11-15-2020

Factors Motivating Leaders to Volunteer: An Examination of Volunteer Leadership in Long-term Post-Acute Care

Christian Allen Mason

Factors Motivating Leaders to Volunteer:

An Examination of Volunteer Leadership in Long-term Post-Acute Care

Christian Allen Mason

George Fox University

DBA Cohort 8

December 15, 2020

Justine Haigh, Ph.D., Chair

College of Business, George Fox University

Annette M. Nemetz, Ph.D., Internal

College of Business, George Fox University

Leonard Friedman, Ph.D., External

Department of Health Policy and Management, George Washington University

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Dissertation Completion Approval
Doctor of Business Administration

Student Name: Christian Mason Student ID#: 1627450

Cohort #: 8 Concentration: MGMT

Project Title:

Factors Motivating Leaders to Volunteer: An Examination of Volunteer Leadership in Long Term Post-Acute Care

has been approved for the Doctor of Business Administration Program at George Fox University as a dissertation for the DBA degree.

Approval Signatures:

_____ Date 1/13/21
Chair

Dr. Justine Haigh, PhD
Chair (print)

Annette M. Nemetz, Ph D Date January 11, 2021
Member

Dr. Annette Nemetz, PhD
Member (print)

_____ Date 1/13/21
Member

Dr. Leonard Friedman, PhD
Member (print)

_____ Date 1/13/21
Dr. Justine Haigh, PhD - Director, DBA Program

Acknowledgements

As a boy growing up my parents impressed on me the importance of learning. My mother and father used to ask me every evening at dinner what I learned that day. Their encouragement set my siblings and me on a lifelong path of learning. So, at age 55 I returned to school once again with the dream of completing my doctorate.

To my family and friends who have supported my journey I ask God to bless each of you. To my teammates at work who have gone the extra mile giving me the time to go to school, I say thank you. Your willingness to take on more than your share will never be forgotten. Your constant encouragement and support have helped me during the difficult times and filled my heart with great joy.

To my dissertation chair, Dr. Justine Haigh: I would not have finished this without you. You understood how difficult it was for me to find the time to finish while trying to serve my residents, families, and staff during a global pandemic. To Doctors Nemetz and Freidman: I will forever owe you a debt of gratitude. Dr. Nemetz, your knowledge of statistics was immensely helpful in defining and analyzing my data. Dr. Freidman, your level-headed and thoughtful insights helped me narrow my focus and produce a much better final product.

I would also like to thank the American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living for their support and assistance on this study. Without access to the leadership this study would not have been possible. A special thank you to Mark Parkinson and Scott Tittle for their help in coordinating my survey of association volunteer leaders across the country.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Volunteer literature presents distinct insights into the motives, individual personalities, and socio demographic characteristics of volunteers. Numerous studies exploring the cognitive, behavioral, and functional approaches to volunteerism populate the literature. However, comparatively little research has been conducted focusing on the specific motives leading association members to volunteer in nonprofit health care trade associations. Yet, non-profit health care trade associations offer some of the highest volunteer rates. Using the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), this study examines the functional motivations of professional long-term post-acute care (LTPAC) leaders volunteering in a member-driven trade association. This research examines intrinsic and extrinsic motivations using a quantitative approach to collect and analyze descriptive and inferential data gathered from volunteer leaders. Identifying the factors that motivate leaders to volunteer enables us to better understand, attract, and retain them.

Keywords: motivation theory, volunteer theory, volunteer functions inventory

.

Factors Motivating Leaders to Volunteer:

An Examination of Volunteer Leadership in Long-Term Post-Acute Care

Chapter One: Introduction and Background of Study

To a healthcare professional, volunteering in association management seems like a natural extension of a caring occupation. Many remember the speech given by President John F. Kennedy from the 1960 election race calling the youth of America to volunteer. With the signing of Executive Order 10924 the Peace Corps was established (Tam, 2014). To date that program has sent 200,000 volunteers to more than 139 countries (Tam, 2014). In the 50-plus years since his death, associations have continued to carry out Kennedy's call to serve. It's not hard to look around and see the impact that volunteer groups have in our communities and in our society. So, what motivates people to give their time to help and support others? Winston Churchill (2007) said, "We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give."

The percentage of association members who reported volunteering within their association or with another organization in 2008 exceeded 92.2 percent, according to ASAE's Decision to Volunteer, which published the results of a survey of more than 26,000 association professionals (ASAE, 2013). In comparison, the volunteer rate among the U.S. population was 26.5 percent in 2012, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS, 2014). So why are association volunteer rates so much higher than volunteer rates for the U.S. population in general? Why do association volunteer rates exceed those of other groups? Can this information be helpful in understanding what motivates people to volunteer and be used to improve volunteer rates in other areas of society?

Volunteers are the lifeblood of associations in America. Dietz (2017) indicates there are five reasons why people volunteer in associations. These include; (1) Help people, (2) try a new role or develop a new skill, (3) make business connections or friends in the industry, (4) build out their resume, and (5) be a part of something bigger. Professionals who volunteer bring business instinct and knowledge that is irreplaceable.

Handy et al (2000) suggest volunteers possess a difficult but limitless energy that motivates them to help others. For this study, volunteering is defined as an activity in which time is given without reimbursement for the benefit of another person or group. Volunteering is often defined as the policy or practice of volunteering one's time or talents for charitable, educational, or other worthwhile activities, especially in one's community.

The subject of volunteering covers a broad spectrum of activities designed to benefit and support others. Volunteer activities range from community service, to charity, to public service, to environment management and social care. But what drives and motivates individuals to volunteer?

Studies show volunteer engagement in associations is related to acceptance of organization mission (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copland, Stukas, Haugen & Miene, 1998; Clary & Snyder, 2002; Penner, 2002; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Gerstein, Wilkerson, and Anderson, 2004; Hanson, White, Dorsey, & Pulakos, 2005; CNCS, 2006; Legault, 2016; Ormel et al., 2019). Without volunteerism, many organizations wouldn't be able to support their mission. Passion for mission, and a willingness of volunteers to advance the mission, is a formidable force for associations. "We're understanding the changing needs of volunteers, the changing drivers for volunteering, and the changing paths of volunteer

leadership development that are less structured or less hierarchical than we've seen in the past," said Debra BenAvram, CEO of the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. (Associations Now, 2013, par. 7)

The literature suggests organizations are motivated to understand why individuals donate their time and energy to help others. Are individual motivations affected by such variables as generation, gender, years of work, or education? Are they driven by internal or external factors? Today, the population of the United States stands at approximately 326.37 million (PEW, 2016). Based on volunteer participation rates, more than 80 million Americans volunteer every year.

While Carson (1999) suggests that volunteering has been a distinguishing feature of American society, it is clearly not limited to the United States. The number of volunteers around the globe may exceed one billion. Volunteers, U.N. (2016) indicates many governments leverage volunteerism to better serve their citizens. While volunteerism exists globally, the focus of this research centers on volunteerism in the United States

De Tocqueville (2003) viewed volunteerism and philanthropy as contributions of financial support and volunteer resources to not-for-profit, non-governmental organizations which serve the public good and improve the quality of human lives.

De Tocqueville described associations as an enduring impact of *Democracy in America*. His extensive research illustrates the role associations play in strengthening American philanthropy and volunteerism. De Tocqueville viewed the growth and expansion of associations in America as a critical component to the success of the experiment we call democracy (De Tocqueville, 1840).

Association Background

The traditional segmentation of the healthcare profession is made up of two major sectors: Acute and Ambulatory Care, and Long-Term Post-Acute Care. With the movement to person-centric longitudinal healthcare and the elimination of provider silos, these sectors of healthcare have become more dependent on one another in both funding and in the delivery of care (LTPAC, 2012). Emerging care models encourage individualized care be delivered in the best care setting, at the right time, and at the best cost. Since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, accountable care organizations and medical home models have emerged as new care models. Here, the focus is on providing the highest level of quality to the individual at the lowest cost possible. Today, the growth of long-term post-acute care (LTPAC) as an essential sector provides a means to deliver the high quality, low cost alternatives required under this new spectrum of care (Reinhard, Kassner, & Houser, 2011).

Many patients receiving care in the inpatient hospital setting require specialized follow-up care known as post-acute care. Post-acute care covers a wide range of services that facilitate continued recovery with a focus on restoring medical and functional capacity to enable the patient to return to the community and prevent further medical deterioration. Post-acute care settings include long-term care hospitals (LTCH), inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRF), skilled nursing facilities (SNF), home health (HH) agencies, assisted living (AL), memory care (MC), and other community-based care alternatives (CBC) (LTPAC, 2012).

The American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living represent providers as a national not-for-profit trade association for the long-term post-

acute care industry. The American Health Care Association (AHCA) and the National Center for Assisted Living (NCAL) represent the nation's largest association of long-term and post-acute care providers ("Who We Are," 2014). AHCA/NCAL advocates for quality care and services for frail, elderly, and disabled Americans. Members provide essential care to well over one million individuals in 12,000 not-for-profit and proprietary member facilities ("Who We Are," 2014). AHCA represents the long-term care community to the nation at large—to government, business leaders, and the general public. Other national trade associations also in this space include Argentum, Leading Age, National Association for the Support of Long-term Care (NASL), and the National Investment Center (NIC).

The volunteer leadership structure of AHCA/NCAL is comprised of a series of boards and councils that represent the various constituent members. At the top of the organization is the board of governors for AHCA and the board of directors for NCAL. In addition, the volunteer leadership also includes various councils, committees, cabinets, state leaders, sub committees, and task forces. As a Federation model the association is comprised of state affiliates from member states across the country. These organizations are also led and governed by volunteers. This study surveys these groups across the association at the national level. Included in this group of leaders is a subgroup of volunteers who have completed the AHCA/NCAL Future Leaders Program. This group is comprised of individuals who have been identified at the state level as being up and comers and future potential volunteer leaders at the national level.

Since 2004, the American Health Care Association (AHCA) and the National Center for Assisted Living (NCAL) have hosted the "Future Leaders of Long-term Care

in America" symposium in Washington, DC ("AHCA Future Leaders", 2014). During the symposium AHCA/NCAL "trains and mentors" long-term post-acute care (LTPAC) professionals to be groomed for volunteer positions within the individual state associations and within the national organization.

Research Purpose, Problem and Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine the functional motivations of leaders in a nonprofit healthcare trade association. As long-term, post-acute care takes on a larger role with the aging of our population it is essential that non-profit associations that work to serve the public and help establish quality standards remain a vibrant voice representing both providers and consumers of care.

In order to select the most appropriate research survey tool for the study a search of validated instruments used to measure volunteerism, charitable giving, motivation, and philanthropy was conducted. Nine tools were examined with the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary et al, 1998), proving to be the best choice.

Reliability of the instrument must be based on the internal consistency of the items within the tool. This is accomplished by determining the Cronbach's alpha α score for each function in the tool. The VFI produced the highest alpha scores and demonstrated the best internal consistency of the nine tools examined. Results indicated that of the scales in the VFI show reliability coefficients between .78 and .84.

Additionally, using the VFI tool as a foundation, commonalities and differences among study participants are explored. Specifically, this research explores the functional motivations of volunteer leaders within a non-profit health care trade association. Functional motivation examines ones' motives as actions (Allison, Okun & Dutridge,

2002). Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) suggest the same belief could be viewed as different functions for different people. Volunteer concern and commitment under a functional approach are collectively determined by whether there is a match between the motives that are most critical for an individual and the opportunity configurations associated with the volunteer experience (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen and Miene, 1998).

Research suggests a growing need for volunteers in America at a time when volunteerism is declining (Grimm Jr, R. T., & Dietz, N., 2018; BLS, 2014). The future of volunteer management rests with the Generation X and Millennial Generations as the Traditionalists and Baby Boomers begin to exit the volunteer market. While the torch for volunteering seems to have been passed to the Generation X group it clearly has not been picked up by the Millennial generation. Millennials now represent the largest segment of the U.S. workforce at 52.3 million workers; they comprise the largest segment with a college degree and yet represent the smallest percentage of volunteers (PEW, May 2015).

Millennials are unique among the various generations. One of the most unique traits of this generation is that many millennials view their personal and professional lives collectively. Millennials represent the most racially and ethnically diverse generation, and the generation that is the most technologically advanced. DoSomething.org (2012), released "The DoSomething.org Index on Young People & Volunteering." Research data collected from more than 4,300 millennials found that over half of young people (54.2 percent) volunteered. This was significantly higher than the federal data of 22.5% suggested. This could suggest young adults are volunteering in unconventional ways not being captured by traditional volunteer research collection methods. Millennials believe

that their daily work and social lives are intertwined. Thus, their volunteer world is often interwoven with their social world. Volunteering with friends is viewed as a socially responsible activity.

Hypotheses

1. Long-term post-acute health care trade association volunteers are motivated by intrinsic factors.
2. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on gender.
3. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on age cohort.
4. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LPTAC healthcare trade associations based on years of work.
5. There is no difference in the motivation factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations between members of the future leader program and the other participants in the study.

Definition of Terms

- **U.S. Long-term Post-Acute Care industry**. This is defined to include the following post-acute care settings: (1) long-term care hospitals (LTCH), (2) inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRF), (3) skilled nursing facilities (SNF) (4) home health (HH) agencies, (5) Assisted Living (AL), (6) memory care (MC), and (7) other community-based care alternatives (CBC).
- **American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living State Executives.** This is the national trade association representing the long-term post-acute

care industry in the United States. It is the largest of the national trade associations and provides the largest lobbying presences in Washington, D.C. In addition, their primary focus is on improving the quality of care for all seniors in long-term post-acute care.

- **Volunteerism** The use or involvement of volunteer labor, especially in community services.
- **Silent Generation (Traditionalists) –** Those born between 1928 and 1945. This generation accounted for 47 million births (PEW, 2016).
- **Baby Boomers Generation** – Those born between 1946 and 1965. This generation accounted for 75 million births (PEW, 2016).
- **Generation X Generation** – Those born between 1966 and 1980. This generation accounted for 55 million births (PEW, 2016).
- **Millennial Generation (Generation Y) –** Those born between 1981 and 1998. This generation accounted for 66 million births (PEW, 2016).
- **Generation Z (Post Millennials) –** Those born between 1999 and 2014. This generation accounted for 69 million births (PEW, 2016).
- **Motivation** The reason or reasons one has for acting or behaving in a particular way.
- **Volunteering** Any activity in which time is given without compensation to benefit another person, group, or organization (Wilson, 2012).
- **Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI)** Measures motivations to volunteer.

Variables

Volunteer Functions Inventory - A 30-item measure of motivations to volunteer. The authors use a functionalist approach to volunteering, examining the functional motives

individuals have for choosing to volunteer. The scale is divided into six separate functional motives (i.e., factors):

- Protective Motives – a way of protecting the ego from the difficulties of life.
- Values – a way to express ones altruistic and humanitarian values.
- Career –a way to improve career prospects.
- Social –a way to develop and strengthen social ties.
- Understanding –a way to gain knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- Enhancement –a way to help the ego grow and develop.

  For each item, respondents are asked to indicate "How important or accurate each of the 30 possible reasons for volunteering were for them in doing volunteer work." Respondents answer each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all important/accurate) to 7 (extremely important/accurate).
- Gender – Male or Female
- Generation – Age defined by generation.
- Work Status – Number of years of healthcare work experience.
- Did you participate in the AHCA/NCAL Future Leaders Program – Yes or No

Delimitations

In choosing how to study the motivating factors influencing healthcare leaders to volunteer in LTPAC non-profit trade associations and the variables associated with those functions, this research focuses on volunteer leaders who are involved with the American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living. Understanding why people serve helps create better volunteer experiences. The study population consists of leaders from 43 states across the United States. It includes members and association

executives who volunteer their time by serving on a committee, a task force, a board, or advisory council. Their involvement is crucial to the associations success.

The sample consists of leaders who are currently volunteering in the American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living nonprofit healthcare trade association. In total 666 surveys were emailed to these volunteer leaders. The survey was sent using Survey Monkey and employed the Dillman (2000) method for building a response rate. The participants had two weeks to respond to the questionnaire. Questionnaires were identified by a numbered code. A second survey was sent to those who did not respond to the first one. Respondents had one additional week before the survey was "closed."

Assumptions and limitations

Assumptions

Rudestam and Newton (2007) suggest that Assumptions are critical in defining and building the research problems. This study is built on the following assumptions:

- Historical use of the VFI demonstrates it is an effective survey tool in measuring motivations to volunteer. This survey tool has been used repeatedly to measure motivating factors in volunteerism. Combined with key demographic questions the survey allows the researcher to examine respondents and analyze survey data based on age, gender, work history, and prior participation on the Future Leader program.
- A measureable sample of respondents can be obtained from the population of volunteer leaders involved with the American Health Care Association and National Center of Assisted Living from across the country. Association

management has indicated their support of the study. A preliminary discussion was conducted with key stakeholders in Washington, D.C. to garner support before proceeding.

- Survey respondents complete the surveys and provide honest and accurate information. Anonymity and confidentiality was preserved and that the participants are volunteers who may withdraw from the study at any time with no ramifications.
- Survey respondents include a subset of volunteer leaders known as the Future Leaders. Future leaders are volunteer leaders selected from each state to participate in a year-long program designed to teach leadership skills and introduce participants to state and national association programs and volunteer leadership roles. More than 80 percent of the future leader program participants serve in some volunteer leadership capacity within their respective state association or within the national association. Currently there are over 400 graduates of this program with the association membership. With support of the AHCA/NCAL leadership it is believed that state leaders also support the study.
- State Executive Leaders representing state healthcare non-profit trade associations across the country support the study. State leaders are continually working to attract and improve volunteer programs within their respective states. They view the information gathered from the study as supportive of their efforts. With support of the AHCA/NCAL leadership it is believed that state leaders also support the study.

- The study can be completed within the time frame developed. Using an online survey tool (Survey Monkey) coupled with a statistical analysis program (SPSS) data is collected and analyzed in a much shorter time frame than sending out paper surveys and having to complete data entry and analysis by hand.
- AHCA/NCAL continues to represent the LTPAC industry as the dominant healthcare trade association in the United States. The continued political success and growth of AHCA/NCAL suggests that the association continues to play a central role in representing the LPTAC industry.
- Volunteer management continues to be important to state and national trade associations. With volunteers making up the vast majority of the labor force for state and national trade associations it is expected that continued interest in understanding what motivates their volunteer members to participate is important.

Limitations

- This study examines a group of convenience as opposed to a random sample from volunteers in associations across the county. As such, results of this study cannot be generally applied to other associations, only suggested. However, this study provides a platform for future studies with other associations.
- This study examines motivation factors of volunteers using the VFI and as such, data collected is only as strong and reliable as the instrument being used.
- This study was conducted over a certain interval and is therefore a snapshot in time. It is dependent on conditions occurring during the study time period.
- There is limited research on volunteer motivation within trade associations. However, there is sufficient research demonstrating the importance of volunteerism

and motivating factors to volunteer to empirically tie the factors together in a research study. In addition, healthcare workers have a higher probability of volunteering than those in the general population.

Significance of Study

This study helps nonprofit LTPAC healthcare trade organizations and those leading these organizations to better understand the motivations most important to volunteer leaders. Macduff (2004) suggests understanding these factors provides a stronger platform for volunteer management, including recruiting, training, and retaining volunteers. Nonprofit healthcare trade organizations depend on the work of effective and motivated volunteers and must maintain an environment that allows those volunteers to thrive in order to maximize their participation and minimize their turnover. This study helps nonprofit healthcare trade associations provide a fulfilling experience for volunteer leaders as they consider the motivations most important to their volunteer support.

Understanding differences in motivation to volunteer based on age (generational cohorts) helps organizations tailor their volunteer management recruitment and retention efforts. Knowing if there are differences in motivations between male and female adult volunteer leaders helps volunteer managers consider whether different strategies are necessary to engage both male and female volunteers (Adamson, 1997). Understanding any difference in motivation to volunteer between those presently volunteering and those not presently volunteering helps equip volunteer managers to strategize more carefully in recruiting and retaining volunteer leaders. Understanding any difference in motivation to volunteer based on career status and education background helps volunteer managers be more thoughtful about recruitment messaging and retention strategies.

