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ABSTRACT

Volunteer service is a valuable product of our society. Increasingly, at recent sporting events, volunteers are a critical part of the overall success of the events (Williams, Dossa, & Tompkins, 1995). Today, an expectation of most sport event administrators is recruiting and retaining enough volunteers to fulfill the wide range of roles which are needed for a sport event to achieve its goals. In order to recruit and retain enough volunteers in sport events, it is important to clearly understand the demographic characteristics of volunteers, volunteer motivation and commitment.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among selected demographic characteristics (income, education and age), motivation and commitment of volunteers at a marathon running event. The specific aims of this investigation were to: (a) describe the type of individuals who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (b) examine the motives that were most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (c) confirm the multidimensionality of commitment (i.e., four bases of volunteer commitment) and motivation (i.e., five-factor model of volunteer motivation) among volunteers in a marathon running event, and (d) explore the relationships among the selected demographic characteristics (income, education and age), motivation and commitment among volunteers in a marathon running event.

For the main purpose of the study, the measurement models for volunteer motivation and commitment and the structural model to investigate the relationships among the selected demographic characteristics (income, education and age), motivation and commitment were analyzed. The results of the measurement models showed that the proposed models of volunteer motivation and commitment were confirmed. The structural model illustrated that the paths of selected demographic characteristics (income, education and age) and volunteer commitment were statistically significant. The path of volunteer motivation and commitment was also statistically significant. In other words,
the sample data clearly showed that selected demographics (income, education and age) and volunteer motivation influence volunteer commitment.

The outcomes of this study will contribute not only to an extension of the knowledge base of volunteerism in the field of sport management, but also to practical applications for volunteer coordinators, administrators and event marketers. The directions for future research are presented.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Volunteers are not only one of the most significant and powerful human resources for our society, but also a cornerstone for its prosperity. Morrison (1994) stated that “Our country has survived and flourished in great part because of the concern and care of people in every community” (p. 2). People contribute significantly to the needs of their society by volunteering services such as companionship for the lonely, tutoring for the illiterate, counseling for the troubled, and health care for the sick (Clary et al., 1998). Volunteers make a significant contribution to American society; each year, approximately one-third of adult Americans participate in a volunteer organization to help others (Independent Sector, 2006). According to a survey conducted in 2006, about 61.2 million American adults (ages 16 and older) engaged in some kind of volunteer activity. These 61.2 million formal volunteers represented 26.7 percent of the population, and they devoted a median of 52 hours per year to volunteer service. These volunteers also created a service value of 260.3 billion dollars (Independent Sector, 2006). The number of Americans offering volunteer services over the years has increased more than 170%, from 22 million in 1964 to 61.2 million in 2006.

In the sport industry, the importance of volunteerism has also been raised in economic as well as non-economic aspects. Chelladurai (2006) appraised that the economic value of volunteers in sport exceeds $50 billion. It can be surmised that about 20% of the 260.3 billion dollars (total volunteer service value of year) were in sport and recreation. Williams, Dossa and Thompkins (1995) mentioned that volunteers are a critical part of the overall success of many major sporting events. Several financial benefits result from the retention of volunteers in sport events: (a) organizations benefit financially from the use of well-trained volunteers in place of paid staff; (b) managers are able to save time due to the availability of more personnel; (c) volunteers come from various backgrounds and possess different aptitudes, thus are able to serve in various job
positions and responsibilities; (d) volunteers can be used again in future sporting events, making their financial impact even greater. Chelladurai discussed the non-economic significance of volunteers. According to him, volunteers can provide an objective evaluation because they are not tied to any financial benefits and/or incentives. This role of volunteers can help the organization stay on the right track.

Following these views about the significance of sport volunteerism, Farrell, Johnson, and Twynam (1998) suggested that managers should understand volunteer motivation along with the volunteering experience, in order to effectively respond to management needs in the areas of recruitment, retention, and daily operations in sport events. Therefore, research of volunteerism in the context of sport management has been focusing on motivation and management relating to the recruitment and the retention of volunteers.

Motivation to volunteer is instrumental in explaining the differences between volunteers and non-volunteers as well as differences between volunteers that continue serving an organization and those that abandon their activities (Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). Motivation is also responsible for most differences between paid employees and volunteer labor. Employee motivation studies have been focused on job performance, absenteeism, tenure, and productivity, while most motivation studies for volunteers have been focused on the decision to volunteer (Cnaan & Cascio, 1999). Understanding the motives that cause volunteers to work in major sport events can help sport associations set up successful recruiting and training programs for such individuals.

Commitment has been identified as a significant variable associated with other employee outcomes in the field of Organizational Behavior (OB) and sport. From the studies by Reichheld (1996) and Pfeffer (1998), it is assumed that commitment could contribute to organizational effectiveness, although there is no empirical evidence in the field of sport management. Reichheld mentioned that loyalty to customers, employees, and investors is critical and thus an important source of growth, profits, and competitive advantage. He focused on the reasons that make loyal employees so valuable to companies. In his argument, he suggested that loyal employees (a) develop higher quality
relationships with customers (as a result, employees’ loyalty contribute to customer loyalty), (b) seek opportunities to learn and grow professionally, (c) increase organizational efficiency, and (d) reduce recruiting and training costs, releasing resources that can then be reinvested in other parts of the business. Reichheld asserted that loyalty of employees can create a powerful competitive advantage for the company. His view is also supported in Pfeffer’s work. Pfeffer discussed that “firms that have pursued high involvement, high performance, and high commitment management practices have produced superior economic returns over the long-term” (p. 394).

**Foci and Bases of Commitment**

Recently, commitment studies have taken two separate directions, which include foci and bases of commitment. Meyers, Allen and Smith (1993) tried to demonstrate that commitment is definitely an independent construct and contributes uniquely to the understanding of work behavior. Today, most researchers agree that commitment is a multidimensional construct (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), studies have tried to differentiate between the diverse entities to which an employee is committed and the varying nature of the employees’ commitment: “When we say that someone is committed, we usually imply or state specifically that he or she is committed to something (e.g., he is committed to his family; she is committed to the project)” (p. 16). These distinct two directions are called foci of commitment (Reichers, 1985) and bases of commitment (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Foci of commitment refer to the individuals and groups to whom an employee is attached, which include organizational and occupational commitment (Becker & Billings, 1993). Separating foci of commitment is significant because “Employees who are relatively uncommitted to the organization might nevertheless perform effectively because of a commitment to the work group, profession, or clients” (Meyer, Allen, & Topolnytsky, 1998, p. 84). Bases of commitment are the motives that produce the attachment to the foci of commitment (Becker & Billings, 1993). They are categorized as
affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment-low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt) and continuance commitment-high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac) (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Turner, 2001).

Affective commitment is defined as an emotional attachment to an organization characterized by acceptance of organizational values and by willingness to remain with the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). Similarly, Meyer and Allen stated: “Affective commitment refers to an employee’s attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (1997, p. 11). An employee who has a strong affective commitment to an organization stays with the organization because he or she has developed an emotional attachment to the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) found that the best predictor of affective commitment was work experience. Employees whose work experiences are consistent with their expectations and whose basic needs are satisfied within the organization have a stronger level of affective commitment.

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), “continuance commitment refers to the awareness of cost associated with leaving the organizations” (p. 11). Employees with a strong continuance commitment to the organization recognize that leaving the organization may be detrimental to them financially due to lack of employment alternatives and loss of investments (e.g., personal relationships, pension plans). Continuance commitment was originally a unitary dimension, but through continued research (McGee & Ford, 1987) the dimension was subdivided into two dimensions: continuance commitment-low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt) and continuance commitment-high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac).

The former reflects an individual’s commitment to an organization because of lack of employment opportunities. The latter describes an individual staying with an organization because of the personal loss that would occur by leaving the organization. Employees with strong continuance commitment are said to remain with the organization because they have to do so. In order to prove the differences between the two variables, further research was conducted and revealed the two-dimensionality of continuance

The third component, normative commitment, reflects a feeling of “obligation to continue employment” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11). An employee with a strong normative commitment feels he or she has a moral obligation to stay in the organization. Normative commitment was developed on the basis that the organization made a particular kind of investment in the employee, which gives the employee a sense of obligation to the organization.

For the study, occupational commitment refers to volunteer commitment and is only used as a variable out of the foci of commitment due to the characteristics of the participants in this study. The ING marathon running event is presented on an annual basis and there are no permanent volunteer organizations for the event. Therefore, commitment in this study was defined as four bases volunteer commitment. The studies regarding commitment of volunteers are unique, particularly in connection with other related variables such as volunteer motivation and demographic characteristics.

**Need for the Study**

Research focusing on sport volunteerism is limited and most of the measurements and concepts are derived from studies in non-sport sectors (Green & Chalip, 1998). Research efforts were also insufficient to support whether volunteering in sport sectors is driven by considerations that are unique to sport and have failed to answer adequately all the questions concerning the complex nature of volunteer behavior in sport sectors. Understanding of the motives to volunteer in the sport setting is extremely important; recruitment, retention, and training processes of volunteers can be a very expensive endeavor in most cases.

In addition, committed volunteers can be an important asset to enhance the effectiveness of sport event organizations and to recycle as human resources for future events (Chelladurai, 2006). Cuskelley, MaIntyre and Boag (1998) suggested that the commitment of volunteers is critical to the effective organization and delivery of
community-based sport. Today, expectation for most sport event administrators is recruiting and retaining enough volunteers to fulfill the wide range of roles which are needed for sport event to achieve its goals. A common desire for a sport event organization is “if only we had more volunteers.” Part of the solution to this problem might be to strive to be more effective at retaining the existing committed volunteers rather than continually trying to recruit new ones. High levels of turnover can have a deleterious effect on most amateur sporting organizations.

Why is understanding volunteer commitment important for people who may only volunteer on an annual basis? It is important for administration of such types of events to understand commitment of the volunteers for better enticing them to return the next year. If existing committed volunteers return next year, the effectiveness of event organization will be enhanced in economic and non-economic aspects. For example, event marketers and managers can monitor individual levels of volunteer commitment through surveys and use the information as a basis for volunteer retention. Moreover, event marketers and managers may have different marketing strategies depending on different levels of volunteer commitment. In spite of the need for studies of volunteer commitment, many studies have focused on organizational commitment of volunteers.

A lack of knowledge of current trends in volunteerism or ignorance of the needs and motives of volunteers can be catastrophic for the expansion of volunteer human resources, the effectiveness of the sport organization, or the execution of a special event. The demographic profile, primary motivations, and commitment of sport volunteers should be further assessed. Consequently, the knowledge of demographic profiles of sport volunteers, motivational typologies tailored to the needs of sport volunteers, commitment level of volunteers, and their relationship will play an important role in providing the solutions needed from sport managers to effectively recruit and retain volunteer labor, as well as in creating the conditions necessary to maximize volunteers’ performance and input toward the success of the sport event.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among selected demographic characteristics (income, education and age), motivation and commitment of volunteers at a marathon running event (see Figure 1.1). The specific aims of this investigation were to: (a) describe the type of individuals who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (b) examine the motives that were most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (c) confirm the multidimensionality of commitment (i.e., four bases of volunteer commitment) and motivation (i.e., five-factor model of volunteer motivation) among volunteers in a marathon running event, and (d) explore the relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment among volunteers in a marathon running event.

Research Questions

1. What are the demographic characteristics of the volunteers in a marathon running event?
2. What are the motives that are most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event?
3. What are the bases of commitment that are most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event?
4. Do the factors of motivation for volunteers in a marathon running event include social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external influence?
5. Do the bases of commitment for volunteers in a marathon running event include affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment–high personal sacrifice, and continuance commitment–low number of alternatives?
6. Are there any differences in motivation between male and female volunteers in a marathon running event?
7. Are there any differences in motivation among races of volunteers in a marathon running event?
8. Are there any differences in commitment between male and female volunteers in a marathon running event?
9. Are there any differences in commitment among races of volunteers in a marathon running event?
10. Are there any relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment of volunteers in a marathon running event?

Figure 1.1
The potential relationship between selected demographic characteristics, volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment
Significance of the Study

The growing significance of volunteer labor has created a compelling need to review and re-evaluate the existing knowledge regarding volunteerism. Strategies for recruiting and retaining volunteers are the primary marketing problems. Understanding what motivates people to volunteer their time and expertise in an organization is extremely important because agencies could use this knowledge to design their marketing efforts in a way that could appeal persuasively to this free labor during recruitment time.

Research regarding sport volunteerism is restricted, and all the measurements and concepts have originated from volunteer studies in non-sport sectors. Conducted studies have been insufficient to support whether volunteering in sport is driven by considering the uniqueness in the sport setting. Furthermore, these studies fail to answer adequately the important questions concerning the complex nature of volunteer behavior in sport. Currently, these questions are still critical issues: why people really want to volunteer in sporting events? Is there a single dimension, a two dimension, a three dimension, or more complex dimensions of motivation to volunteer? The answer to these questions could provide researchers the tools they need to estimate volunteerism in sport accurately.

Previous studies showed that knowledge regarding the internal structure of motivation to volunteer remains restricted. This knowledge is especially narrow in the case of volunteerism in the sport setting. Published research in the field of sport management is limited to studies by Farrell, Johnston, and Twynam (1998) and Strigas (2001). Moreover, there is no published research that answers adequately the proposed research questions in the field of sport psychology. For an extension of the knowledge base of volunteerism in the field of sport management and to better serve the number of sport volunteers throughout the globe, additional research should be conducted.

This study examines the demographics, motivation and commitment of volunteers and their relationships. This study is important for several reasons. First, although many studies have been conducted with the purpose of understanding the demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment of volunteers, no studies have been
undertaken to develop a conceptual model of commitment based on demographics and motivation of volunteers in sport events.

Secondly, in many previous studies of commitment for volunteers, continuance commitment has not been used due to its attribution that it focuses on monetary aspects, and volunteerism is not a paid position. Therefore, it can be said that some researchers may disagree with the concept including the continuance commitment of volunteer commitment. However, many volunteers are still concerned about their egoistic benefits, especially sport volunteers, and are connected to continuance commitment. This study tried to confirm the conceptual validity of four bases of the volunteer commitment model, including continuance commitment. It is believed that the current study will contribute important implications to provide a new internal structure for volunteer commitment in the academic area.

Thirdly, the study may also help to develop various management skills such as volunteer training for a marathon running event. For example, volunteer administrators may apply a different training program depending on the level of motivation and commitment of volunteers. With improved training, volunteers will have better knowledge, skills and abilities to help them with their jobs. From a marketing point of view, proper training of volunteers is critical because well trained volunteers are able to enhance organizational effectiveness. Volunteers are preferable to paid employees for several reasons. First, organizations have economic benefits from the use of well-trained volunteers in place of paid staff. This allows managers to maintain more personnel at lower cost. Second, volunteers come from various backgrounds and have different skills (i.e., doctor, accountant, or musician). They are able to serve as volunteers in various job positions and responsibilities. Finally, volunteers can be resources again for future sporting events. For example, if highly committed and well trained volunteers return for the next event, they will be a great asset for the event’s success.

The results of this study will contribute to theory development for scholars in the area of sport marketing and management and to practical applications for sport team marketers and managers. Not only are sport volunteers attending sporting events, they are
creating a great deal of money in the process. According to Williams et al. (1995), volunteer service plays a tremendous role in the overall success of various sport events. Sport team marketers or managers need to effectively utilize their marketing strategies in order to increase attendance at sporting events. In order to increase attendance, it is essential to understand how the attitudinal dimension of motives of volunteers and commitment of volunteers actually work with psychological components of sport volunteers.

Understanding sport volunteers’ commitment associated with psychological components, which influence volunteers to attend sport events, is a key to developing different strategies that will eventually meet the sport event’s objectives. In order to meet the goals of sport events, various strategies are utilized to create a greater profit. For example, one of the various strategies is to promote the sport event in association with psychological components that influence sport volunteers to attend. Therefore, sport team marketers and managers need to develop a greater understanding of volunteer commitment. This knowledge provides sport team marketers and managers with a more effective application of strategies in order to increase attendance.

**Assumptions**

1. Subjects will honestly answer all questions, respond to each question sincerely, and reply to all questions independently.
2. Subjects will participate in this project voluntarily, without coercion or reward.
3. The selected sample for this study represents the population.

**Limitations**

1. The results of this study cannot be generalized to all marathon running events.
2. There will be limitations attributed to survey research. These limitations are related to whether the questions to be answered are clear and not misleading and to whether subjects for this study thoughtfully and honestly completed the survey questionnaire (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).
3. There will be a limitation of sampling technique. The limitation is that a random sampling method could not be used in this study. Consequently, results are less exact than those based on random sampling techniques (McMillan, 2000).

**Delimitations**

1. The volunteers were selected only from those that participated in the ING Georgia Marathon event in the United States of America.
2. The subjects were selected from volunteers who stopped by the volunteer office to sign in before they served as volunteers.

**Definitions of Terms**

**Volunteer**

Henderson (1981) defined a volunteer as “someone who freely chooses to give his/her time and effort for no monetary gain” (p. 55). The Cobuild English Dictionary (1995) provides the definition of volunteer as “someone who does work without being paid for it, because they want to do it. A volunteer is someone who offers to do a particular task or job without being forced to do it” (p. 1872).

**Volunteering**

Volunteering refers to “Any activity that is distinguished from or complements such activities that are carried out by paid staff and which is undertaken freely and voluntarily by physical persons in the context of a broader structure and which benefits individuals or groups” (European Round Table of Charitable Social Welfare Associations, 1998)

**Volunteer Motivation**

According to Richard and Lyman (1991), motivation refers to “the set of personal forces that causes people to behave in certain ways or do something” (p. 6). In this study, volunteer motivation is the group of reasons that cause people to want to do voluntary service.
**Organizational Commitment**

Porter, Steer, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) defined organizational commitment as “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 604). The organizational commitment by Porter et al. includes three key components: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort for the organization, and (3) a strong desire to maintain organizational membership.

**Occupational Commitment**

Occupational commitment refers to “a positive attitude toward one’s occupation or profession reflecting a strong sense of identification with and involvement in that occupation” (Turner, 2005, p. 195). In this study, occupational commitment refers to volunteer commitment.

