>	<u>Participation Groups</u>			<u>F-Value</u>	<u>P-Value</u>
	<u>Low</u> (N=174)	<u>Mod</u> (N=174)	<u>High</u> (N=174)		
Efficacy and Competing Commitments					
Efficacy	3.885 ^a	4.376 ^a	5.708 ^b	5.04	.007
Competing Commitments	-1.262 ^a	-0.520 ^a	0.174 ^b	2.75	.066
VFI					
Career	3.915 ^a	4.484 ^a	4.609 ^a	2.74	.067
Social	5.217 ^a	5.259 ^a	5.367 ^a	0.09	.918
Protective	4.747 ^a	5.181 ^a	6.681 ^b	7.36	.001
Values	9.558 ^a	10.051 ^a	10.682 ^b	2.88	.058
Enhancement	5.412 ^a	5.584 ^a	6.783 ^b	5.898	.003
Understanding	7.667 ^a	8.313 ^a	9.652 ^b	5.033	.007
Co-production					
The department needs me	8.435 ^a	9.122 ^a	11.130 ^b	10.146	.000
Knowledge of park operations	6.425 ^a	6.606 ^a	7.000 ^a	1.168	.313
Serious Leisure					
Personal	15.298 ^a	16.798 ^a	19.818 ^b	8.31	.000
Social Interactions	13.827 ^a	16.454 ^b	19.435 ^c	15.27	.000
Giving	9.131 ^a	10.094 ^b	11.087 ^c	8.69	.000
Sharing Knowledge and Growth	12.138 ^a	14.103 ^b	16.650 ^c	11.80	.000

Note: Means with different superscripts are significantly different based on Student-Newman-Keuls.
For participation, Low= 0-100 hours, Mod= 101-500 hours, and High= 501+ hours.

Table 9

 Relationship between level of participation and demographic characteristics

Demographic	Level of Participation (%)			Chi-square	P-value
	Low	Mod	High		
Gender					
Male	17.9	23.6	6.1	3.02	.389
Female	21.8	24.0	4.4		
Age (years)					
Up to 35	3.6	2.3	0.0	5.68	.224
36-55	9.9	9.9	1.4		
56 and up	27.0	36.5	9.5		
Income Level					
Below \$50,000	14.0	27.7	7.7	33.62	.000
Above \$50,000	21.7	13.2	1.7		
Education Level					
No college	4.7	13.6	3.0	76.43	.000
Yes college	34.0	32.8	7.2		
Marital Status					
Never Married	7.5	3.5	0	19.36	.080
Married	26.3	32.9	8.8		
Widowed	2.6	2.8	0.4		
Divorced	3.5	5.7	1.3		
Family Size					
1 member	8.7	10.0	1.3	21.28	.046
2 members	21.4	27.5	5.7		
3 members	2.6	4.8	0		
4 members	4.4	3.9	0.9		
5 members	2.6	1.3	2.6		
Employment Status					
Employed Full Time	14.8	7.2	0.9	28.42	.000
Employed Part Time	2.7	4.9	0.0		
Unemployed but not Retired	0.0	1.8	0.0		
Retired	18.4	31.8	9.4		
Other	4.5	3.1	0.4		
CSO Membership					
Yes	12.1	20.6	4.0	3.78	.286
No	27.8	26.9	6.7		
Other Memberships					
Yes	18.1	23.3	3.5	2.36	.502
No	21.6	24.2	7.0		

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This research study examined the key motivational factors of volunteers identified by Martinez and McMullin (2004) and Silverberg (1999) and explored evidence of serious leisure in volunteer motivations as identified by Stebbins (2001). This chapter provides a discussion of the results of the study based upon the study objectives. Implications for future research and management are also discussed.

Summary of Results

Organizational and Demographic Characteristics

What are the characteristics of FPS volunteers? The demographic analysis revealed that most FPS volunteers contribute from one to 300 hours per year. This is a significant donation of time. Most FPS volunteers have attained at least a high school education and some college. Interestingly, only slightly fewer have attained a bachelor's degree or master's degree. The typical family of FPS volunteers consists of two people, with most volunteers being married. Most FPS volunteers are age 46 and up, with a significant majority being retirees age 56 and up. More females volunteer than males. Most FPS volunteers have incomes of \$25,000 or higher. Of these, most have incomes of \$75,000 or higher. An overwhelming majority of FPS volunteers are white, with other racial categories minimally represented. Parks could benefit by expanding the scope of their recruitment programs to encourage people of other racial backgrounds to participate. Most FPS volunteers are satisfied or very satisfied with their volunteer duties.