Researcher's Perspective

It is clear that with any research the perspective of the researcher plays an important part in the selection of the subject matter and methodology of the study. The author is a past National Chair for the National Center for Assisted Living, National Board Member for the American Health Care Association National Board of Governors, and Officer for the American College of Health Care Administrators. Additionally, the author has spent over 40 years as a volunteer leader in various state and national healthcare associations. This background provides a unique perspective from which to study this topic. As a leader in a national organization that utilizes the time, energy and support of well over 10,000 volunteers across the country to accomplish its mission, the management of those volunteers is a very important aspect of the success of this association ("Who We Are", 2014). This research provides an opportunity to better understand how to make volunteer leadership experiences more fulfilling for both the individual and the organization they serve.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter considers the prominent theoretical aspects of motivation theory and how, when coupled with volunteer theory, can be used to examine volunteer motivation. The literature review is divided into two parts. The first part takes an in-depth look at motivation theory and the second part examines volunteer theory.

To frame this discussion, it is important to understand that volunteer management rests with the Generation X and Millennial Generations as the Traditionalist and Baby Boomer generations are now beginning to exit the volunteer market. Despite representing the largest segment of the workforce in the United States, Millennials represent the smallest percentage of volunteers (PEW, May 2015). This study adds to the understanding of what motivates leaders to volunteer in nonprofit healthcare trade associations. Additionally, with this information as a foundation, differences among the study participants is explored. Research suggests a growing need for volunteers in America at a time when volunteerism is declining (BLS, 2014).

In addition to examining motivation theory and volunteerism, this chapter discusses the importance of understanding what motivates volunteers and the dynamics between motivation, and its relationship to volunteerism. It examines research on career path development in the lives of healthcare leaders and how those developmental motivations influence their involvement in volunteer activities in nonprofit LPTAC healthcare trade associations. Motivation outcomes are examined as either intrinsic or extrinsic in nature. Outside of the motivations to volunteer are issues related to leadership style. While they are not addressed in this study, an appendix has been added examining leadership theory as a means of providing additional support.

Finally, understanding what motivates volunteers in nonprofit healthcare associations helps strengthen volunteer management (recruiting, training, and retaining volunteers). Greater effectiveness in volunteer management helps nonprofit healthcare associations accomplish their association missions of serving others.

Motivation Theory

Motivation originally comes from the Latin word *movere*, which translates "to move" (Luthans, 2002). Motivation is used in the social sciences to describe a state of tension that seeks relief or equilibrium through action (Shye, 2010). Motivation theory works to explain what causes people to take action, how that behavior is directed, and how those behaviors are supported (Mitchell and Daniels, 2003). Motivation is defined as the goal-directed psychosomatic process made up of a number of key elements: (1) arousal, (2) attention and direction, and (3) intensity and persistence (Mitchell and Daniels, 2003).

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Motivation theory often begins with a discussion of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. According to Maslow (1943) this theory examines an individual's need influences in order to understand motivation. Maslow's model can be defined by five levels: physiological, safety, love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. Kenrick et al. (2010) provided the following examples of the five levels:

Table 1 – "Table of Needs within Hierarchy" (Adapted by Kenrick et al., 2010)

Physiological Needs	Air, food, drink, shelter, warmth, sex, sleep.
Safety Needs	Protection from elements, security, order, law, stability, freedom from fear.
Love and Belongingness Needs	Friendship, intimacy, affection and love from workgroup, family, friends, and romantic relationships.
Esteem Needs	Achievement, mastery, independence, status, dominance, prestige, self-respect, respect from others
Self-Actualization	Realizing personal potential, self-fulfillment, seeking personal growth, and peak experience.

This category of motivational theories promotes the concept that motivation is the pursuit of activities that lead to "Growth," "Self-fulfillment," and "Self-Actualization." Social scientists and psychologists generally agree that the higher the organism the higher the level of motivation (Karnes, Deason and D'ilio, 1993). Theories associated with this category include: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory; Existence, relatedness and growth (ERG) theory; and self-determination theory. Self-determination theory will be further examined below.

Herzberg – Two Factor Theory

Herzberg's (1959) Two Factor (Motivator-Hygiene) theory followed Maslow's work. Herzberg's critical incident test labeled results as either motivating or hygiene in nature. Motivating factors included elements such as recognition, achievement, work itself, opportunity for advancement, and responsibility (Herzberg and Mausner, 1959). Hygiene factors included elements such as salary, company policy, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and technical competence. Bassett-Jones and Lloyd (2005) suggest that the Two Factor Theory represents the initial work distinguishing between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination theory provides an outline to understand how external factors such as family, work, and life pursuits are influenced by personality. “Self Determination is the capacity to choose and to have those choices, … be the determinants of one’s actions” (Deci & Ryan, 1985. p.38). This indicates that a person has control over one’s decisions through the concept of choice.

In theory, self-determination allows an individual to differentiate between intrinsic, extrinsic, and a motivation types (Deci & Flaste, 1996). The tenants of self-determination theory represent the framework by which an individual’s need to be effective through competence in achieving a desired outcome (Pennock & Alberts, 2014).

Other Motivation Theory

Mullins (2007) believes that motivation is why people behave in a specific way and why those actions take preference to others. Three fundamental underlying assumptions have been used to frame discussions regarding human behavior and motivation. These include: people are “goal setters.” They are future-oriented and set meaningful goals and work to attain them. Theories related to this assumption are (Locke, 1997) with goal setting, (Vroom, 1964) with expectancy theory and (Bandura, 1986) with self-regulation. A second fundamental assumption is people seek pleasure and avoid pain. This assumption relates to external factors that increase motivation. Related theories include (Skinner, 1953) with reinforcement theory and (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997) with flow theory.

The highest level of intrinsic motivation has been labeled “optimal experience” or “flow” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Flow research and theory stems from the interest in understanding the phenomenon of autotelic activity. This is defined as reward from the activity in and of itself as opposed to reward as an end product. Csikszentmihalyi and Nakamura, (1979) examined the nature and conditions of enjoyment as an end product by interviewing a variety of individuals (rock climbers, athletes, chess players etc.) who indicated that enjoyment was the main motivation for undertaking the activity. This phenomenon was examined in both work and leisure settings.

The conditions of flow are described where the identified challenges or opportunities for action stretch existing skills and one is engaged in a challenge at their optimal level of skill and where clear goals and immediate feedback is achieved. When in-flow the individual is performing their peak (Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi, 2009). They have extreme focused concentration on what they are doing in the present with a joining of action and awareness. According to the model, experiencing flow creates a positive dynamic with the person to continue at and return to an activity because of the experiential rewards offered (Csikszentmihalyi and Nakamura, 1979).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

At the most fundamental level motivation can be seen as either intrinsic or extrinsic in nature. Intrinsic motivation means that the individual’s motivational stimuli are coming from within (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The individual has the desire to perform a specific task, because its results are in accordance with his or her belief system or fulfills a need or desire. The deeper we see a need or desire the higher the motivational power it has on us. Examples include:

- **Acceptance:** We all want to belong and be accepted by our peers and co-workers.
- **Curiosity:** We all have the desire to learn and understand
- **Independence:** We all need to feel we are unique.
- **Power:** We all have the desire to be able to have influence.
- **Social Status:** We all have the desire to feel important.

Extrinsic motivation means that the individual's motivation stimulus is coming from external forces. Extrinsic motivation drives individuals to do things for tangible rewards or pressures, rather than for the fun of it (Hennessey, Moran, Altringer, & Amabile, 2015). Examples include:

- **Recognition:** Being identified by others for your efforts.
- **Reward:** Receiving money or benefits for one's efforts.
- **Success:** Goal achievement

Motivation can also be classified as positive or negative in nature. Motivating forces can be positive as in impelling one to obtain a goal. They can also be negative as in driving away an unwanted situation or event. Ryan & Deci, (2000) sort motivation theories into three primary categories. These include hedonic or pleasure motivation theories, cognitive or need to know motivation theories, growth or actualization motivation theories.

Hedonistic and pleasure represents one of the larger categories of motivational theories. These are based on the role that pleasure plays with our lives. These theories generally posit that the best way to motivate an individual is from exposing him or her to naturally motivating stimuli. Drive-arousal or drive-reduction are important concepts and

both have the potential to lead to optimal motivation. Theories in this category include attribution theory, opponent process theory, instinct theory, and flow theory.

A second category of motivation theories focuses on the cognitive processes involved within each person. These theories suggest that motivation is the outcome of active information processing where a person, subconsciously or consciously, affirmatively weighs the performing of a specific behavior. Theories associated with this category include: cognitive dissonance theory, expectancy theory, goal setting theory, reversal theory, and equity theory.

A final category of motivation theory focuses on the underlying assumption that people prefer control. Overall, motivation is viewed as a number of mental processes that are explained by different point of views. Motivation theories, in their basic form, seek to explain the driving force (s) that convert our thoughts into behaviors.

Understanding motivation is a very complex process due to the number of inter-related factors and theories. Table 2. Summarizes central research related to motivation theory.

Table 2. Summary of Theories on Motivation.

Theory	Description	Theorist	Seminal Works
Instinct Theory	Born motivated to engage in certain behaviors because of genetic programming	Bolles Darwin Loewald	Bolles, R. C. (1975). *Theory of motivation*. HarperCollins Publishers. Darwin, C. (2009). *The origin of species by means of natural selection: or, the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life*. W. F. Bynum (Ed.). AL Burt. Loewald, H. W. (1971). On motivation and instinct theory. *The Psychoanalytic study of the child*.

Drive theory	Desire to reduce internal tension caused by unmet biological needs	Freud Peters Weiner	Freud, S., & Freud, A. (2001). *Complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 1). Random House. Peters, R. S. (1958). The concept of motivation. Weiner, B. (1972). Theories of motivation: From mechanism to cognition.
Incentive motivation	External goals and or rewards	Collins Depue Skinner	Depue, R. A., & Collins, P. F. (1999). Neurobiology of the structure of personality: Dopamine, facilitation of incentive motivation, and extraversion. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *22*(03), 491-517. Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Simon and Schuster.
Self-actualization	Motivated to satisfy needs at each progressive level (basis needs, safety, belonging, esteem, self- actualization)	Cox Deci Frager Maslow Ryan	Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, *50*(4), 370. Maslow, A. H., Frager, R., & Cox, R. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (Vol. 2). J. Fadiman, & C. McReynolds (Eds.). New York: Harper & Row. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist*, *55*(1), 68.
Curiosity	As person's knowledge base increases, curiosity also increases	Piaget	Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children* (Vol. 8, No. 5, p. 18). New York: International Universities Press. Piaget, J. (1997). *The moral judgment of the child*. Simon and Schuster.

Arousal	Motivated to maintain an optimal level of arousal	Deci Ryan Wheeler Zuckerman	Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media Zuckerman, M. (1994). *Behavioral expressions and biosocial bases of sensation seeking*. Cambridge university press. Zuckerman, M. (2014). *Sensation Seeking (Psychology Revivals): Beyond the Optimal Level of Arousal*. Psychology Press. Zuckerman, M., & Wheeler, L. (1975). To dispel fantasies about the fantasy-based measure of fear of success.
Competence and achievement motivation	Motivated to achieve	Nicholls Weiner	Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological review*, *91*(3), 328 Weiner, B. (Ed.). (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. General Learning Press. Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological review*, *92*(4), 548.
Self-efficacy	Convinced of ability to meet demands of a situation, one tries harder, and thus increases likelihood of success	Bandura	Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191. Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Flow Theory	Ideal state	Csikszentmihalyi Kowal Fortier Nakamura Rathunde Schneider Shernoff	Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Nakamura, J. (1979). Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention. *Harper Perennial, New York, 39*. Csikszentmihalyi, M., Abuhamdeh, S., & Nakamura, J. (2014). Flow. In *Flow and the foundations of positive psychology* (pp. 227-238). Springer, Dordrecht. Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rathunde, K. (1993). The measurement of flow in everyday life: Toward a theory of emergent motivation. Kowal, J., & Fortier, M. S. (1999). Motivational determinants of flow: Contributions from self-determination theory. *The journal of social psychology*, *139*(3), 355-368. Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2014). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. In *Applications of flow in human development and education* (pp. 475-494). Springer, Dordrecht.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Studies

Stukas, Snyder, and Clary (2016) examined the theoretical and empirical literature that identified features of efforts that are likely to produce intrinsically motivated volunteers with a focus on helping others and extrinsically motivated volunteers with a self-motivation focus. Specifically, the authors focused on socialization among young people as it related to building a sense of community (Stukas et al., 2016). As such, Stukas et al. (2016) examined five key areas to help identify the aforementioned features.

The first area was the development of an ongoing prosocial behavior in young people through early socialization. The authors found that through socialization children learn that helping makes them feel good and reduces negative feelings. The second area of interest was the development of a sense of community and belonging, wherein the authors found that communities are easier to build when they are homogeneous and promote ingroup helping. Stukas et al. (2016) then focused on service learning and the effects of explicit social norms, finding that freely chosen community service had much stronger effects on the internalization of prosocial values than required service for all students, including those originally more egoistic. These findings corroborated prior studies demonstrating that students who were originally positive toward volunteering when required continued to volunteer longer into the future than students who were less positive from the start.

The final two areas included extrinsic motivations to volunteer and intrinsically motivated community involvement. For extrinsic motivation, it was determined that self-oriented motivations had a higher likelihood of being associated with reduced intentions to continue volunteering in the future and with lower psychological and physical well-being. Conversely, the authors found that for intrinsic motivation, having the chance to act on one's important values and principles through personal contributions was both self-rewarding and beneficial to one's health. In addition, people chose to volunteer because they created a sense of fun. Thus, volunteers with more intrinsic motivation and other-oriented goals may receive more personal health and well-being benefits as a result of their service. Therefore, methods that encourage people to develop and to internalize a

compassionate motivation to help others in need of their help may result in the most benefits for all.

Stukas et al.'s (2016) review of the literature offered confirmation and support for the volunteer functional inventory. The authors examined motivation from social and a sense of community perspectives. Additionally, Stukas et al. (2016) developed the volunteer functional inventory (VFI), which offers a substantial amount of support to the proposed study. Where the proposed research examines the factors motivating individuals to volunteer, Stukas et al.'s (2016) research explored the organizational context affecting volunteers. By understanding social and community-based motives, it is easier to develop prosocial behavior among youth; it also allows for the development to better shape organizational context to meet the motivations of volunteers. As such, Stukas et al. (2016) concluded that by encouraging youth to volunteer, there is a potential to instill within them a sense of community and an integration of prosocial behavior and service learning. The research results indicate that it is possible to build an engaged society in areas of volunteering. Creating tools to promote volunteer engagement can be designed to better attract and retain intrinsically motivated individuals or extrinsically motivated individuals. These groups can be influenced to a large degree by the way the volunteer environment is structured.

Volunteerism is a planned activity (Maki, Dwyer, & Snyder, 2016). Typical volunteer activities are planned and occur in the future and over time and are seldom spontaneous. As such, Maki et al. (2016) examined whether individuals with a future focus were more likely to volunteer and sustain their volunteer activity over time. Using both longitudinal (study 1) and experimental (study 2) paradigms, Maki et al. (2016)

investigated whether a person's orientation toward the future is related to volunteers' beliefs and behavior.

In study 1, Maki et al. (2016) found that a person's dispositional level of future time perspective was closely linked to volunteer beliefs and behavior. This demonstrated that, compared to present time perspective, future time perspective is more strongly associated with volunteerism.

> Individuals with a future focus were, more motivated to serve in AmeriCorps, more satisfied with AmeriCorps service, had higher intentions to engage in volunteer activity, and were more involved in volunteerism. These results strongly suggest that future time perspective, but not present time perspective, is linked to positive outcomes associated with volunteerism over time (p 341).

In study 2, people who wrote about the future reported higher intentions to volunteer. This study focused on developing insight into how to assist potential volunteers focus on the future through future-oriented writings aimed at individuals not typically future oriented or focused on volunteering. Results suggested that writing about the future led to higher intentions to volunteer. This was particularly true for people who had been infrequent volunteers. Although not part of the initial hypothesis, the authors also discovered that individuals who wrote about the future and were frequent volunteers but lower in future time perspective reported lower volunteer intentions.

Maki et al.'s (2016) research offers a unique perspective on the future likelihood and sustainability of volunteering. One trait that might influence a person's decision to volunteer is time perspective, defined by Lewin (1951) as "the totality of the individual's views of his [or her] psychological future and psychological past existing at a given time"

(p. 75). The proposed research examines the motivations of individuals to volunteer with a focus on generational and gender differences. Association members are always asked in advance to participate in organizational volunteer activities. Plans, such as thinking about whether to volunteer, where to volunteer, and whom to help all necessarily involve thoughts about the future. This study demonstrated the relevance of time perspective, particularly future time perspective, in understanding volunteerism. This study tested the theory that a future time perspective would be positively associated with volunteerism outcomes, and that by asking people to write about the future their intentions to volunteer would increase. This study demonstrated that a focus on the future contributed to an individual's motivation to serve, their service satisfaction, volunteer intentions, and volunteer behavior.

Omoto and Packard (2016) examined retirees' sense of community. They examined the retiree's psychological history of volunteerism through the retiree's sense of community measured by empathy, self-esteem, generativity, and their personal psychological sense of community. Data collected tracked involvement in volunteer activities through weekly hours served. In a follow up study, Omoto and Packard (2016) examined psychological sense of community along with environmental concern and connectedness to understand their impact on environmental volunteerism and activism. The follow up study indicated that the only reliable indicator of retiree involvement was a psychological sense of community.

Across the two studies, the findings supported the validity and utility of psychological sense of community in understanding both general and specific issues related to volunteerism (Omoto & Packard, 2016). Understanding how volunteers relate

to the groups they are serving from a sense of belonging is critical in understanding why they volunteer and why they continue to volunteer. Results demonstrate a positive correlation and causation between an individual's motivation to volunteer and their psychological sense of community. Understanding the antecedents of volunteerism is critical when studying the predictors of social action.

Harnish, Bridges, and Adolph (2016) examined student involvement in volunteerism. In their study, 102 respondents completed an online survey consisting of 14 items used in the National Survey of Student Engagement. Through the aforementioned online survey as well as self-reported course grades and volunteer activities, students reported on their engagement within volunteering. Harnish et al. (2016) reported that students who engaged in campus volunteer activities statistically reported higher levels of campus engagement, higher satisfaction with their overall education experience, and better grades. As such, Harnish et al. (2016) suggested that the examination of student self-perception is a key link in the ongoing discussions regarding how or whether student engagement positively impacts students' academic persistence and success.

A self-perception of engagement ties in with the psychological sense of community and is connected to a positive relationship of personal development. This is also connected with other-oriented volunteer focus. Harnish et al. (2016) explored the impact campus-related volunteerism has on perceptions of personal and educational development. Results suggest a positive relationship between a student's involvement in volunteer activities and their personal and educational development.

Volunteerism is viewed as a material way to provide community involvement, which can offer both physical and mental health benefits (Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson,

Brown, & Aisbett, 2016). Using 4085 Australian volunteers, Stukas et al. (2016) set out to examine their motivations to volunteer. Using the VFI along with measures of self-esteem, well-being, self-efficacy, social connectedness, and social trust, respondents were examined for individual differences in well-being. Stukas et al. (2016) found that there were differences in well-being between self- and other-oriented respondents. Furthermore, other-oriented motives were positively correlated with feelings of well-being while self-oriented motives were negatively correlated, with satisfaction and intentions to continue volunteering (Stukas et al., 2016).

Historically, people become involved in volunteering for different reasons that suggest they are either self-oriented or other-oriented. (Clary & Snyder, 2002, Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 2008, Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010, Wilson, 2012) suggest that other-oriented reasons for volunteering may lead to great health benefits than self-oriented volunteering. Stukas et al. (2016) provided a model very similar to the model being used by this researcher. Both use the VFI to examine the self and other oriented motives of volunteers. This research offers a well-structured analysis using a variety of statistical techniques including a data screening approach to normalizing data when respondents picked the midpoint on every question. In these cases, responses were converted to missing data. Australian volunteers engaged for other-oriented reasons were more likely to report higher levels of well-being (self-esteem, self-efficacy, well-being, social connectedness, and trust). They were also more likely to report higher satisfaction than those who engaged in service for self-oriented reasons.

Functional Motivation Theory

Functional motivation theory states that motives signify the functions served by actions (Allison, Okun, & Dutridge, 2002) and one action may serve different functions. The functional approach to motivation can be traced to the early theorizing of Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) and Katz (1960) who suggested the same belief could be viewed as different functions for different people. Clary et al, (1988) suggest that individuals engage in purposeful pursuits to achieve goals and that individuals can pursue the same activities to meet different psychological functions. According to the functional approach, volunteer concern and commitment are collectively determined by whether there is a match between the motives that are most critical for an individual and the opportunity configurations associated with the volunteer experience (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen and Miene, 1998). Attempts to recruit volunteers succeed to the extent the specific motivational functions underlying the behavior and attitudes of volunteers are addressed.