**Affective Commitment**

Affective commitment refers to “the employee’s emotional attachment to identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment in the organization because they want to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67).

**Normative Commitment**

Normative commitment refers to “the employee’s feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67).

**Continuance Commitment**

Continuance commitment refers to “awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67).
**Foci of Commitment**

Foci of commitment can be defined as “the individuals and groups to whom an employee is attached” (Becker & Billings, 1993, p. 177). Foci of commitment include occupational and organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Turner, 2001).

**Bases of Commitment**

Bases of commitment can be defined as “the motives engendering attachment” (Becker & Billings, 1993, p. 177). Bases of commitment include affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment-low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt) and continuance commitment-high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac) (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Turner, 2001).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses theories, related studies, and measurement instruments used in this study. The review is organized into the following sections: (a) Motivation Theories; (b) Volunteer Motivation; (c) Volunteer Motivation in the Sport Setting; (d) Commitment in Research of Organizational Behavior; (e) Development of Commitment; (f) Commitment in the Sport Setting; (g) Antecedents and Consequences of Commitment; (h) Current Trends in Commitment Research; and (i) Measurement Issues of Motivation and Commitment.

Motivation Theories

Motivation refers to “the complex forces, drives, needs, tension states, or other mechanisms that start and sustain voluntary activity toward the achievement of personal goals (Miskel, 1982, p.137). Another recent definition by Carrell, Jennings and Heavrin (1997) is “the effective stimulant that causes individuals to take action or to achieve different levels of productivity in pursuit of a goal” (p. 19). Scholars in Organizational Behavior (OB) research have explained motivational theory from two basic perspectives: content theories of motivation and process theories of motivation (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1988).

Content theories of motivation are interested in what motivates an individual in the workplace. The best known content theories of motivation are: (1) Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1954); (2) exchange theory (Blau, 1964); (3) Herzberg’s two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1999); (4) Alderfer’s ERG theory (Alderfer, 1969); and (5) expectancy theory (Atkinson, 1964; McClelland, 1961). On the other hand, the process theorists of work motivation center on how an individual’s behavior is energized, sustained, and stopped. Two famous process theories are equity theory (Adams, 1963, 1965) and expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964).
The best known motivation theory, developed by Maslow (1943), is known as the theory of “a hierarchy of needs,” which suggests that people have particular requirements that are essential to human life. Table 2.1 displays Maslow’s theory of the hierarchy of needs, which is ranked from the most basic level of need to the highest.

Table 2.1
Maslow’s Theory of a Hierarchy of Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Physiological: the most basic needs of food, water, air, and sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Safety: the need for a safe and secure physical and emotional environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Love and belonging: to be accepted by others; the need for affiliation or closeness with other humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Esteem: the need to be rewarded and recognized as a person of value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Self-actualization: the highest need of developing one’s potential and becoming all that it is possible to become.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maslow’s theory is broadly accepted and used. Need is considered to be one of the factors that decides the importance of stimulus for an individual (Rumsey, 1996). Based on Maslow’s theory, Knowles (1972) concluded that volunteerism is a means for nurturing a self-actualized human being as well as a way to serve society. Therefore, Maslow’s theory tends to emphasize the egoistic aspect out of various motivations of volunteerism.

Thibaut and Kelley (1959) assumed that “social relationships and the interaction between people is the exchange of reward and costs which occurs during this interaction” (Rumsey, 1996, p. 17). They referred to this concept as the “exchange theory.” The term “exchange theory” deals with the concept of rewards, such as economic accrual, emotional satisfaction, social prestige, and good feeling. Rumsey (1996) maintained that exchange theory expresses a function of the perception of fairness. In his opinion, “to a
volunteer who seeks recognition but feels that the amount of recognition they receive is a lesser amount compared to the recognition bestowed on others, they may become dissatisfied and decide not to continue in their unpaid position” (p. 18).

The motivation-hygiene theory developed by Herzberg (1966) is related to studies of volunteer motivation as well as the motivation of employees (Winniford et al., 1997). Herzberg (1966) investigated human development factors that affect the degree of motivation toward one’s work. In Herzberg, there is a relationship between a person’s higher order needs and motivators resulting in satisfaction (Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1997). Based on Herzberg’s formulation, Gidron (1983) studied the structure and sources of job satisfaction among volunteers. His findings suggest that the “overall job satisfaction of volunteers was related to two facets of job content (work itself and achievement) and two facets of job context (convenience and absence of job stress factors)” (p. 30). These outcomes indicate that self-expression is a considerable factor in voluntary work. A task in which self-expression is possible provides volunteers an opportunity to develop skills and abilities, as well as a sense of accomplishment or fulfillment, stemming from the assigned task.

Table 2.2
The Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, 1966)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYGIENE FACTORS (dissatisfiers)</th>
<th>MOTIVATORS (satisfiers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Company policies</td>
<td>1. Opportunity for achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervision</td>
<td>2. Opportunity to be recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship with supervisor</td>
<td>3. Opportunity to do interesting work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working conditions</td>
<td>4. Opportunity to assume responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salary</td>
<td>5. Opportunity to become involved in how the work is done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship with peers</td>
<td>6. Opportunity to assume challenging work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relationship with subordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ERG (Existence, Relatedness and Growth) theory by Alderfer (1972) allows the order of the needs to be different for different people. Based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1954), Alderfer presented three levels of essential needs, including existence, relatedness, and growth. Existence needs include physiological and safety needs. Relatedness is related to another part of Maslow’s definition of safety needs, in this case protection from people, as well as social and external esteem needs. Maslow closely associated growth with self-esteem and self-actualization. In other words, growth includes self-actualization and internal esteem needs.

A study by Mounter (1985) suggested that a belief in a desired reward or goal results in behavior intended to achieve the reward. Mounter (1985) used McClelland and Atkinson’s expectancy motivation theory, which describes three factors that affect behavior. The first factor is the need for achievement, which comes from taking pride in accomplishments. The second factor is the need for affiliation, which results from one’s interest in relationships with others. The third factor is the need for power, which comes from the desire to control others. Even though these three needs are likely to motivate
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The relationship between Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Alderfer’s ERG theory
everyone, the relative strength of the needs depends upon the particular person and various situational factors. The intensity of the needs has an influence on the degree of motivation and the degree of satisfaction expected. Mounter’s study showed that affiliation is the highest motivation for volunteering, followed by the needs for achievement and power. Expectancy theory has been received as a universal description of work motivation (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). According to the ideas of Silver (1983), motivation is conceptualized as “the combination of two major elements: one’s expectancy that an action will have a particular outcome, and the instrumentality of that outcome in relation to other valued outcomes” (p. 322). In relation to this viewpoint, Anderson and Moore (1978) suggested that the “payoff package” for volunteers might consist of diverse psychological gains.

Equity theory (Adams, 1963) is one of the famous process theories. In equity theory, behavior is motivated by the desire to reduce guilt or anger associated with social exchanges that are perceived to be unfair. For example, if rewards are to be meaningful and effective, pay or compensation must be perceived as equitable according to a particular referent comparison. Equity theory consists of three major components: (1) input, (2) outcomes, and (3) comparison persons or reference persons. Based on equity theory, an employee provides inputs to his or her job, including effort, education, knowledge, technical skills, experience, and time. In return, the employee receives pay, benefits, recognition, colleague relationship, and promotion. Individuals may use the following to obtain equity: (1) change inputs, (2) change outputs, (3) change attitude, (4) change the reference person, and (4) change the inputs or outputs of the reference person (Ivancevich & Matterson, 1996).

In the expectancy theory by Vroom (1964), people are conscious agents who are continually sizing up situations in terms of their perceived needs and then acting in accordance with these perceptions. According to Vroom, motivation can be explained as a process of making choices within different forms of voluntary activities. This theory includes three major concepts: instrumentality, valence, and expectancy. Instrumentality means that individuals believe that first-level outcomes such as turnover, absence,
quantity and quality of productivity are related to second-level outcomes such as rewards or punishment. Valence assumes that an individual favors certain outcomes over others. That is, valence means that an individual is more attracted to or satisfied by certain outcomes than others. Expectancy means that individuals believe in a positive link between individual effort and good job performance; i.e., the greater the effort, the better the job performance.

Motivation = E \times I \times V

E (Expectancy: probability of success)
I (Instrumentality)
V (Valence: value of a particular reward)

Figure 2.2
Vroom’s expectancy theory

In addition, social identity theory is presented by Tajfel (1981). According to social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981), identifying with a group enhances a person’s self-esteem because of the personal meaning and value that comes from belonging to or associating with a particular group. For example, through team identification, an individual forms a psychological connection with a team. As a result, the individual thinks of himself or herself as part of a particular team and experiences vicarious achievement when his or her team performs well (Sloan, 1979).

Volunteer Motivation

Motivation for volunteerism is a multifaceted phenomenon meriting future study (Martin, 1994; Parnell, 1990). Because of the complexity and diversity of the study fields that are related to volunteerism, there is no single conceptual model that has received
universal support (Winniford et al., 1997). According to Martin (1994), egoism and altruism are two major constructs that have been explored in many studies about volunteer motivation. Theories highlighting egoism focus on self-seeking as the primary motivation for volunteering, whereas theories emphasizing altruism assert that a significant motivation for volunteering is helping others. Fitch (1987) proposed that both altruism and self-serving motives explain volunteerism. In addition, Serow (1991) suggested that motivations for volunteering are “complex and variable, potentially encompassing a mixture of self-regarding and other-regarding forces” (p. 546). Batson (1991) focused upon the ultimate goal for volunteering rather than on the unintended by-products in order to distinguish between egoistically and altruistically motivated helpings.

In a study by Miller (1985), volunteers in three social service agencies rated the desirability of potential outcomes of their behavior as well as the likelihood that those outcomes would occur. The researcher concluded that volunteers whose regular employment failed to satisfy their needs for psychological growth tended to be involved in volunteering. They expected volunteer work to fulfill those needs and were satisfied with volunteering to the extent that they felt personally in control of their lives.

Caldwell and Andereck (1994) identified three categories of motivations for volunteering: purposive, solidary, and material. Purposive motives may be described as the desire of the volunteer to make a useful and valuable contribution to society. Solidary relates to factors such as social interaction, group identification, and networking. Material motives are satisfied by substantial profits, such as monetary reward and memorabilia. According to Caldwell and Andereck, purposive incentives are the strongest motives, followed by solidary, and material.

Beard and Ragheb (1983) developed a scale to measure leisure motivation. Through a factor analysis, the authors found leisure motivation was divided into four major factors. That is, the questionnaire includes 48 items that represented four major dimensions in leisure motivation. The four motivational factors include: (1) intellectual, (2) social, (3) competence-mastery, and (4) stimulus-avoidance. In the intellectual factor, “leisure motivation assesses the extent to which individuals are motivated to engage in
leisure activities which involve substantial mental activities such as learning, exploring, discovering, creating, or imaging” (p. 225). The social factor means leisure motivations assess “the extent to which individuals engage in leisure activities for social reasons” (p. 225). This factor includes the need for friendship and the need for the esteem of others. Competence-mastery relates to activities in order to achieve, master, challenge, and compete. In stimulus-avoidance, “leisure motivation assesses the drive to escape and get away from overstimulating life situations” (p. 225).

Beard and Ragheb (1983) also deleted items having low factor loading values and extensively overlapped items and proposed a shortened scale of eight items each. Full scale’s alpha reliability ranged from .90 to .92 and short scale’s reliability ranged from .80 to .91. Both scales were proved reliable by criteria of Nunnaly (1978).

Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) thoroughly reviewed literatures regarding motivation to volunteer (MTV) and developed an inventory of 28 items. For each motivation they provided a list of at least five supporting references, evidencing that this specific item had been used in the past. Although many literatures have cited additional motives to volunteer, they selected only 28 items. The criteria for exclusion included: (a) motive was irrelevant for volunteers providing direct service in human service; (b) the motives was relevant only to a specific subgroup; or (c) the motive overlapped with another motive. They collected a sample, including 258 volunteers in human services and 104 nonvolunteers, and conducted a factor analysis to determine dimensionality of MTV. The results revealed that 22 of the 28 motives were loaded together on one factor. Also, Cronbach’s alpha score to test reliability was .86 and acceptable. Therefore, the authors concluded that MTV was a unidimensional phenomenon.

Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991) stated that their findings are significant for the field:

Our findings are significant for the field for the following two reasons. First, the relative ranking or the motives, obtained by rigorous statistical analysis, did not coincide with either two- or three-category model of MTV generally accepted by researchers. As we noted previously, most studies that have used the model assumed its validity. Second, the motives for volunteering are not distinct but overlapping. If our theory that MTV is unidimensional is correct, then volunteers are both altruistic and egoistic. That is, volunteers do not distinguish between types of motives; rather they act on both. (p. 281)
Schondel, Shields and Orel (1992) pooled 55 items regarding volunteer motivation from a review of the literature and from in-depth interviews with volunteers. The items were then administered to 150 volunteers of a youth service organization and 247 members of an AIDS volunteer organization. Through a principal component factor analysis, the authors proposed five-factor model for the volunteer motivation, called an “Attitude Toward Volunteer Motivation” scale. The factors included: (a) helper principle, (b) self-serving, (c) self-esteem, (d) identification with group, and (e) power. Helper principle means personal benefits acquired as a result of volunteer experiences. This factor related to actual therapeutic gain made by the helping of others which was suggested by Riessman (1965). Self-serving refers to a self-orientation to volunteerism. Most items including this factor concerned the need to look after one’s own interest. This factor is parallel with “self concern as a reinforcing component of altruism” by Flashman and Quick (1985). Self-esteem related to “volunteering in terms of feelings of self worth,” addressed by Smith (1981). Identification with group associates with “the degree of comfort in sharing with others their volunteer membership” (Schondel, Shields, & Orel, 1992, p. 65). Power related to “the need for power as the compelling force for people to have an effect on others” (Schondel, Shields, and Orel, 1992, p. 65). Conceptualization by McClelland (1975) and Pinder (1985) showed that people want to possess power to influence and control the lives of others through volunteer activity. Cronbach’s Alpha scores to test reliability ranged from .881 to .502. The least reliable was the “power” subscale, indicating that this scale needs further work in order to be inserted in the scale. Face and content validity were used, and then the Pearson Correlation test was computed, comparing the constructed scale with an existing scale, “Volunteer Needs Profile” (Francies, 1982), in order to ascertain the convergent validity.

Clary et al. (1998) have identified the following six major functions served by volunteerism: a) values, b) understanding, c) social, d) career, e) protective, and f) enhancement. Clary et al. named these six functions as “Volunteer Functions Inventory” (VFI). The expression of the values motive is the altruistic concerns of helping others. A need to engage in new experiences, and to exercise knowledge and skills underlies the
understanding motive. The social motive reflects a need to be involved in volunteer service organizations to meet others who are valued or held in high esteem. The career motive is associated with concern for enhancing career opportunities or skills. The protective motive addresses a need to reduce or relieve negative or adverse feelings, such as loneliness or guilt, by participating in volunteer service. Finally, the enhancement motive focuses on the ego’s growth and development. In other words, some people volunteer for reasons of personal development or to obtain satisfaction related to personal growth and self-esteem.

Another approach regarding volunteer motivation includes three major reasons: altruistic, egoistic, and social obligation (AES motives) (Snyder & Cantor, 1998). In the 1980s, egoistic motivations were considered as the primary explanation for volunteering (Marotta & Nashman, 1998). In a study of volunteer motivation conducted at a mental hospital, Green, Aaron, and Cross (1984) found that egoistic reasons were stronger than altruistic reasons for volunteering; “broadening my experience” was the most significant motivation, out of the ten motives ranked by the volunteers. The participants expected useful and beneficial experiences from involvement in volunteer service organizations (Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1997). During the 1990’s, on the other hand, colleges and universities developed service learning programs to encourage the integration of service as a component of the college mission (Winniford et al., 1997). Winniford, Carpenter and Grider (1995) indicated that even though most of the research focuses on egoistic reasons as the major motivation for volunteering (Fitch, 1987, 1991; Green, Aaron, & Cross, 1984), altruistic reasons are most important to college students participating in volunteer service organizations. According to the findings of Winniford et al. (1995), 28.9% of college student volunteers answered “help others” among the altruistic reasons for volunteering, the primary volunteer motivation, followed by “people/friend” (18.6%), among the egoistic reasons for volunteering. In short, the primary volunteer motivation of college students were an altruistic concern for others.
Egoistic Motivation

According to Rumsey (1996), college students were more motivated to increase career-related experience and have a significantly greater need for social approval, achievement, and future rewards than do older volunteers.

Green, Aarons, and Cross (1984) studied individuals who volunteered at a mental hospital. They found that egoistic motives were stronger than altruistic motives. The participants expected the experience to be beneficial for them, with “broadening my experience” given as the most important of the ten motives ranked by the volunteers.

In an analysis of the traits and motivations of college students involved in service organizations, Winniford et al. (1995) suggested that important motivational factors for continued involvement in volunteer service organizations reveal two types of egoistic motivations: (a) enrichment motivations, and (b) affiliation motivations (p. 32). Enrichment motivations are defined as those based upon the desire to develop or enrich the volunteer’s skill and experience for present or future advantage. Affiliation motivations are those based upon the volunteer’s desire to have relationships with others, like friendship and inclusion. For college students, motives based upon affiliation desires were more important than those based upon enrichment desires.

Altruistic Motivation

Although most classic theories of volunteerism emphasize egoistic motives to explain involvement with volunteer service, altruism is currently considered a primary motivation for volunteering in much research (Wakefield, 1993). A significant number of volunteers indicate that their unpaid work makes them feel better, helps improve their attitude, and gives them an opportunity to develop relationships (Rumsey, 1996). In recent years, many studies on volunteer motivation cite altruistic reasons among the primary motivations to volunteer (Unger, 1991). Altruism is defined variably: helping people (Howarth, 1976), benefiting children (Henderson, 1981), working for a cause (Gittman, 1975), and showing care (Henderson, 1981). Rumsey (1996) defined altruism as the desire to “help others,” “to do something for others,” “to share God’s love,” “to provide emotional support,” and “to solve problems for others” (p. 23). Smith (1981)
defined “altruism as an aspect of human motivation that is present to the degree that the individual derives intrinsic satisfaction or psychic rewards for attempting to optimize the intrinsic satisfaction of one or more other persons without the conscious expectation of participating in an exchange relationship whereby those others would be obligated to make similar or related satisfaction optimization efforts in return” (p. 23). A selfless motive is a common point in these definitions. Altruism has been mentioned across extensive fields of organizations and specific situations (Wiehe & Isenhour, 1977; Unger, 1991).