Motivational Factors and Volunteer Behavior

What role do efficacy and competing commitments play in decisions to volunteer in the FPS? Efficacy appears to play a significant role in decisions to volunteer. Most FPS volunteers believe that their efforts provide protection for the park, ensure the existence of the park for both their own enjoyment and for future generations, and contribute to the management of natural resources. Park management should capitalize upon these beliefs when recruiting volunteers. Development of specific volunteer positions allowing achievement of these ideals may lead to even greater job satisfaction and therefore greater retention of volunteers.

Competing commitments appear to play a lesser role in decisions to volunteer for FPS volunteers. Most FPS volunteers agree that time constraints affect their decisions to volunteer. However, neither financial constraints, family constraints, nor career constraints significantly affect those decisions. Perhaps the age and employment/retirement status of FPS volunteers lessen the impact of these constraints.

What are the key factors that motivate individuals to volunteer in the FPS? The VFI items that were most important in decisions to volunteer included those labeled Values, Enhancement, and Understanding. These factors include such statements as helping others, doing something for a cause, increasing knowledge of self, making new friends, and feeling better about oneself. The Co-production items that were most important to decisions to volunteer included those labeled The Department Needs Me and Knowledge of Park Operations. These factors include such statements as helping the park to offer more and better programs and fulfilling the responsibility of a good citizen.

Are rewards associated with serious leisure present in volunteering? Based on the means of the factors developed in this study, volunteering in the FPS does constitute serious leisure for most participants. The most important factor was labeled Personal, followed by Sharing Knowledge and Growth, Social Interactions, and Giving. These four factors ranked in the top five motivational factors based on means.

What is the relationship between motivational factors and level of volunteer participation? Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the relationship between motivational factors and level of volunteer participation. There is a statistically significant relationship between level of participation and nine of 15 motivational factors. Across all variables, scores for motivational factors increased as level of participation increased.

What is the association between demographic characteristics and level of volunteer participation? Chi-squared values were measured for demographic characteristics. The results indicate that education level, income level, family size, and employment status are significantly associated with volunteer participation. Significant relationships were not found for marital status, gender, age, or other organization memberships.

Discussion of Results

Organizational Characteristics

Organizational characteristics were comprised of such items as length of volunteer service and number of hours volunteered annually. In the present study the mean length of service for volunteers was 6.4 years, whereas the mean for ATC members was 10.2 for active members and 5.7 for inactive members (Martinez & McMullin,

2004). The total number of FPS respondents who were also CSO members was 84, or 36% of respondents. The total number of respondents who volunteered with other organizations was 105, or 45%. The ATC study revealed that active members donated 91 hours annually to other NGOs, while inactive members donated 86. The present study found that 39.6% of FPS volunteers donated between 0 – 100 hours annually, 46.4% donated between 101-500 hours annually, and 10.3% donated over 500 hours annually. Silverberg, Ellis, Whitworth, and Kane (2002/2003) found that most respondents volunteered 36 hours per month. While the factors measured differed somewhat from other studies, the findings of the present study are believed to be consistent with their findings.

Demographic Characteristics

The discussion of demographic characteristics will focus on age, gender, education level, and income level. The ATC study by Martinez and McMullin (2004) revealed that the most respondents were between 36-55 years of age. In contrast, the present study found that the majority of respondents were between 56-75 years of age. Silverberg et al. (2002/2003) agreed, finding that the average age of respondents was 57 years. This represents a significant age difference between the study groups. The present study found that more females volunteer than males, which is consistent with active ATC members. However, the reverse is true for inactive ATC members. Both Silverberg et al. (2002/2003) and Cuskelly et al. (2002/2003) found that most respondents were male. Like the ATC study, the present study revealed that an overwhelming majority of respondents had education levels greater than high school. Findings by both Silverberg et al. (2002/2003) and Cuskelly et al. (2002/2003) agree. Finally, both the present study and

the ATC study agreed that the largest income level represented included those with annual family incomes of \$75,000 or over. This differs from Silverberg et al.