Clary et al. (1998) identified six motives for volunteering based on an examination of current empirical research. These motives include: (1) developing and enhancing one's professional work (career); (2) enhancing and enriching personal development (enhancement); (3) strengthening one's social relationships (social); (4) escaping from negative feelings (protective); (5) learning new skills and practicing under-utilized abilities (understanding); and (6) expressing values related to altruistic beliefs (values).

These motives were subsequently used in the development of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary et al, 1998). The VFI has been used to study motivation

in a number of settings for a number of different population groups, including generational differences. Each has been used to help understand what motivates different people to volunteer, for example: business organizations (Clary and Snyder, 2002); medical students (Fletcher and Major, 2004); environmental volunteers (Bruyere and Rappe 2007); gender and culture (Terrell F., Moseley, Terrell A., and Nickerson, 2004); age (Okun, Barr and Herzog, 1998); paid or unpaid (Gerstein, Wilkerson and Anderson, 2004).

Six motivational functions

The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) measures six motivational functions (career, enhancement, social, understanding, protective, values) all of which show up in the volunteer motivation literature.

Career/Continuity motivational function

The career motivation to volunteer is the inducement that suggests value to volunteering built on the belief that it positively impact one's work-related experiences. Research suggests the career motive has a higher priority in volunteering to individuals still in the workforce. Principi Warburton, Schippers, and Di Rosa, (2013) explored the motivational differences between working and non-working adult volunteers (N = 955). Results indicated no difference in motivational pattern between the two groups. However, older working adults scored the career motivation to volunteer higher than the nonworking older adults.

Enhancement motivational function

The enhancement motivation is to strengthen one's personal development through volunteering.

Protective motivational function

The protective motivation to volunteer is to protect against or to escape negative feelings like guilt.

Understanding motivational function

The understanding motivation to volunteer is to learn new skills and practice under-utilized ones. Dwyer et al. (2013) found a positive correlation between volunteer contribution and an understanding motivation.

Social motivational function

The social motivation to volunteer is the motivation that sees value in volunteering for how it might strengthen interpersonal relationships with others who are volunteering.

Values motivational function

One of the most consistently important motives, across the research, for volunteering is expressing values related to altruistic beliefs. Borgonovi (2008) examines whether engaging in voluntary work leads to greater well-being, as measured by self-reported health and happiness. This research explores reasons that could account for the observed causal effect of volunteering on happiness. Borgonovi (2008) suggests that volunteering contributed to happiness levels by increasing empathic emotions, shifting aspirations, and by moving the salient reference group in subjective evaluations of relative positions from the relatively better off to the relatively worse-off.

Motivation to volunteer and volunteer management

Understanding volunteer motivations can be very helpful for organizations and for those who manage volunteers within organizations. Volunteer management practices and

strategies are affected by volunteer managers' understanding of volunteers' motivation. Therefore, a manager's understanding needs to be accurate to be effective because understanding determines how managers recruit, trains, and retain volunteers.

Volunteer Theory

Handy et al (2000) define volunteering as a difficult but limitless energy that motivates individuals to help others. Getz (2007) indicates that volunteers hold similar qualities even when providing time and support across different industries or sectors. Lauffner and Gorodexky (1977) state that individuals use volunteering to gain new experiences socially, build confidence and learn new skills. Volunteering involves any activity in which time is given without reimbursement that benefits another person or group. Volunteering is often defined as the policy or practice of volunteering one's time or talents for charitable, educational, or other worthwhile activities, especially in one's community. The more comprehensive definitions of volunteering describe volunteerism as voluntary, perpetual, structured, helping, non-compensated, and framed within the mission of an organizational context (Finkelstien, 2009).

Volunteering is generally considered an altruistic activity and is intended to promote goodness or improve human quality of life. In return, this activity can produce a feeling of self-worth and respect. There is no financial gain involved for the individual. Volunteering is also well known for skill development, socialization, and networking. Volunteering may have positive benefits for the volunteer as well as for the person or community served. It is also intended to make contacts for possible employment. It is helping, assisting, or serving another person or persons without pay. Many volunteers are

specifically trained in the areas they work, such as medicine, education, or emergency rescue. Others serve on an as-needed basis, such as in response to a natural disaster.

Examining volunteers from a self-determined motivation perspective provides a methodology to look at intrinsic and extrinsic motivators as a means for understanding what drives a volunteer to participate. As with engagement strategies for employees, it is personal motivation that drives both commitment and involvement. Delaney and Royal (2017) dissected engagement as a construct of component parts suggesting that motivation is a key component of engagement and performance. Engagement can be further broken down as intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. "Engagement has long been an instrumental component of human capital strategies and continues to dominate the conversation about how high-performing organizations attract and retain their best talent (127)."

Intrinsic motivation is internal to the volunteer and relates to personal experiences that connect with the individual's self-concept that generate positive feelings and outcomes. Creating a sense of excitement, accomplishment and self-satisfaction are examples of intrinsic reasons to participate (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Intrinsic motivation often happens when tasks or duties align with personal beliefs and values.

In comparison, extrinsic motivation is driven by outside sources such as peer influence or reward. Extrinsic motivation refers to performance of behavior that is essentially linked to the achievement of an outcome that is separate from the outcome itself.

In 2005, 65.4 million Americans reported that they volunteered, almost 30 percent (28.8 percent) of the U.S. population (CNCS, 2006). In 2013, 62.6 million Americans

volunteered approximately 7.9 billion hours valued at $171 billion dollars (BLS, 2014). The annual volunteer rate was little changed at 25.3 percent for the year ending in September 2014, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. About 62.8 million people volunteered at least once between September 2013 and September 2014. The volunteer rate in 2013 was 25.4 percent. Data on volunteering was collected through a supplement to the annual September Current Population Survey (CPS). The Corporation for National and Community Service sponsors the supplement to provide insights into volunteerism in America. The CPS is a monthly survey of about 60,000 households that obtains information on employment and unemployment for the nation's civilian non-institutional population age 16 and over. Volunteers are defined as persons who do unpaid work (except for expenses) through or for an organization.

Looking at the national volunteer statistics for 2018, 33.8% of women volunteer compared to men at 26.5%. Likewise, the number of volunteer hours for women exceeds those of men at 3.9 billion hours of service compared to 3 billion hours of service. The total number of women volunteers in 2018 was 44.6 million compared to men at 32.7 million (CNCS, 2018). Likewise, generational statistics show several differences in volunteer patterns between key age groups. Table 3 summarizes these findings.

Table 3. Summary of Generational Volunteer Activity for 2018.

Generation	Percent of Volunteers	Number of Volunteers (in Millions)	Total Hours Volunteered (in Millions)	Average Volunteer Hours Per Person (Median Hours)
Traditional	24.8%	6.67	798.1	92.0
Baby Boomers	30.7%	22.63	2200.0	53.0
Generation X	36.4%	21.72	1800.0	44.0
Millennials	28.2%	19.91	1500.0	36.0

http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/special/

One alarming note identified in the national volunteer statistics was the decline in volunteering among people with a bachelor's degree or higher, which fell from a 2009

high of 42.8 percent to 39.8 percent in 2013 (CNCS, 2014). According to the study, education is the single best predictor of volunteering. Volunteering entails a commitment of time and effort ("Association Now", 2013).

Volunteer Management

Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) examined the organizational factors affecting volunteers and their coordination. In their literature review, Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) identified 386 articles relevant to volunteer coordination; from there, the authors formulated three propositions. The first proposition was that the practices and instruments of volunteer management and the organizational attitudes towards volunteers were crucial; second, these factors are co-determined by social processes; and third, organizational structural features limit the action space for volunteers and volunteer coordination. Additionally, the authors identified organizational and moderating social factors affecting volunteers. Their grounded theory approach to research identified three result clusters. The first was that volunteer coordination practices are strongly influenced by human resource management literature and are often based on the incorrect assumption that volunteers are paid staff (Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013). The second cluster identified that the attitudinal aspect of volunteer coordination was linked to a different intervention logic than the more instrumental aspects of outlined in cluster 1 (Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013). The final cluster was that understanding the nature of volunteer coordination introduces tradeoffs between the needs of the volunteer and the needs of the organization (Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013).

Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) explored the organizational context affecting volunteers. By understanding both the multidimensional motives to volunteer and the

organizational context affecting volunteers, a practical bridge could be built to better shape organizational context to meet the motivational needs of volunteers. Building program and content that is based on a person's reasons for volunteering provides a systematic means by which recruitment and retention of volunteers can be achieved.

Volunteers are an essential part of any nonprofit association management world. Almost all associations operate predominately with volunteers. Volunteers are used to expand program efforts. Non-profit association boards are comprised almost entirely of volunteers. Association executives realize volunteers are the lifeblood of their organizations but they can also pose risks if they are not well managed in areas such as recruitment, training, and supervision. Smith, (1994) researched determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering. Smith suggested that contextual, social, attitudinal, situational, and social participation variables were all reasons individuals volunteer.

Most volunteers are asked to complete a written volunteer application prior to beginning their volunteer work. This allows the organization to obtain information on a candidate in order to maximize the individual's skills and talents. In addition to basic contact information, a volunteer application should collect information on the applicant's education, work experience, previous volunteer experience, and support for the organization's mission (Penner, 2002).

Of course, not every volunteer is right for every association. Most associations today require background checks and credit checks. If volunteers require any skill certifications or licenses to perform their volunteer duties, a copy of certification is usually kept on file with the organization. All volunteers should receive an orientation.

The orientation program should be customized to fit the needs of the volunteers. A volunteer handbook can help to quickly integrate volunteers into an organization. The volunteer handbook should clearly communicate to an organization's volunteers what they can expect from the organization and what the organization expects from them. A volunteer handbook should include the organization's policies on nondiscrimination, sexual harassment, conflicts of interest, confidentiality, code of conduct, copyright and trademark use, e-mail use, privacy, dress code, evaluations, travel, use of property, publicity, and political activity. New volunteers should receive instructions on their particular duties. A volunteer mentor or a staff member should be designated as the person to provide guidance as the new volunteer becomes familiar with the organization and the volunteer's duties. An organization's training program may vary depending on the material it needs to convey to its volunteers and to its consituency. For that reason, it is important to make changes as needed to keep training programs fresh and responsive to current volunteer needs.

No matter what their level in the organization, volunteers cannot be successful unless they have been provided the information and the opportunities they need to succeed. Volunteer "job descriptions" are helpful in describing what the volunteer should be doing and in setting boundaries for what might be beyond the scope of the volunteer's authority. This is especially important for volunteers at the board level where others see their individual actions as the actions of the organization (Penner, 2002).

Volunteers should be adequately supervised. The supervisor can be a staff member or an experienced volunteer. Volunteers should know who their supervisor is and they should receive regular feedback on their performance. The supervisor should

treat any volunteer failures or misconduct appropriately including documenting any complaints and any action plans to improve performance.

Volunteer communications are important, both to obtain information and feedback from the volunteers and to share with them news and information about the organization, its mission, goals, successes and challenges. Regular communication can help even the most geographically remote volunteer or those working irregular hours feel connected to the organization. Changes in the organization's programs or direction need to be communicated to the volunteers. To be successful, volunteers should be surveyed periodically about their successes, the challenges they face, and changes that could be made to improve their volunteer service or experience. Volunteers should also be asked about where they see opportunities for growth, both for the organization and for themselves as volunteers (Allison, Okun, and Dutridge, 2002).

Volunteers who are performing their duties outside of the organization's facilities and removed from daily oversight pose special challenges. It is easy for organizations to overlook remote volunteers when providing training and supervision to their volunteers. The key to the successful management of remote volunteers is continual communication with them. It is especially important that managers are linked to their remote volunteers and receive as well as give information. The Internet has opened up new opportunities for volunteers. Someone who is in another community, state, or even another country can volunteer for your organization and provide valuable service through an Internet connection. Volunteers design and maintain websites, enter data, respond to inquiries from members or the general public, engage in lobbying activity, participate in strategic and programmatic planning, and raise funds while sitting at home or in their favorite

coffeehouse. They may consider themselves to be ambassadors, activists, or engaged citizens and not volunteers.

Organizations with virtual volunteers should adapt their volunteer management programs to meet the needs of this new breed of volunteer. Manuals should be provided online through an intranet or other private website and they should be adapted to meet the needs of the virtual volunteers. The organization should be clear in defining the scope of their volunteer duties and the demarcation between volunteer and staff duties and roles.

Although volunteer recognition programs are often focused on recognizing and rewarding devoted volunteers, they have other uses as well. Recognition—even if it is as simple as a service pin or an annual luncheon—can help to motivate and retain volunteers who might otherwise lose interest in their volunteer work. Recognition can also be used to help guide the behavior and improve the performance of volunteers who are not meeting the organization's expectations. By recognizing outstanding volunteers, the organization is affirming for the other volunteers what it takes to be a successful volunteer. Events that recognize outstanding volunteers also open the door for conversations with other volunteers as to why they were not selected and what they can do to improve their performance.

Volunteers who serve as officers or board members of the organization are in a unique position. In addition to the usual issues presented by volunteers, they have special duties and responsibilities under the organization's articles of incorporation and bylaws and under state and federal laws. Managing volunteers who serve in the governance structure of the organization is tricky as the volunteer board members and officers are the ones who hire and fire the chief staff person and are not subordinate to any staff member.

Some resist the idea that they can or should be managed by staff in the performance of their volunteer duties. Careful attention needs to be paid to give due deference to them when they act in their governance roles without failing to provide training and supervision for any services they provide that are normally provided by the staff.

Volunteerism in Associations

Organizations whose members serve as volunteers face unique challenges. Whether it is service on a committee or in the direct provision of services, member volunteers are deepening their relationship with the organization through their volunteer service. This is one of the positive aspects of a volunteer program although it can present a challenge to staff that supervise member volunteers. These are often the very people the organization is committed to serving, particularly for associations. This can cause problems, as staff may be hesitant to hold volunteer members to the same standards.

One way to prevent problems from arising in conjunction with member volunteers is to clearly articulate that all volunteers are subject to the same rules and policies as employees and that member volunteers are welcome to volunteer under those terms. This means that member volunteers are subject to the same supervision, evaluation and potentially the same termination process as employees within the organization.

Chapter Three: Method

This chapter describes the methodology for the study. It covers the research design, the instruments used and their reliability and validity, collection procedures, and limitations.

The methodology for this study is quantitative (Creswell, 2003). One questionnaire is used to measure motives for volunteering. Clary et al. (1998) demonstrated that volunteer motivation can be derived from individual questionnaire data. The specific purpose of this study is to investigate motivations most important to volunteer leaders in non-profit long-term post-acute care health care trade associations. Additionally, this study elucidates the relationships between generation, gender, years of work, and motivations to volunteer in non-profit post-acute care health care trade associations.

In order to select the most appropriate research survey tool for the study a search of validated instruments used to measure volunteerism, charitable giving, motivation, and philanthropy was conducted. The following tools were identified: (1) Volunteer Functional Inventory (VFI) (Clary et al, 1998); (2) Attitude Towards Helping Others Scale (AHO) (Webb, Green, and Brashear, 2000); (3) Helping Attitudes Scale (HAS) (Nickell, 1998); (4) Attitude Towards Charitable Giving Scale (Furnham, 1995); (5) Bales Volunteerism-Activism Scale (Bales, 1996); (6) Helping Power Motivation Scale (Frieze and Boneva, 2001); (7) Attitudes Towards Charitable Organizations (ACO) (Webb, Green, and Brashear, 2000); (8) Charity Values Scale (Bennett, 2003); and (9) Philanthropy Scale (Schuyt, Smit, and Bekkeres, 2004).

As a means of insuring reliability of a survey tool, the internal consistency and reliability of the items within the tool must be verified. This is accomplished by determining the Cronbach's alpha α score for each function in the tool. Accordingly, each of the various tools were reviewed. Of the nine tools examined, the VFI produced the highest alpha scores and demonstrated the best internal consistency for the group. (Chacón, Gutiérrez, Sauto, Vecina, & Pérez, 2017) found that most factor analyses of the VFI confirm the original factor structure, maintaining the six factors, so it can be concluded that the VFI has high dimensional stability. Their research conducted a systematic review of the research on volunteers using Clary et al.'s VFI (1998). A total of 48 research studies including 67 independent samples met eligibility criteria. The total sample of the studies analyzed ranged from 20,375 to 21,988 participants. Results indicated that of the scales in the VFI show reliability coefficients between .78 and .84.

These results are internally consistent with Clary et al. (1998), factor analyses which shows that six factors corresponding to the functions of values, social, understanding, protective, enhancement and career, can be extracted, and these factors are stable across two random samples of volunteers (coefficients of congruence of the sub-scales range from .93 to .97). In addition, the VFI and its subscales are internally consistent (alphas range from .80 to .89).

Research Design and Rationale

The purpose of this study is to understand the motivations to volunteer and whether these motivations are influenced by the individual's gender, generational cohort, years of work experience, or participation in the AHCA/NCAL future leader program.

Participants were selected from the volunteer leadership in AHCA/NCAL. It includes volunteer members of the board of directors, board of governors, various councils, committees, task forces, and those who have completed the AHCA/NCAL Future Leaders Program. A summary list of the volunteer leadership was provided by the information technology department of AHCA/NCAL The list included participants from the following groups: (1)AHCA Board of Governors; (2) NCAL Board of Directors; (3) Members of the Business Management Committee; (4) Members of the Clinical Practice Committee; (5) Members of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee; (6) Members of the Council for Post-Acute Care; (7) Members of the Credentialing Committee; (8) Members of the Customer Experience Committee; (9) Members of the Emergency Preparedness and Life Safety Committee; (10) Members of the Future Leaders Program; (11) Members of the Independent Owners Council; (12) Members of the Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Residential Services Committee; (13) Members of the Legal Committee; (14) Members of the NCAL Finance and Policy Committee; (15) Members of the NCAL Quality Committee; (16) Members of the NCAL State Leaders Group; (17) Members of the Not-for-profit Council; (18) Members of the Political Action and Involvement Committee; (19) Members of the Quality Improvement Committee; (20) Members of the Regional Multifacility Council; (21) Members of the Reimbursement Committee; (22) Members of the State Executive Council; (23) Members of the Survey and Regulatory Committee; and (24) Members of the Workforce Committee. A total of 666 individuals were identified as the 2020-2021 volunteer leadership population for AHCA/NCAL. This population group was surveyed using

Survey Monkey. The survey was comprised of demographic questions along with questions from the Volunteer Functional Inventory.

The number of individuals to be surveyed was based on purposeful sampling strategy that allow for sufficient in-depth information on the views of participants to be collected. This population is defined as LTPAC leaders who are inclined to serve when roles are specific and time requirements are clear. They are willing to give time, energy, and personal resources to a well-defined mission and vision and are consistent in attendance of, involvement in, and support of their local state health care trade association.

Measures (variables, instrumentation, and materials)

The VFI

As the literature in volunteering was reviewed, the use of a questionnaire identified as the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) was repeatedly reported and referenced. This led to the investigation of the original development of the VFI, its reliability and validity, and how it compared with other surveys of motivation to volunteer.

Clary et al. (1998) developed the VFI to measure volunteer motivation from a functional strategy perspective. A functional strategy approach is defined as certain actions serve different functions for different people. Clary and his associates identified six motives for volunteering: An example of an item for each motive is included.

1. **Career/Continuity** - developing and enhancing one's career or developing the possibility to assist career opportunities in the future. For example, "Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I'd like to work."

2. **Enhancement** - enriching personal development, offering ego positive growth and development. For example, “Volunteering increases my self-esteem.”
3. **Protective** - escaping from negative feelings or thoughts of perhaps being more fortunate than others. For example, “Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.”
4. **Social** - strengthening one’s relationships and the need to be with one’s friends or create new relationships. For example, “Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.”
5. **Understanding** - learning new skills, practicing underutilized abilities, and creating opportunities to permit new learning experiences. For example, “Volunteering lets me learn through direct ‘hands on’ experience.”
6. **Values** – expressing personal altruistic beliefs and concern for others. For example, “I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.”

The scale contains 30 items, with five items assessing each of the six functions. Respondents are asked to indicate the importance for each of the 30 possible reasons for their volunteering. The instrument uses a response scale ranging from “not at all important” = 1 to “extremely important” = 7. (See Appendix A.)