Wakefield (1993) explored “how philosophers, researchers, and members of the lay public tend to accept an egoistic view of human nature and suggest ways of countering their arguments to allow for the possibility of altruism” (Winniford et al., 1997, p. 138). Wakefield considered altruism as the cornerstone of humanitarianism and a basic concept unified into theories of motivation. Many college students believe that they are motivated to volunteer through altruism and tend to downplay egoistic motivations (Winniford et al., 1995).

A characteristic of younger volunteers was that they centered their volunteerism on values such as growth, self-satisfaction and self-development. An increase in the instructive aspect of volunteering is associated with an aspiration for self-development and satisfaction through involvement with volunteer service organizations (Winniford et al., 1997). These results paralleled the findings of Winniford et al. (1995), that despite the pursuit to achieve self-developmental needs and satisfaction, a major motivation of college students was the altruistic concern for others.

Social Obligation

According to Winniford et al. (1997), the concept of social obligation, which is defined as the goal of compensating a liability to society, is associated with the idea of volunteer motivation as “an exchange of costs and benefits” (p. 140). Fitch (1987), in his study about the traits and motivations of college student volunteers, classified motivations for volunteering into egoistic, altruistic, and social obligation divisions. Egoistic motivations for volunteering appear to be the strongest. Altruistic and egoistic
motives associated with the desire to “help others” and “affiliate with others,” respectively, were the next strongest. Social obligation was the third reason cited by the college students. Another frequent answer related to social obligation included students’ aspirations to make a contribution to society because they were “so fortunate” (Fitch, 1987, p. 427).

In his study involving social obligation, Serrow (1991) suggested that personal assistance is more important than social convictions in college students’ relatively altruistic motives for participating in service organizations. In Serrow’s study, eighty percent of the college students responded that they volunteered due to a “sense of satisfaction from helping others” (p. 545). Fifty-six percent of respondents participated in volunteer service organizations through a club, activity, or college course. Fifty-four percent of college students related their volunteerism to social obligation (“duty to correct social problems”). The next highest response was connected to egoistic motivations (i.e., meeting people, acquiring career skills and experience). Serow concluded that “the nature of the campus organizations in which the students were involved seemed to have an effect on their reasons for volunteering” (Winniford et al., 1997, p. 140). Table 2.3 summarizes the relationship between AES motives and VFI.

Table 2.3
The Relationship between AES Motives and VFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AES motives</th>
<th>VFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Obligation</td>
<td>Understanding/ Career/ Protective/ Enhancement/Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Volunteer Motivation in the Sport Setting

Several studies were related to volunteer motivation in the sport setting. Within these areas, five studies came from the last decade. Four of the studies dealt with the volunteer motivation in the sport event or sport competition (Chun, 2003; Farrell, Johnston, & Twynam, 1998; Pi, 2001; Strigas, 2001). One of them investigates the motivation of coach volunteers in the youth sport (Gentile, 2001).

The study by Farrell et al. (1998) was a cornerstone for research of volunteer motivation in sport events. Instrument of a 28-item scale adapted for this study from the scale developed by Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen was tested by a factor analysis. Farrell et al. suggested that volunteer motivations might be separated into four dimensions: purposive, solidary, external traditions, and commitments. The highest-ranking motive of importance was the purposive reason. The purposive and solidary factors paralleled those described by Caldwell and Andereck (1994). Two new dimensions that resulted from this analysis were the external traditions dimension and the commitments dimension. These new categories appeared to be the lowest ranking reasons in terms of importance. Purposive motives may be explained as the desire of the volunteer to make a useful and valuable contribution to society. Solidary motives included factors such as social interaction, group identification, and networking. The external traditions category emphasized extrinsic motivations. The commitments dimension centered on expectations from others for volunteering.

In the study, Farrell et al. (1998) examined attributes of satisfaction and motivation for volunteers at an elite sporting competition. The sample included 300 volunteers from the 1996 Scott Tournament of Hearts. The results showed that the factors explain 49.7% of the variance with the purposive, the solidary factor 10.3%, the external tradition factor 7.5%, and the commitment factor 6.2%. The highest ranking reason was “I want to help make the event a success,” while the lowest ranking reason was “I could obtain an educational experience.” In addition, about 80% of volunteers were satisfied or very satisfied with their volunteer experience at the competition.
Motivation for special event volunteers is different from that of other volunteers. Farrell et al. (1998) stated, “managers need to be prepared to address the variety of motivations when seeking volunteers for special events” (p. 298). This implication by Farrell et al. can be a good model for how theories regarding motivation or volunteer motivation can be used for future study in human resource management in organizations of the sport industry.

Strigas (2001) made a contribution to the development of a new scale to measure volunteer motivation in sport events. He tried to investigate primary motives to volunteer and develop a reliable and valid scale to measure volunteer motives. The sample included 477 volunteers who participated in the Country Music Marathon. Descriptive statistics showed that egoistic motives were the most important reasons to volunteer in the sport event. A set of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses revealed the emergence of a five-factor model to explain motivation of volunteers in the events. The five factors included: social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive, and external influence. The social/leisure factor is explained as the individual’s need for social interaction and interpersonal relationships, as well as the individual’s need to relax and “chill out.” The material dimension relates to a monetary value such as expected utility gain. The egoistic factor refers to the individual’s need for self-actualization, self-esteem, and achievement. The purposive factor includes motives related to the desire of volunteers to contribute to the sport event and/or the community. The external influence factor expresses motives influenced by others for volunteering.

Pi (2001) examined factors influencing volunteerism for international sport events in Taiwan and suggested a model for volunteer recruitment and training. The sample included 500 student volunteers from two universities in Taiwan. Instrument was modified from studies by Farrell et al. (1998). In order to assess the purpose of the study, descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were computed. A chi-square test was applied to determine levels of probability in associating factors with a willingness to volunteer. The results revealed that personal issues are a significant factor to volunteer. Important motives included opportunities for personal growth and
experience, a sense of fulfilling an obligation to society, and the desire for future benefits from the volunteer effort. Advertising for volunteer recruitment was not effective.

Chun (2003) examined the motivation of volunteers at the 2002 FIFA World Cup. Two major purposes of the study were to investigate volunteer motivation and satisfaction and to improve better management skills for organizations in order to retain volunteers and maintain their desire to participate in future events. The instrument was modified from Farrell et al.’s (1998) scale and was composed of four factors which included altruism, patriotism, egoism, and solidarity. The sample was comprised of 1100 volunteers for the 2002 FIFA World Cup. Descriptive statistics such as percentage, mean, and standard deviation were conducted to describe the data. In addition, T-test, one-way ANOVA, and Tukey post-hoc tests were conducted to analyze mean and group differences. The results proposed that four factors of motivation were associated with volunteer satisfaction.

Gentile (2001) conducted research including only qualitative methods in this area. Gentile’s study investigated the motivation and satisfaction of coach volunteers in youth sport. The sample was 100 coach volunteers. Two surveys and follow-up interview questions were invented from previous literatures. Analyses of variance were utilized to decide the significance of the relationship between each of the motivation variables with the gender of subject, the gender of the team coached, and participation in a coaching program. ANOVA were conducted to determine the differences between each of the seven satisfaction variables with the gender of subject, the gender of the team coached and participation in a coaching program. The findings indicated that the highest ranked motives for volunteering included: to give back to the community, enjoyment associating with youth, and to teach and lead others. Coach volunteers were highly satisfied with their role. In the follow-up interview (n=20), results showed that most coaches volunteered because their children were in the program. Other motives for volunteering included a reason to contribute to society and the need of alternatives due to lack of trust in other coaches.
Even though the studies regarding volunteer motivation in the sport setting have made a critical contribution, there are several weaknesses. The sampling techniques in most literatures of volunteer motivation have utilized the convenience sampling method; thus, there is important criticism about generalizability of the results. In convenience sampling, the researcher used the most easily accessible person or objects as the sample in a study. Although this sampling method is easy, fast and usually the least expensive, it has a major disadvantage concerning the representativeness of collected data (Lunsford & Lunsford, 1995). In other words, the researcher cannot generalize the results that are obtained by convenience sampling.

Table 2.4 shows a summary of sampling techniques that were used in the major literatures of volunteer motivation in the field of sport management. Also, even though the studies by Farrell et al. (1998) and Chun (2003) used random sampling methods, the scope of the studies was limited to only a single sport event. Therefore, there are still issues of generalizability.

Table 2.4
A Summary of Sampling Techniques Used in the Literatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random Sampling</td>
<td>Farrell et al. (1998) Volunteer motivation, satisfaction, and management at an elite sporting competition</td>
<td>About 900 event volunteers in the Scott Tournament of Hearts</td>
<td>300 volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Random Sampling</td>
<td>Chun (2003)  A study of volunteers’ motivation and satisfaction in the 2002 FIFA World Cup Korea &amp; Japan</td>
<td>16169 volunteers in the 2002 FIFA World Cup Korea &amp; Japan</td>
<td>500 volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convenience Sampling</th>
<th>Pi (2001)</th>
<th>Factors affecting volunteerism for international sport events in Taiwan, Republic of China</th>
<th>Volunteers for international sport events in Taiwan</th>
<th>500 college student volunteers who had experiences of volunteering in the international sport events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Sampling</td>
<td>Gentile (2001)</td>
<td>Volunteering to coach: an analysis of youth sport coaches</td>
<td>Volunteers for youth sport coaches</td>
<td>100 volunteer coaches who participated in organizational meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Sampling</td>
<td>Strigas (2001)</td>
<td>The assessment of motives and the development of a typology of motivational factors for volunteers in marathon running event</td>
<td>1800 Volunteers in marathon running event</td>
<td>500 volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commitment in Research of Organizational Behavior**

Organizational behavior (OB) is defined as “the behavior of individuals and groups, in organizations as they act and interact to attain desired outcomes” (Bobbitt, Breinholt, Doktor, & McNaul 1978, p. 5). Johns (1996) suggested that “organizational behavior refers to the attitudes and behaviors of individuals and groups in organizations. The discipline or field of organizational behavior involves the systematic study of these attitudes and behaviors” (p. 6). After analyzing definitions of OB that appeared in several literatures, Doherty (1998) indicated that the key concepts of OB include individuals and groups in organizations, and organizational effectiveness. He stated that “the concern of
organizations is managing individuals and groups towards organizational effectiveness based on the ability to explain and predict their attitudes and behavior” (p. 3).

Attitude is the antecedent of the behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Attitude is comprised of three common components, including affective, behavioral and cognitive factors, known as the ABC Model (McGuire 1985).

The affective component is explained as one’s feelings and emotions about an individual, group, organization, idea, issue, problem or opportunity. An example is when an employee says “I like my manager.” The cognitive component is explained as one’s beliefs, values, or opinions about an individual, group, organization, idea, issue, problem or opportunity. A possible example is when an employee says “I respect my organization’s goals.” The behavioral component of an attitude is explained as the tendency of a person to act in a certain way toward someone or something. A person can act toward someone or something in a friendly, warm, aggressive, hostile, or apathetic way or in any of a number of other ways. Such actions could be measured or assessed to examine the behavioral component of attitudes (McGuire 1985).

Even though the ABC model has explained attitude for predicting behaviors, the ABC model failed to show a consistent relationship between attitude and behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Due to this criticism, recent works include only affective and behavior components to measure attitude (Doherty, 1998; Hammer & Organ, 1978).

Doherty (1998) presented a conceptual model for managing human resources that encompasses the key concept of OB. In the model, the concept of affective and behavioral employee outcomes has an impact on the relation between the three different levels of analysis (individual, group, organization), and the organizational effectiveness of an organization. At an individual level, affective outcomes include: job satisfaction, motivation, commitment, intrapersonal conflict, and stress and burn out. At a group level, affective outcomes include: cohesion and interpersonal and inter-group conflict. At both an individual and group level, behavior outcomes contain turnover and performance.

Organizational effectiveness refers to goal achievement, acquisition of resources, efficient and effective organizational processes and constituent satisfaction (Chelladurai
& Haggerty, 1991). Affective and behavior outcomes contribute to the effectiveness of the organization. These outcomes are critical determinants of an organization’s human resources effectiveness and the human resources effectiveness is an indicator of organizational effectiveness (Robbins, 1996).

Organizational commitment refers to “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter, Steer, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974, p. 604). Many researchers have had different views regarding organizational commitment. For example, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) developed a two-component construct they called normative commitment and instrumental commitment. Normative commitment is defined by eight items representing commitment based on an acceptance of an organization’s values, whereas instrumental commitment is defined by four items describing commitment based on exchange or in response to specific rewards.

Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed a three-component commitment model. They categorized organizational commitment as affective, continuance and normative dimensions. Affective commitment refers to “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment in the organization because they want to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). This factor is conceptualized when the employee has a strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational goals and objectives. Continuance commitment refers to “awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). This factor is an employee’s commitment based on the cost the employee associates with departing an organization. Normative commitment refers to “the employee’s feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). This factor is conceptualized when an employee has the desire to remain with an organization because of the feeling of social responsibility against leaving.
Numerous research has presented that organizational commitment is associated with various affective and behavior outcomes. For example, it has been found that organizational commitment is related to employees' age and tenure within an organization, but inversely related to education (Mowday, Porter, & Steer, 1982). In addition, the outcomes of organizational commitment are postulated as behavior and behavioral intentions such as job performance, including absenteeism and tardiness and turnover or turnover intention (Mowday et al., 1982). According to the research by Mayer and Allen (1997), employees who are more committed have characteristics such as higher job performance, higher organizational citizenship, more ethical behavior, less stress, less job displeasure, and diminished intent to leave. More recent research by Clugston (2000) indicated that commitment partially mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Only recently, a few studies have been conducted in the field of sport management, although studies of organizational commitment have developed numerous conceptualizations and definitions of organizational commitment in other areas over the last 40 years (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Similar to research results in the other fields, sport-related research also showed that organizational commitment related to other employee outcomes. For example, Cuskelly (1995) tried to examine relationship commitment and group-level processes and reported a link between organizational commitment and committee functioning's five dimensions: decision process, cohesion, conflict resolution, receptiveness and homogeneity. Moreover, Turner and Chelladurai (2005) suggested that continuance commitment: LoAlt was positively correlated with intention to leave the organization.

As seen above, commitment has been treated as a significant variable associated with other employee outcomes in the field of OB and sport. Moreover, it is expected that commitment will contribute to organizational effectiveness. Studies of Reichheld (1996) and Pfeffer (1998) have supported such reasons. Reichheld mentioned that loyalty to customers, employees, and investors is critical to value creation and thus is an important source of growth, profits, and competitive advantage. He focused on the reasons why
loyal employees are so valuable to companies. In his argument, he suggested four major reasons for value of loyal employees: (1) higher quality relationships with customers (as a result, employees’ loyalty contributes to customer loyalty), (2) greater opportunities to learn, (3) increased efficiency, (4) reduced recruiting and training costs, producing resources that can then be reinvested in other parts of the business. Reichheld asserted that loyalty to employees can be a powerful source of competitive advantage. Pfeffer’s insistence (1998) was parallel with Reichheld’s viewpoint (1996). Pfeffer discussed that “firms that have pursued high involvement, high performance, and high commitment management practices have produced superior economic returns over the long-term” (p. 394).

In summary, organizational commitment as the affective employee outcome has been closely associated with various affective and behavior outcomes: personal characteristics, job satisfaction, job performance, turnover, and so on forth. Also, it can be assumed that organizational commitment of individuals makes a critical contribution to increased organizational effectiveness in the field of sport.

**Development of Commitment**

**Side-Bet Theory**

The initial conceptualization of organizational commitment was developed by Becker in 1960. Becker’s interest was in why a person performs a consistent behavior. He focused on extraneous interests which are the consequences of participating in a social group, including such factors as money, time, effort, reward, connection with the organization, and so on forth. Becker believed that “commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity” (p. 32). The side bets can be categorized as contribution to pension plans, development of organizational specific skills or status, or use of organizational benefits (Meyer & Allen, 1984). For example, an employee may not leave his/her company in spite of an offer of better income by another company because the employee may want to obtain the pension plan that his/her company has invested for him/her.
Even though side-bet theory has contributed to conceptualizing organizational commitment, criticisms have appeared. Wallace (1997) said that side-bet theory did not explicitly define commitment. Another important criticism from Cohen and Gattiker (1992) came from a meta-analysis of 50 studies using the side-bet theory, stating that side-bet indexes do not explain the significant amount of variance in organizational commitment. They stated that “side-bet indexes appear to have a stronger effect when it tries to predict calculative commitment than did either value-moral commitment or the 15 item overall commitment questionnaire” (p. 449).

**Unidimensional Model**

Porter, Steer, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) defined organizational commitment as “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 604). The organizational commitment by Porter et al. includes three key components: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort for the organization, and (3) a strong desire to maintain organizational membership.

An unique view by Porter et al. is that they conceptualized organizational commitment as an unidimensional construct. Based on their conceptualization, they developed a questionnaire to measure organizational commitment, called Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). OCQ includes 15 items and for more than 20 years has been mostly used in commitment studies. A shorter nine-item version which deleted the six reverse items was developed later by Tett and Meyer (1993).

The OCQ has also been criticized. Q’Reilly and Chatman (1986) argued that items in the OCQ included antecedents and consequences in the commitment. For example, Balfour and Wechsler (1991) suggested that “the definition of commitment underlying the OCQ does not differentiate commitment from attitudes such as role involvement, job satisfaction, expectancy (motivation)” (p. 357). Another major criticism related to OCQ’s unstable dimensionality. Many studies proposed through factor analysis of OCQ that two separate dimensions are more appropriate to measure organizational
commitment. The dimensions contain value (moral) commitment and continuance commitment (Angel & Perry, 1981; Cohen &Gattiker, 1992).