(2002/2003), whose findings indicate the average annual income to be \$51,000.

The current study compared participation levels labeled high, moderate, and low based on demographic characteristics. It was found that both male and female volunteers fell in the low-moderate categories. Most respondents with incomes below \$50,000 fell in the moderate category, while those with incomes above \$50,000 fell in the low category. Most of those with a college education or above fell in the low-moderate categories, while most of those without college educations fell in the moderate category. The majority of married respondents fell in the low-moderate categories. These results differ slightly from those of Martinez and McMullin (2004) in that demographic profiles were found to be similar in both categories of participation measured (active and nonactive).

Efficacy and Competing Commitments

The factors Efficacy and Competing Commitments were revealed to have some effect on decisions to volunteer with the ATC by Martinez and McMullin (2004). The present study revealed a mean of 1.08 for Efficacy and -0.08 for Competing Commitments. Therefore, Efficacy had a fairly significant effect on decisions to volunteer in the FPS, while the effects of Competing Commitments were fairly insignificant.

VFI and Co-Production

The present study utilized the VFI to determine reliability of six different scale items using three items each. As was the case with Silverberg et al., (1999), the results of the present study indicated that all six VFI factors identified by Clary et al., (1998) were

reliable for the population of FPS volunteers. Based on item means the most important factor in the present study was Values, followed by Understanding. Means for both these items were higher in the present study than in that of Clary et al., (1998). Means for all other factors in the present study were only slightly lower than those found by Clary et al., (1998).

Three co-production items identified by Silverberg et al., (1999), were also examined for reliability. In contrast to Silverberg (1999), the results of the present study indicated that two of the three factors were reliable. However, the factor labeled Benefits to People I Know was the least important based on item means and due to having an alpha reliability of .39, was found to be not reliable for the current population of FPS volunteers. Because this is a marginal alpha score, it is possible that the modifications of the co-production items that were made for purposes of this study were contributing factors. Modifications for the present study included reducing the number of items per co-production factor down to three each.

Serious Leisure

The present study measured the ten serious leisure rewards factors presented by Stebbins (2001) to determine the presence of serious leisure in FPS volunteers. Based on a study of alpha reliability, it was determined that nine of the ten factors were indeed reliable for the present population of FPS volunteers. The reliability of the tenth factor was unable to be determined because it consisted of only one item whereas the other nine factors consisted of three items each. This was believed to be the first attempt at operationalizing these serious leisure rewards in such a format. The results provide support for Stebbins' concepts and their application to volunteering in parks.

Cuskelly, Harrington, and Stebbins (2003) took a serious leisure approach to explore changes in the level of commitment of a group of sport volunteers over time. They determined that reasons for volunteering and changes in commitments levels are very dynamic by nature and are re-evaluated over time and concluded that for some people volunteering is a form of serious leisure, while to others it is a form of obligation. In essence, it is not always possible to neatly compartmentalize volunteers as either career or marginal. However, career to marginal volunteers had spent more time in their volunteer positions than all other categories combined. Similarly, in the present study the Serious Leisure Rewards items were found to have a very strong relationship to level of participation.

In volunteering, serious leisure benefits community through the various roles volunteers play in providing community services (Jackson & Burton, 1999). This allows the wider community to benefit from their services. In the FPS, park visitors benefit directly from serious leisure by utilizing park facilities. At the same time, because of the economic impact that Florida State Parks provide to the community, local and area residents benefit indirectly from serious leisure. In addition, serious leisure activities such as volunteering in the FPS can offer opportunities for retirees to remain involved in community activities. This is particularly important for Florida as it is a leading retirement destination.