In their study, Allison et al. (2002) describe the VFI as the most comprehensive set of Likert rating scales (30 questions across six motives) for assessing motives for volunteering. The VFI is easy to administer and to score. Internal psychometric analyses of the VFI (e.g., internal consistency reliability and factor analysis) have demonstrated that items “behave” in a way consistent with theoretical expectations (Clary et al., 1998). External psychometric analyses have shown that volunteer outcomes such as intent to

volunteer are a function of the joint effect of VFI motive scores and potential needs that can be fulfilled by volunteering (Clary et al., 1998).

The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) was selected for this study because of its extensive use and its specificity to the measures of motivation. As the validity and reliability section in this chapter describe, the VFI has demonstrated both reliability and validity in measuring volunteer motivation across a variety of demographics and is the preferred survey tool for measuring volunteer motivation for multiple studies. Finally, the inventory was chosen because it was specific to *volunteer* motivation and appropriate for this study.

Description of Measure

The VFI is a 30-item measure of motivations to volunteer. The authors use a functionalist approach to volunteering, examining the functional motives individuals have for choosing to volunteer. The scale is divided into 6 separate functional motives (i.e., factors):

1. Protective Motives – a way of protecting the ego from the difficulties of life.
2. Values – a way to express ones altruistic and humanitarian values.
3. Career/Continuity –a way to improve career prospects
4. Social –a way to develop and strengthen social ties.
5. Understanding –a way to gain knowledge, skills, and abilities.
6. Enhancement –a way to help the ego grow and develop.

For each item, respondents are to indicate "How important or accurate each of the 30 possible reasons for volunteering were for you in doing volunteer work."

Respondents answer each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all important/accurate) to 7 (extremely important/accurate).

Why do significant numbers of people engage in the unpaid helping activities known as volunteerism? Drawing on functional theory about the reasons, purposes, and motivations underlying human behavior, Clary et al, (1998) identified six personal and social functions potentially served by volunteering. In addition to developing an inventory to assess these motivational functions, their program of research has explored the role of motivation in the processes of volunteerism, from the initial decision to become a volunteer to the decision to remain a volunteer over time.

Community service often involves sustained pro-social actions by individuals. Volunteerism involves long–term, planned, pro-social behaviors that benefit strangers, and usually occur in an organizational setting (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene, 1998). Clary et al. (1998) conducted a selective review of the literature on the correlates of volunteerism. One part of their review concerned the relationship between dispositional variables and volunteerism; it included new data from an online survey that showed significant relationships among personality traits, religiosity, and volunteer activities. The other part of their review examined how organizational variables, alone and in combination with dispositional variables, were related to volunteerism. Their theoretical model suggested a strong tie between sustained volunteerism and how dispositional variables are managed in organizations.

With the widespread emergence of required community-service programs comes a new opportunity to examine the effects of requirements on future behavioral intentions. To investigate the consequences of such “mandatory volunteerism” programs, the authors

followed students who were required to volunteer in order to graduate from college (Stukas, Snyder, and Clary, 2002). Results demonstrated that stronger perceptions of external control eliminated an otherwise positive relation between prior volunteer experience and future intentions to volunteer. A second study experimentally compared mandates and choices to serve and included a premeasured assessment of whether students felt external control was necessary to get them to volunteer. After being required or choosing to serve, students reported their future intentions. Students who initially felt it unlikely that they would freely volunteer had significantly lower intentions after being required to serve than after being given a choice. Those who initially felt more likely to freely volunteer was relatively unaffected by a mandate to serve as compared with a choice (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene, 1998). Theoretical and practical implications for understanding the effects of requirements and constraints on intentions and behavior are discussed.

Scale

Respondents to the survey were asked to indicate how important each of the 30 possible reasons for volunteering were to them using a 7-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from 1 (not at all important/accurate) to 7 (extremely important/accurate).

This case is bounded in terms of time and methods. Initial approval was sought immediately following the election of the new association boards. This gives adequate time to select potential survey subjects, receive support, prepare, and distribute original materials prior to initiating the study. The study took approximately three months to complete. This includes selecting the participants, notifying them, sending out the

surveys, gathering study documentation, reviewing and analyzing data collected, and preparing preliminary findings.

Validity

The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) has been examined using factor analysis. In exploratory factor analyses of college students' responses, Clary et al. (1998) identified six interpretable factors that corresponded to the six motives proposed by Clary et al. (1992). Confirmatory factor analyses of the VFI data indicated the best fitting model was the six-factor model (Clary et al., 1998). The initial study introducing the VFI (n = 465), Clary et al. (1998) found internal consistency by computing alpha coefficients for each of the VFI scales: career, .89; enhancement, .84; social, .83; understanding, .81; protective, .81; and values, .80.

Pilot Testing

This study was pilot tested using the NCAL board within the association. These individuals are asked to complete the survey. These individuals are representative of the group being studied. There are approximately 20 board volunteers and state executives represented by this group. Surveys were distributed to the group at their March 2020 board meeting and they were given time to complete the survey during the meeting online. They were given the link to the survey along with an electronic cover letter. The first questions in the survey are biographical data asking generation, gender, and years of employment, etc. Surveys were collected and analyzed.

Data Collection

To study the motivation of LTPAC healthcare leadership volunteers, the survey containing the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) was provided through Survey Monkey (see Appendix A for a copy of the VFI). An email to the link to the survey along with the cover letter was sent to each appropriate contact of AHCA/NCAL. A letter explaining the importance of the study, sent by myself as a past national chair of AHCA/NCAL, accompanied these surveys.

The Dillman method or data collection and analysis was followed (Dillman, 2000). This method follows social exchange theory to explain why individuals are engaged in certain social behaviors. When used in internet based surveys this method offers a series of parameters and steps to help maximize survey participation. It emphasizes questionnaires with interesting questions seen as useful and easy to answer by respondents. It also emphasizes how answering the survey would be useful to others. (Dillman, 1978).

Data Analysis

Table 4 identifies the hypothesis for the study. The first column states each research hypothesis:

1. Long-term post-acute health care trade association volunteers are motivated by intrinsic factors.
2. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on gender.
3. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on age cohort.

4. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LPTAC healthcare trade associations based on years of work.
5. There is no difference in the motivation factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations between members of the future leader program and the other participants in the study.

The second column describes the survey content as it relates to the specific research question. The third column identifies the data level. The final column describes how the research question are analyzed.

For example, research question 1 uses a T-test to evaluate self-oriented and other oriented survey scores to determine whether survey participants are primarily intrinsically or extrinsically motivated. To accomplish this two variables were created using the six motivational factors. The factors of values and understanding have been linked with intrinsic motivation where the factors of protect, career, social, and enhancement have been linked to extrinsic motivation. (see Appendix D for a copy of the Modified VFI scoring sheet). Research questions 2 uses a T-test to evaluate whether there are differences based on gender between the six factors of motivation to volunteer. Research questions 3 and 4 use a one-way ANOVA with a post-hoc analysis to determine differences from survey responses to the volunteer motivation items (30 items with a scale 1-7) and responses to the individual demographic questions: gender (male or female), age, years of work, and future leader program participation (Brown, 2015; Kim and Mueller, 1978). Research question 5 uses a T-test analysis to evaluate whether there are differences based on future leader participation between the six factors of motivation to volunteer.

In summary, the methodology follows a quantitative approach. In addition to a series of descriptive statistics a number of inferential statistics are used. This study uses data gathered from the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) survey to run a series of T-tests, and one-way ANOVA tests.

Table 4. Hypothesis, Survey Items, and Related Analyses.

Hypothesis	Survey Items	Variable Level	Statistics and Analysis
1. Long-term post-acute health care trade association volunteers are primarily motivated by intrinsic factors to volunteer rather than extrinsic factors.	Volunteer motivation section: Items 1-30 Response Range: 1 = not at all important/accurate to respondent to 7= extremely important/accurate to respondent	Scale and Ordinal	Examining Intrinsic (other oriented) and Extrinsic (self-oriented) motivations A T-test of independent sample means of other oriented (intrinsic) and self-oriented (extrinsic) individual motivations will be conducted. The study examined the motivation of leader volunteers using the Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) through Survey Monkey (see Appendix A for a copy of the Volunteer Survey). Respondents receive an email link to the survey with a cover letter Null Hypothesis: Long-term post-acute health care association volunteers are motivated by intrinsic factors. All participants were sent an email letter outlining the reason for the study and the importance of the survey, the reason for the survey, and a link to the survey (see Appendix C for a copy of the email sent to potential participants). The email explains their responses are anonymous and the survey needs to be completed within 14 days to be included in the results. A reminder was sent out five days before the expected completion date.
2. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on gender.	Volunteer motivation section: Items 1-30 Response Range: 1 = not at all important/accurate to respondent to 7= extremely important/accurate to respondent Information about you section: Question 1: Gender?	Scale and Ordinal	Relating gender to volunteer motivation Null Hypothesis: There is no difference of motivation to volunteer between men and women. Independent samples T-test analysis identifying difference in motivation between men and women.

	Two responses: (male, female)		
3. There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on age cohort.	Volunteer motivation section: Items 1-30 Response Range: 1 = not at all important/accurate to respondent to 7= extremely important/accurate to respondent Information about you section: Question 2: What year where you born? (Age Cohort)	Ordinal	Relating age to volunteer motivation Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between motivation to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on age cohort. Correlational statistics at individual level. Difference statistics at the individual level ANOVA with post hoc analysis identifying relationships between motivation to volunteer and age cohort.
4.There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LPTAC healthcare trade associations based on years of work.	Volunteer motivation section: Items 1-30 Response Range: 1 = not at all important/accurate to respondent to 7= extremely important/accurate to respondent Information about you section: Question 3: How many years of work experience in healthcare industry?	Ordinal	Relating age to volunteer motivation Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LPTAC healthcare trade associations based on years of work Difference statistics at the individual level ANOVA with a post hoc analysis identifying difference of motivation based on years of work in healthcare industry.
5. There is no difference in the motivation factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations between members of the future leader program and the other participants in the study	Volunteer motivation section: Items 1-30 Response Range: Not at all important for you 1 – Extremely important for you 7. Information about your section: Question 4: Did you participate in the AHCA/NCAL Future Leaders Program?	Scale and Ordinal	Comparing future leader program graduate motivations to other survey participants. Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the motivation factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations between members of the future leader program and the other participants in the study Difference statistics at the individual level Independent samples T-test analysis identifying difference of motivation based on future leader program participation.

Chapter Four: Analysis and Results

Chapter Four is organized as follows: 1) responses to demographic questions of gender (male or female), age generation cohort, years of work, and future leader program participation, 2) descriptive statistics of each of the responses identified in the volunteer functions inventory, and 3) T-test or ANOVA with post-hoc analysis for each of the five hypotheses from survey responses to the volunteer functional inventory motivation items (30 items with a scale 1-7).

A total of 666 individuals were identified and surveyed as the 2020-2021 volunteer leadership population for AHCA/NCAL. A total of 216 surveys were returned. The groups surveyed within the leadership of AHCA/NCAL included participants from the following specific groups: (1)AHCA Board of Governors, (2) NCAL Board of Directors, (3) Members of the Business Management Committee, (4) Members of the Clinical Practice Committee, (5) Members of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, (6) Members of the Council for Post-Acute Care, (7) Members of the Credentialing Committee, (8) Members of the Customer Experience Committee, (9) Members of the Emergency Preparedness and Life Safety Committee, (10) Members of the Future Leaders Program, (11) Members of the Independent Owners Council, (12) Members of the Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Residential Services Committee, (13) Members of the Legal Committee, (14) Members of the NCAL Finance and Policy Committee, (15) Members of the NCAL Quality Committee, (16) Members of the NCAL State Leaders Group, (17) Members of the Not-for-profit Council, (18) Members of the Political Action and Involvement Committee, (19) Members of the Quality Improvement Committee, (20) Members of the Regional Multifacility Council, (21) Members of the

Reimbursement Committee, (22) Members of the State Executive Council, (23) Members of the Survey and Regulatory Committee, and (24) Members of the Workforce Committee.

Demographic Overview

The association leadership is fairly evenly distributed between male and female participants. Of the total of 216 survey responses 116 were females and 100 males. Examining the response group from a generational perspective identified following breakdown: Gen Z or Centennials: Born 1996 or later (1); Millennials or Gen Y: Born 1977 to 1995 (24); Generation X: Born 1965 to 1976 (86); Baby Boomers: Born 1946 to 1964 (101); and Traditionalists or Silent Generation: Born 1945 and before (4).

Table 5. Gender and Generation Cross Tabulation

What is your gender? * What year where you born? Cross Tabulation
Count

		What year where you born?					
		Gen, Gen Z or Centennials: Born 1996 or later	Millennials or Gen Y: Born 1977 to 1995	Generation X: Born 1965 to 1976	Baby Boomers: Born 1946 to 1964	Traditionalists or Silent Generation: Born 1945 and before	Total
What is your gender?	Female	1	14	44	56	1	116
	Male	0	10	42	45	3	100
Total		1	24	86	101	4	216

In terms of years of experience in long-term post-acute care the survey respondents were heavily skewed towards 16 or more years of experience. The following is a summary of years of experience: 1) One to five years of experience (8); 2) Six to ten years of experience (8); 3) 11 to 15 years of experience (11); 4) 16 to 20 years (16); 5) 20 or more years (173); and retired (0).

Table 6. Gender and Work Experience Cross Tabulation

What is your gender? * How many years of work experience do you have? Cross tabulation

		How many years of work experience do you have?					
		Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 1-5	Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 6-10	Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 11-15	Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 16-20	Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry >20	Total
What is your gender?	Female	2	3	4	10	97	116
	Male	6	5	7	6	76	100
Total		8	8	11	16	173	216

The future leader program has been a path to leadership in the association. Of the survey respondents: 1) Participated in the future leader program (70), and 2) Did not participate in the future leader program (146).

Table 7. Gender and Participation in Future Leader Program Cross Tabulation

What is your gender? * Did you participate in the Future Leaders Program? Cross tabulation

		Did you participate in the Future Leaders Program?		
		Yes	No	Total
What is your gender?	Female	38	78	116
	Male	32	68	100
Total		70	146	216

Descriptive Statistics

The Volunteer Functions Inventory is comprised of 30 statements that are grouped into six factors describing motivations to volunteer. Each statement is measured

using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) not important at all to (7) extremely important. The six motivations are:

(1) Values: By volunteering, individuals express their humanitarian concerns for others.

(2) Understanding: Volunteering allows one to exercise skills and learn about the volunteer organization being served and provides a means of serving the greater community.

(3) Enhancement: Volunteering helps the individual's ego grow.

(4) Protective: Individual issues such as loneliness and guilt are helped by volunteering.

(5) Social: Volunteering provides a way to strengthen one's social relationships.

(6) Continuity: Volunteering can be beneficial to one's professional career.

The six factors are generated by summarizing responses to the thirty statements as follows:

VFI Continuity	Add Items	1, 10, 15, 21, and 28.
VFI Social	Add Items	2, 4, 6, 17, and 23.
VFI Values	Add Items	3, 8, 16, 19, and 22.
VFI Understanding	Add Items	12, 14, 18, 25, and 30.
VFI Enhancement	Add Items	5, 13, 26, 27, and 29.
VFI Protect	Add Items	7, 9, 11, 20, and 24.

Table 8. Mean Comparison of 30 VFI Responses.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Volunteering allows me to continue to use my professional knowledge and skills.	215	1.00	7.00	5.6372	1.50963
My friends volunteer.	209	1.00	7.00	3.1340	1.86084
I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.	214	1.00	7.00	5.8551	1.40172
People I'm close to want me to volunteer.	209	1.00	7.00	3.4545	1.99497
Volunteering makes me feel important.	209	1.00	7.00	3.5646	2.03736
People I know share an interest in community service.	208	1.00	7.00	4.6635	1.75345
No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.	207	1.00	7.00	3.8792	1.95332
I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.	198	1.00	7.00	6.2879	1.27966
By volunteering, I feel less lonely.	214	1.00	7.00	2.8037	1.99501
Volunteering provides an opportunity for me to continue to mix with other professionals.	214	1.00	7.00	5.4299	1.70397
Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.	209	1.00	7.00	2.1531	1.51451
I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.	209	1.00	7.00	5.4880	1.61159
Volunteering increases my self- esteem.	210	1.00	7.00	3.8619	1.92067
Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.	208	1.00	7.00	5.8077	1.30460
Volunteering gives me a feeling of continued self-development.	209	1.00	7.00	5.5215	1.56916
I feel compassion toward people in need.	214	1.00	7.00	6.0187	1.28173
Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.	211	1.00	7.00	4.0995	1.80859
Volunteering lets me learn though direct "hands on" experience.	213	1.00	7.00	4.9906	1.68509
I feel it is important to help others.	211	1.00	7.00	6.3791	1.09472
Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.	214	1.00	7.00	2.1729	1.55434
Volunteering gives me a sense of achievement that I previously gained from work.	210	1.00	7.00	3.4381	1.90905
I can do something for a cause that is important to me.	211	1.00	7.00	5.9147	1.38093
Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.	211	1.00	7.00	3.5403	1.80529
Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.	209	1.00	7.00	2.2775	1.65236
I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.	209	1.00	7.00	4.3828	1.87773
Volunteering makes me feel needed.	211	1.00	7.00	3.7393	1.85506
Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.	211	1.00	7.00	3.8673	1.89270
Volunteering gives me a sense of purpose that I previously obtained from my work.	211	1.00	7.00	3.4455	1.93971
Volunteering is a way to make new friends.	213	1.00	7.00	4.3897	1.74380
I can explore my own strengths.	212	1.00	7.00	4.8726	1.76802

Examining responses to the VFI indicate the top five statements most agreed with by respondents all fell under the values motivation function. This suggests survey respondents are motivated to volunteer based on their humanitarian concerns to help others. Respondents also indicated motivation to volunteer based on the functions of understanding and continuity. This suggests that organizational mission and professional development are also important considerations in their volunteer decisions. Listed below is a summary of the six factors of motivation to volunteer.

Table 9. Mean Comparison of Six VFI Motivation Factors

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VFIContinuity	201	1.00	7.00	4.6756	1.19023
VFISocial	192	1.00	7.00	3.7500	1.39663
VFIValues	193	1.60	7.00	6.0715	0.99858
VIFUnderstanding	193	1.00	7.00	5.1233	1.19649
VFIEnhancement	196	1.00	7.00	3.8929	1.41644
VFIProtect	195	1.00	6.40	2.6615	1.33405
Valid N (listwise)	146				

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1: Null Hypothesis: Long-term post-acute health care association volunteers are motivated by (other oriented) intrinsic factors rather than (self-oriented) extrinsic factors. To test this hypothesis two variables were generated using the six factors from the volunteer functions inventory. The values and understanding functions have been linked to other oriented or intrinsic motivation while the functions of protect, enhancement, social, and continuity (career) have been linked to self-oriented or extrinsic motivation.

Results indicate that the primary motivation to volunteer is based on intrinsic or (other oriented) factors. An independent samples T-test indicated that participants with an intrinsic or (other oriented) focus scored much higher (M = 5.59, SD = .94, N = 178) than extrinsic or (self-oriented) focus (M = 3.73, SD = 1.00, N = 159) conditions; t(176)=2.82,

p = 0.005. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Tables 10 and 11 provide mean comparison of intrinsic verses extrinsic variables and independent T-test results.

Table 10. Mean Comparison of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation Factors to volunteer.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Other Oriented	178	1.80	7.00	5.5865	0.93714
Self Oriented	159	1.40	6.25	3.7349	1.00487
Valid N (listwise)	145				

Table 11. Independent Samples T-test of Intrinsic (other oriented) and Extrinsic (self-oriented) motivations to volunteer.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Other Oriented (Intrinsic)	Equal variances assumed	0.303	0.583	2.823	176	0.005	0.39099	0.13851	0.11765	0.66434
	Equal variances not assumed			2.800	162.805	0.006	0.39099	0.13966	0.11522	0.66677
Self Oriented (Extrinsic)	Equal variances assumed	0.103	0.748	0.973	157	0.332	0.15640	0.16082	-0.16125	0.47405
	Equal variances not assumed			0.969	144.567	0.334	0.15640	0.16136	-0.16253	0.47533

Hypothesis 2: Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in motivation to volunteer between men and women. A T-test analysis was conducted to determine differences in motivation between men and women. Results suggest there are two factors with significant difference between men and women in motivation to volunteer. These differences are based on the values and understanding functions.