Two-dimensional Model

O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) research has also made an important contribution to the development of organizational commitment study. O’Reilly and Chatman borrowed attitudinal change theory from Kelman (1958) to conceptualize organizational commitment. Kelman constructed that people can accept influence in three conceptually different ways: (a) compliance or exchange, (b) identification or affiliation, and (c) internalization or value congruence.

Compliance, the first stage of attitudinal change, occurs when attitudes and behaviors are adopted to acquire rewards regardless of an individual’s belief or value. Identification occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish or maintain a satisfying relationship. Internalization occurs when influence is accepted because the induced attitudes and behaviors are parallel with one's own values. In other words, the value of the individual is the value of the group or organization. Based on this conceptualization, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) suggested:

. . . the basis for one's psychological attachment to an organization may be predicated on three independent foundations: (a) compliance or instrumental involvement for specific, extrinsic rewards; (b) identification or involvement based on a desire for affiliation; and (c) internalization or involvement predicated on congruence between individual and organizational values. These differences may represent separate dimensions of commitment. (p. 493)

In order to investigate three independent dimensions of commitment, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) conducted principal component analysis with 21 items. The results showed that three separated factors emerged and 21 items were reduced to 12 items, which included 3 identification, 4 compliance, and 5 internalization items. In addition, O’Reilly’s and Chatman’s research reported that internalization and identification are negatively related to turnover intention, whereas compliance-based commitment is positively associated with turnover intention. Compliance was negatively associated to tenure. Identification was positively related to length of service. However, internalization or value-based commitment was not significantly correlated with tenure. After several
years, O’Reilly et al. (1991) combined identification and internationalization into one factor and conceptualized commitment as a two-dimensional construct. The two factors are normative commitment and instrumental commitment. Normative commitment refers to an acceptance of an organization’s values, while instrumental commitment relates to specific rewards.

Criticism of O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986; 1991) study is similar to that of Porter et al.’s (1974) conceptualization. They also failed to distinguish the antecedents of commitment, consequence of commitment, and commitment itself. For instance, O’Reilly and Chatman criticized Porter et al.’s commitment construct that a willingness to exert effort for the benefit of the organization and a desire to maintain organizational membership are the consequence of commitment. However, they also made the same mistake, inserting both compliance and identification (1986) or normative and instrumental (1991) into commitment construct.

**Three-Component Model**

Initially, Meyer and Allen (1984) conceptualized organizational commitment as two different factors: affective and continuance commitment. After several years, they inserted normative commitment into their conceptualization of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). They defined the three commitments as:

Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment in the organization because they want to do so. Continuance commitment refers to awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Finally, normative commitment refers to the employee’s feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization. (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67)

Based on this conceptualization, Meyer and Allen developed an instrument to measure three dimensions of organizational commitment. The initial instrument consisted of 24 items (eight for each dimension) and was reduced to 18 items (six for each dimension) through a factor analysis. Reliability and validity have evaluated
appropriately throughout many studies (Heckett, Bycio, & Hausdorf., 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Major criticism of the three-component model includes vagueness of the differences between normative and affective commitment. Normative commitment appeared to be considerably similar to the emotional attachment with affective commitment (Jaros, 1995; Meyer & Allen, 1997). In relation to inappropriateness of the use of normative commitment, Morrow insisted (1993):

Conceptually, normative OC overlaps with the desire to remain dimension of attitudinal and affective OC and this redundancy is evident in the empirical analysis (i.e., a lack of discriminant validity). Normative OC, with its prescriptive overtones related to moral correctness may also overlap work ethic endorsement. At this juncture, normative OC cannot be recommended for hypothesis testing research but studies delineating the nature of this concept are desirable. (p. 106)

**Multidimensional Model Consisting of Five Parts**

Theories for organizational commitment began to emerge in the 1960’s. Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a multi-dimensional model of organizational commitment, which has recently become the most widely accepted model in organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen stated that the purpose of the organizational commitment construct was:

> to provide a better understanding of the commitment process and allow practitioners to scrutinize carefully the reports of more in-depth qualitative analysis of what did or did not work in other organizations and to evaluate what programs are most likely to work for them. (1997, p. ix)

As seen in a previous section, Meyer and Allen (1984) initially identified two dimensions of organizational commitment, including affective attachment and cost attachment. But after continued research, they added another dimension, that of obligation. Therefore, Meyer and Allen’s three distinct themes of organizational commitment are affective orientation, cost-based, and obligation or moral responsibility.

From the three themes, Meyer and Allen (1997) developed a multidimensional model of organizational commitment consisting of five stages: 1) distal antecedents, 2) proximal antecedents, 3) process, 4) commitment, and 5) consequences.
**Distal antecedents.** The first section of the multi-dimensional model dealt with distal antecedents. The distal antecedents are categorized as: organizational characteristics, personal characteristics, socialization experience, management practices, and environmental conditions. Distal antecedents are variables which indirectly affect organizational commitment.

**Proximal antecedents.** The second stage of the multidimensional model identified the proximal antecedents. The proximal antecedents are categorized as: work experiences, role status, and psychological contracts. Proximal antecedents are variables that directly affect organizational commitment. Many studies (Lee, Ashford, Walsh, & Mowday, 1992) have concluded that antecedents are a reliable predictor of organizational commitment.

**Process.** The third stage of the multidimensional model is the process in which the antecedents affect the various components of commitment. Process stage includes affective-related, normative-relative, and cost-relative. Examples of affective-related are attribution, person-job fit, and satisfaction. Normative-relative contains expectation and obligation. Lastly, cost-related includes alternatives and investments.

**Bases of commitment.** The fourth section of the model identified the three components of commitment: affective, continuance or normative. The three components were found to be related, but were distinguishable from each other.

Affective commitment is defined as an emotional attachment to an organization characterized by acceptance of organizational values and by willingness to remain with the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). Similarly, Meyer and Allen state, “Affective commitment refers to an employee’s attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (1997, p. 11). An employee who has a strong affective commitment to an organization stays with the organization because he or she wants to continue working in the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) found that the best predictor of affective commitment was work experience. Employees whose work experiences are consistent with their expectations and their basic needs within the organization are satisfied, and have a stronger level of affective commitment to the
organization. Employees with strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to do so.

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), “continuance commitment refers to the awareness of cost associated with leaving the organizations” (p. 11). Employees with a strong continuance commitment to the organization recognize that leaving the organization may be detrimental to them financially due to the lack of employment alternatives and loss of investments (e.g., personal relationships, pension plans).

Continuance commitment was originally a unitary dimension, but through continued research (McGee & Ford, 1987) the dimension was subdivided into two dimensions: continuance commitment-low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt) and continuance commitment-high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac). The former reflects an individual’s commitment to an organization because of a lack of employment opportunities. The latter describes an individual staying with an organization because of the personal loss that would occur from leaving the organization. Employees with strong continuance commitment are said to remain with the organization because they have to do so. Much further research have proven the differences between the two variables (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Somers, 1993).

The third component, normative commitment, reflects a feeling of “obligation to continue employment” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11). An employee with a strong normative commitment feels he or she has a moral obligation to stay in the organization. Normative commitment was developed on the basis that the organization made a particular kind of investment in the employee, which gives the employee a sense of obligation to the organization.

**Consequences.** The last stage of the multidimensional model is the consequences of organizational commitment. These have been defined as retention (withdrawal behavior and turnover), productive behavior (performance), and employee well being (Allen & Meyer, 1990). A number of other studies have been researched in this area to support Meyer and Allen’s claims. For example, Steers (1977) identified the outcomes of
organizational commitment as attendance, intent to remain, job involvement, job effort, and retention.

Additional research showed that the results of strong commitment were lower absenteeism (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Somers, 1995), lower turnover (Lee & Maurer, 1999; Somers, 1995; Steers, 1977), and higher productivity (Angle & Perry, 1981; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989).

**Multiple Bases and Foci of Commitment**

Clugston, Howell and Dorfman (2000) tested prior theoretical assertions regarding culture’s influence on organizational commitment. Specifically, the authors tried to support and extend organizational commitment theory by testing if individualized measures of power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity can influence an employee’s affective, continuance, or normative commitment to the organization, supervisor, or workgroup.

The results showed that (1) power distance is related to normative commitment across all foci; (2) uncertainty avoidance is related to continuance commitment across all foci; (3) collectivism is related to workgroup commitment across all bases of commitment.

Clugston et al. (2000) stated that “A major contribution of this paper lies in the conceptual framework of utilizing individualized measures of well-known cultural dimensions to predict multiple bases and foci of commitment. Previous studies in this area failed to incorporate multidimensional measures of commitment, as well as individualized measures of culture” (p. 24).

**New aspects of the instrument including three foci.** The organizational commitment questionnaire by Porter, Steer, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) has been the most widely utilized instrument to measure organizational commitment (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). OCQ measures an individual’s affective commitment to the organization (Becker, 1992; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). However, the OCQ is inadequate for serious theoretical research in the area of employee commitment because
individuals make different types of commitments to their organizations than they do to their supervisors or peers (Reichers, 1985). Becker’s (1992) test about Reichers’ suggestion indicated that individual measures of commitment across multiple bases and foci accounted for unique variance in key dependent variables. Becker’s research was confirmed by Hunt and Morgan (1994). Moreover, Becker et al. (1996) again confirmed the diverse bases of commitment in the fact that there are distinctions for each employee between various commitment types they make to their organization, supervisor, and peers.

Meyer and Allen (1991) developed three-component organizational commitment instrument, including affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Meyer and Allen stated that each of the three bases of commitment is also affected by different classes of antecedents. A direct effect on affective commitment could be factors such as work experience and personal characteristics. The cost related to leaving the organization could affect continuance commitment. The social and cultural orientations of each employee could affect the normative commitment.

Clugston, Howell & Dorfman (2000) developed a new commitment scale by modifying Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component organizational commitment instrument. Three foci of organization, supervisor and workgroup are included in three-component organizational commitment instrument, including three bases of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Therefore, the instrument by Clugston et al. has nine separate commitment constructs measuring the three bases of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the three foci of organization, supervisor, and workgroup.

**Factors That Influence Commitment**

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) reported that job satisfaction is positively associated with both affective and continuance organizational commitment. Williams and Hazer (1986) utilized structural equation modeling to prove that job satisfaction is antecedent to organizational commitment. Hackett, Bycio and Hausdorf (1994) found that job satisfaction has a positive effect on affective and normative commitment but has a negative influence on continuance commitment. Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) and
Withey (1988) also found that job satisfaction has a negative impact on continuance commitment.

In their meta-analysis, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) showed that both affective and continuance commitment has a negative impact on intent to leave. Meyer, Allen and Smith (1994) also suggested that three bases of commitment (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative commitment) are negatively associated with intent to leave. Tate, Whatley and Clugston (1997) reported that job satisfaction has a direct and negative impact on intent to leave.

Clugston (2000) tried to prove the mediating effects of affective, continuance, and normative commitment on the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave by utilizing structural equating modeling. Clugston suggested three models to estimate. Model 1 describes that job satisfaction influences affective, continuance, and normative commitment which in turn affect an employee’s intent to leave the organization (see figure 2.3). Model 2 depicts a competing hypothesis which suggests that commitment only partially mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave (see figure 2.4). Model 3 proposes a non-mediated model whereby job satisfaction is hypothesized to directly impact multidimensional commitment and intent to leave, but the commitment variables are not hypothesized to impact intent to leave (figure 2.5). The authors found that a partially mediated model of multidimensional commitment (model 2) fits the data better than a fully mediated or non-mediated model.
Figure 2.3
Model 1 - Fully mediated multidimensional commitment model

Figure 2.4
Model 2 - Partially mediated multidimensional commitment model
Commitment in the Sport Setting

Cuskelly (1995) and Cuskelly, McIntyre and Boag (1998) investigated the organizational commitment of volunteer administrators of sport organizations. Cuskelly (1995) explored the extent to which perceived committee functioning was predictive of organizational commitment to sporting organizations. In order to measure, he used OCQ and gathered data from 159 volunteer administrators in 17 different sporting organizations. Results showed that male volunteers were more committed than female volunteers. In addition, results revealed that volunteer administrators were more committed in organizations in which they used an open process to make decisions and resolve conflicts.

Cuskelly, et al. (1998) conducted a three-wave, six month longitudinal study to examine the development of organizational commitment among volunteers in relation to

Figure 2.5
Model 3 – Non-mediated multidimensional commitment model
several organizational factors and personal characteristics. In order to access the purpose of the study, they utilized a nine-item short version of OCQ. As in the previous study by Cuskelly (1995), results showed that volunteers revealed stronger organizational commitment to the sport organization that functioned in a positive manner and used an open decision-making process to resolve conflicts. Also, organizational commitment was positively associated with variables such as volunteer age group, volunteer hours per week, and tenure as an organizational member. In conclusion, committees of sport organizations need to have a more positive and open approach when working with volunteer administrators in order to develop higher levels of organizational commitment.

Winterstein (1998) investigated the commitment and techniques of head athletic trainers in their intercollegiate work environment. Head athletic trainers (n=330) of NCAA Division I, II, and III were used as the sample for the study. Results revealed that continuance commitment was significantly lower than the affective and normative commitment. In addition, results showed Division I and Division II head athletic trainers demonstrated higher levels of normative commitment to their athletic departments and affective and normative commitment to their co-workers than their Division III head athletic trainers.

Turner (2001) conducted an organizational commitment study utilizing a sample of intercollegiate coaches. This study investigated the multidimensionality of organizational commitment among athletic coaches. In order to approach the purpose of the study, Turner utilized the four bases of commitment (affective, normative, continuance: low number of alternatives, and continuance: high alternatives) and the two foci (organizational or occupational) of commitment. The sample used for the study was 724 head coaches at NCAA Division I and Division III member institutions. Results from the study revealed that the four bases of occupational commitment had a greater influence on intention to leave the occupation than satisfaction with the occupation. The results also revealed that satisfaction with the organization had a greater influence on intention to leave rather than the four components of organizational commitment.
As mentioned above, Turner (2001) examined two foci (organizational behavior and occupational behavior) and four bases (affective commitment [AC], normative commitment [NC], continuance commitment: HiSac (CC:HiSac), and continuance commitment: LoAlt [CC:LoAlt]) of commitment. In order to investigate these, he rebuilt 8 different commitment scales. A critical issue of these scales is organizational affective commitment’s reliability. The Cronbach’s alpha score was .68 and below the cut off level of .70, which was suggested by Nunally (1978). Another issue relates to validity. Turner selected 3 items from Meyer and Allen’s (1993) 18 item-versions due to non-response error. From these rebuilt items, moreover, he removed 1 item from CC:HiSac because of low reliability; thus, the instrument include: 3 items for AC, 3 items for NC, 2 items for CC:HiSac, and 3 items for CC:LoAlt. However, he failed to discuss the validity issue of the instrument.

Kent and Chelladurai (2001) investigated the relationship between perceived transformational leadership and leader-member exchange with organizational commitment. The authors used three dimensions based on Bass’ view (1985) in order to measure transformational leadership: (a) charismatic leadership, (b) intellectual stimulation, (c) individualized consideration. Two dimensions, including affective and normative commitment, were utilized to measure organizational commitment. The instrument by Meyer and Allen (1997) included six items for each of the affective and normative commitments.

Results showed that the correlations of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange with affective commitment were all significant. For the relationship between leadership and commitment, charismatic leadership and individualized consideration out of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange were significantly correlated with normative commitment. There was no significant correlation between intellectual stimulation and normative commitment.

Even though Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested three dimensions, including affective, normative, and continuance commitment to measure organizational commitment, Kent and Chelladurai (2001) used the instrument, including only affective
and normative commitment. That is, continuance commitment scale was not utilized. To explain the reasons that excluded continuance commitment scale, the authors suggested that three-dimension scale is “conceptually distinct from the other two commitment scales and has not been related to transformational leadership either conceptually or empirically” (p. 141). However, there is still a dearth of rationale about why the authors used only two dimensions. The authors need to explain in detail about how three-dimension scale conceptually differ from two-dimension scale and how three-dimension scale did not relate to transformational leadership either conceptually or empirically.

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) considered two aspects of commitment: organizational and occupational commitment. Organizational commitment is defined as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p. 27). According to Maier and Brunstein (2001), the definition by Mowday et al. has been used most widely in job-related attitudes. Similarly, occupational commitment has been defined as "one's attitude, including affect, belief, and behavioral intention, toward his/her occupation" (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993, p. 311). Many studies showed organizational or occupational commitment to the extent to which an employee: (a) believes and accepts the goals and values of the organization or occupation, (b) is willing to exert effort on behalf of the organization or occupation, and (c) prefers to continue to be a member of the organization or occupation (Blau & Boal, 1989; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Mowday et al., 1982). Organizational and occupational commitment is negatively associated with turnover intention (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Therefore, Chelladurai and Ogasawara indicated that there is a need to study the extent to which coaches are committed to both their organization and their occupation.

Brislin (1990) argued that Japanese and American workers differ in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and that such differences have been attributed to cultural influences. Hofstede (1980) found the Japanese workers are more committed to their organizations than American workers and attributed this to cultural differences in collectivistic orientation. In other words, organizational attachment is
considered to be a manifestation of the cultural characteristics to be closely aligned with family, groups, and community. In collectivist cultures such as Japan, personal identity comes from the groups one belongs to (e.g., family, school class, work group, employing organization). Loyalty to group members and organization is valued. As the Japanese culture is more collectivist than the American culture (Hofstede, 1980), organizational commitment of Japanese workers is higher than the Americans (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1985).

Based on findings in the general work place, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) tried to apply these findings concerning commitment to the sport setting. They made a cross-cultural comparison between Japanese and American collegiate coaches regarding their job satisfaction and organizational and occupational commitment, using General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC). The 31-item GIWC of Blau et al. (1993) included: occupational commitment (11 items), job involvement (7 items), value of work (7 items), and organizational commitment (6 items). The findings showed that Japanese coaches had a higher commitment to their organization than American coaches (division I and III). On the other hand, Japanese coaches had a lower commitment to the occupation than American coaches (division I and II).