Motivational Factors and Level of Participation

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare motivational factors across participation groups. Scale means for the motivation factors identified by Martinez and McMullin (2004), VFI and Co-production factors suggested by Silverberg

et al. (1999), and four factors resulting from the factor analysis of Serious Leisure rewards were compared across three levels of participation. The results generally indicate that there was an association between motivational factors and level of participation. Specifically, Serious Leisure Rewards items showed a very strong association. All other items except Competing Commitments showed an association. For Serious Leisure factors labeled Social Interactions, Giving, and Sharing Knowledge and Growth, a clear pattern of increasing strength of importance of these factors was indicated as levels of participation increased. For Efficacy, Protective, Enhancement, Understanding, The Department Needs Me, and Personal, because of the similarity between low and moderate levels of participation and the differences between these and high levels of participation, the pattern of increasing strength of importance of these factors as levels of participation increased was still evident but less clear. The increasing importance corresponding with increasing participation is believed to be indicative of the volunteer experience symbolizing serious leisure.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations have been identified. For instance, the sample response rate of 49.2% was less than desired. Characteristics and behaviors of non-respondents are unknown. Therefore their impact cannot be determined. One possible explanation of the low response rate relates to flaws in the questionnaire. For instance, demographic questions were located near the front. Asking for personal information in that section could have negatively affected response rates. These questions should have been located in the last section. Another notable but insignificant flaw was the duplication of one response category in the questionnaire item concerning marital status. Another possible

explanation of the low response rate relates to the timing of the study. Due to volunteers being on vacation, and due to the large number of retired volunteers who travel out of state during the hot summer months, it is believed that summer may not be the best time to sample FPS volunteers. On another note, while the reliability of all VFI items was confirmed through the study, modifications were made to shorten the questionnaire in order to reduce the respondent burden.

Research Implications

This study provided empirical research on volunteering in Florida State Parks at a time when such studies are in demand due to the growth of this activity. Several issues for future research can be identified. Future research might focus on how volunteers in parks learn about opportunities to volunteer and how volunteer motivations change over time. Clary et al., (1998) suggest that different motives can be fulfilled by repeating the same behavior, and different individuals bring different motivations to an activity. In order to understand retention, studies on stability and change among different age groups in volunteer motivations might be worthwhile.

Another possibility for study would be a comparison of motivations by the different roles that volunteers play. For instance, a comparison of motivations and experiences could be made of leaders who have greater responsibility compared to those with fewer responsibilities.

A contribution of this study was the operationalization of serious leisure rewards through quantitative methods. These measures should be tested in other settings to further assess their validity and reliability. A confirmatory factor analysis should be conducted to

verify the results of the present study. Further development and refinement of measurement scales used in this study could contribute to this emerging area of research.

The differences in motivations of particular groups could be examined. For instance, the motivations of one-time volunteers could be compared to those of continuing service volunteers. This may be important because volunteer motivations could become more focused with increased experience. At the same time motives are often diffuse and varied among novices because the participant might be in a learning stage.

Finally, further study is needed in special demographic groups of volunteers such as elder volunteers and youth volunteers as alluded to in this study.

Management Implications

The dependency of public parks and recreation agencies, such as the Florida Park Service, upon volunteerism is expected to increase. Silverberg, Ellis, Backman, and Backman (1999) indicate that the majority of public agency managers do not have the background or understanding necessary to effectively manage volunteers. Increased understanding of volunteer motivations and sound practices in the management of volunteers will be necessary to ensure job satisfaction. In the case of the Florida Park Service, gaining greater understanding of the needs and characteristics of volunteers is vitally important. As described earlier, during the time of this study more than 7,000 individuals were serving as volunteers in Florida state parks. In the previous year, volunteers contributed more than 1,000,000 hours in service making Florida the first state park system in the United States to reach 1,000,000 hours. The contributions of volunteers, therefore, result in substantial savings to the State of Florida. This level of

dependency on volunteers underscores the need to know more about why people volunteer in state parks. In particular, information to support recruitment and retention efforts would be highly useful.

The findings of this study suggest several management implications for recruitment and retention of volunteers and management of volunteer programs. First, demographic and socioeconomic characteristics are important to recruitment and retention efforts. The study found that income, education, family size, and employment status were associated with level of volunteering. Individuals with higher income, college education, smaller family size and who were retired, reported greater number of volunteer hours. In terms of recruitment, these characteristics can be used to target populations who are most likely to volunteer. This information can also be useful in expanding volunteer programs by identifying volunteer opportunities for individuals who are more likely to be employed, without a college education, of lower income and larger family sizes. For example, short term projects or single events might be attractive to the latter “profile” while longer term volunteer activities can be planned for the former.