An independent samples T-test indicated that there was a significant difference between men and women and that women scored higher (M = 6.26, SD = .88, N = 107) than men on the values function (M = 5.83, SD = 1.09, N = 86) conditions; t(190)=3.05, p = 0.003. Women also scored higher (M =5.29, SD = 1.23, N = 105) than men on the understanding function (M =4.92, SD = 1.12, N =88) conditions; t(190) =2.21, p = 0.28.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Table 12 shows the mean comparison comparison of the VFI factors based on gender. Table 13 shows results of the independent samples t-test based on the six factors of motivation between men and women.

Table 12. Mean Comparison of VFI Factors based on Gender

What is your gender?		VFI Continuity	VFI Social	VFI Values	VFI Understanding	VFI Enhancement	VFI Protect
Female	N	110	107	107	105	107	106
	Minimum	1.00	1.00	2.60	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Maximum	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.00
	Mean	4.8164	3.7439	6.2636	5.2914	4.0523	2.7377
	Std. Deviation	1.18310	1.42770	0.87679	1.23383	1.41110	1.31203
Male	N	91	85	86	88	89	89
	Minimum	1.00	1.00	1.60	1.60	1.00	1.00
	Maximum	7.00	6.40	7.00	6.60	6.60	6.40
	Mean	4.5055	3.7576	5.8326	4.9227	3.7011	2.5708
	Std. Deviation	1.18297	1.36490	1.09065	1.12462	1.40684	1.36167
Total	N	201	192	193	193	196	195
	Minimum	1.00	1.00	1.60	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Maximum	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.40
	Mean	4.6756	3.7500	6.0715	5.1233	3.8929	2.6615
	Std. Deviation	1.19023	1.39663	0.99858	1.19649	1.41644	1.33405

Table 13. Independent Samples T-test –VFI Factors based on Gender

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
VFI Continuity	Equal variances assumed	0.133	0.716	1.893	198	0.060	0.31836	0.16821	-0.01335	0.65007
	Equal variances not assumed			1.893	191.842	0.060	0.31836	0.16817	-0.01334	0.65006
VFI Social	Equal variances assumed	0.219	0.641	0.060	189	0.952	0.01216	0.20232	-0.38693	0.41126
	Equal variances not assumed			0.060	182.368	0.952	0.01216	0.20161	-0.38563	0.40995
VFI Values	Equal variances assumed	4.169	0.043	3.047	190	0.003	0.43348	0.14224	0.15290	0.71406
	Equal variances not assumed			2.981	162.002	0.003	0.43348	0.14542	0.14632	0.72064
VFI Understanding	Equal variances assumed	0.370	0.544	2.208	190	0.028	0.37920	0.17175	0.04041	0.71798
	Equal variances not assumed			2.225	188.957	0.027	0.37920	0.17041	0.04304	0.71535
VFI Enhancement	Equal variances assumed	0.032	0.857	1.870	193	0.063	0.37623	0.20124	-0.02068	0.77315
	Equal variances not assumed			1.868	186.596	0.063	0.37623	0.20141	-0.02109	0.77356
VFI Protect	Equal variances assumed	0.377	0.540	0.956	192	0.340	0.18350	0.19198	-0.19516	0.56216
	Equal variances not assumed			0.953	184.115	0.342	0.18350	0.19263	-0.19654	0.56354

Hypothesis 3: Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between motivation to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on age cohort. A one-way ANOVA with post hoc analysis was conducted to determine differences in motivation between participants based on age cohort. Results suggest no significant difference between participants based on the age cohort. An analysis of variance between age cohorts showed no statistically significant differences with understanding being the closest at, F(2.063,192) = , p=6.508 .087. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that no significant differences were found between individual groups relative to the six functions identified by the volunteer functions inventory. The null hypothesis is not rejected. Table 14 illustrates the mean comparison of VFI factors based on age cohort. Table 15 shows results of a one-way ANOVA test based on the six factors of motivation between the age cohorts defined in the study.

Table 14. Mean Comparison of VFI Factors Based on Age Cohort

What year were you born?		VFI Continuity	VFI Social	VFI Values	VFI Understanding	VFI Enhancement	VFI Protect
Millennials or Gen Y: Born 1977 to 1995	N	24	24	23	23	24	23
	Mean	4.6667	3.4583	6.0000	5.5391	4.3500	2.8348
	Std. Deviation	1.02094	1.19779	1.09045	1.15276	1.37588	1.25865
Generation X: Born 1965 to 1976	N	78	77	79	77	81	80
	Mean	4.5744	3.7221	6.0253	5.2052	3.8272	2.6700
	Std. Deviation	1.17787	1.48507	0.97316	1.13646	1.47029	1.31711
Baby Boomers: Born 1946 to 1964	N	94	87	87	90	88	88
	Mean	4.7766	3.8805	6.1379	4.9911	3.8727	2.6818
	Std. Deviation	1.26860	1.36107	1.02222	1.23431	1.36228	1.36546
Traditionalists or Silent Generation: Born 1945 and	N	4	3	3	2	2	3
	Mean	4.5000	3.9333	5.9333	3.6000	3.2000	1.0667
	Std. Deviation	0.41633	0.83267	0.64291	0.56569	0.84853	0.11547
Total	N	200	191	192	192	195	194
	Mean	4.6790	3.7644	6.0719	5.1281	3.9056	2.6701
	Std. Deviation	1.19225	1.38594	1.00117	1.19775	1.40871	1.33212

Table 15. One Way ANOVA - VFI Factors based on Age Cohort

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
VFIContinuity	Between Groups	1.881	3	0.627	0.437	0.726
	Within Groups	280.991	196	1.434		
	Total	282.872	199			
VFISocial	Between Groups	3.644	3	1.215	0.629	0.597
	Within Groups	361.314	187	1.932		
	Total	364.958	190			
VFIValues	Between Groups	0.727	3	0.242	0.239	0.869
	Within Groups	190.721	188	1.014		
	Total	191.448	191			
VIFUnderstanding	Between Groups	10.703	3	3.568	2.547	0.057
	Within Groups	263.306	188	1.401		
	Total	274.008	191			
VFIEnhancement	Between Groups	6.329	3	2.110	1.064	0.366
	Within Groups	378.655	191	1.982		
	Total	384.984	194			
VFIProtect	Between Groups	8.349	3	2.783	1.582	0.195
	Within Groups	334.138	190	1.759		
	Total	342.487	193			

Hypothesis 4: Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LPTAC healthcare trade associations based on years of work in healthcare. A one-way ANOVA with post hoc analysis was conducted to determine difference in motivation between participants based on years of work experience in healthcare.

Results indicate no statistically significant differences between groups based on years of work experience in healthcare. An analysis of variance between cohorts based on years of experience in healthcare showed no statistically significant differences with understanding being the closest at, $F(0.799,191) = 1.122$, $p > 0.54$). Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that no significant differences were found between individual groups relative to the six functions identified by the volunteer functions inventory. The null hypothesis is not rejected. Tables 16 shows results of mean comparisons of VFI factors based on years of healthcare work experience. Table 17 shows results of a one-way ANOVA test based on the six factors of

motivation defined by the VFI between study participants defined in the study based on years of experience in healthcare.

Table 16. Mean Comparison of VFI Factors Based on Healthcare Work Experience

How many years of work experience do you have?		VFI Continuity	VFI Social	VFI Values	VFI Understanding	VFI Enhancement	VFI Protect
Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 1-5	N	8	8	7	8	8	7
	Mean	4.6750	3.9750	5.8857	5.8000	3.4000	3.2857
	Std. Deviation	1.47721	1.49833	1.19363	0.96806	1.30494	0.96511
Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 6-10	N	8	8	7	8	6	7
	Mean	4.5000	3.5000	5.8571	5.3000	4.5667	2.7143
	Std. Deviation	0.92582	1.17108	1.12377	0.93197	1.69430	1.67673
Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 11-15	N	10	10	8	11	11	11
	Mean	4.2200	3.9200	5.9500	5.2000	3.7818	2.8545
	Std. Deviation	0.28983	1.44284	0.48697	0.82462	0.66003	0.91254
Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry 16-20	N	15	16	16	14	16	16
	Mean	4.3867	3.3125	5.8875	4.9571	3.7125	2.3000
	Std. Deviation	1.19395	1.47326	1.17523	1.29420	1.55601	1.33267
Number of years of work experience in the healthcare industry >20	N	159	149	154	151	154	153
	Mean	4.7447	3.8054	6.1156	5.0940	3.9351	2.6654
	Std. Deviation	1.22359	1.38446	0.99483	1.23371	1.42909	1.35682
Total	N	200	191	192	192	195	194
	Mean	4.6790	3.7644	6.0719	5.1281	3.9056	2.6701
	Std. Deviation	1.19225	1.38594	1.00117	1.19775	1.40871	1.33212

Table 17. One Way ANOVA - VFI Factors based on Years of Experience

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
VFI Continuity	Between Groups	4.331	4	1.083	0.758	0.554
	Within Groups	278.541	195	1.428		
	Total	282.872	199			
VFI Social	Between Groups	4.674	4	1.168	0.603	0.661
	Within Groups	360.284	186	1.937		
	Total	364.958	190			
VFI Values	Between Groups	1.522	4	0.381	0.375	0.826
	Within Groups	189.926	187	1.016		
	Total	191.448	191			
VFI Understanding	Between Groups	4.489	4	1.122	0.779	0.540
	Within Groups	269.519	187	1.441		
	Total	274.008	191			
VFI Enhancement	Between Groups	5.566	4	1.391	0.697	0.595
	Within Groups	379.418	190	1.997		
	Total	384.984	194			
VFI Protect	Between Groups	5.236	4	1.309	0.734	0.570
	Within Groups	337.251	189	1.784		
	Total	342.487	193			

Hypothesis 5: Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in the motivation factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations between members of the future leader program and the other participants in the study. A T-test was conducted to determine differences in motivation between participants based on Future Leader participation. Table 18 shows results of a mean comparison of the six VFI factors based on participation in the future leader's program. Table 19 shows results of a T-test analysis on the six VFI factors based on participation in the future leader program. An independent samples T-test indicated that there was a significant difference between those who participated in the future leader's program (M = 5.50, SD = 1.06, N = 58) and those that did not on the understanding function (M = 4.97, SD = 1.22, N = 134) conditions; t(190)=2.86, p = 0.005. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 18. Mean Comparison of VFI Factors based on Future Leader Participation

Did you participate in the Future Leaders Program?		VFI Continuity	VFI Social	VFI Values	VFI Understanding	VFI Enhancement	VFI Protect
Yes	N	61	64	59	58	62	62
	Mean	4.8525	3.8531	6.1186	5.4966	4.1258	2.6935
	Std. Deviation	1.01647	1.47454	1.05184	1.05979	1.19794	1.28125
No	N	139	127	133	134	133	132
	Mean	4.6029	3.7197	6.0511	4.9687	3.8030	2.6591
	Std. Deviation	1.25755	1.34288	0.98123	1.22231	1.48996	1.36000
Total	N	200	191	192	192	195	194
	Mean	4.6790	3.7644	6.0719	5.1281	3.9056	2.6701
	Std. Deviation	1.19225	1.38594	1.00117	1.19775	1.40871	1.33212

Table 19. Independent Samples T-test Based on Future Leader Participation.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
VFI Continuity	Equal variances assumed	1.887	0.171	1.366	198	0.173	0.24958	0.18271	-0.11073	0.60989
	Equal variances not assumed			1.483	140.178	0.140	0.24958	0.16827	-0.08310	0.58226
VFI Social	Equal variances assumed	0.709	0.401	0.627	189	0.531	0.13344	0.21280	-0.28632	0.55320
	Equal variances not assumed			0.608	116.494	0.544	0.13344	0.21948	-0.30125	0.56813
VFI Values	Equal variances assumed	1.093	0.297	0.430	190	0.668	0.06752	0.15694	-0.24205	0.37709
	Equal variances not assumed			0.419	104.578	0.676	0.06752	0.16122	-0.25216	0.38720
VFI Understanding	Equal variances assumed	1.766	0.185	2.856	190	0.005	0.52790	0.18482	0.16332	0.89247
	Equal variances not assumed			3.022	123.927	0.003	0.52790	0.17468	0.18215	0.87364
VFI Enhancement	Equal variances assumed	3.412	0.066	1.495	193	0.137	0.32280	0.21594	-0.10311	0.74871
	Equal variances not assumed			1.617	145.689	0.108	0.32280	0.19959	-0.07168	0.71727
VFI Protect	Equal variances assumed	0.123	0.726	0.168	192	0.867	0.03446	0.20562	-0.37110	0.44001
	Equal variances not assumed			0.171	126.191	0.864	0.03446	0.20122	-0.36375	0.43266

Results indicate there are statistically significant differences between those who participated in the Future Leader program and those who did not in the motivating factor of "understanding." The motivating factor of understanding is indicative of learning new skills, practicing underutilized abilities, and creating opportunities to permit new learning experiences. Thus, the Future Leader program provides a means by which new volunteer leaders learn through direct "hands-on experience."

Chapter Five: Conclusions, Discussion, and Suggestions for Future Research

This study examined what motivates volunteer leaders in a not-for-profit long-term post-acute care trade association to volunteer their time and energy in support of the association and its members. The Volunteer Functions Inventory was used to measure what motivated association members to take on volunteer leadership roles within the association. A total of 666 volunteer leaders from the American Health Care Association and National Center of Assisted Living received surveys, with 216 surveys completed. The overall response rate was 32.38 percent. Survey response rates in excess of 30 percent using a digital medium fall within normal response rate ranges of 23 percent to 47 percent (Nulty, 2008). At this level of participation, this survey allows for a confidence level of 95 percent with a margin of error of +/- 5.49 percent.

This section interprets the statistical analysis of the surveys completed by the volunteer leaders of the American Health Care Association and National Center for Assisted Living. It examines the five hypotheses tested in the study and provides confirmation or rejection of each along with an interpretation of how they impact association volunteer management.

Intrinsic verses Extrinsic

First, Hypothesis one (H1) tested whether long-term post-acute health care trade association volunteers are primarily motivated by intrinsic factors rather than extrinsic factors. Results indicate that the primary motivation to volunteer is based on intrinsic or (other oriented) factors. An independent samples T-test indicated that participants with an intrinsic or (other-oriented) focus scored much higher ($M = 5.59$, $SD = .94$, $N = 178$) than extrinsic or (self-oriented) focus ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.00$, $N = 159$) conditions; $t(176)=2.82$,

$p = 0.005$. Study results indicated that volunteer leaders in LTPAC not-for-profit trade associations are primarily motived by the other-oriented or intrinsic motivations as identified in the Volunteer Functions Inventory. The factors of "values and understanding" represented intrinsic or other-oriented motivations. These factors are associated with intrinsic or altruistic motives on the part of the volunteer and are labeled the "sticky factor" because this focus tends to be long term in nature.

Survey results found the "value" function to be the dominant factor driving respondents to volunteer. This was consistent with previous findings indicating the "value" factor to be the dominant driver for intrinsically motivated volunteers (Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Ridge, R, 1992). Clary and Miller (1986) suggest the values function refers to concerns for the welfare of other and social contributions. This function has been linked to altruism. Anderson and Moore (1978) found evidence that the values function was the reason why over 70% of respondents in their study endorsed "to help others" as their primary reason for volunteering.

Additionally, Farrell, Johnston, and Twynam (1998) found volunteer motivations are linked to volunteer satisfaction of actual experiences. Consumer behavior literature suggests that if volunteers are satisfied with the volunteering experience they will come back and volunteer again.

Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) suggest that by understanding which multidimensional motives cause individuals to volunteer and the organizational context affecting volunteers, a practical bridge could be built to better shape organizational context to meet the motivational needs of volunteers. Building program and content that is based on a person's reasons for volunteering provides a systematic means by which

recruitment and retention of volunteers can be achieved. It is important for the volunteer organization to create a sense of excitement, accomplishment and self-satisfaction for intrinsically motivated volunteers (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Intrinsic motivation often happens when tasks or duties align with personal beliefs and values. Volunteers with more intrinsic motivation goals may receive more personal health and well-being benefits as a result of their service. Therefore, methods that encourage people to develop and to internalize a compassionate motivation to help others in need of their help may actually result in health benefits for themselves. Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown and Aisbett (2016) found that other-oriented volunteers accrued greater personal health benefits than self-oriented volunteers. They found a positive correlation with other-oriented motives and a negative correlation with self-oriented motives. Findings further suggested greater self-esteem, well-being, self-efficacy, social connectedness, and social trust.

The highest level of intrinsic motivation has been labeled "optimal experience" or "flow" (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Flow research and theory stems from the interest in understanding the phenomenon of autotelic activity. Volunteer members who indicate that the "value" factor is the primary motivation for volunteering may be experiencing flow as the reward for participating in the volunteer action in and of itself. For intrinsically motivated volunteers the enjoyment of helping others is the main motivation for undertaking the activity.

Last, study findings showed no difference in altruistic beliefs between older adults and younger adults based on age cohorts. This runs contrary to research by (McAdams, de St. Aubin, & Logan, 1993; Midlarsky & Kahana, 1994) which suggests that older adults demonstrate more altruistic tendencies and generational concern than younger

volunteers. Fung et al (2001) suggests that older volunteers act on long-standing beliefs thus providing a means of expressing humanitarian beliefs. They further suggest that older volunteers derive a sense of purpose from the volunteer activity itself and emotional meaning.

Gender

Second, Hypothesis two (H2) tested that there was no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on gender. An independent samples T-test indicated that there was a significant difference between men and women and that women scored higher (M = 6.26, SD = .88, N = 107) than men on the values function (M = 5.83, SD = 1.09, N = 86) conditions; t(190)=3.05, p = 0.003. Women also scored higher (M =5.29, SD = 1.23, N = 105) than men on the understanding function (M =4.92, SD = 1.12, N =88) conditions; t(190)=2.21, p = 0.28. Results suggest a significant difference between men and women in motivation based on the values and understanding functions.

While both groups indicate values function as the most important reason for volunteering, women rated it significantly higher and were more centrally in agreement as a group. Understanding subtle differences between groups can be valuable in developing strategies, approaches, and long-term goals. Trade associations are by their very nature homogeneous groups. They could share common views on such things as politics, religion, occupation, or industry. Association members often share common missions and values. In this study, both men and women were in agreement on what order of importance the six motivation factors should be put in. Both selected “values” as the most important motive for volunteering. As a group, women rated “values” higher.

This indicated that female volunteer leaders were more strongly in agreement with values-oriented statements identified in the Volunteer Functions Inventory. The female volunteer leaders were also more closely grouped in their scores. In total, 666 volunteer leaders were surveyed for this study. Of those 374 were female (56.2%). In total 216 leaders responded to the survey. Of those 116 were female (53.7%) This is consistent with national volunteer statistics between men and women.

It is not surprising that gender had a significant effect when examining the values motivations of the Volunteer Functions Inventory. This was consistent with previous research that suggested there would be a difference due to gender. Women tend to be more altruistic and willing to volunteer than men. In 2018, national volunteer statistics indicated 33.8 percent of women volunteered compared to 26.5 percent for men (CNCS, 2018).

A question that has often been asked is how does paid work and family work affect the amount of volunteer time that men and women have? Taniguchi, (2006) examined this question and found a statistically significant difference in the way employment status affects men's and women's volunteering behavior. Results indicated that both men and women are putting in more hours at work, while struggling to find the proper career and family balance. Examining men and women in this context, a gender asymmetry was developed in the way volunteer work was related to paid and family work. In addition to work, women were faced with more time constraining situations such as managing the family and other areas of focus such as aging parents. As a result, women's free time is likely to be more fragmented than men's (Bianchi and Mattingly, 2003). The implication for volunteer organizations is to find ways to offer volunteer

opportunities that may be more in line with constraints and fragmentations of available time.

Psychological research indicates women score higher in areas based on traits, motivations, and values that predict helping others. Likewise, women are more apt to step in and help family or friends. Einolf (2011) investigated the hypotheses that men offset this lower level of motivation with more resources and social capital. Results indicted partial support for this hypothesis, as "men scored higher on measures of income, education, trust, and secular social networks" (Einolf, 2011. p. 1).

Einolf (2011) research examined gender differences from three perspectives as indicators for volunteering. These included motivation, social capital, and resources. Findings suggests limited differences between men and women in volunteering based on motivation. However, women did score higher in caring and were more likely to volunteer on that basis. In the area of social capital (defined as trust and social networks) men appear to have the edge. These differences were small however and were less significant in other studies (Musick & Wilson, 2008). Certain volunteer activities have strong gender norms. For example, men are more likely to participate in volunteer fire and rescue opportunities whereas women are more likely to participate in volunteer opportunities such as hospice. Some studies found that men were more likely to volunteer in sports, civic, and recreation opportunities, while women are more likely to volunteer for religious, human services, and educational organizations.