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) suggested an unique implication that “even though Japanese coaches were more committed to their organization, they are less likely to leave their organization because of the still prevailing convention of lifetime employment in Japanese culture” (p. 71).

Criticism of Chelladurai and Ogasawara’s (2003) research relates to unidimensionality of instrument. In order to measure organizational commitment, they used six items in GIWC, an unidimension scale. However, Meyer and Allen (1997) indicated an advantage of the multidimensional scale to measure organizational commitment related to cultural differences. They stated:

Normative commitment, for example, might be a better predictor than affective commitment in collectivist cultures that emphasize strong social ties (and obligation) and in cultures characterized by uncertainty avoidance where loyalty is considered a virtue (see Hofsted for a more detailed discussion of the conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences). (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 108)
Chang and Chelladurai (2003) conducted research to distinguish job attitudes between part-time and full-time workers in Korean sports organizations. Specially, the authors centered on how organizational commitment (affective and continuance commitment) related to organizational citizenship behaviors among part-time and full-time workers.

In order to measure organizational commitment, the authors used the eight-item affective (AC) and the eight-item continuance (CC). Commitment scales were developed by Meyer and Allen (1984). Even though Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed three dimensions of organization commitment such as affective, continuance, normative, the authors used only two dimensions (i.e., affective, continuance). The reasons were grounded in “(a) possible correlation between affective and normative components (see Allen & Meyer, 1990), and (b) lack of relevancy normative commitment to part-time workers.” (p. 401).

Results showed that the full-time workers had higher scores on AC and OCB than the scores of the part-time group. On the other hand, the part-time workers had a higher score on CC. In the investigation for a relationship between OC and OCB, the results showed the relationship between AC and OCB was positive in both groups, and the relationship between CC and OCB was significant and negative in the full-time group.

One of the reasons the authors utilized two dimensions instead of three dimensions of organization was “a lack of relevancy normative commitment to part-time workers” (p. 401). However, they fail to detail and validate the lack of relevancy. Their reasoning was vague and needed to be explained in detail.

Another weak point of this article is that the authors did not consider gender and age as grouping variables. A higher percentage of female and younger people tended to be employed as part-time workers (Korean Ministry of Labor, 1998). Although it should be verified whether the proportion of age and gender in a sport organization is the same as in other industries, variables such as gender and age that affect job attitudes, including organizational commitment, also need to be investigated.
Cunningham and Sagas (2004) investigated the effects of age, tenure, and ethnic diversity on group occupational commitment and occupational turnover intent. The results showed that ethnic diversity and organizational tenure diversity were negatively associated with occupational commitment and positively related to occupational turnover intention.

Cunningham and Sagas (2004) used Meyer et al.’s (1993) affective occupational commitment questionnaire. The reasons the authors only utilized the affective occupational commitment questionnaire were because: (1) diversity could influence one’s involvement with or emotional ties to an occupation, (2) diversity would influence less one’s sense of obligation to remain in the occupation, and (3) diversity would influence less the lack of alternatives outside the occupation.

Turner and Chelladurai (2005) found that various grouping variables such as NCAA division, gender, and marital/lifestyle status did not influence the organizational and occupational commitment. However, four organizational and occupational commitment variables (i.e., affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment: HiSac, continuance commitment: LoAlt) were significantly associated with intention to leave the organization.

In order to measure, the authors revised Meyer et al.’s (1993) three-component 18-item scale, including affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Based on Goffin and Gellatly’s (2001) work, the three highest loading items in the Meyer et al. scale were selected for affective and normative commitment. Continuance commitment was divided into three items for HiSac and three items for LoAlt based on McGree and Ford’s (1987) study. The questionnaire was composed of total 12 items which asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with each of the 12 items on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

An interesting result was that continuance commitment LoAlt was only positively correlated with intention to leave the organization, whereas the other three commitment variables were negatively correlated.
Antecedents and Consequences of Commitment

Through reviews of literatures in the field of organizational commitment, the author has mentioned antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. For example, organizational commitment was positively associated with job satisfaction and job performance, and negatively associated with turnover intention, job stress, and burnout. Figure 2.6 is a model of related antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. The proposed model has been proven empirically.

Relationship among Demographics, Motivation and Commitment

Many researchers have tried to explore the factors that influence commitment (Dunham, Grube & Castaneda, 1994; Mathieu & Hamel, 1989; Meyer & Allen, 1997). They found that the factors that influence commitment are: (a) personal characteristics such as demographic characteristics and personal motivation (personality); (b) job satisfaction; (c) job involvement; (d) organizational characteristics such as organization size, structure, and climate; and (e) environmental conditions such as family responsibility, family support.

In order to predict volunteers’ commitment, Dailey (1986) used four factors such as personal characteristics, job characteristics, job involvement, and job satisfaction. He measured personal characteristics by assessing only personal motivation; however, he did not use demographic characteristics as a variable. Personal motivation was an important predictor for commitment of volunteers. Daily argued that highly motivated volunteers have high commitment and high commitment might contribute to organizational effectiveness.

Hsieh (2000) has developed the model that explains the relationships between motivation and commitment of volunteers. He tried to explore which variable among volunteer motivation, demographic characteristics, volunteer involvement, and volunteer satisfaction was the best predictor of commitment. From the results, volunteer involvement and volunteer satisfaction were the best predictors for commitment. Among demographic characteristics, annual family income, age and education level were the predictors of commitment. In his study, older volunteers with high income and education
level were more committed to volunteer organization. He also found that when the six volunteer motivation factors by Clary et al. (1998) were used to replace overall volunteer motivation, career motivation was the only predictor of commitment. He discussed that knowledge of relationships between demographic profile and commitment of volunteers plays an important role in better recruiting and retaining volunteers.

Figure 2.6
Summarized model of antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment (based on Meyer & Allen, 1997; Steers, 1977)
Current Trends in Commitment Research

Relevance of Organizational Commitment

Mowday (1998) mentioned that studies on commitment have been an important portion of organizational behavior research. However, Baruch (1998) argued that employee commitment to organizations is less relevant due to the recent downsizing tendency of organizations. As a result of corporate downsize, the affective commitment of individuals might increase due to the effect of enrichment, while other individuals become less committed to the organization due to the burden of overwork (Meyer, Allen, & Topolnytsky, 1998). Mowday (1998) also suggested that “although much of the early research on commitment was driven by the strong belief that the concept was of relevance to employees and managers, some contemporary writers have questioned whether commitment is any longer a relevant focus of research” (p. 392).

Negative view of relevancy of commitment. Baruch (1998) stated that “the importance of Organizational Commitment (OC) as a leading concept in the management and behavioral science is decreasing and this tendency will continue” (p. 138). He raised two propositions. First, organizational commitment to employees is an antecedent to employees’ commitment to the organization. Second, as the former declines, the latter will subsequently decline too. Although his thought does not propose the usefulness of organizational commitment, it seems that organizations run the risk of reducing commitment by focusing on non-human resources in difficult times. Baruch insisted that the concept of organization commitment needs to be renewed due to recent business changes. He indicated that organizations’ frequent layoffs and downsizing are a new tendency of human resources and industrial relation system. This change results in a low commitment from organizations to their employees; subsequently, Baruch concluded that “the strength of organizational commitment as a leading concept in management and behavioral sciences is continuously decreasing” (p. 135).

Positive views of relevancy of commitment. Reichheld (1996) presented that loyalty to customers, employees, and investors is critical to value creation and thus an important source of growth, profits, and competitive advantage. He focused on the
reasons why loyal employees are so valuable to companies. In his argument, he suggested four major reasons for value of loyal employees: (1) higher quality relationships with customer (as a result, employees’ loyalty contributes to customer loyalty), (2) greater opportunities to learn, (3) increased efficiency, (4) reduced a recruiting and training costs, producing resources that can then be reinvested in other parts of the business. Reichheld asserted that loyalty to employees can be a powerful source of competitive advantage.

The views of Pfeffer (1998) were parallel to those of Reichheld (1996). Pfeffer discussed that “firms that have pursued high involvement, high performance, and high commitment management practices have produced superior economic returns over the long-term” (Mowday, 1998, p. 394). Based on the argument of Reichheld, Pfeffer suggested a set of seven management practices: (1) employment security, (2) selective hiring, (3) self-managed teams and decentralization of decision-making, (4) high compensation contingent on performance, (5) employee training, (6) reduced status differentials, and (7) sharing information. Additionally, an important argument by Pfeffer was that a people-centered strategy is an important source of competitive advantage because, unlike technology, cost, or new product development, it is difficult to imitate.

Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Tripoli (1997) demonstrated the relationship between human resource management strategies and individual-level employee commitment. The research showed that organizational investment in employees result in (1) higher levels of employee affective commitment, (2) higher levels of citizenship behavior, (3) lower intention to leave the organization, and (4) fewer unexcused absences. Mowday (1998) mentioned that “employee commitment to organizations has as much, if not greater, relevance to managers today than it did 25 years ago” (p. 396). In his view, organizations pursuing high performance and high commitment human resource strategies can create superior economic advantages. In conclusion, employee commitment seems very relevant as a management construct in that it can lead to competitive advantage and financial success.

Organizational commitment is still important in the areas of organizational behavior or management. There are two major reasons: (a) even though recent
organizations have a tendency toward frequent layoffs and downsizing, organizations still exist everywhere; and (b) recent empirical research have consistently reported that organizational commitment is associated with other variables, such as job satisfaction, job performance, job stress, and turnover intention in workplace. For example, many studies have reported that more committed employees have lower turnover intentions than uncommitted employees (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Because qualified employees play an important role in accessing an organization’s profits or goals, it is important that they stay in the organization. Therefore, it is a necessity to study organizational commitment itself and the antecedents and consequences of commitment.

**Measurement Issues of Motivation and Commitment**

The volunteer motivation scale and the four bases and two foci scale of commitment have had the appropriate reliability and validity of the context of sport management as well as general management.

**Construct Validity**

There are many definitions of construct validity. In order to grasp the concept of construct validity, several definitions of construct validity will be introduced. Carmines and Zeller (1979) defined construct validity as “the extent to which a measure performs in accordance with theoretical expectations” (p. 27). In the definition by Schwab (1980), construct validity refers to “representing the correspondence between a construct (conceptual definition of a variable) and the operational procedure to measure or manipulate that construct” (p. 6). According to Trochim (2006), construct validity refers to “the degree to which inferences can legitimately be made from the operationalizations in your study to theoretical constructs on which those operationalizations were based” (cited from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/constval.htm). A good construct has a theoretical basis which is translated through clear operational definitions involving measurable indicators, while a poor construct may be characterized by the dearth of theoretical agreement on its content (Garson, 2001). Construct validity tries to validate a
body of theory underlying the measurement and testing of the hypothesized relationships (LoBiondo-Wood, 2002).

Construct validity can be determined by both convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity examines the degree to which the operationalization is similar to other operationalizations that it, theoretically, should be similar to (Trochim, 2006). For example, in order to show the convergent validity of the program to increase organizational commitment, evidence is gathered that shows that the program is similar to other programs to increase organizational commitment. Another example could be that to show the convergent validity of a test of English skills, the scores on our test might be correlated with scores on other tests that purport to measure abilities in English, where high correlations would be the evidence of convergent validity.

Discriminant validity examines the degree to which the operationalization is not similar to other operationalizations that it, theoretically, should not be similar to (Trochim, 2006). For instance, in order to show the discriminant validity of the program motivating someone to serve as a volunteer, evidence is gathered that shows that the program is not similar to other programs, restraining one from serving as a volunteer. In other words, to show the discriminant validity of a test of math skills, the scores on my test might be correlated with scores on tests about verbal ability, where low correlations would be the evidence of discriminant validity.

Convergent and discriminant validities can also be examined by factor analysis. Convergent validity is usually assessed by the magnitude of the factor loadings linking the observed and latent variable in the confirmatory analysis. If each item’s factor loading is greater than twice its standard error, it supports convergent validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Discriminant validity is evaluated by the correlations between the measures of different constructs (Cambel, 1960). According to Kline (1998), if two constructs are distinct, the measures of one construct should not be too highly correlated with those of the other (<.85).
Evidence of Construct Validity of Commitment

Schwab (1980) discussed the methods for assessing construct validity in the research of organizational behavior. According to Schwab, three different kinds of evidence can be used to support the construct validity of a set of conceptually related measures. The three kinds include: (1) reliability of the measures, (2) factor analytic results, and (3) patterns of correlations between the commitment measures and other variables (a nomological net).

**Estimates of reliability.** Coefficient alpha has typically been used to measure internal consistency. Median reliabilities, across both versions of the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS), and Normative Commitment Scale (NCS) are .85, .79, and .73, respectively, and all reliability estimates exceed .70, with very few exceptions (Allen & Meyer, 1996).

There are several longitudinal studies to assess test-retest reliability and all test-retest reliabilities have an acceptable range. For example, Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) reported that the correlations between pretest and second test (after 5 months) of ACS, NCS, and CCS are .66, .56, and .61, respectively.

**Factor analytic evidence.** Exploratory factor analyses have shown that (a) ACS items are distinct from related measures assessing career, job, and work value constructs (Blau, Paul, Doherty, and John, 1993); (b) ACS items are distinct from CCS items (McGee & Ford, 1987); (c) ACS and NCS items load on the same factor, but are distinct from CCS items (Cohen, 1993); and (d) ACS, CCS, and NCS items load appropriately on three factors (Allen & Lee, 1993 cited in Allen & Meyer, 1996). Results of confirmatory factor analyses demonstrated that the ACS and CCS, and the ACS, CCS, and NCS loaded on separate factors (Meyer, Allen, & Gellately, 1990; Somer, 1993). Meyer et al. (1990) conducted confirmatory factor analysis to compare one-factor model of CC and two-factor model of CC (CC: Hi Sacrifice [HiSac]) and CC: Low Alternative [LoAlt]). They found that although the one-factor model provided a good fit to the data, the best fit was provided by a two-factor model. Hackett, Bycio and Hausmdorf (1994) applied confirmatory factor analyses to all three commitment measures and compared the fit of
one-, three-, and four-factor models. The results suggested that a four-factor model provided the best fit to the data, again supporting a two-dimensional CCS structure. However, Allen and Meyer (1996) discussed that although a model hypothesizing a two-dimensional CCS structure clearly provides a better fit to the data than does a unidimensional model, the superiority is modest, and the two factors are highly related.

**A nomological net approach.** In delineating the basic principles of construct validation, Cronbach and Meehl (1955) argued that “to validate a claim that a test measures a construct, a nomological net surrounding the concept must exist” (p. 291). In other words, in order to provide evidence that the measures have construct validity, Cronbach and Meehl suggested that one has to develop a nomological network for the measures. The network includes the theoretical framework for what one is trying to measure, an empirical framework for how one is going to measure it, and specification of the linkages among and between these two frameworks (Trochim, 2006).

Meyer and Allen (1997) presented the tests of a nomological net of organizational commitment measures to evaluate construct validity. They mentioned that the three-component model of commitment developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) outlines a set of hypothesized relations between the three commitment variables and other variables presumed to be antecedents and consequences of commitment. By demonstrating that the pattern of empirical findings matched the hypothesized pattern, Meyer and Allen (1997) argued that further evidence was provided for the construct validity of the measures.

There are many empirical evidences. First, Allen and Meyer (1996) argued that the correlations between Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) and commitment measures are an important issue to estimate construct validity. OCQ, which focuses on emotional attachment to the organization, should correlate strongly with the ACS. Though normative commitment is based on obligation, not affect, it does appear to overlap somewhat with affective commitment; thus, it is expected that NCS scores would be correlated modestly with other affective measures. Continuance commitment, however, is considered to be affectively neutral: though one may feel that the costs associated with leaving would be high, this, in itself, does not necessarily generate positive or negative
feelings toward the domain in question. Therefore, CCS scores would be expected to share very little variance with these other work attitude measures. In empirical research, the OCQ is strongly related to the ACS as expected, and it provides evidence for convergent validity. In addition, OCQ is moderately correlated with NCS and was very little correlated with CCS as expected (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 1993; Hackett et al., 1994; Lee, 1992). This is evidence of discriminant validity.

The ACS correlates with measures reflecting affective reaction to other variables (e.g., Allen & Lee, 1993; Blau et al., 1993; Hackett et al., 1994; Jenkins, 1993; Lee, 1992; Meyer et al., 1993; Somer, 1993; Withey, 1988). Many studies found that the ACS is positively related to positive variables (e.g., job satisfaction, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior) and negatively related to negative variables (e.g., job stress, conflict, turnover intention). As the CCS and NCS correlate differently with other variables, it provides further evidence of discriminant validity (Allen & Meyer, 1996). For example, organizational citizenship behavior is consistently correlated positively with affective commitment, correlated less consistently with normative commitment, and is either unrelated or negatively related to continuance commitment (Allen & Smith, 1987; Lee, 1992; McDonald, 1993; Meyer et al., 1993). An additional example is that turnover intention had a negative relationship with affective commitment. A similar pattern exists for normative commitment with lower negative relationship than affective commitment. Correlations between continuance commitment and turnover intentions are less consistent across studies (Allen & Lee, 1993; Carson & Bedeian, 1994; Heckett et al., 1994; Jenkins, 1993; Lee, 1992; Meyer et al., 1993; Whitener & Walz, 1993).

Construct Validity of Commitment in Sport

A panel of experts. Turner (2001) presented the four-base dimensionality of commitment among NCAA Division I and III athletic coaches in America. In order to check construct validity of the instrument, he asked a panel of experts to thoroughly examine the Commitment of Athletic Coaches Questionnaire. The panel included four current and former intercollegiate athletic coaches, four sport management professors, and two individuals who had conducted research on organizational commitment.
Estimates of reliability. In reliability, which is one of the evidences of construct validity, Turner (2001) reported that reliabilities of ACS, NCS, CCS:HiSac, and CCS:LoAlt were .68, .70, .77, and .73, respectively. These measures were similar to the reliabilities of .73 to .85 reported by Meyer & Allen (1997). However, the value of ACS did not exceed Nunnally’s (1978) criteria of .70. In occupational commitment, the reliability was ranging from .73 to .84. These measures were also consistent with the reliability measures of .73 to .87 reported by Meyer et al. (1993).