Second, to retain volunteers, managers should regularly assess the needs of volunteers and whether they are being met in their volunteer roles. The results of this study showed that the five most important motivational factors among Florida state park volunteers include the Serious Leisure factors labeled Personal, Social Interactions, Sharing Knowledge and Growth, and Giving, as well as the Co-production factor labeled The Department Needs Me. The factor labeled Personal refers to personal fulfillment, satisfaction, development, and refreshment from volunteer activities. It is recommended that FPS managers focus on how well the job duties of the individual volunteer meet

these specific motivations. The factor labeled Social Interaction refers to participating with other volunteers and being part of a group. It is recommended that FPS managers provide opportunities for volunteers to engage in social activities both on and off the job. Making the distinction between individuals who stress this need and those who do not can also suggest which individual is best suited for projects requiring solitary work versus group work. The factor labeled Sharing Knowledge and Growth refers to using knowledge gained from past experience in volunteer activities, and sharing that knowledge with others. It is recommended that FPS managers utilize those volunteers with particular knowledge and skills in areas where they can use and share their knowledge and experience. The factor labeled Giving refers to contributions to the park operation and accomplishments of the park. It is recommended that FPS managers avail themselves of opportunities to appreciate individual volunteer efforts and emphasize the importance of the volunteer accomplishments. Finally, the factor labeled The Department Needs Me refers to the importance of the contributions of the volunteer. It is recommended that FPS managers recognize their limitations and need for the services provided by volunteers. Better understanding these motives will offer FPS managers the opportunity to provide support and encouragement for volunteers to continue their careers. This will require a great deal of communication on the part of managers, volunteer coordinators, and individual volunteers. Periodic meetings, surveys, or focus groups with volunteers could be used to assess their needs and desires.

Third, managers should provide opportunities for individuals to continue or develop volunteer careers. Volunteering in the FPS has been shown to constitute serious leisure activity. This suggests that many individuals, as Stebbins (1992, p.3) indicated,

find volunteering to be “so substantial and interesting that they launch themselves on a career centered on expressing its skill, knowledge, and experience.” This study developed and measured four psychological rewards of serious leisure. They were labeled Personal, Social Interactions, Sharing Knowledge and Growth, and Giving. This study demonstrated the importance of these rewards by showing that the importance placed on these rewards increased as level of volunteer participation increased. It is recommended that FPS managers pay particular attention to these rewards and periodically ensure that opportunities are provided for them to be met. This will help volunteers to become more and more involved in the park operation over time. Because higher rewards are evidenced at higher levels of participation in the present study, FPS volunteers should be encouraged to pursue their volunteer careers to their utmost. In terms of recruitment, new Florida Park Service volunteers could be recruited simply based upon the known rewards that they will receive as a volunteer.

Ultimately, management support, encouragement, and involvement is crucial to the longevity of any volunteer program. Identifying and understanding the needs and motivations of volunteers can facilitate managers as they undertake these roles. Through studying volunteer participation, motivational factors associated with volunteering, and characteristics of volunteers, this study provides valuable information for managing volunteers and volunteer programs in Florida State Parks. Recognizing the importance of specific motivational factors in relation to volunteer participation is crucial in maintaining job satisfaction and in the recruitment and retention of volunteers. Active involvement by managers of the Florida Park Service and similar organizations and

application of the study results can have a direct impact on the longevity of a vitally important component of their workforce, the volunteer program.

APPENDIX A
2005 FPS VOLUNTEER STUDY



FLORIDA PARK SERVICE
AND
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, RECREATION, AND SPORTS
MANAGEMENT
PO BOX 118208
GAINESVILLE, FL 32611-8208

FPS Volunteer Survey

Section 1. Tell us about your volunteer experiences.

How long have you been a volunteer?

_____ Years

Are you a member of a CSO (Citizen Support Organization)?

No

Yes

How many hours do you volunteer each year?

Zero

1 to 100

101 to 300

301 to 500

501 to 1000

1001 to 1500

1501 or more

Are you a member of any other volunteer-based organizations?

No

Yes--- List them: _____

What is the highest education level you have completed?