Enjoying the volunteer experience has been found to be significant in retention of volunteers. Karl, Peluchette, and Hall (2008) investigated whether the issue of "fun at work" would be favorably received as part of the overall process of recruitment and

retention of volunteers. The authors investigated volunteer attitudes towards fun and what types of activities would be favorably received. Their findings suggested incorporating fun activities with the volunteer experience resulted in higher satisfaction and lower turnover intentions. Some age and gender issues were noted but collectively retention rates were better when volunteer activities were viewed as enjoyable.

In summary, this study found the values motivation came out on top for both men and women. It is interesting that an examination of the other motivating factors showed no statistical difference (95% confidence level) between male and female volunteers. Both groups rated values, understanding, and continuity factors as their top three causes or motivations to volunteer. Women rated enhancement and social as numbers four and five with protect last. Men rated social and enhancement as numbers four and five with protect last.

Generation Cohort

Third, Hypothesis three (H3) tested that there was no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations based on age cohort. A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine differences in motivation between study participants based on age cohort. Study results found that there were no differences in the factors motivating participants to volunteer based on age cohort. Age doesn't seem to matter. While volunteers don't seem to be motivated differently to volunteer based on age it is still critical to recognize that generational differences may exist in whether members elect to participate on a volunteer basis. Organizations should tailor their volunteer management recruitment and retention efforts to be positively perceived by various generational cohorts (Adamson, 1997).

While no difference based on generation cohort (age) were identified in the study, it is important to note that by understanding social and community-based motives, it is easier to develop prosocial behavior among younger members which allows the organization to better shape organizational context to meet the motivations of younger volunteers.

Stukas et al. (2016) concluded that by encouraging youth to volunteer, there is a potential to instill within them a sense of community and an integration of prosocial behavior and service learning. It is important for the organization to create tools that promote volunteer engagement that align with the motivations of younger members. This group can be influenced to a large degree by the way the volunteer environment is structured. This is particularly important when one considers the declining volunteer statistics among Millennials at a time when they now represent the largest segment of the work force.

Research suggests a growing need for volunteers in America at a time when volunteerism is declining (BLS, 2014). The future of volunteer management rests with the Generation X and Millennial Generations as the Traditionalists and Baby Boomers begin to exit the volunteer market. Millennials now represent the largest segment of the US workforce at 52.3 million workers; they comprise the largest segment with a college degree and yet represent the smallest percentage of volunteers (PEW, May 2015). This is an important consideration for trade associations working to recruit volunteers

Providing members a future focus of the organization will help attract and engage members to become part of the volunteer leadership. By providing members with a future focus they are more likely to volunteer and sustain their volunteer activity over

time. "Individuals with a future focus were, more motivated to serve in AmeriCorps, more satisfied with AmeriCorps service, had higher intentions to engage in volunteer activity, and were more involved in volunteerism (p 341)."

Stukas et al. (2016), determined that creating tools to promote volunteer engagement could better attract and retain intrinsically motivated individuals or extrinsically motivated individuals to volunteer. They found groups could be influenced by the way the volunteer environment was structured.

The VFI has been used to study and to help understand what motivates different people to volunteer in: (1) business organizations (Clary and Snyder, 2002); (2) medical students (Fletcher and Major, 2004); (3) environmental volunteers (Bruyere and Rappe 2007); (4) gender and culture (Terrell F., Moseley, Terrell A., and Nickerson, 2004); (5) age (Okun, Barr and Herzog, 1998); and (6) paid or unpaid (Gerstein, Wilkerson and Anderson, 2004);

Understanding the differences in motivation to volunteer between those presently volunteering and those not presently volunteering helps equip volunteer managers to recruit and retain volunteers who may not yet be in the volunteer workforce.

Work Experience

Fourth, Hypothesis four (H4) tested that there was no difference in the motivating factors to volunteer in LPTAC healthcare trade associations based on years of work. A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine differences in motivation between study participants based on years of work experience. Study results found that there were no differences in the factors motivating participants to volunteer based on years of experience. Values-driven motivation can happen anytime.

Of those surveyed, 187 of the 216 respondents were either from Generation X or from the Baby Boomer Generation. Additionally, 80 percent of respondents had 20 years or more in experience and 92.5 percent had 11 or more years of experience. This suggests a mature leadership with strong industry experience. It also suggests a need for volunteer leadership development as older volunteer leadership begin to age out and retire.

Volunteerism is a tradition and enduring fixture in American society. It is a pillar of our country's ethos of citizenship and civic participation (Snyder, 1993). We can all make a difference in the lives of those we serve. The American Health Care Association along with the National Center for Assisted Living represent the large segment of long-term post-acute care health care providers in the US. The mission of the association is to improve lives by delivering quality healthcare solutions. By doing so, member facilities can provide outstanding quality and compassionate care in an ever-changing health care environment. That ethos transcends years of work experience and represents a philosophy of care. Programs such as the Future Leaders program promote internal nurturing and growth of younger members into volunteer leaders.

(Omoto & Packard, 2016). Understanding how volunteers relate to the groups they are serving, from a sense of belonging, is critical in understanding why they volunteer and why they continue to volunteer. Creating a culture of growth and inclusion through volunteer leadership training opportunities like the Future Leaders Program demonstrate a positive correlation and causation between an individual's motivation to volunteer and their psychological sense of community. Understanding the antecedents of volunteerism is critical when studying the predictors of social action.

Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) explored the organizational context affecting volunteers. By understanding both the multidimensional motives to volunteer and the organizational context affecting volunteers, a practical bridge can be developed to better shape organizational context to meet the motivations of volunteers. Building program and content that is based on a person's reasons for volunteering provides a systematic means by which recruitment and retention of volunteers can be achieved. Utilizing experienced and seasoned professionals to lead the organization and to mentor their future replacements through education and programming provides for a systematic means by which to transfer mission, vision, and values to future volunteer leaders.

Future Leader Participation

Fifth, Hypothesis five (H5) tested that there was no difference in the motivational factors to volunteer in LTPAC healthcare trade associations between members of the Future Leaders program and the other participants in the study. An independent samples T-test indicated that there was a significant difference between those who participated in the Future Leaders program ($M = 5.50$, $SD = 1.06$, $N = 58$) and those that did not on the understanding function ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.22$, $N = 134$) conditions; $t(190)=2.86$, $p = 0.005$. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Study results found that there was a statistical difference in the understanding function motivating participants to volunteer based on participation in the Future Leaders program. So, what does this mean?

Association records indicate that there have been more than 400 members who have participated in the Future Leaders Program since its inception in 2006. Of those, 70 were identified as part of the national volunteer leadership. In all, 80% of all Future

Leaders graduates have assumed some volunteer leadership role at the state or national level. This suggests a strong and growing gateway for volunteer leadership growth.

Clary, Snyder, idge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Mine (1998) indicated that to successfully recruit volunteers one should first understand the specific motivational functions underlying the behavior and attitudes of those volunteers. Developing engagement strategies for volunteers, one must consider the personal motivation that drive both commitment and involvement. Delaney and Royal (2017) dissected engagement as a construct of component parts suggesting that motivation is a key component of engagement and performance.

All participants in the Future Leader Program hold a bachelor's degree or higher. According to one national study, education is the single best predictor of volunteering. ("Association Now," 2013). National volunteer statistics suggest we should be concerned as volunteering among people with a bachelor's degree or higher has fallen from a 2009 high of 42.8 percent to 39.8 percent in 2013 (CNCS, 2014). Individuals with higher levels of education were more likely to volunteer than those with less education.

Implications Relative to the Volunteer Literature.

The author contributed to theory or the research stream on functional motivation as it applies to volunteerism in not-for-profit healthcare trade associations. The author's purpose is to inform association leadership and healthcare practitioners by illustrating the motivating factors driving members to volunteer their time and energy. Six motivating factors are discussed. Building strategies for recruiting, engaging, and retaining volunteers is central to this research. Those who volunteer based on an other oriented

focus are more likely to remain as volunteers over time (sticky factor) compared to those who volunteer based on a self oriented focus (retention attention required).

One of the most consistently important motives for volunteering across the research is expressing values related to altruistic beliefs. Borgonovi (2008) examined whether engaging in voluntary work leads to greater well-being, as measured by self-reported health and happiness. This research explored reasons that could account for the observed causal effect of volunteering on happiness. Borgonovi (2008) suggests that volunteering contributed to happiness levels by increasing empathic emotions, shifting aspirations and by moving the salient reference group in subjective evaluations of relative positions from the relatively better off to the relatively worse-off. Understanding the importance of the motivation function "values" can help drive organizational structure, strategy, and culture.

Organization culture is driven by the beliefs of the members. Having a foundation based on altruistic values provides a guiding architecture that helps propel performance and behavior. Multiple studies have illustrated how organizations and their members share and accept common mission and values (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copland, Stukas, Haugen & Miene, 1998; Clary & Snyder, 2002; Penner, 2002; Fletcher & Major, 2004; Gerstein, Wilkerson, and Anderson, 2004; Hanson, White, Dorsey, & Pulakos, 2005; CNCS, 2006; Legault, 2016; Ormel et al., 2019). Values are the backbone or glue behind organizational culture.

This study does not support findings by McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1993; Midlarsky & Kahana, 1994 that older volunteers deomonstrate more altruistic beliefs and generational concers than younger volunteers.

Implications for volunteeerism in not-for-profit organizations.

Not-for-profit organizations rely on volunteerism for their lifeblood. In many cases, volunteers are in fact their greatest asset. Most organizations would not be able to conduct programs, raise funds, or meet their mission without them. This study offers insight into how gender and organizational leadership training, through programs such as the Future Leaders program, can generate member engagement and involvement.

Managing volunteers is similar in nature to managing paid employees. Treating volunteers with respect and dignity, keeping them informed on organizational issues, communicating with them, providing training on organizational needs, and involving them in organizational decisions help make the volunteer experience positive. This means that volunteers should be sent the right message from the start. This includes having a positive work environment, position descriptions, and creating the right environment. It also includes regularly saying thanks, seeking feedback using member surveys, and continuing to engage volunteers based on their motivations.

In many organizations, volunteer leaders bring much needed skills that help the organization achieve its mission. Providing continuing education through the organization in the form or orientation or leadership development adds to the volunteer experience and creates added value for both the individual volunteer and the organization.

This study corroborates the “values” function as the driving mission matched, motivation to volundeer. It also provides additional on how men and women differ in motivations to volunteer.

Volunteer Management Implications.

The functionalist approach, first introduced by Clary, Snyder & Ridge (1992), explains the motivation behind deliberately volunteering with an organization as well as the conscious decision to continue this relationship. (Clary et al, 1992) suggest three reasons to support the actions taken by individuals to begin the volunteering process. First, a need or motivation must be present in the individual, whether it be personal or social. This creates dissonance that can only be solved by satisfying that need or motivation through volunteering. Second, the same act of volunteering can satisfy different needs or motivations in different people. Third, in order to keep the bond between the organization and the volunteer, the volunteer environment or job must satisfy that need or motivation expressed by the individual. If it does not satisfy this need, the volunteer will leave the group in search of another route to fulfil this need.

This study presents several implications to volunteer management. First, it reinforces the belief that volunteer leaders are primarily motivated by altruistic values to help others. The study found both men and women are primarily motivated by the Values function. Second, when recruiting volunteers it is essential to develop volunteer opportunities that reflect the beliefs and values of those being recruited. Third, understanding the need to further develop volunteer opportunities for Millennials will help with building volunteer continuity over time. Finally, providing an understanding of who volunteers and why individuals volunteer enables association leadership to tailor strategies, programs, and volunteer opportunities that aligned with association volunteer leadership's underlying value systems.

Implications for community wide volunteerism.

Understanding the elements of what motivates people to engage in volunteer activity is essential in volunteer recruitment and retention. This study examined a defined group of volunteer in LTPAC association management. It found that women were statistically more significant to volunteer when motivated by issues such as altruism "Values" and skill building and training "Understanding." It also found that members who were provided leadership training were more motivated because of the learning opportunities ("Understanding") than those who did not receive the leadership learning opportunities.

This suggests that when appealing to potential volunteers it is important to understand what motivations are driving individuals to get involved. Understanding these motivations will enable the group seeking volunteers to better establish structures that will be in line with the individual's personal values. This in turn will lead to better engagement as well as provide better opportunities for recruitment and retention. Leadership development like the Future Leaders Program can serve as a model for leadership growth.

Implications for the functional approach to motivation theory development.

This study examined the functional motivations of leaders in a nonprofit healthcare trade association. As long-term, post-acute care takes on a larger role with the aging of our population it is essential that associations serving these populations remain viable to help advocate for this vunerable population. As stated by Gage and Thapa (2012), the VFI is viewed as "the standard instrument to assess volunteer motivation" (p. 413).

(Wymer, Riecken and Yavas, 1997) suggested there are four primary determinants of volunteerism. These include the person, their social interactions, efficacy, and context. The person refers to the individual's personality, values and attitude. Primary values have the greatest impact on an individual's motivations to volunteer. The second determinant of volunteerism was the individual's social interactions. This includes past, present, or future relationships. The third determinant of volunteerism is the individual's efficacy. Will an individual's skills and talents be useful to the organization? The final determinant is context. Does the individual have the time, money, and personal resources to volunteer? This also includes what is expected by the organization of the volunteer in terms of time, monetary commitment, and personal resources.

(Chacón, Gutiérrez, Sauto, Vecina, & Pérez, 2017) conducted a systematic review of research on volunteers using the Volunteer Functions Inventory. In total 48 research studies were examined including 67 independent samples. The total sample of the studies examined ranged from 20,375 to 21,988 participants. Results of their review found that the Values factor obtained the highest mean score. This was true on an overall basis and within each type of volunteer organization studied. This study provides additional confirmation that the "values" function is a critical factor in volunteer motivation. Volunteer concern and commitment under a functional approach are collectively determined by whether there is a match between an individual's critical motives and the opportunity configurations associated with the volunteer experience (Clary et al., 1998).

Significance of the findings.

Though the research suggests that volunteer engagement is contingent on understanding the motivations of the volunteer, little research has been done to understand why member driven health care trade associations have such high levels of volunteerism. Results suggest that volunteer healthcare leaders are "values" or intrinsically motivated. This is true regardless of age, gender, years of experience, or association-based leadership training. Thus, volunteer leadership in health care trade associations should be recruited, engaged, and retained based on strategies focused on the primary motivating factors of value, understanding, and continuity.

Limitations of the Conclusions Drawn From Results.

First, this study examines a group of convenience as opposed to a random sample from volunteers in associations across the county. As such, results of this study cannot be generally applied to other associations, only suggested. Results suggest participants are motivated to volunteer by the same primary functions. This study provides a platform for future studies with other associations.

Second, this study examined motivation factors of volunteers using the VFI and as such, data collected is only as strong and reliable as the instrument being used. The VFI has been used multiple times and validated. The survey return rate compared to the total number of surveys distributed sets the margin of error at five percent.

Third, this study was conducted over a certain interval and is therefore a snapshot in time. It is dependent on conditions occurring during the study time period. It is unknown how much the leadership changes from year to year or its composition. Taking

a snapshot in multiple years and then comparing results would provide additional date to compare findings.

Fourth, there is limited research on volunteer motivation within trade associations. However, there is sufficient research demonstrating the importance of volunteerism and motivating factors to volunteer to empirically tie the factors together in a research study. Clary et al.'s (1998) examined 48 research studies including 67 independent samples that used the VFI to examine groups. The total sample of the studies analyzed ranged from 20,375 to 21,988 participants, depending on the motivation analyzed. Results showed the Values factor obtained the highest mean score, on an overall basis and within each volunteer group analyzed. Volunteer research indicates that healthcare workers have a higher probability of volunteering based on occupation, and education. According to Association Now (2013), education is the single best predictor of volunteering.

Possible Alternative Explanations for the Results.

George Fox University's DBA Research Manual (Haigh, 2018) indicates that researchers should always consider possible alternative explanations from the results of their dissertation study. The one-way ANOVA test did not provide inconclusive results in this study. Values were identified as the primary volunteer motivator for all groups examined. No inconclusive results were found in the study. In this study's case, there appears to be no other possible alternative explanations of the study's results.

Future Research

For further research on the individual motivations experienced by the AHCA/NCAL volunteer leadership, a Volunteer Functions Inventory Questionnaire could be distributed to individual members when they submit their names each year for

potential volunteer leadership assignments. Given the aging of the volunteer leadership pool it would be beneficial to continue to study and develop strategy and messaging for the associations younger volunteer leadership.

Non-profit healthcare trade associations have a large volunteer leadership pool to draw from due to the homogeneity of the group. Members show alignment of personal values, social interactions, efficacy, and context. Volunteer leaders in the association tend to be college educated, with significant job experience. Based on research by (Wymer, Riecken and Yavas, 1997) we should continue to better understand such questions as; Does the individual have the time, money, and personal resources to volunteer? And what is expected by the organization of the volunteer in terms of time, monetary commitment and personal resources?

Another opportunity for continued research in this area is to do a follow up with association leadership on the 18-question volunteer outcome survey. These additional questions reflect the volunteers' long-term intentions as they apply to the six functional areas of motivation.

Clary and Snyder's (1999) framework suggests that people are purposeful, plan-oriented, and goal-directed in their volunteer activates. They engage in volunteer activity in order to satisfy significant personal values. People may volunteer or engage in similar activities for differing reasons. People are often motivated by multiple goals they are trying to fulfill at the same time. Outcomes will be dependent on how well volunteers and organizations match goals to opportunities. An organization's success in recruiting and retention of volunteers will be tied to the individual's satisfaction and the overall fulfillment of the individual's motives through the volunteer experience

Limited research is available on specific studies done using the VFI in healthcare association management. Having multiple studies to compare and contrast would help add context and depth to the functional approach to motivation as it applies to association management. Adding additional demographic questions such as income, length of membership in association, and job title/role would allow further analysis of the data.

Conclusion

This study was done to investigate and better understand what motivates long-term post-acute care leaders in not-for-profit health care trade associations to volunteer, using the Volunteer Functions Inventory. It was the opinion of the researcher that understanding what motivates leaders to volunteer would be beneficial to attracting and retaining them. Study findings support the cross-validation study done by Clary et al. (1998), that measured college students' motivations. Data from that study indicated that the "values" factor was the dominant motivation for participants.

The literature review for this study revealed many interesting perspectives on the subject of volunteer motivation as it applies to nonprofit organizations in the healthcare sector. The four primary determinants of volunteerism identified include person, social interactions, efficacy, and context. This study focused on the functionalist approach to understanding volunteer motivations. Researchers have found that volunteers can be motivated by different factors when completing the same work. Therefore, it is imperative to understand the underlying motives to volunteer in order to build long-term sustainable volunteer relationships. To have long-term sustainable relationships with volunteers the volunteer must receive positive satisfaction from the volunteer activity.

The volunteer functions inventory (Clary, Snyder, & Ridge, 1992) identified six primary motivations of volunteerism; values, understanding, enhancement, career, social and protective. This study examined these six functional motivations by surveying the volunteer leadership of the association. The results indicated that values, understanding, and continuity were the most popular motives for volunteering. In addition, the least popular motivating factors were career, social, and protective. Clary and Snyder concluded that following a strategy of messaging tailored towards an individual's motivations were more likely to attract and retain volunteers.

The literature review also suggested that leaders in healthcare tended to be well educated (at least a BS/BA degree). They also tend to score lower on social, protective, and career motivating factors. This reinforces the views found in this study where volunteers were focused helping others, contributing to the organization, and contributing to their community. The volunteer leadership at AHCA/NCAL are primarily comprised of Gen Xers and Baby Boomers. As indicated, older volunteers are motivated by their desire to help others. They are less motivated by career and protective factors.

The altruistic "values" focus of volunteer leaders is similar in nature to servant leadership. This suggests a leadership style with an "other-oriented" focus. Volunteer leaders experiencing "flow" are more involved with everything around them because they are fully immersed in the volunteer activity. Longevity among volunteer leaders suggests this may also be present.

Alignment of organizational mission with member motivation is critical for a successful volunteer experience. This is a group of very high homogeneity. Association should focus on the "sticky factor" related to other oriented volunteerism but not loose

sight of the fact that self oriented volunteers will require significantly more “retention attention”.

Building volunteer acceptance and motivation by younger members will be important as older volunteers begin to retire. It will be important to build messaging to better meet their motivations to volunteer. While younger volunteer members also prioritize the value, and understanding motivations to volunteer as most important, they have a stronger relationship to the career motivation compared to other age groups.