In another sport research, Kent and Sullivan (2003) used the three-dimensional scale by Meyer and Allen (1991) and reported the value of Cronbach’s alpha for affective, continuance, and normative commitment to be .73, .78, and .76, respectively. The values exceeded Nunnally’s (1978) criteria of .70.

A nomological net approach. In sport research, many studies found that the ACS is positively related to positive variables (e.g., job satisfaction, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior) and negatively related to negative variables (e.g., job stress, conflict, turnover intention). The CCS and NCS correlated weakly with other variables; this provided further evidence of discriminant validity (Allen & Meyer, 1996). For example, there were relationships between organizational commitment and performance. ACS had the strongest correlation with job performance, followed by CCS: HiSac and NCS, respectively (Turner, 2001). In addition, Chang and Chelladurai (2003) investigated the relationship between commitment and citizenship behaviors of part-time workers and full-time workers. The findings showed that the full-time workers scored significantly higher on ACS and OCB, while the part-time workers scored higher on CC. The relationship between ACS and OCB was positive and significant in both groups. The relationship between CCS and OCB was significant and negative only in the case of the full-time group. These results provided evidence of discriminant validity.

Turner (2001) suggested the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational tenure. CC:HiSac had the highest correlation, followed by AC and NC, respectively. The findings corresponded to Meyer and Allen’s (1997) results that organizational commitment and organizational tenure were positively related, with
continuance commitment having a stronger relationship than affective commitment. The strong relations between CCS and organizational tenure were consistent, as expected, and provided evidence for convergent validity.

**Construct Validity of Volunteer Motivation**

There are two major studies to measure volunteer motivation in sport events. Farrell et al. (1998) suggested four-factor model and Strigas (2001) developed five-factor model. The Special Event Volunteer Motivation Scale (SEVMS) by Farrell et al. is the most often used instrument to measure volunteer motivation in sport events. Based on the literature, most studies related to volunteer motivation in the sport settings used SEVMS. Even though Farrell et al. proposed a well-developed four-factor instrument which included purposive, solidary, external traditions, and commitments, there were still problems concerning validity and reliability. First, some items had low factor loading scores (i.e., last item in the purposive motive had a loading score of .285). Secondly, Cronbach’s alpha score of two factors was below .70, which is the cutoff as Nunnally (1978) suggested (i.e., external traditions and commitments had Cronbach’s alpha score of .65). Lastly, the commitment, fourth labeled factor, was vague. There was a dearth of enough rationale to explain commitment as a factor of volunteer motivation. For example, Farrell et al. indicated that the commitment factor includes motives that link external expectations and personal skills with commitment to volunteering. However, the commitment factor is conceptually similar to the solidary factor.

In spite of the weaknesses of SEVMS, most research has utilized it to measure volunteer motivation in the sport settings. For example, Pi (2001) examined factors that influence the willingness of university physical education students to volunteer for international events sponsored in Taiwan. In order to assess the purpose of the study, Pi used SEVMS. However, he failed to demonstrate enough construct validity of SEVMS. He only mentioned the appropriateness of the instrument by test-retest reliability scores and content validity for the process of translation. For instance, Chun (2003) tried to investigate the volunteers’ motivation and perceived satisfaction in relation to their experience working at the 2002 FIFA World Cup. Based on Farrell et al.’s (1998)
conceptualization, he developed a survey questionnaire that was modified by recommendations of a panel of experts. The questionnaire included four factors such as altruism, patriotism, egoism, and solidarity. However, the construct validity and the reliability of the instrument were not discussed enough.

Strigas (2001) made a contribution to the development of a new scale to measure volunteer motivation in the sport event. Strigas (2001) developed a survey instrument based on conceptual frameworks that emerged from literature review. After the review, the author conducted the following processes: (a) items in literatures had to be adapted as necessary in order to reflect motivation for sport volunteers, (b) a number of items were deleted because they were not applicable to sports, and (c) new items were coined to help identify motives relevant to this specific marathon event. The final number of the items included at this newly-constructed questionnaire was 40. The 40 items were categorized as five factors by EFA (Exploratory Factor Analysis).

Strigas (2001) conducted a CFA (Confirmatory Factor Analysis) and deleted 10 items because of the following reasons:

Although the five-factor model that resulted from the EFA of the 40-item instrument was characterized by an almost perfectly clean and interpretable structure (that clearly corresponds to what is known today about volunteerism in sports), and with the majority of the items loaded on the factors that conceptually fit, a small amount of items exhibited a problematic behavior: weak associations with a factor, loadings on factors that do not conceptually fit, as well as recording high loadings on two or more factors simultaneously. (p. 87)

Strigas (2001) conducted EFA and CFA for a 30-item instrument and suggested a five-factor model, which includes social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive, and external influences. In comparison between 40 and 30-item instruments, Strigas (2001) found a 30-item instrument better fits the data and is preferred to a 40-item instrument. The reliability ranged from .68 to .88.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The main purpose of this study was to investigate if the selected demographic characteristics and motivation influence commitment of volunteers at a marathon running event. The chapter outlines the procedures used to investigate the motivation and commitment of volunteers at a marathon running event. The chapter is composed of five sections: (a) research design; (b) instrumentation; (c) participants; (d) sampling method; (e) data collection; and (f) data analysis.

Research Design

This study was designed as a non-experimental cross-sectional descriptive study. A cross-sectional study is defined as an examination of a phenomenon that occurs at one point in time (Depoy & Gitlin, 1994). For the current study, data were collected at one point in time from volunteers in a marathon running event. The survey method was employed in this particular study because of the economy of the design and the quick turnaround in collecting the data.

Instrumentation

From a review of literature on motivation and commitment relating to sport volunteerism, the Motivation of Sport Volunteers questionnaire and the Commitment of Sport Volunteers questionnaire was constructed by the author. Existing scales were modified and some words and phrases were modified. A panel of experts was asked to thoroughly examine the questionnaires for content validity. A panel of experts included sport management professors (n=3), current volunteer coordinators in ING Georgia marathon running event (n=2), and individuals who had conducted research on sport volunteerism (n=2).
Demographic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics included: (a) basic personal information, such as gender, race, age, income, and the level of education; (b) information relating to volunteer service: hours of service per month, years of service, volunteers’ title; and (c) employment status such as part-time or full-time employment.

Volunteer Motivation

Strigas’ (2001) 5-factor and 30-item motivation scale was modified to measure volunteer motivation in a marathon running event. Strigas’ scale included social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external influences. The content validity was checked by a panel of experts. The reliability of original instrument ranged from .68 to .88 (see Table 3.1). The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.1
Reliability of Original Instrument of Volunteer Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social / Leisure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Egoistic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Purposive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. External Influences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volunteer Commitment

As stated above, there are two foci (organization and occupation) and four bases (AC, NC, CC:HiSac and CC:LoAlt) of commitment. In order to measure commitment of volunteers in a marathon running event, a 12-item scale from Turner (2001) was modified. Turner adapted it from a three-component 18-item scale of Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) to measure coaches’ commitment. Turner’s scale includes four bases of
commitment: (a) affective commitment (3 items), (b) normative commitment (3 items), (c) continuance commitment–high personal sacrifice (3 items), and (d) continuance commitment–low number of alternative (3 items). These items were modified to fit into the commitment of volunteers in the sport event. The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each of the 12 items on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The reasons the author used the four bases scale of commitment by Turner were as follows: (a) OCQ has often loaded as a two-factor solution and has focused on affective commitment; (b) even though there is criticism regarding the discriminant validity between affective and normative commitments, many studies still support the differences between the two dimensions (Meyer & Allen; 1991; 1997). For example, Meyer and Allen (1997) indicated that normative commitment was a better predictor than affective commitment in different cultures; and (3) two separated continuance commitments were associated independently with the other outcome variables. For example, CC:LoAlt was positively associated with the intention to leave the organization, while CC:HiSac was negatively correlated to a turnover intention (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005).

As mentioned in chapter 1, occupational commitment refers to volunteer commitment in this study and is only used as a variable of the foci of commitment due to the characteristics of the participants in the study. The reliability of original instrument ranged from .73 to .84.

Table 3.2
Reliability of Original Instrument of Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normative Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CC-HiSac</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CC-LoAlt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-HiSac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-LoAlt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 305 volunteers in the ING Georgia Marathon event, a sport event with international participation, that was held in Georgia in March 25, 2007, including Health and Fitness Expo (March, 23-24, 2007). For its organizational needs, approximately 1,000 volunteers offered their services as volunteer coordinators, runner assistance, registration and accreditation aids, medical staff, race coordinators, holding fans, set-up and cleaning crews, security staff, etc. Their time commitment to the event depended upon the task assigned.

Sampling Method

Participants in the study were recruited based on a non-probability sampling method. A convenience sampling technique was used to select subjects for the study. Convenience sampling is a non-random sampling technique, which is typically conducted in a non-probability sampling method. The sample for the study was drawn from volunteers participating in the ING Georgia marathon event.

Data Collection

The volunteer coordinators of the ING Georgia Marathon event were contacted via e-mail, providing information and an attached proposal. The volunteer coordinators agreed to participate in and permit an on-site survey.

The ING Georgia Marathon event continued for three days and included a Health and Fitness Expo (March, 23-24, 2007) and marathon day (March, 25, 2007). There were
more than 1,000 volunteers. All volunteers stopped by the volunteer office to sign in before they served as a volunteer, and the surveys were distributed in the office. Each volunteer were able to have enough time to fill out the survey because they waited for volunteer orientation in the office.

The instruments were coded to protect the anonymity of the respondents. The participants were assured that all information gathered would be held confidential, presented in group form and only used in this study.

The surveys distributed included a) a letter explaining the project and requesting the participation, b) the instrument, and c) a self-addressed stamped envelope in case participants wished to respond by mail. Finally, participants expressing an interest in the results will receive a summary of the findings and their interpretations upon their request.

**Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSSPC 14.0) and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS 7.0). Data received from the returned questionnaires were screened through descriptive analysis. Descriptive statistics provided information of outliers, invalid data, and normal distribution. Invalid responses or input errors might cause invalid data. When human errors occurred in the input data process, particular answers were checked to correct them. Otherwise, invalid data were excluded from analysis. In addition, normal distribution was investigated by skewness and kurtosis.

In order to assess psychometric properties of the measures, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted using the computer program Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS 7.0).

Each research question is analyzed in the following way:

RQ 1) What are the demographic characteristics of the volunteers in a marathon running event? The first research question was answered by descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage distributions.
RQ 2) What are the motives that are most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event? The second research question was answered by mean scores to determine rank order for motivational factors.

RQ 3) What are the bases of commitment that are most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event? Mean scores were utilized to determine rank order for commitment bases.

RQ 4) Do the factors of motivation for volunteers in a marathon running event include social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external influence? Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) provided the answer to the fourth research question.

RQ 5) Do the bases of commitment for volunteers in a marathon running event include affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment–high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac) and continuance commitment–low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt)? Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) provided the answer to the fifth research question.

RQ 6) Are there any differences in motivation between male and female volunteers in a marathon running event? MANOVA was used to answer this research question because of the multiple dependent measures—the five volunteer motivational factors. Independent variable is gender.

RQ 7) Are there any differences in motivation in the race of volunteers in a marathon running event? MANOVA was used to answer this research question because of the multiple dependent measures—the five volunteer motivational factors. Independent variable is race.

RQ 8) Are there any differences in volunteer commitment between male and female volunteers in a marathon running event? MANOVA was used to answer this research question because of the multiple dependent measures—the four bases of commitment. Independent variable is gender.

RQ 9) Are there any differences in commitment in the race of volunteers in a marathon running event? MANOVA was used to answer this research question because
of the multiple dependent measures—the four bases of commitment. Independent variable is race.

RQ 10) Are there any relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment of volunteers in a marathon running event? Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was utilized to examine paths identified in this research question. In this design, exogenous variables are the selected demographic characteristics, including income, education and age, and motivation of volunteers while an endogenous variable is volunteer commitment.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment of volunteers and the relationship among their variables at a marathon running event. The specific aims of this investigation were to: (a) describe the type of individuals who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (b) examine the motives that were most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (c) confirm the multidimensionality of commitment (i.e., four bases of volunteer commitment) and motivation (i.e., five-factor model of volunteer motivation) among volunteers in a marathon running event, and (d) explore the relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment among volunteers in a marathon running event.

This chapter contains the results of the quantitative data analysis procedures conducted for this study. The results of this study are reported which include a descriptive analysis of the demographic characteristics; mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis scores; Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the presented measurement models; Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA); and analysis of the structural equation model (SEM). The presented measurement models were estimated based on overall model fit, validity, and reliability. The structural model was estimated using overall model fit, and the path coefficient associated with a causal effect.

Descriptive Statistics

Preliminary analyses were conducted to identify any missing data, outliers and possible violations of the multivariate normality assumption associated with maximum likelihood estimation. The data were examined prior to the advanced analyses to resolve any problems associated with missing data, to identify outliers caused by data entry
mistakes, and to identify possible violations of the multivariate normality assumption associated with maximum likelihood estimation (Kline, 1998; Tate, 1998). The results indicated there were no missing data and no outliers among the 305 respondents.

According to Kline (1998), there are three requirements for detecting whether data have multivariate normality: (1) each individual variable is distributed normally, (2) the joint distributions of any combination of the variables also need to be normal, and (3) all bivariate scatterplots are linear and homoscedastic. “A lack of multivariate normality is particularly troublesome because it substantially inflates the chi-square statistic and creates upward bias in critical values for determining coefficient significance” (Muthen & Kaplan, 1985; Wang, Fan, & Wilson, 1996 cited in Hair et al., 1998, p. 601).

Considering the assumption of multivariate normality, there are no clear guidelines of suggested values for identifying violation of multivariate normality (Kline, 1998). Hair et al. (1998) mentioned, “although univariate normality does not guarantee multivariate normality, if all variables meet these requirements, then any departures from multivariate normality are usually inconsequential” (p. 349). Multivariate normality was examined by testing univariate normality.

The skewness and kurtosis statistics were examined to determine whether the observed variables were normally distributed. According to Kline’s guideline (1998), data with absolute values in a univariate skewness index greater than 3.0 are considered to be extremely skewed. His guidelines also indicate that absolute values of the univariate kurtosis index over 8.0 appear to be extreme kurtosis. All skewness and kurtosis values ranged from -1.585 to 2.218. Based on Kline’s guideline, it was assumed that all variables in the data set achieved multivariate normality.
Table 4.1
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 1</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>-.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>-.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 3</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>-.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.879</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.752</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.730</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 7</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>-.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 8</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure 9</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 3</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 4</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 5</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 6</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-1.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material 7</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>-.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic 1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic 2</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>-.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic 3</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.804</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic 4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic 5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.479</td>
<td>-.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic 6</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.530</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive 1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-.925</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive 2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>-.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive 3</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.535</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive 4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.559</td>
<td>-.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive 5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influence 1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influence 2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-1.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influence 3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-1.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong> 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong> 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con HiSac</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con HiSac</strong> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con HiSac</strong> 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con LoAlt</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con LoAlt</strong> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con LoAlt</strong> 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability**

The reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) for the four bases of commitment and the volunteer motivation by five dimensions are reported in Table 4.2. The results revealed that Cronbach’s α coefficients of volunteer motivation scales ranged from .7082 to .8726 and volunteer commitment scales ranged from .7274 to .7907. The reliability test indicates that the items are internally consistent since the items are considered to be reliable when a Cronbach’s α coefficient is more than .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Correlation (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>.7453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influence</td>
<td>.7082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.7513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment-High Sacrifice</td>
<td>.7431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment-Low Number of Alternatives</td>
<td>.7907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment-High Sacrifice</td>
<td>.7274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Characteristics (RQ 1)

- RQ 1: What are the demographic characteristics of the volunteers in a marathon running event?

The survey instrument was distributed at a 2007 ING Georgia Marathon event, which was held from March 23 to 25, 2007. A total of 322 survey instruments were distributed and the same number was returned. From this total, 17 were excluded because they were not complete. A total of 305 (94.7%) questionnaires were utilized for the data analysis. Table 4.3 lists the demographic information regarding the respondents.

Table 4.3
Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 305)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>No high school</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>4.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>&lt; $17,999</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 18,000-$24,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $75,000</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank Order of Volunteer Motivation and Commitment (RQ 2 and 3)

· RQ 2: What are the motives that are most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event?
· RQ 3: What are the bases of commitment that are most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event?

The most important motive to volunteer in this sport event was “Egoistic” (M=3.61) followed by “Purposive,” “Social/Leisure,” “External,” and “Material” (see Table 4.4). In volunteer commitment, affective commitment (4.29) was most highly ranked, while continuance commitment-low number of alternatives (M=2.55) was lowest rated (see Table 4.5). All mean comparisons were statistically significant (P < .05).
Table 4.4
Comparison of Means of Volunteer Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Egoistic</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purposive</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social/Leisure</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. External Influence</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Material</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5
Comparison of Means of Volunteer Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normative Commitment</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continuance Commitment-HiSac</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continuance Commitment-LoAlt</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensionality of Volunteer Motivation and Commitment (RQ 4 and 5)

· RQ 4: Do the factors of motivation for volunteers in a marathon running event include social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external influence?
· RQ 5: Do the bases of commitment for volunteers in a marathon running event include affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment–high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac) and continuance commitment-low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt)?
Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted in order to examine the adequacy of the measurement relationship of the proposed model. Three types of fit indices, absolute, comparative, and parsimonious fit index, were recommended to assess overall model fit (Kelloway, 1998). The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and \( \chi^2 \) test were used to measure absolute fit; the comparative fit index (CFI) was used to measure comparative fit; and the parsimonious normed fit index (PNFI) was used to measure parsimonious fit. Browne and Cudeck (1993) suggested that an RMSEA value of .08 or less would indicate acceptable model fit. In addition, Hu and Bentler (1999) recommended that CFI values greater than .95 and PNFI values greater than .60 are threshold values for reasonable model fit. However, because of \( \chi^2 \) statistics’ sensitivity to sample size, the normed chi-square (\( \chi^2 \)/df) was recommended as a measure of model fit (Kline, 2005). Bollen (1989) proposed that values of normed chi-square (NC) of 2.0, 3.0, or even as high as 5.0, have been considered as indicators of reasonable fit.