Less than High School

High School/GED

Some College

Associate Degree

College (4-year) Degree

Master degree

Professional degree

Doctorate degree

Other (please specify): _____

What is the zip code of your current home residence? _____

We are interested in learning more about the rewards and constraints associated with volunteering.

Based on your current activities and level of involvement, please indicate to what level you either agree or disagree with the following statements. Circle the appropriate response.

SA= Strongly Agree **A=Agree** NO/NA=No Opinion/Not Applicable **D=Disagree** SD=Strongly Disagree

1. Through my service as a volunteer I am able to help protect the park.

SA A NO/NA D SD

2. Through my service as a volunteer I am able to ensure the existence of the park for future generations.

SA A NO/NA D SD

3. Through my service as a volunteer I can ensure the future of the park for my enjoyment.

SA A NO/NA D SD

4. Through my service as a volunteer I am able to contribute to the management of natural resources.

SA A NO/NA D SD

5. I would volunteer more but I do not have time.

SA A NO/NA D SD

6. I would volunteer more but I do not have enough money.

SA A NO/NA D SD

7. I would volunteer more but I have too many family commitments.

SA A NO/NA D SD

8. I would volunteer more but I have to spend too much time at work.

SA A NO/NA D SD

We are interested in what motivates people to volunteer. **Based on your current activities and level of involvement**, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following reasons for volunteering is for you. Circle the appropriate response.

Reason:	Extremely Important/ Accurate for You				Not at all Important/ Accurate for You			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
Volunteering can help me "get my foot in the door" at a park where I would like to work	4	3	2	1				
I volunteer because my friends volunteer					4	3	2	1
People I'm close to want me to volunteer					4	3	2	1
I volunteer because a family member benefits from my service to the park					4	3	2	1
No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it					4	3	2	1
I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving					4	3	2	1
I volunteer because I directly benefit from the service that I help provide					4	3	2	1
Doing volunteer work relieves me of the guilt of being more fortunate than others					4	3	2	1
I volunteer because it helps the park offer more programs					4	3	2	1
Volunteering allows me to explore different career options					4	3	2	1
I feel it is important to help others					4	3	2	1
Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems					4	3	2	1
Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession					4	3	2	1
I can do something for a cause that is important to me					4	3	2	1
Volunteering makes me feel better about myself					4	3	2	1
I volunteer because it enables me to contribute something to my community					4	3	2	1
Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things					4	3	2	1
Volunteering is a way to make new friends					4	3	2	1
I can explore my own strengths					4	3	2	1
I can learn more about the cause for which I am working					4	3	2	1
I volunteer because it helps the park offer higher-quality programs					4	3	2	1
People I know share an interest in community service					4	3	2	1
My volunteering contributes to the success of the program for which I volunteer					4	3	2	1
I volunteer because volunteering is the responsibility of a good citizen					4	3	2	1

We are interested in knowing more about the rewards you experience while serving as a volunteer. **Based on your current activities and level of involvement**, please rate the importance of each item below as it applies to you by circling the appropriate response.

1 Not Important 2 Somewhat Important 3 Important 4 Very Important

Fond memories of my experience as a volunteer	1	2	3	4
Learning something new	1	2	3	4
Being able to share my knowledge with others	1	2	3	4
Being known as a committed volunteer by my community	1	2	3	4
Participating in volunteer activities that are deeply fulfilling	1	2	3	4
Having opportunities to rejuvenate myself	1	2	3	4
Personal financial benefit (where applicable)	1	2	3	4
Social involvement with other volunteers	1	2	3	4
Contributing to the accomplishments of the park	1	2	3	4
Contributing to the well-being of the park	1	2	3	4
Opportunities to become a better person	1	2	3	4
Developing a new skill	1	2	3	4
Being creative in my volunteer activities	1	2	3	4
Being known by other volunteers	1	2	3	4
Participating in volunteer activities that are deeply satisfying	1	2	3	4
Mental refreshment through my activities	1	2	3	4
Meeting new people through volunteer activities	1	2	3	4
Being a valued member of the park volunteer staff	1	2	3	4
Contributing to the planning of volunteer activities	1	2	3	4
Personal growth	1	2	3	4
Reaching my full potential	1	2	3	4
Use my knowledge from other jobs or experiences	1	2	3	4
Being known by park staff as a committed volunteer	1	2	3	4
Participating in volunteer activities that give personal enjoyment	1	2	3	4
Change in my routine through volunteer activities	1	2	3	4
Participating in volunteer projects with other members	1	2	3	4
Giving of myself to a group effort	1	2	3	4
Being able to give freely to help the park	1	2	3	4

The following questions will help us to know more about volunteers. The information you provide will remain strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with your answers.

Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

- YES
 NO

What category best describes your racial background?

- American Indian/Alaska Native
 Asian
 Black or African American
 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 White
 Other (please specify): _____

What is your employment status?

- Employed full-time (more than 30 hours/week)
 Employed part-time (29 hours/week or less)
 Unemployed but not retired
 Retired
 Other (please specify): _____

What is your occupation? (If retired, what was your occupation?)

Overall, how satisfying has your volunteer experience been so far?

- Very Satisfying
 Satisfying
 Somewhat Satisfying
 Not Satisfying

Which best describes your family size?

- 1 member (just yourself)
2 members
3 members
4 members
5 or more members

What is your age?

_____ Years

Are you:

- Male
 Female

Which best describes your marital status?

- Never married
Married
Separated
Divorced
Widowed
Divorced

What is your approximate annual household income before taxes?

- Less than \$15,000
- \$15,000 to 19,999
- \$20,000 to 24,999
- \$25,000 to 34,999
- \$35,000 to 49,999
- \$50,000 to 74,999
- \$75,000 or above

Is there anything else you would like to share with us about your service as a volunteer?

Your contribution of time to this study is greatly appreciated. Please return your completed questionnaire in the return envelope as soon as possible. Thank you.

University of Florida
Department of Tourism, Recreation, and Sports Management
PO Box 118208
Gainesville, FL 32611-8208

APPENDIX B
COVER LETTER
December 6, 2005

«SALUTATION» «FNAME» «LNAME»
«ADDRESS»
«CITY», «STATE» «ZIP»

Dear «SALUTATION» «LNAME»:

The valuable contributions of volunteers to the Florida Park Service is without question. Because volunteers are so important, the Florida Park Service is interested in better understanding what leads people to serve as volunteers. With this information, the Florida Park Service can better meet the needs and expectations of their volunteers.

The purpose of this survey of volunteers is to learn more about what motivates people to serve as volunteers. You are one of a large number of volunteers who are being asked to participate in this study. In order for the results to truly represent the thinking of all Florida Park Service volunteers, it is important that you complete and return the enclosed survey. The survey should take you less than 20 minutes to complete. Your name will never be linked to your survey. Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law and your identity will not be revealed in the final report to the Florida Park Service.

There are no anticipated risks, compensation or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the study at any time without consequence.

If you have any questions about this research protocol, please contact me at (352) 365-8522 or my faculty supervisor Dr. Myron Floyd at (352) 392-4042. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant may be directed to the UFIRB office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611; phone (352) 392-0433.

Please sign and return a copy of this letter in the enclosed envelope along with your completed questionnaire. By signing this letter, you give me permission to report your responses anonymously in the final report to be submitted to my faculty supervisor and the Florida Park Service as part of my course work.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Wilson

APPENDIX C
POSTCARD

July 19, 2005

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about volunteer motivations was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a systematic sample of Florida Park Service Volunteers.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of FPS volunteers it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of FPS volunteers.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, (352-465-8536) and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely

Robert S. Wilson

REFERENCES

- Arai, S., Smale, B. (2003). Recontextualizing the Experiences of the Volunteer. *Leisure, 27*, 153-159.
- Babbie, E. (2005). *The Basics of Social Research*. Toronto: Wadsworth. (pp. 228-292).
- Citizen-Board Member Branch. (2003). Who are Volunteers? *Parks & Recreation, 38*, 89.
- Clary, E., Snyder, M., Copeland, J., French, S. (1994). Promoting Volunteerism: An Empirical Examination of the Appeal of Persuasive Messages. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23*, 265-280.
- Clary, E., Snyder, M., Ridge, R., Copeland, J., Stukas, A., Haugen, J., Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1516-1530.
- Cuskelly, G., Harrington, M., Stebbins, R. (2003). Changing Levels of Organizational Commitment Amongst Sport Volunteers: A Serious Leisure Approach. *Leisure, 27*, 191-212.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Basic Books. (pp. 43-77).
- Dillman, D. (1978). *Mail and Telephone Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gramann, J.H., Bonifield, R.L., Kim, Y. (1995). Effect of Personality and Situational Factors on Intentions to Obey Rules in Outdoor Recreation Areas. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*, 326-343.
- Gramann, J.H., Vander Stoep, G.A. (1987). Prosocial Behavior Theory and Natural Resource Protection: a Conceptual Synthesis. *Journal of Environmental Management, 24*, 247-257.
- Hendee, J., Pitstick, R. (1994). Growth and Change in U.S. Forest-related Environmental Groups. *Journal of Forestry, 9*, 24-31.
- Independent Sector. (2001). *Giving & Volunteering in the United States: Key Findings*. Retrieved September 20, 2005, from <http://www.independentsector.org>.

- Independent Sector. (1999). *Giving & Volunteering in the United States: Findings From a National Survey*. Retrieved September 20, 2005, from http://independentsector.org/GandV/s_intr.htm.
- Jackson, E., Burton, A. (1999). *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty-first Century*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Kenworthy, Tom. (February 3, 2005). *USA Today*. McLean, Va. Pg. A3.
- Kim, J., Mueller, C. (1978). *Introduction to FactorAnalysis: What Is It and How To Do It*. Beverly Hills, CA & London: Sage.
- Martinez, T., McMullin, S. (2004). Factors Affecting Decisions to Volunteer in Nongovernmental Organizations. *Environment and Behavior*, 36, 112-126.
- Nunnally, J. (1967). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Rouse, S., Clawson, B. (1992). Motives and Incentives of Older Adult Volunteers. [Electronic version.] *Journal of Extension*, 30, 1-12.
- Scott, Jonathan T. (1996). Volunteers. *Parks & Recreation*, 31, 50-52.
- Silverberg, K., Ellis, G., Backman, K., Backman, S. (1999). An Identification and Explication of a Typology of Public Parks and Recreation Volunteers. *World Leisure and Recreation*, 41, 30-34.
- Silverberg, K., Marshall, E., Ellis, G. (2001). Measuring Job Satisfaction of Volunteers in Public Parks and Recreation. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 19, 79-92.
- Silverberg, K., Ellis, G., Whitworth, P., Kane, M. (2003). An "Effects-Indicator" Model of Volunteer Satisfaction: A Functionalist Theory Approach. *Leisure*, 27, 283-304.
- Smith, D. (1994). Determinants of Voluntary Association Participation and Volunteering: A Literature Review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23, 243-263.
- Stebbins, R. (2000). Obligation as an Aspect of Leisure Experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32, 152-155.
- Stebbins, R. (2001). Serious Leisure. *Society*, 38, 53-58.
- Stebbins, R. (2005). *Participating in Organized Serious Leisure: Costs, Rewards, and Lifestyle as Social Motivation*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Calgary.

- Stergios, C., Carruthers, C. (2002/2003). *Motivations of Elder Volunteers to Youth Programs. Leisure/Loisor, 27, 333-361.*
- Sundeen, R., Raskoff, S. (1994). Volunteering Among Teenagers in the United States. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23, 383-403.*
- United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (2004). *Volunteering in the Unites States, 2004.* Retrieved September 20, 2005, from <ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/news.release/volun.txt>.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K., Brady, H. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Volunteers Give...and Receive. (1996). Manisses Communications Group. *Behavioral Health Treatment, 1, 1-2.*
- Wilson, John, Musick, Mark. (1999). The Effects of Volunteering on the Volunteer. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 62, 141-170.*
- Yoshioka, C., Ashcraft, R. (2003). Leadership Traits of Selected Volunteer Administrators in Canada. *Leisure, 27, 265-282.*

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

During my graduate career I attended the University of Florida, earning a Master of Science in Recreational Studies in December 2005. During my undergraduate career, I attended Tusculum University, earning a Bachelor of Science in organizational management in May 2000. I also attended Cleveland State Community College, earning an Associate of Science in criminal justice in May 1993.