References

Adair, J. (1973) *Action-Centered Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Adamson, T. (1997). An examination of gender differences in ideal leadership style using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Griffith University, Griffith.

Allison, Lora D., Okun, Morris A., and Dutridge, Kathy S. (2002). Assessing volunteer motives: A comparison of an open-ended probe and Likert rating scales. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 12*(4), 243-255. doi: 10.1002/casp.677

American Health Care Association (AHCA). (2014). "AHCA Future Leaders." Retrieved June 11, 2014 from http://www.ahcancal.org/about_ahca/futureleaders/Pages/default.aspx

American Health Care Association (AHCA). (2014). "Who we are." Retrieved June 11, 2014 from http://www.ahcancal.org/about_ahca/Pages/Who-We-Are.aspx

Anderson, J. C., & Moore, L. F. (1978). The motivation to volunteer. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 7*(3-4), 120-129.

ASAE. (2013). Decision to Volunteer. Retrieved July 7, 2015 from http://www.asaecenter.org/Resources/content.cfm?ItemNumber=35122

Associations NOW (2013). 50 years later, associations carry JFK's volunteerism torch. Retrieved July 13, 2015 from www.associationsnow.com/2013/11/50-years-later-associations-carry-jfks-volunteerism-torch/

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The leadership quarterly, 16*(3), 315-338.

Bales, K. (1996). Measuring the propensity to volunteer. *Social Policy & Administration*, *30*(3), 206-226.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bass, B. (1985) *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership* (Vol. 11). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231-272.

Bass, B.M.& Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Bassett-Jones, N., & Lloyd, G. C. (2005). Does Herzberg's motivation theory have staying power? *Journal of management development*, *24*(10), 929-943.

Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *8*(1), 12-29.

Bergman, J. Z., Rentsch, J. R., Small, E. E., Davenport, S. W., & Bergman, S. M. (2012). The shared leadership process in decision-making teams. *The Journal of social psychology*, *152*(1), 17-42.

Bianchi, S. M., & Mattingly, M. J. (2003). 5. Time, Work, and Family in the United States. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *8*, 95-118.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The new managerial grid: strategic new insights into a proven system for increasing organization productivity and individual effectiveness, plus a revealing examination of how your managerial style can affect your mental and physical health*. Gulf Pub. Co.

Bolles, R. C. (1975). *Theory of motivation*. HarperCollins Publishers.

Borgonovi, F. (2008). Doing well by doing good. The relationship between formal volunteering and self-reported health and happiness. *Social science & medicine*, *66*(11), 2321-2334.

Bowie, N. (2000). "A Kantian theory of leadership", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 21(4), 185–193

Boyer, J.P. (2003). Leading in an upside-down world: New Canadian perspectives on leadership. Toronto, CA: Dundurn.

Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Publications.

Bruyere, B., & Rappe, S. (2007). Identifying the motivations of environmental volunteers. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *50*(4), 503-516.

Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: Some neglected issues. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(3/4), 280-304.

Bureau of Labor and Statistics. (2014). BLS. Retrieved July 1, 2015 from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/volun.pdf

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2005). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.

Carlyle, T. (1897). *The Hero as Man of letters*. G. Bell.

Carson, E. D. (1999). Comment: On defining and measuring volunteering in the United States and abroad. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, *62*(4), 67-71.

Chacón, F., Gutiérrez, G., Sauto, V., Vecina, M. L., & Pérez, A. (2017). Volunteer functions inventory: a systematic review. *Psicothema*, *29*(3).

Churchill, W. (2007). Winston Churchill quotes. *Thinkexist.com*.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Ridge, R. (1992). Volunteers' motivations: A functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *2*(4), 333-350. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.413002040

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Meine, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1516-1530.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteers' Motivations: Findings from a National Survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *25*(4), 485–505. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764096254006

Clary, E. G. & Snyder, M. (2002). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*, 156-159.

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2002). Community involvement: Opportunities and challenges in socializing adults to participate in society. Journal of Social Issues, 58, 581–591.

Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 12, 637-647.

Corporation for National and Community Service. (2006) CNCS. Retrieved June 1, 2015 from http://www.nationalservice.gov/

Corporation for National and Community Service. (2014) CNCS. Retrieved July 2, 2015 from http://www.nationalservice.gov/

Corporation for National and Community Service. (2018) CNCS. Retrieved January 3, 2020 from http://www.nationalservice.gov/

Covey, S. (1992) *Principle-Centered Leadership*. Simon and Schuster.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design. *Qualitative and Quantitative approaches*.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Nakamura, J. (1979). The concept of flow. *Play and learning*, 257-274.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention. *Harper Perennial, New York, 39*.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., Abuhamdeh, S., & Nakamura, J. (2014). Flow. In *Flow and the foundations of positive psychology* (pp. 227-238). Springer, Dordrecht.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rathunde, K. (1993). The measurement of flow in everyday life: Toward a theory of emergent motivation.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, *13*(1), 46-78.

Darwin, C. (2009). *The origin of species by means of natural selection: or, the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life*. W. F. Bynum (Ed.). AL Burt.

Deci, E. L., & Flaste, R. Why we do what we do: understanding self-motivation. 1996.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Delaney, M. L., & Royal, M. A. (2017). Breaking engagement apart: The role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in engagement strategies. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *10*(1), 127-140.

Depue, R. A., & Collins, P. F. (1999). Neurobiology of the structure of personality: Dopamine, facilitation of incentive motivation, and extraversion. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *22*(03), 491-517.

De Tocqueville, A. (1954). Democracy in America. 1835, 1840. *and abridged by Richard D. Heffner. New York: New American Library*.

De Tocqueville, A. (2003). *Democracy in America* (Vol. 10). Regnery Publishing.

Dietz, J. (2017) Why Do People Volunteer For Professional Associations and Trade Groups. Retrieved January 24, 2020 from https://blog.higherlogic.com/why-do-people-volunteer-for-professional-associations-and-trade-groups

Dillman, Don A. (1978). *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*, 1978. John Wiley: New York

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (Vol. 2). New York: Wiley.

Einolf, C. J. (2011). Gender Differences in the Correlates of Volunteering and Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *40*(6), 1092–1112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010385949

Farrell, J. M., Johnston, M. E., & Twynam, G. D. (1998). Volunteer motivation, satisfaction, and management at an elite sporting competition. *Journal of sport Management*, *12*(4), 288-300.

Fiedler, F. (1961). Leadership and leadership effectiveness traits: A reconceptualization of the leadership trait problem. D. A. P. Porter (Ed), *Studies in Organizational Behavior and Management*. Pennsylvania: International Textbook.

Fiedler, (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Finkelstien, M. A. (2009). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*(5-6), 653-658.

Fletcher, T. D., & Major, D. A. (2004). Medical students' motivations to volunteer: An examination of the nature of gender differences. *Sex Roles*, *51*(1-2), 109-114.

Freud, S., & Freud, A. (2001). *Complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 1). Random House.

Frieze, I. H., & Boneva, B. S. (2001). Power motivation and motivation to help others. *The use and abuse of power: Multiple perspectives on the causes of corruption*, 75-89.

Fry, L. W., & Cohen, M. P. (2009). Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organizational transformation and recovery from extended work hours cultures. *Journal of business ethics*, *84*(2), 265-278.

Furnham, A. (1995). The just world, charitable giving and attitudes to disability. *Personality and individual differences*, *19*(4), 577-583.

Geiser, C., Okun, M. A., & Grano, C. (2014). Who is motivated to volunteer? A latent profile analysis linking volunteer motivation to frequency of volunteering. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling*, *56*(1), 3.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gerstein, L. H., Wilkeson, D. A., & Anderson, H. (2004). Differences in motivations of paid versus nonpaid volunteers 1. *Psychological reports*, *94*(1), 163-175.

Getz, K. (2007). *The gift of participation: A guide to making informed decisions about volunteering for a clinical trial*. CISCRP.

Graen, G. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, *1201*, 1245.

Greenleaf, R. (1970) *Servant as Leader*. Center for Applied Studies.

Grimm Jr, R. T., & Dietz, N. (2018). Where are America's volunteers? A look at America's widespread decline in volunteering in cities and states. *Research Brief, Do Good Institute, University of Maryland*.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The leadership quarterly*, *13*(4), 423-451Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2, 163-194.

Haigh, J. (2018). Doctor of Business Administration Research Manual. George Fox University.

Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Brudney, J. L., Ascoli, U., Meijs, L. C., & Ranade, S. (2000). Public perception of" who is a volunteer": An examination of the net-cost approach from a cross-cultural perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 11*(1), 45-65.

Hanson, R. M., White, S. S., Dorsey, D. W. & Pulakos, E. D. (2005). Training adaptable leaders: Lessons from research and practice. U.S. Army Research Institute For the Behavioral and Social Services. Personnel Decisions Research Institute. 1-56.

Harnish, R. J., Bridges, K. R., & Adolph, A. (2016). Volunteerism: Its Impact on Personal Development and Educational Experience. Currents In Teaching & Learning, 7(2).

Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). Leadership in a (permanent) crisis. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(7/8), 62-69.

Hennessey, B., Moran, S., Altringer, B., & Amabile, T. M. (2015). Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. *Wiley encyclopedia of management*, 1-4.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Holy Wiley & Sons.

Herzberg, F. M., & Mausner, B. (1959). B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*, *2*, 49-58.

House, R. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Quarterly*, 16, 321-338.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1975). *Path-goal theory of leadership* (No. TR-75-67). WASHINGTON UNIV SEATTLE DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY.

House, R. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. J. L. L. Hunt (Eds), Leadership: The cutting edge. Illinois: Illinois University Press.

House, R. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 23-58.

House, R., & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-474.

Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Jennings, E. E. (1960). *An anatomy of leadership: Princes, heroes, and supermen*. Harper.

Karl, K. A., Peluchette, J. V., & Hall, L. M. (2008). Give them something to smile about: A marketing strategy for recruiting and retaining volunteers. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *20*(1), 71-96.

Karnes, F., Deason, D., & D'ilio, V. (1993). Leadership skills and self-actualization of school-age children. *Psychological Reports*, 73(3), 861.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public opinion quarterly*, *24*(2), 163-204.

Kenrick, T., Neuberg, L., Griskevicius, V., Becker, V., and Schaller, M. (2010). Goal-Driven Cognition and Functional Behavior The Fundamental-Motives Framework. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19(1),* pp. 63-67

Kim, B. J., Kim, M. H., & Lee, J. (2019). Congruence Matters: Volunteer Motivation, Value Internalization, and Retention. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, *19*(5).

Kim, J. O., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it* (No. 13). Sage.

Kirkpatick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter? *The executive*, *5*(2), 48-60.

Kotter, J. P. (2008). *Force for change: How leadership differs from management*. Simon and Schuster.

Kowal, J., & Fortier, M. S. (1999). Motivational determinants of flow: Contributions from self-determination theory. *The journal of social psychology*, *139*(3), 355-368.

Legault, L. (2016). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences*, 1-4.

Lehman, B. H. (1928). *Carlyle's theory of the hero: its sources, development, history, and influence on Carlyle's work: a study of a nineteenth century idea*. Duke university press.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in the social sciences: Selected theoretical papers. New York, NY: Harper.

Locke, E. A. (1997). The motivation to work: What we know. *Advances in motivation and achievement*, *10*, 375-412.

Loewald, H. W. (1971). On motivation and instinct theory. *The Psychoanalytic study of the child*.

Long-term Post-Acute Care Health Information Technology. (2012). LTPAC. Retrieved June 24, 2015 from http://www.ltpachealthit.org/content/about-long-term-and-post-acute-care

Luthans, F. (2002). *Organizational Behaviour*. (9th ed.). McGraw Hill.

McAdams, D. P., de St Aubin, E. D., & Logan, R. L. (1993). Generativity among young, midlife, and older adults. *Psychology and aging*, *8*(2), 221.

Macduff, N. (2004, November). The shrinking volunteer: Where have all those long-term service volunteers gone. In *Annual Conference, Association for Research on Nonprofits and Voluntary Action, Los Angeles*.

Maki, A., Dwyer, P. C., & Snyder, M. (2016). Time perspective and volunteerism: The importance of focusing on the future. The Journal of Social Psychology, 156(3), 334-349.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, *50*(4), 370.

Maslow, A. H., Frager, R., & Cox, R. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (Vol. 2). J. Fadiman, & C. McReynolds (Eds.). New York: Harper & Row.

Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M. C. (2003). *Personality traits*. Cambridge University Press.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, 21, 166.

Midlarsky, E., & Kahana, E. (1994). *Altruism in later life*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Mitchell, T. R., & Daniels, D. (2003). Observations and commentary on recent research in work motivation. *Motivation and work behavior*, *7*, 225-254.

Mullins, L. (2007). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. (8th ed.). Pearson, Education Limited

Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). Volunteers: a social profile Indiana.

Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2009). Flow theory and research. *Handbook of positive psychology,* 195-206.

Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2014). The concept of flow. In *Flow and the foundations of positive psychology* (pp. 239-263). Springer, Dordrecht.

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological review*, *91*(3), 328.

Nickell, G. S. (1998). The helping attitude scale. *American Psychological Association, San Francisco*.

Okun, M. A., Barr, A., & Herzog, A. (1998). Motivation to volunteer by older adults: a test of competing measurement models. *Psychology and aging*, *13*(4), 608.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (2010). Influences of psychological sense of community on voluntary helping and prosocial action. In S. Stuermer & M. Snyder (Eds.), The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping (pp. 223–243). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Omoto, A. M., & Packard, C. D. (2016). The power of connections: Psychological sense of community as a predictor of volunteerism. The Journal of social psychology, 156(3), 272-290.

Ormel, H., Kok, M., Kane, S., Ahmed, R., Chikaphupha, K., Rashid, S. F., ... & Taegtmeyer, M. (2019). Salaried and voluntary community health workers: exploring how incentives and expectation gaps influence motivation. *Human resources for health*, *17*(1), 59.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2002). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Sage Publications.

Penner, L. A. (2002). Dispositional and organizational influences on sustained volunteerism: An interactionism perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 58,* 447-467.

Pennock, S. F., & Alberts, H. (2014, December 24). What is Self-Determination Theory? Retrieved October 25, 2020, from https://positivepsychologyprogram.com/selfdetermination-theory/

Pervin, L. A. (1994). A critical analysis of current trait theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, *5*(2), 103-113.

Peters, R. S. (1958). *The concept of motivation*.

PEW Research Center. (May 11, 2015). PEW. Retrieved July 1, 2015 from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-gen-xers-as-the-largest-generation-in-u-s-labor-force/

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children* (Vol. 8, No. 5, p. 18). New York: International Universities Press.

Piaget, J. (1997). *The moral judgment of the child*. Simon and Schuster.

Posner, B., & Kouzes, J. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 483-496.

Principi, A., Warburton, J., Schippers, J., & Di Rosa, M. (2013). The role of work status on European older volunteers' motivation. *Research on Aging*, *35*(6), 710-735.

Raelin, J. A. (2003). *Creating leaderful organizations: How to bring out leadership in everyone*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Reinhard, S. C., Kassner, E., & Houser, A. (2011). How the Affordable Care Act can help move states toward a high-performing system of long-term services and supports. *Health Affairs, 30*(3), 447-453

Russell, R.F., & Stone, A.G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23*(3), 145–157.

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2007). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist, 55*(1), 68Mauch, J. E., & Burch, J. W. (1998). *Guide to the successful thesis and dissertation: A handbook for students and faculty* (4th ed.). New York: Marcel Dekker.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schuyt, T., Smit, J. H., & Bekkers, R. (2013). Constructing a philanthropy-scale: Social responsibility and philanthropy.

Senge, P. (1995). In on schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. *J. O'Neil. Educational Leadership, 52*(7).

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Broadway Business.

Serow, R. C., & Dreyden, J. I. (1990). Community service among college and university students: Individual and institutional relationships. *Adolescence, 25*(99), 553.

Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2014). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. In *Applications of flow in human development and education* (pp. 475-494). Springer, Dordrecht.

Shye, S. (2010). The motivation to volunteer: A systemic quality of life theory. *Social Indicators Research*, *98*(2), 183-200.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Simon and Schuster.

Smith, D. H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *23*(3), 243-263.

Smith, M. B., Bruner, J. S., & White, R. W. (1956). Opinions and personality Wiley. *New York*.

Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.

Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature.

Strack, G., & Fottler, M. D. (2001). Spirituality and effective leadership in healthcare: Is there a connection? *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 18(4), 3-18.

Studer, S., & von Schnurbein, G. (2013). Organizational factors affecting volunteers: A literature review on volunteer coordination. VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 24(2), 403-440.

Stukas, A. A, Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2002). The effects of "Mandatory Volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10,* 59-64.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2008). The social marketing of volunteerism: A functional approach. In C. P. Haugtvedt, P. Herr, & F. Kardes (Eds.), Handbook of consumer psychology (pp. 959–979). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stukas, A. A., Hoye, R., Nicholson, M., Brown, K. M., & Aisbett, L. (2016). Motivations to volunteer and their associations with volunteers' well-being. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 45(1), 112-132.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2016). Understanding and encouraging volunteerism and community involvement.

Sturm, B. A. (2009). Principles of servant-leadership in community health nursing: Management issues and behaviors discovered in ethnographic research.' Home Health Care Management & Practice, 21(2), 82–89.

Tam, S. (2014). CCC History.

Taniguchi, H. (2006). Men's and women's volunteering: Gender differences in the effects of employment and family characteristics. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *35*(1), 83-101.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1973). *How to choose a leadership pattern* (pp. 3-12). *Harvard Business Review*.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I., & Massarik, F. (2013). *Leadership and organization*. Routledge.

Terrell, F., Moseley, K. L., Mosley, K. L., Terrell, A. S., & Nickerson, K. J. (2004). The relationship between motivation to volunteer, gender, cultural mistrust, and

willingness to donate organs among Blacks. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, *96*(1), 53.

Tichy, N. and Devanna, M. (1986) *Transformational Leadership*. New York: Wiley.

Volunteers, U. N. (2016). State of the world's volunteerism report 2015: Transforming governance.

Vroom, V. (1964). Motivation and work.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American psychologist*, *62*(1), 17.

Webb, D. J., Green, C. L., & Brashear, T. G. (2000). Development and validation of scales to measure attitudes influencing monetary donations to charitable organizations. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *28*(2), 299-309.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of economic and social organization.* Trans. AM Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weiner, B. (1972). Theories of motivation: From mechanism to cognition.

Weiner, B. (Ed.). (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. General Learning Press.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological review*, *92*(4), 548.Yin, R. K. (2009). Case study research: Design and method (4th ed.). Thousand

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41, 176–212. doi:10.1177/0899764011434558

Wymer, W., Riecken, G., & Yavas, U. (1997). Determinants of volunteerism: A cross-disciplinary review and research agenda. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public-Sector Marketing*, *4*(4), 3-26.

Yukl, G. (1971). Toward a behavioral theory of leadership. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, *6*(4), 414-440.

Yukl, G. (1988). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.

Yukl, G. (1993). A retrospective on Robert House's 1976 theory of charismatic leadership and recent revisions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(3/4), 367-373.

Zuckerman, M., & Wheeler, L. (1975). To dispel fantasies about the fantasy-based measure of fear of success.

Zuckerman, M. (1994). *Behavioral expressions and biosocial bases of sensation seeking*. Cambridge university press.

Zuckerman, M. (2014). *Sensation Seeking (Psychology Revivals): Beyond the Optimal Level of Arousal*. Psychology Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Volunteer Survey

Personal Demographic Data - Part 1

Information about You:
Question 1: Gender?
_____ Female _____ Male
Question 2: When year where you born? _____
Question 3: How many years of work experience do you have? _____
Question 4: Did you participate in the AHCA/NCAL Future Leaders Program?
___ Yes ___ No

Volunteer Motivation - Part 2

As a volunteer leader in either your state healthcare association or as a volunteer leader in the national association, please indicate how important each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you, using the 7-point scale below.
Record your answer in the space next to each item:
Not at all important for you 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely important for you
____ 1. Volunteering allows me to continue to use my professional knowledge and skills.
____ 2. My friends volunteer.
____ 3. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
____ 4. People I'm close to want me to volunteer.
____ 5. Volunteering makes me feel important
____ 6. People I know share an interest in community service.
____ 7. No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
____ 8. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
____ 9. By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
____ 10. Volunteering provides an opportunity for me to continue to mix with other professionals.
____ 11. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
____ 12. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
____ 13. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
____ 14. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
____ 15. Volunteering gives me a feeling of continued self-development.
____ 16. I feel compassion toward people in need.
____ 17. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
____ 18. Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands on" experience.
____ 19. I feel it is important to help others.
____ 20. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
____ 21. Volunteering gives me a sense of achievement that I previously gained from my work.
____ 22. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
____ 23. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.
____ 24. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
____ 25. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
____ 26. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
____ 27. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
____ 28. Volunteering gives me a sense of purpose that I previously obtained from my work.
____ 29. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
____ 30. I can explore my own strengths.