Average variance extracted (AVE) were utilized to assess the reliability of each construct. Fornell and Larcker (1981) recommended that the value exceeding .50 and AVE scores are considered acceptable levels of reliability.

Average variance extracted (AVE) was suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981) to be an indicator of the overall convergent validity of a subscale and the value should exceed .50. Anderson and Gerbing (1988) suggested that convergent validity can be investigated by identifying whether each indicator’s loading on its posited construct was greater than twice its standard error, and whether each factor loading was over .707. Discriminant validity was evidenced based on whether the AVE for each construct was greater than the squared correlation between the construct and any other construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Additional evidence of discriminant validity was that estimated correlations among factors were less than the recommended value of .85 (Kline, 2005).
First-Order CFA Measurement Model of Volunteer Motivation

The five-factor (social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external) CFA model for volunteer motivation had 395 degrees of freedom. The model fit results for the five-factor CFA model for volunteer motivation revealed acceptable model fit to the data ($\chi^2_{[395]} = 931.3219; p < .05; \chi^2/df = 2.35; CFI = .98; PNFI = .68; and RMSEA = .061$). All of the model fit indices were satisfactory within recommended thresholds. Upon estimation of the model fit indices, construct validity (e.g., standardized loadings and the estimated correlations) were measured. Construct validity was supported by the results of the standardized solution for convergent validity and the results of the estimated correlation among factors for discriminant validity.

As shown in Table 4.6, convergent validity was assessed by examining whether each indicator’s loading on its posited construct was greater than twice its standard error, and whether each factor loading was over .707 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). For the five constructs, all items loaded significantly on their designated construct (t-values ranged from 10.185 to 24.098). All factor loadings were greater than twice its standard error. Factor loadings exceeded .707 except for items 7, 8, 12, and 17. The values of average variance extracted (AVE) all exceeded the recommended value of .50, ranging from .57 to .81. These results evidenced convergent validity for the hypothesized measurement model.

For discriminant validity, the estimated correlations among the five factors ranged from .431 to .687 (see Table 4.7) and were statistically significant ($p < .05$), less than the recommended value of .85 (Kline, 1998). The results supported the discriminant validity of the constructs in the measurement model.
Table 4.6
First-Order CFA Measurement Model of Volunteer Motivation: Item Loading (β), Standard Errors (SE), t-values (t), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/Leisure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I wanted to discover new interests</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>16.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I wanted to experience the feeling of being absorbed by what I do</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>16.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volunteering is a good escape from my daily routine</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>14.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted to slow down the pace of life</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>13.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have more free time than I used to have</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>13.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I wanted to relieve the stress and tension of everyday life</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>20.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I wanted to develop friendships with other volunteers</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>10.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wanted to interact with other volunteers</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>10.211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I wanted to provide me the excitement I crave</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>15.850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I wanted to make new contacts that might help my business or career</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>15.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I wanted to be recognized for doing this volunteer work</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>20.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Volunteering my services for this event is considered prestigious</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>12.563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>10.444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I wanted to gain some practical experience toward paid employment (or a new career)</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>10.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My employer/school is going to give me an extra bonus/credit for volunteering</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>10.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Complimentary items</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>14.984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egoistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wanted to improve my skills and abilities through my volunteer assignments</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>11.235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I wanted to challenge my abilities</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>19.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel better about myself/helps my self esteem</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>15.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Volunteering in this sport event is worthy of my efforts and attention</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>15.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>It is fun and exciting to volunteer for this sport event</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>24.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Volunteer activities energize me</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>19.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purposive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Volunteering for this sport event enables the organizational committee to provide more services for less money</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>14.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I wanted to volunteer because I am genuinely concerned about this sport event and the participants of this sport event</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>15.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I adhere to the organizational committee’s special goals.</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>14.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I wanted to put something back in to the community.</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>10.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I wanted to volunteer because this sport event promotes our national values, image, or heritage</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>14.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Because I was asked by others to volunteer in these games</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>14.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I wanted to be appreciated by my significant other/family/community members</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>14.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My friends/family/significant other are also volunteering at these events</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>14.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7
Correlations among Five Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>So/Le</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Egoistic</th>
<th>Purposive</th>
<th>EI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So/Le</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>.431*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.681**</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.687**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

First-Order CFA Measurement Model of Volunteer Commitment

The four-bases (affective, normative, continuance-high sacrifice and continuance-low number of alternatives) CFA model for volunteer commitment had 62 degrees of freedom. The results of the model fit indicated acceptable model fit ($\chi^2_{[62]} = 155.3722; p < .05; \chi^2/df = 2.50; CFI = .98; PNFI = .63; and RMSEA = .064$). All of the model fit indices were satisfactory within recommended thresholds.

As shown in Table 4.8, all standardized loadings were relatively high, ranging from .722 to .905 and statistically significant, indicating convergent validity for the four bases CFA model of volunteer commitment. The value of average variance extracted (AVE) ranged from .56 to .71 and all exceeded the criteria of .50 by Fornell and Larker (1981). For discriminant validity, the estimated correlations between the four bases were from .312 to .624 (see Table 4.9), which is less than the recommended value of .85 (Kline, 1998).
Table 4.8
First-Order CFA Measurement Model of Volunteer Commitment: Item Loading (\(\beta\)), Standard Errors (SE), t-values (t), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I dislike being a volunteer (R)</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>10.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am enthusiastic about volunteering</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>10.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I regret doing volunteering (R)</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>10.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel a responsibility to volunteering to continue in it</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>19.549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am volunteering because of a sense of loyalty to it</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>15.970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People in my community appreciate the contributions that I make to it</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>15.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance-HiSac</strong></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It would be very hard for me to quit volunteering right now, even if I wanted to</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>14.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to quit volunteering right now</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>14.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I had not already put so much of myself into volunteering, I might consider quit volunteering.</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>13.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance-LoAlt</strong></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Right now, continuing as a volunteer is a matter of necessity as much as desire</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>13.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe that I have too few options to consider quitting volunteering</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>13.396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. One of the few negative consequences of quitting volunteering would be the scarcity of available alternatives</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>14.971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.9

Correlations among Four Bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Co-HiSac</th>
<th>Co-LoAlt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-HiSac</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.312*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-LoAlt</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Second-Order Model of Volunteer Motivation

Based upon the acceptable results of the first-order CFA measurement model for volunteer motivation, a second-order model of volunteer motivation was tested to determine whether five first-order latent variables could be explained by a higher order structure, which is a single second-order latent variable of the global construct of volunteer motivation. The model for this study is a hierarchical factorial structure composed of first-order factors (social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external) labeled as unobserved endogenous variables and one independent second-order factor (volunteer motivation) labeled as an unobserved exogenous variable.

The second-order model for the volunteer motivation was needed to test whether five first-order latent variables could be explained by the higher order structure. Based on the results of the first-order model test, four problematic items (item 7, 8, 12 and 17) for which the loading value was below .707 was discarded before conducting the test.

The results indicated that the hypothesized second-order model evidenced an acceptable model fit to the data (χ² (278) = 722.0901; p < .05; χ²/df = 2.59; RMSEA= .072; CFI= .98; and PNFI= .69). The factor loading between the five first-order latent variables and the second-order factor were .916, .823, .712, .638, and .574, respectively, which were statistically significant (p < .05). The values of average variance
extracted (AVE) were ranged .55 to .74 and all exceeded the recommended value of .50. These results evidenced relatively high convergent validity for the measurement model.

In addition, the results indicated that the correlations between the five constructs were .372 to .671 and did not exceed the criteria of .85 by Kline (1998). All of the five constructs satisfied this test for discriminant validity. The results supported for the discriminant validity of the measurement model. Figure 4.1 provides the results of CFA for second-order model volunteer motivation.

**Second-Order Model of Volunteer Commitment**

As represented in the conceptual framework, the concept of volunteer commitment was designed to be illustrated by a hierarchical factorial structure composed of four first-order factors (Affective, Normative, Continuance-HiSac, and LoAlt) and a single second-order factor (Volunteer Commitment).

The results showed that all model fit indices of the model exceeded their recommended thresholds ($\chi^2 (55) = 119.1481; p < .05; \chi^2/df = 2.16; \text{RMSEA} = .056; \text{CFI} = .99; \text{and PNFI} = .67$). The results indicated that the second-order measurement model for the volunteer motivation construct fit to the sample data. The first-order factors loaded significantly on the second-order volunteer motivation construct. The factor loadings between the four first-order factors and the second-order factors were .931, .881, .837 and .813, respectively. The values of average variance extracted (AVE) all satisfied the recommended value of .50, which are .61, .66, .72 and .78. The measurement model indicated relatively high convergent validity. The correlations between the four constructs were .542 to .783 and below the criteria of .85 by Kline (1998). The results supported for the discriminant validity of the measurement model. Figure 4.2 is the results of second-order model of volunteer commitment.
Figure 4.1
Second-Order model of volunteer motivation
Figure 4.2
Second-Order model of volunteer commitment
Gender and Race Differences of Volunteer Motivation (RQ 6 and 7)

· RQ 6: Are there any differences in motivation between male and female volunteers in a marathon running event?
· RQ 7: Are there any differences in motivation in the race of volunteers in a marathon running event?

The interaction of gender and race on volunteer motivation was significant (Wilks’ $\Lambda = .879$, $F = 1.523$, $p = .026$). Univariate testing related to the comparison of volunteer motivation between the gender showed that there were statistically significant differences in “Social/Leisure” and “Material” factors (see Table 4.11). Males were more involved with volunteer service due to “Social/Leisure” ($F = 7.118$, $p = .008$) and females volunteered more for “Material” ($F = 9.738$, $p = .002$) reasons. However, there was no statistically significant difference on the “Egoistic” ($F = .035$, $p = .852$), “Purposive” ($F = .272$), and “External Influences” factors ($F = .168$, $p = .682$). Univariate results to test the differences of race showed that there were significant differences in Social/Leisure” ($F = 3.182$, $p = .008$), “Material” ($F = 7.185$, $p = .000$), and Purposive ($F = 3.243$, $p = .007$).

Table 4.10
Multivariate Effects of Gender, Race and Their Interaction on Volunteer Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Wilks’ $\Lambda$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender × Race</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$P < .05$
Table 4.11
Univariate Effects of Gender on Volunteer Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Male (n=137) Mean</th>
<th>Female (n=168) Mean</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social / Leisure</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.570</td>
<td>7.118</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influences</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12
Univariate Effects of Race on Volunteer Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>White Mean</th>
<th>Black Mean</th>
<th>Hispanic Mean</th>
<th>Asian Mean</th>
<th>Native Mean</th>
<th>Others Mean</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.737</td>
<td>7.185</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoistic</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>3.243</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influences</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < .05

Gender and Race Differences of Volunteer Commitment (RQ 8 & 9)

· RQ 8: Are there any differences in volunteer commitment between male and female volunteers in a marathon running event?
· RQ 9: Are there any differences in commitment in the race of volunteers in a marathon running event?
The interaction of gender and race on the bases of volunteer commitment was significant (Wilks’ $\lambda = .797$, $F= 3.409$, $p= .045$) (see Table 4.13). In a follow-up univariate test, there were significant gender differences in “Affective,” “CC:HiSac” and “CC:LoAlt” bases. Females were more committed to volunteer service due to “Affective” ($F= 7.118$, $p= .008$) and “CC:LoAlt” ($F= 7.703$, $p= .006$) reasons, while “CC:HiSac” ($F=9.581$, $p= .002$) was a more important commitment for male volunteers (see Table 4.14). In the univariate results to test the differences of race, the findings showed that there were significant differences in “Affective” ($F=2.779$, $p= .018$), “CC:HiSac” ($F=5.721$, $p= .000$), and “CC:LoAlt” ($F=5.167$, $p= .000$) bases (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.13
Multivariate Effects of Gender, Race and Their Interaction on Volunteer Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Wilks’ $\lambda$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>8.031</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender $\times$ Race</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>3.409</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P <.05

Table 4.14
Univariate Effects of Gender on Volunteer Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Male (n=137)</th>
<th>Female (n=168)</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>7.703</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC:LoAlt</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.624</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P <.05
Table 4.15
Univariate Effects of Race on Volunteer Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Others Mean</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>2.779</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC:HiSac</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>5.129</td>
<td>5.721</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC:LoAlt</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>5.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < .05

Structural Model (RQ 10)

· RQ 10: Are there any relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment of volunteers in a marathon running event?

The hypothesized structural model was tested to identify the relationships among selected demographics (income, education and age), volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment. The hypothesized structural model consisted of a single endogenous variable (volunteer commitment) and four exogenous variables (income, education, age and volunteer motivation), which implied that the hypothesized structural model illustrated the direct effects of volunteer commitment upon income, education, age and volunteer motivation.

The results indicated satisfactory model fit to the sample data ($\chi^2_{[637]} = 1338.1816; \ p < .05; \ \chi^2/df = 2.10; \ CFI = .99; \ PNFI = .71; \ and \ RMSEA = .051$). The factor loadings indicated that the five indicators of volunteer motivation were between .771 and .952 and the four indicators of volunteer commitment were between .825 and .942. The coefficients between the selected demographics (income, education and age) and volunteer commitment were .714, .511, .408, respectively. In addition, the path coefficient value between the volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment was .526. All results of path coefficient were statistically significant (p < .05). The sample data...
clearly showed that selected demographics (income, education and age) and volunteer motivation antecedes volunteer commitment (see Figure 4.3).

Figure 4.3
Structural model of selected demographics, volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to: (a) describe the type of individuals who participated as a volunteer for a marathon running event, (b) examine the motives that were most and least important to those who participated as volunteers for a marathon running event, (c) confirm the multidimensionality of commitment (i.e., four bases of volunteer commitment) and motivation (i.e., five-factor model of volunteer motivation) among volunteers in a marathon running event, and (d) explore the relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment among volunteers in a marathon running event. This chapter presents a discussion of the results, academic and practical implications based on the results, and recommendations for future research. First of all, a discussion with brief summary based on the results of this study is provided in the above format of the purpose of study. Secondly, the theoretical implications for scholars and managerial implications for practitioners are proposed. Lastly, recommendations for future research are offered.

Discussion

The first purpose of this study was to investigate the demographic characteristics of volunteers in a marathon running event. The study presented five volunteer demographics, including gender, race, education, income and age. The “typical” volunteer of this marathon event was a 20-29 year-old Caucasian female with a Bachelor’s degree and over $75,000 in household income. The results revealed that female (55.1%) and white-Caucasian (70.2%) volunteers were more involved in the marathon event. These findings were parallel with the demographic results of previous volunteer studies in sport events as well as general service organization (Cnaan & Cascio, 1999; Chun, 2003; Rumsey, 1996; Strigas, 2001). It was confirmed that female and
white-Caucasians were traditionally more likely to participate in volunteer service than male, non-Caucasians.

Dominance of participation of volunteers with high education and income was also similar to the results of previous studies (Rumsey, 1996; Strigas, 2001; Strigas & Jackson, 2003). Education and income were positively correlated. Becker (1975) indicated that individuals with higher levels of education have higher incomes. This relationship between education and income has been documented many times, and it is well established. From the result of previous studies and this study, it might be said that an opportunity of higher education that may encourage the enhancement of social obligation and contribution to society might result in higher volunteer participation. Moreover, this fact might be connected to the results of previous studies and this study that individuals with higher levels of income volunteer more.

There were many minority volunteer participants (29.8%) in this marathon event when compared to the Strigas’ (2001) study. Strigas examined the volunteer motivation in the Nashville Country Music Marathon, and the results showed that only 8.3% minorities were involved as volunteers in the event. This difference might be a result of event location, because Atlanta is a more diverse city than Nashville, Tennessee. The racial makeup of Atlanta is 61.39% black, 33.22% white, 1.93% Asian, and 3.4% other races, while Nashville’s is comprised of 66.99% white, 25.92% black, 2.33% Asian, 4.7% other races (from Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki). The outstanding racial differences between the two cities might explain the racial discrepancy between Strigas’ and this study.

A unique finding concerning demographics in this study was the participation of young age groups in the marathon running event. Compared to previous research (Gentile, 2001; Strigas, 2001) many young college students between 20 and 29 participated in the marathon event. Pi (2001) discussed that students preferred volunteer work, which would connect classroom theory to practice. Moreover, Han (2004) mentioned that many young college students volunteer in sport events because of class requirement and bonus credits. Based on previous research, it might be said that variables such as class requirement,
bonus credits, convenience and event location affected many college students’ participation in this marathon event. For example, Atlanta has more than 30 institutions of higher education and many students might volunteer for bonus credits and because of class requirement in this marathon event. These demographic findings, however, have focal weaknesses, because the samples used for this study were extracted from just one marathon event, which was insufficient to suggest a generalization for all marathon events. Even though this finding parallels a number of studies on volunteer motivation, it is hard to conclude, due to the sample number, that female and white-Caucasian college students were more likely to volunteer for sport-related activities.

The second purpose of this study was related to an examination of the primary motives for volunteering in sport events. The most important motive that influences involvement in volunteer services appears to be related to the “egoistic” factor. The representative items in this factor include “It is fun and exciting to volunteer for this marathon event” and “Volunteer activities energize me.” The second important dimension was “purposive.” Many volunteers also became involved in volunteer services because of a sense of social obligation; they want to make a contribution to society: “I want to volunteer because this sport event promotes our national values, image, or heritage” and “I wanted to put something back in my community.” In reply to the “material” factor—“complimentary items (t-shirt, goodie bags, free tickets) played a very important role at my decision to volunteer for this sport event” and “I want to gain some practical experience toward paid employment (or new career)”—many participants responded that material gain was not an important reason to volunteer.

These findings are not consistent with a study by Winniford et al. (1995), where they reported “altruistic motivations are most important in their initial involvement in volunteer service organizations,” whereas “social obligation does not play a particularly important role in students’ initial or continued involvement in service organizations” (p. 35). The difference might be in the similarity between the “purposive” factor of this study and the “altruistic” factors of Winniford et al.’s study. Winniford et al. attributed “contribute to community” (p. 34) to altruistic motivational factor, while this study
categorizes factor “contributing to community” as a purposive factor. If so, these results may partially support the contention of Winniford et al. that even though most of the research focuses on egoistic reasons as the major motivation for volunteering, altruistic reasons are also important for participation in volunteer service in marathon running events.