Appendix B: Introduction E-mail or Letter to State Executive Leaders

Email of Introduction to State Leaders

Subject: Volunteer Leadership in LTPAC Association Management

Dear State Executive Directors

Providing volunteer leadership in our state and national health care associations is essential to their success. At AHCA/NCAL, we want every future leader to find the place that fits his or her gifts, abilities, and passion. Understanding why people serve is part of making sure that AHCA/NCAL does a good job of creating the best volunteer opportunities for you. Whether it is serving on a committee, a task force, a board or advisory council your involvement is crucial to our success. One of our current national leaders, Chris Mason (Past NCAL Chair) is doing research on what motivates leaders to volunteer. All research data gathered is kept confidential.

The goal of his research is to help AHCA/NCAL and the state affiliates be more intentional in their efforts to help future leaders find their place of effective volunteer leadership. I am asking you to participate in this research by completing a short survey (link below). Completing the survey took only five minutes and respondents were told it would take no more than 15 minutes. In order for your input to be included in the research, you need to complete the survey by (Date).

We are really excited to see what Chris learns in this research and how it might help us at AHCA/NCAL in matching future leaders to volunteer opportunities within our organization. If you are interested in finding out the results of this research, please email Chris at cmason12@gerogefox.edu. He is happy to share a copy of his results with you. This letter/email came from AHCA/NCAL.

Appendix C: Introductory E-mail or Letter Association Leadership

Email of Introduction to Association Leadership

Subject: Volunteer Leadership in LTPAC Association Management

Dear AHCA/NCAL Leader

Providing volunteer leadership in our state and national health care associations is essential to their success. At AHCA/NCAL, we want every leader to find the place that fits his or her gifts, abilities, and passion. Understanding why people serve is part of making sure that AHCA/NCAL does a good job of creating the best volunteer opportunities for you. Whether it is serving on a committee, a task force, a board or advisory council your involvement is crucial to our success. One of our national leaders, Chris Mason (past NCAL Chair) is doing research on what motivates leaders to volunteer. All research data gathered is kept confidential.

The goal of his research is to help AHCA/NCAL and the state affiliates be more intentional in their efforts to help leaders find their place of effective volunteer leadership. We are asking you to participate in this research by completing a short survey (link below). Completing the survey should take no more than 15 minutes. In order for your input to be included in the research, you need to complete the survey by (March 1, 2020).

We are really excited to see what Chris learns in this research and how it might help us at AHCA/NCAL in matching leaders to volunteer opportunities within our organization. If you are interested in finding out the results of this research, please email Chris at cmason12@gerogefox.edu. He is happy to share a copy of what he learns through this research. This email/letter was signed by AHCA/NCAL.

Appendix D: VFI Scoring Sheet

VFI Continuity Factor Item 1 10 15 21 28
Response ___ + ___ + ___ + ___ + ___ = _____ _____
(SUM) (mean)

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

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

VFI Understanding Factor Item 12 14 18 25 30
Response ___ + ___ + ___ + ___ + ___ = _____ _____
(SUM) (mean)

VFI Enhancement Item 5 13 26 27 29
Response ___ + ___ + ___ + ___ + ___ = _____ _____
(SUM) (mean)

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

Appendix E: Leadership

Leadership Theory

After a comprehensive review of the leadership literature, Stogdill (1974, p. 259) concluded, "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept." Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, leader behavior, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organizational culture (Boyer, 2003).

This section begins with a review of leadership theories and examines their evolution from the notion of heroic leaders, through the development of trait theory, behaviorist theory, situational leadership, contingency theory and on to transactional and transformational leadership. These theories were built from insights discovered from watching and learning from successful leaders (Bowie, 2000). Examining leadership theory from a historical view shows an evolution in thought and focus from the generic features and behaviors of the leader as an individual to a recognition of the importance of replying to various situations and environments and the leader's role relative to followers. Table 5 provides a summary of key theorists and theories on leadership.

Table 20. Summary of Leadership Theory.

Theory	Description	Theorist	Seminal Work
Great Man Theories	Built on the premise that leaders are extraordinary people, born with innate qualities, destined to lead. The leadership thought of this concept was that leaders were primarily male, military and Western. This theory was the base from which Trait Theory was developed.	Carlyle Lehman Jennings	Carlyle, T. (1897). *The Hero as Man of letters*. G. Bell. Jennings, E. E. (1960). *An anatomy of leadership: Princes, heroes, and supermen*. Harper. Lehman, B. H. (1928). *Carlyle's theory of the hero: its sources, development, history, and influence on Carlyle's work: a study of a nineteenth century idea*. Duke university press.
Trait Theories	The lists of traits or qualities associated with leadership. Due to the abundance of traits used to describe this leadership theory virtually all the positive adjectives in the dictionary could be used to describe virtues or human attributes.	Alport Bass Pervin Stogdill	Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership* (Vol. 11). New York: Free Press. Pervin, L. A. (1994). A critical analysis of current trait theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, *5*(2), 103-113. Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of psychology*, *25*(1), 35-71. Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature.

Behaviorist Theories	Behavior theories focus on what leaders actually do rather than on their personality traits. Behavior patterns are observed and classified as 'styles of leadership'. This area has attracted considerable attention from the practitioner or professional manager.	Blake Conger Kanungo House Mitchell McGregor Mouton Yukl	Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The new managerial grid: strategic new insights into a proven system for increasing organization productivity and individual effectiveness, plus a revealing examination of how your managerial style can affect your mental and physical health*. Gulf Pub. Co. Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of management review*, *12*(4), 637-647. House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1975). *Path-goal theory of leadership* (No. TR-75-67). WASHINGTON UNIV SEATTLE DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY. McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. *New York*, *21*, 166. Yukl, G. (1971). Toward a behavioral theory of leadership. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, *6*(4), 414-440.

Situational (contingency) Leadership	This theory views leadership as specific to the situation or event in which it is being used. For example, some situations may require and direct or autocratic style while others may require a participative approach. It also suggests that there may be a need for different leadership styles at different levels in the same organization.	Blanchard Fiedler Hershey	Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Fiedler, (1967) *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American psychologist*, *62*(1), 17.
Contingency Theory	This is a refinement of the situational leadership and focuses on identifying the key elements which best identify the most suitable or effective leadership style to fit a particular circumstance.	Adair Schmidt Tannenbaum	Adair, J. (1973) *Action-Centered Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1973). *How to choose a leadership pattern* (pp. 3-12). Harvard Business Review.
Transactional Theory	This approach emphasizes the significance of the between leader and followers, concentrating on the two-way benefits derived from a form of "agreement" through which the followers receive rewards and recognition in return for commitment and loyalty.	Bass Dansereau Graen Haga Stogdill Weber	Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership* (Vol. 11). New York: Free Press. Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, *13*(1), 46-78. Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of economic and social organization.* Trans. AM Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press.

Transformational Theory	The central concept here is change and the role of leadership in envisioning and implementing the transformation of organisational performance	Avolio Bass Burns Covey Devanna Greenleaf Tichy	Bass, B. (1985) *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press. Bass, B.M.& Avolio, B.J. (1994) *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row Covey, S. (1992) *Principle-Centered Leadership*. Simon and Schuster. Greenleaf, R. (1970) *Servant as Leader*. Center for Applied Studies. Tichy, N. and Devanna, M. (1986) *Transformational Leadership*. New York: Wiley.

The Great Man theory evolved around the mid-nineteenth century. The Great Man theory assumes that the traits of leadership are intrinsic. That simply means that great leaders are born they are not made. In 1860, Spencer disputed this theory through research showing that heroes were the product of their actions and the social conditions prevalent at the time (Yukl, 1988).

Trait theory believes that leaders are either born or made with attributes that make them successful as leaders. Attributes such as creativity, drive, motivation, intelligence, and other positive values make a leader. Gordon Allport (1960), an American

psychologist, “identified almost 18,000 English personality-relevant terms” (Matthews, Deary & Whiteman, 2003, p. 3). Trait theory focuses on examining mental, physical, and social characteristics that are common among leaders. Shortfalls with this theory involve the sheer number of potential combinations of characteristics that can be examined. Allport’s studies were among the first to introduce a behavioral approach to the study of leadership.

The 1940s and 1950s gave rise to the growth of behavioral leadership theory in reaction to trait theory. Under behavior theory, leaders were examined based on their behavior rather than their characteristics. Thus, with the development in psychometrics, especially factor analysis, academicians were able to examine the cause and effect relationship of specific human behaviors. Associated theories developed during this period of time included role theory and the managerial grid/leadership grid.

The 1960s gave rise to contingency theories of leadership. These theories argued that there was no single way of leading and that every leadership style was based on individual situations. Different individuals performed at different levels depending on the situation. Contingency theory had ties to trait theory in that individual traits were related to the situations in which leaders exercised their leadership. It is usually acknowledged within the contingency theories that leaders are more likely to express their leadership when they feel that their followers are receptive. Related theories include: (1) Fiedler (1961) Contingency Theory, (2) Hersey-Blanchard (1993) Situational Leadership Theory, (3) House (1971, 1996) Path-Goal Theory, (4) Vroom-Yetton-Jago (1988) Decision-Making Model of Leadership, (5) (Fielder (1961) Cognitive Resource Theory, and (6) Peters, Hartke, and Pohlmann (1985) Strategic Contingencies Theory.

The 1970s saw the introduction of transactional leadership theories. Transactional theories are characterized by a transaction made between the leader and the followers. This theory is based on a positive, reciprocal relationship between leader and follower. Leaders motivate followers through adequate rewards (or punishments). In other words, transactional leaders develop a mutual supporting setting, where individual and organizational goals are aligned. Related to transactional theory is Leader-Member Exchange Theory (Graen, 1976).

The 1970s and 1980s also gave rise to Transformational Leadership theory. This theory is built on the premise where leaders and followers interact to create a solid relationship that results in trust that later results in an increase of motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic, in both leaders and followers. Related theories include: (1) Burns (1978) Transformational Leadership Theory, (2) Bass (1994) Transformational Leadership Theory, and (3) Posner and Kouzes (1988) Leadership Participation Inventory, (4) Greenleaf (1970) Servant Leadership Theory, and (5) Covey (1992) Person Centered Leadership Theory.

Each of the theories identified in Table 1 portrays an individualistic view of the leader, although one school of thought gaining increasing recognition is that of dispersed leadership (Raelin, 2003). This method has its underpinnings in sociology, psychology and politics. It portrays leadership as vested in staff throughout an organization rather than in defined leaders based on their hierarchical role (Heifetz, Grashow and Linsky, 2009). Here the emphasis is on developing organizations with group accountability for leadership. One major controversy involves the issue of leadership as a distinct phenomenon. Senge (1995, 2006) discusses the importance of leadership in the

development of learning organizations.

Some theorists believe that leadership is no different from the social influence processes occurring within a group, and these theorists view leadership as a cooperative practice shared among the members (Yukl, 1993; Pearce and Cogner, 2002; Bergman, Rentsch, Small, Davenport and Bergman, 2012). The opposing view is that all groups have role specialization, including a specialized leadership role (Hunt, 1991). This perspective believes that leadership cannot be shared and that influence rests with a single individual. Since the 1980s we have seen a greater acceptance of the viewpoint that leadership is a shared process.

Some theorists would limit the definition of leadership to an application of influence resulting in passionate commitment by followers, as compared to apathetic compliance or reluctant conformity. Advocates of this position reason that a person who uses influence and control over rewards and punishments to control followers is not really "leading'" them. The opposing view is that this definition is too constricting, because it disregards influence processes that are essential for determining why a leader is successful or unsuccessful in a given situation. Leadership theorists believe that the definition of leadership should not predetermine the answer of what makes a leader effective.

Personality Traits of Leaders

Trait Methodology developed as a means of identifying the key characteristics of successful leaders. It was believed this approach could identify critical leadership traits that could be isolated and then used to recruit, select, and promote leaders. This approach was common in the military and is still used as a set of criteria to select candidates for

commissions (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991).

The challenge with the trait approach is the sheer number of traits and or attributes that have been identified and defined. Years of research has made it clear that identifying specific traits for effective leadership is largely dependent on the situation and conditions of the individual event. Some leaders might have possessed certain traits but the absence of them did not necessarily mean that the person was not a leader.

Although there was little consistency in the results of the various trait studies, some traits did appear more frequently than others, including: technical skill, friendliness, task motivation, application to task, group task supportiveness, social skill, emotional control, administrative skill, general charisma, and intelligence. Of these, the most widely explored has tended to be "charisma" (Bryman, 1993).

Leadership Types and Styles

In addition to an orientation toward personal characteristics and the tasks and activities of principals, the concept of leadership style has also received considerable attention. Leadership style can be described as the consistent line that can be recognized in a leader. A leader does not consciously choose a leadership style; it is related to such factors as the leader's personality and his or her dominant pattern of values (Hanson, White, Dorsey, and Pulakos, 2005).

The origin of research into leadership styles can be traced to the beginning of the late 1950s. The Ohio State Leadership Studies developed a concept of leadership based on two dimensions. The first dimension (task orientation) involves the achievement of organizational goals. The second dimension (relationship orientation or "consideration") seeks to increase the goodwill and morale of the members of the organization (Stogdill

and Coons, 1957). A summary of examined leadership styles follows.

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership is made up of four components (Avolio and Gardner, 2005): balanced processing, internalized moral perspective, relational transparency, and self-awareness. Balanced processing suggests that a leader examines issues from an objective perspective and uses all relevant data before making decisions. An internalized moral perspective states that a leader is directed by a personal moral compass and acts accordingly even when it goes against the pressures of the group or organization. Relational transparency refers to being oneself and not false in appearance or actions to others. Last, self-awareness refers to the inner recognition of one's strengths and weaknesses. In summary, the dominant view of authentic leadership in the academic literature (George, 2003) suggests that authentic leaders are guided by sound moral beliefs and act in a concordance with their personal values, even under pressure. They are keenly aware of their views, strengths, and weaknesses, and strive to understand how their leadership impacts others.

Authoritarian Leadership

The autocratic (authoritative) style of leadership is characterized by implementing the will of a leader, without taking into the consideration the opinion of subordinates. Leaders decide alone, give orders to subordinates and expect them to carry them out, based on unilateral, top-down communication. In order to motivate, leaders use their position to decide on the appropriate remuneration (Bass and Stogdill, 1990).

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership is defined more narrowly and refers to perception that a

leader possesses a divinely inspired gift and is somehow unique and larger than life (Weber, 1947). Followers not only trust and respect the leader, as they would with a transformational leader, but they also idolize or worship the leader as a superhuman hero or spiritual figure (Bass and Avolio, 1985). According to House (1977), the indicators of charismatic leadership include followers' trust in the correctness of the leader's beliefs, unquestioning acceptance of the leader, affection for the leader, and willing obedience. Thus, with charismatic leadership, the focus is on an individual leader rather than on a leadership process that may be shared among multiple leaders (House and Aditya, 1997).

Collaborative or Distributive Leadership

The term collaborative leadership is defined on the basis of three sub dimensions: governance, collaboration decisions, and participation in evaluating organizational development**.** All three of these areas are closely aligned with functions needed and found in association leadership. Gronn (2002) views collaborative/distributive leadership as a unit of analysis that can be measured rather than simply focusing on the deeds of a leader.

Democratic Leadership

An element of being a more democratic rather than autocratic leader is a willingness to ask for and accept help (McIntyre & Slaas, 1995). A leader's willingness to be critical of oneself sets the bar for the team and permits greater freedom of expression (Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik, 2013); it essentially serves as a signal to other team members that they can discuss errors and concerns without fear of punishment. Because covering up mistakes often compounds them, and because mistakes are often good learning experiences, teams who talk about their mistakes are

likely to be more effective. The democratic style is described as a two-way communication between the leader and the subordinates.

Integrated Leadership

Another example of leadership seen as contingent on the organizational culture is the integrated leadership model of Quinn, Cameron and others. These authors assume that leaders must match the culture of their organizations and emphasize the roles of leaders from this perspective. Cameron and Quinn (2005), assert that effective leadership depends on the life phase of the organization and its attendant value within the organization

Laissez-faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership is defined as a situation in which leaders abdicate responsibilities and avoid decision-making. Laissez-faire leadership, also known as delegated leadership, is a type of leadership style in which leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make the decisions. Researchers have found that this is generally the leadership style that leads to the lowest productivity among group members.

Servant Leadership

Servant Leadership (SL) represents a humanistic and spiritual rather than rational and mechanistic approach to leadership. It puts workers rather than shareholders at the center of concentric circles, and it motivates workers primarily through creating a caring and supportive workplace rather than through individual incentive systems (Greenleaf, 1970).

Different from the traditional trait, behavioral, situational, and contingency leadership models, Servant Leadership focuses on (a) the humble and ethical use of

power as a servant leader, (b) cultivating a genuine relationship between leaders and followers, and (c) creating a supportive and positive work environment (Russell and Stone, 2002). However, in terms of the actual exercise of leadership, servant leaders are free to incorporate the positive aspects of all other leadership models except command-and-control dictatorship (Sturm, 2009).

Spiritual Leadership

According to Fry and Cohen (2009) spiritual leaders are motivated by service to God or humanity. They create a vision wherein leaders and followers experience a sense of calling in that life has meaning and purpose. In addition, spiritual leaders establish a social/organizational culture based on the values of altruistic love whereby leaders and followers have a sense of membership, feel understood and appreciated, and show genuine care, concern, and appreciation for self and others (Strack and Fottler, 2001).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership (Bass, 1985) focuses on the exchange process in which the leader provides rewards or sanctions in return for followers' achievements. Transactional leaders set clear goals, organize the tasks, and allocate the necessary resources, but they do not emotionally engage their followers or show particular regard for their concerns.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership examines leadership from an ethical perspective. Bass (1985) suggested that transformational leaders inspire their followers by their charismatic appearance, by addressing the emotional needs of each individual, and by providing intellectual stimulation. Four general components of transformational

leadership identified in the literature include: (1) leaders adhere to ethical and moral standards and are role-models for their followers, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation and (4) individualized consideration.

Management versus Leadership

Leadership and management are said to go hand in hand. They are not the same thing but they are connected and complementary in many respects (Schein, 1985). Any effort to separate the two is likely to cause more problems than it solves. Still, much time and effort has been spent explaining the differences. The manager's job is to plan, organize and direct. The leader's job is to inspire and motivate. Kotter (2008) tells us that leadership in complex organizations is an important yet confusing topic that can be further understood by exploring its relationship to management.

The biggest difference between managers and leaders is the way they motivate the people who work or follow them. By definition, managers have subordinates while leaders do not have subordinates. Many organizational leaders do have subordinates, but only because they are also managers. But when they want to lead, they have to give up formal authoritarian control, because to lead is to have followers, and following is always a voluntary activity.

Table 21. Summary of Difference Between Leaders and Managers.

Subject	**Leader - Tomorrow**	**Manager - Today**
Focus	Leading people	Managing work
Constituents	Followers	Subordinates
Time Views	Long-term	Short-term
Pursues	Vision	Goals
Approach	Sets direction	Plans detail
Decision	Facilitates	Makes
Control	Personal charisma	Formal authority
Request to	Heart	Head
Culture	Forms	Authorizes
Persuasion	Sell	Tell
Requirements	Achievement	Results
Rules	Breaks	Makes
Truth	Pursues	Determines
Concern	What is right	Being right
Credit	Gives	Takes

Kotter (2008)

AHCA/NCAL Volunteer Leader Profile

The volunteer leader is slightly more likely to be female than male. They would be a Generation Xer or a Baby Boomer (born between 1946 and 1976). They would have more than 20 years of experience in the healthcare field and would have approximately a 32 percent chance that they participated in the Future Leaders program. This leader would have a "values" focus motivating their volunteer efforts. They would also be motivated by the understanding factor that suggests their participation allows them to exercise skills and learn about the volunteer organization being served and provide a means of serving the greater community. They are intrinsically motivated but understand that their skills are enhanced through service to others. The motivations of social, enhancement, and protect were less important than values, understanding, and continuity.