In addition, MANOVA was conducted to test the differences of volunteer motivation between gender and race. The results showed that there were statistically significant differences in “social/leisure” and “material” factors (see Table 4.12). Females were more involved than males in volunteer service due to “material” and males volunteered more for “social/leisure” reasons. However, there was no statistically significant difference in “egoistic,” “purposive,” and “external influences” factors. Testing for differences among ethnic groups showed that there were significant differences in “social/leisure,” “material” and “purposive.” Whites were more involved with volunteer service because of “material” reasons than blacks, while “social/leisure” and “purposive” reasons were more important for blacks than whites. Based on results of these racial differences, it might be said that whites were more motivated to volunteer than African-Americans for a monetary value such as expected utility gain to volunteer in the marathon event, while African-Americans volunteered more than whites in order to contribute to the marathon event and/or the community (i.e., Georgia or Atlanta) as well as for social interaction and interpersonal relations.

From the outcome that whites’ primary motives to volunteer were material reasons, it might be said that whites want to gain some practical experiences or make new contacts that might help the business or career through volunteer service in the marathon running event. For African-Americans’ major motives to volunteer, the results, as mentioned above, might be caused by event location. Compared to other cities, the population of African-Americans is much larger than other ethnicity groups, especially in comparison with the white population. While African-Americans comprise 61.39% of the population, there are only 33.22% whites in Atlanta. For example, the high
percentage of African-American in this city might stir “social/leisure” motive of African-Americans to volunteer in the marathon event.

The third purpose of this study was to confirm the major constructs (dimensions) of volunteer motivation and commitment from previous research. The establishment of major constructs plays an important role in broadening knowledge regarding the motivation and commitment of volunteers in marathon events, as well as to make a significant contribution to future studies of volunteers at sport events. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted in order to examine the adequacy of the five-factor volunteer motivation scale, including social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external influence and the four bases volunteer commitment scale, including AC, NC, CC:HiSac and CC:LoAlt. The results of CFA tests indicated that measurement model satisfactorily fit the sample data and also supported the reliability and validity of the measurement model. In other words, the CFA provided an obvious support for a five-factor model of volunteer motivation and four bases model of volunteer commitment.

**First-order CFA Measurement Models**

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was computed to assess two first-order measurement models of volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment. In the test of the first-order measurement model of volunteer motivation, the results showed that the model fit was acceptable. The results of first-order measurement model test provided evidence of excellent internal consistency among factors. The reliability of the first-order model was evaluated based on AVE. Fornell and Larcker (1981) recommended that the values exceeding .50 of AVE was considered an acceptable level of reliability. The values of AVE for the five constructs ranged from .57 to .81. Values of AVE satisfied the recommended levels.

The results of first-order measurement model test supported convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity is investigated by examining whether each indicator’s loading on its posited construct was greater than twice its standard error, and whether each factor loading was over .707 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In addition, AVE is suggested by Fornell and Larker (1981) to be an indicator of the overall
convergent validity of a subscale and the value should exceed .50. All factor loadings were over .707 except items 15, 29, 40, and 41 (see Table 4.6). The values of average variance extracted (AVE) all exceeded the recommended value of .50, ranging from .57 to .81.

Discriminant validity can be assessed by examining whether the AVE score for each construct is greater than the squared correlation between the construct and any other construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In addition, the correlation between two constructs may be considered as an indicator of discriminant validity. Kline (1998) suggested that the correlations between two constructs should be below the value of .85. All of the five constructs satisfied the correlation test. Overall, the results evidenced that the first-order measurement model were psychometrically sound and appropriate to utilize in further analysis.

The researcher, however, found that item loadings for four of the items (item 7, 8, 12, 17) were lower than the recommended value of .707. These four problematic items were discarded from the item pool in order to provide better measures of the domain interest. Even though item 7 (“I want to develop friendships with other volunteers”) and Item 8 (“I want to interact with other volunteers”) were loaded “material” factor, these two items still dealt with the influence of significant others, which is similar with the “external influence” factor. This similarity might cause low factor-loading scores.

Item 12 (“Volunteering my services for this event is considered prestigious”) was loaded as material factor in this study. However, the wording of “prestigious” in this item was more strongly related to “egoistic” than “material” factor. Item 17 (“I want to improve my skills and abilities through my volunteer assignments”) more closes to “material” factor, while this study categorized item 16 into “egoistic” factor. The “material” dimension relates to a monetary value such as expected utility gain. The “egoistic” factor refers to the individual’s needs of self-actualization, self-esteem, and achievement. These needs can be material goods or services, as well as social status that can easily be translated into a “reward” that carries material values. Material incentives also include tangible rewards such as perks and memorabilia. In other words, item 12
includes vagueness in the statement. It is hard to say whether “considered prestigious” is concern for “individual benefit of self-actualization” or “expected utility gain.” Item 17 also has a vagueness of statement that volunteer motivation to “improve my skills and abilities” is closer to “material” factor related to expected utility gain rather than “egoistic” factor. In other words, low factor-loading values of item 12 and 17 might result from vagueness of the statement or factors.

In the test of the first-order measurement model of volunteer commitment, the results showed that the model fit was acceptable. All model fit indices satisfied the recommended values. The results of first-order measurement model test for volunteer commitment provided evidence of excellent internal consistency among factors. The reliability of the first-order model was evaluated based on AVE. The values of AVE ranged from .56 to .71. The values exceed .50, which is an acceptable level of reliability recommended by Fornell and Larker (1981).

The results of the first-order measurement model for volunteer commitment supported convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was investigated by examining whether each indicator loading on its posited construct was greater than twice its standard error, and whether each factor loading was over .707 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In addition, AVE is suggested by Fornell and Larker (1981) to be an indicator of the overall convergent validity of a subscale and the value should exceed .50. All standardized factor loadings were greater than twice its standard error, and most of the factor loadings were over .707 (see Table 4.8). The values of average variance extracted (AVE) all exceeded the recommended value of .50, ranging from .57 to .71. In addition, the correlations between the constructs may be considered as an indicator of discriminant validity. Kline (1998) suggested that the correlations between the constructs should be below the value of .85. All of the four constructs had lower correlation scores than the criteria by Kline. Overall, the results evidenced that the first-order measurement model were psychometrically sound and appropriate to utilize in further analysis.

In order to measure commitment of volunteers, most research includes only affective and normative commitment because of the assumption that volunteers are not
associated with monetary or material benefits. However, this study supported a four bases measurement model, including CC:HiSac and CC:LoAlt for volunteer commitment. In spite of the similar characteristics of CC:HiSac and CC:LoAlt, the results satisfied the construct and discriminant validity. To support this result, it can be discussed that volunteers in this marathon running event had two different kinds of continuance commitment. In other words, volunteers can be both committed due to a low number of alternatives in other volunteer opportunities and high personal sacrifice in quitting the volunteer service in this marathon event.

**Second-order CFA Measurement Models**

The analysis of fit indices provided support for the second-order measurement models of volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment. The analysis of fit indices provided support for the proposed model of volunteer motivation. There were statistically significant and positive relationships between the volunteer motivation and social/leisure ($\lambda = .712, p<.05$), material ($\lambda = .823, p<.05$), egoistic ($\lambda = .916, p<.05$), purposive ($\lambda = .638, p<.05$) and external influence ($\lambda = .574, p<.05$). The results proved that volunteer motivation is a multidimensional construct composed of five sub-dimensions. The findings confirmed the suggestions of Strigas’ five-factor model to measure volunteer motivation. Egoistic ($\lambda = .916$) and material ($\lambda = .823$) factors were the strongest predictors of volunteer motivation. This finding can be explained that two factors are conceptually similar in that both factors tend to orient selfish motives for the benefit of volunteers.

The results of the second-order measurement model for volunteer commitment indicated that most fit indices exceeded their recommended thresholds, indicating the second-order model fit the sample data. There were statistically significant and positive relationships between the volunteer commitment and AC ($\lambda = .931, p<.05$), NC ($\lambda = .881, p<.05$), CC:HiSac ($\lambda = .837, p<.05$), and CC:LoAlt ($\lambda = .813, p<.05$). The results indicated that volunteer commitment is a multidimensional construct composed of four bases. The finding suggests different views from previous studies related to the commitment of volunteers. Most research did not insert continuance commitment to
measure the commitment for volunteers because continuance commitment is related to job payment; a volunteer position is not a paid position (Hsieh, 2000). People are still involved in volunteer service because of many monetary benefits. For example, material factor (“I want to gain some practical experience toward paid employment”; “my employer/school is going to give me an extra bonus/credit for volunteering”; “complimentary items [t-shirts, goodie bags, free tickets] played a very important role in my decision to volunteer for this sport event”) and egoistic factor (“I want to challenge my ability”) of volunteer motivation are related directly to monetary benefits. These reasons to volunteer might result in continuance commitment of volunteers. Adding continuance commitment for volunteers was a major rationale, confirmed by CFA.

The last purpose of this study was to explore the relationships among the selected demographic characteristics, motivation and commitment among volunteers at a marathon running event. The structural equation model (SEM) was conducted to access this purpose and the results from the test of the causal model yielded acceptable model fit to the sample data. The results also indicated that the standardized regression path between selected demographics (income, education and age), volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment were statistically significant (γ = .714, .511, .408, .526, p < .05). There was a positive association among three variables. It might be assumed that higher income, education and age influence higher volunteer commitment. Moreover, volunteer commitment increases when an individual’s volunteer motivation increases. These results were consistent with the previous studies about antecedents of commitment (Dailey, 1986; Hsieh, 2000; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Steers, 1977). These studies showed that demographics and motivation were the predictors of commitment. Even though all previous studies focused on organizational commitment, the results were consistent with this study. It might be said that commitment toward organization of volunteers is closely correlated with commitment toward volunteer work itself among volunteers. However, further research is needed to generalize because sample of studies was still different. Most commitment studies focused on employees (i.e., paid employees in general company) or volunteers (i.e., 4-H volunteers) in a permanent organization, while the
participants of this study were limited to the volunteers in a single sport event on an annual basis.

**Implications**

The current study contributes an integrated and detailed perspective to advance the knowledge of volunteer commitment in sport events; it confirms four bases believed to comprise the construct of volunteer commitment. While the five-factor model for volunteer motivation has been confirmed in a previous study, the four bases model for volunteer commitment has not been used in any studies.

By conducting an empirical analysis, the results of this study demonstrated that these four constructs fit data fairly well, indicating that the measurements are psychometrically sound and appropriate for representing the concepts. Although the four bases volunteer commitment model was acceptable for a marathon event, it is expected that other researchers may express a variety of quite different views about the sub-dimensions and primary dimensions of the volunteer commitment. Since no study has examined volunteers’ commitment with regard to the four bases used in this study, no direct comparison with previous studies can be made. In many previous studies of commitment for volunteers, continuance commitment has not been used due to its attribution that it focuses on monetary aspects; volunteer commitment is not a paid position. Therefore, it can be said that some researchers may disagree with the findings in this study regarding the four dimensions of volunteer commitment. However, many volunteers are still concerned about their egoistic benefits, especially sport volunteers, and it is connected to continuance commitment. This study has confirmed the conceptual validity of four bases volunteer commitment model, including continuance commitment. It is believed that the current study has contributed important implications in the academic area.

The hypothesized structural model was tested to explore the relationships among selected demographics (income, education and age), volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment. The model implied that the hypothesized structural model illustrated the
direct effects of volunteer commitment upon income, education, age and volunteer motivation. In the test result, there was a significant relationship between the selected demographics (income, education and age) and volunteer commitment and between volunteer motivation and volunteer commitment. The sample data in this study indicated that selected demographics (income, education and age) and volunteer motivation antecedes volunteer commitment. It is believed that the findings from concepts of both motivation and commitment for volunteers in the current study represent a starting point for researchers to deeply investigate these two significant variables that are believed to affect volunteers’ participation and affiliation with sport events.

Useful implications important in relation to administrators, managers, marketers and volunteer coordinators in the sport event emerge from the results of this study. As it is widely known, volunteers are significant assets for economic and non-economic aspects of sport event management. Understanding the broad and diverse spectrum of volunteers and what will motivate them to be involved will be critical to ensure financial stability in event management. Recruiting and retaining volunteers are primary issues: (a) event management companies or sport organizations could use the information from this study to design their marketing efforts in a way that could appeal persuasively to this free labor during recruitment time; (b) when volunteer opportunities for involvement appeal to the individual’s motives, then that volunteer tends to be more effective at his/her assigned tasks, more committed to volunteer work, and more satisfied with the whole experience; (c) different kinds of motivation sets have proven to be strong predictive factors of volunteer retention; and (d) if the advantages taken from the experience match their initial motivation, volunteers tend to offer their services again in the future.

First, the reliable and valid scale developed for the study will prove useful in determining levels, among volunteers, of volunteer participation in sport events. For example, the scale of volunteer motivation may serve as a valuable tool in understanding volunteers, which will provide administrators and managers with a basis for segmentation of the existing motivation base. In addition, a clear understanding of the dynamics of volunteer commitment to a sport event is a critical component in both managing and
increasing the potential revenues of a sport event. With this knowledge, marketers and managers can more effectively develop strategies and programs to both maintain and expand the motivation base.

Secondly, it was indicated that each race was motivated on different sets of factors. African-Americans were more motivated in social/leisure and purposive factors than whites, while whites were more involved in the material reasons to volunteer than African-Americans. For Asians and Hispanics, the social/leisure factor was most important to their volunteer participation. From these results, sport administrators, especially volunteer coordinators, should develop marketing strategies based on the composition of the target volunteer base, focusing on those motivation factors that resonate best with them.

Thirdly, sport event marketers and managers can monitor levels of volunteer commitment through surveys and use the information as a basis for volunteer retention. Information relating to individual levels of volunteer commitment to a sport event can be electronically stored for use in developing and maintaining a large motivation base through individualized marketing; such information would provide an essential basis for developing programs customized for the volunteer commitment levels of spectator groups. In order to maintain high psychological-commitment levels in the volunteer base, marketers and managers should use reinforcement strategies that include reinforcing volunteer commitment through personalized encouragement, such as sending newsletters focused on reinforcing existing cognitions to avoid the possibility of losing committed volunteers, asking volunteer clubs to actively maintain the identification between a sport event and such volunteers, and treating such volunteers as significant because they may decrease their commitment level slowly over time if they are ignored by sport team marketers and managers.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This study focuses on volunteerism in a marathon event, and major variables used in this study include the selected demographics, motivation and commitment for
volunteers. The generalizability of the results in the current study is limited to volunteers merely from the sample of one marathon event. The current study is a first attempt to conduct empirical tests in developing the measurement of the four bases volunteer commitment. Some questions need to be answered regarding the findings of the study by using the same measures. Can the current findings be generalized to the population of sport volunteers? Does the scale demonstrate reliability and validity when employing the sample from different marathon events, sport events and countries? Due to the complexities of volunteer behavior, it is recommended that future research should be undertaken with more diverse samples of sport volunteers.

This study explained the differences of gender and race upon volunteer motivation and commitment. Future research efforts should also concern variables of individual difference among demographic characteristics, such as age, race, marital status, income and education, which may influence motives to volunteer. For example, single and married volunteers may be significantly impacted by managerial factors that motivate them to volunteer in different ways. The future investigation can be distributed in comparative settings for analysis if there are differences between the groups’ perception of managerial factors and their motivation and commitment. Thus, it is suggested that a future study should investigate diversity among different groups which may result from an examination of different individual variables; these needs encourage researchers to use a larger sample size. Moreover, it will be useful to compare the differences of volunteer motivation and commitment upon the variables such as general volunteer and sport-related volunteer experiences. Such a study might provide useful information for sport volunteer coordinators or marketers to enhance the participation of volunteers.

A study should also be conducted that concerns differences in motivation between volunteers and salaried employees in sport settings. The study will be helpful not only for creating a clearer motivational model to volunteer but also for developing a marketing strategy to encourage participation in volunteering.
This study was designed to examine the relationships between motivation and commitment of volunteers. A future study might explore each relationships between the five sub-dimensions (social/leisure, material, egoistic, purposive and external influence) of volunteer motivation and four sub-dimensions (affective, normative, CC:HiSac and CC:LoAlt) of volunteer commitment. The results of such research would provide valuable information toward understanding the dynamics of volunteerism.

It is also possible to test various models associated with different variables, including satisfaction, involvement and future intention of volunteers, as well as motivation and commitment of volunteers. These diverse models will suggest ideas for volunteer coordinators, event managers and marketers to retain qualified volunteers.

It is also a possibility that future study can generate new items that will better represent the managerial factors of interest. While the current study modified the items from previous research (Strigas, 2001; Turner, 2001) in order to measure volunteer motivation and commitment, the results show that factor loadings of four items in motivation scale are low and statistically not significant. It is possible that future research can contribute efforts in improving and refining the current scale items that may better capture the meanings associated with sub-dimensions in motivation construct.

Even though this study has endeavored to add some qualitative dimensions to the closed-form question, future studies should incorporate face-to-face interviews with volunteers to confirm more clearly their motivations for volunteer participation. The interviewer would provide an opportunity for the research to involve volunteers in some communication that could clarify goals and motivations. For instance, an interviewer could clarify whether a statement such as “I wanted to interact with other volunteers (people from different age groups, and/or different backgrounds)” is social/leisure or external influence factor.

It would also be useful for future studies to polish the written instrument by delineating among altruism, egoism, external influence, leisure and social obligation motivation in order to more clearly elicit the true reasons to volunteer. In other words, future research may employ a qualitative approach to acquire ideas suggested by
managers and volunteers to develop items so that the validity and reliability of the scale are improved.

This study confirmed a five-factor model to measure volunteer motivation and four bases model to measure volunteer commitment. Specially, the motivation five-factor model needs to evaluate whether the scale was effective enough, because several items have low factor loading values, which are below the criteria. As argued in the discussion section, meaning and wordings of some items and factors may be confusing to respondents. To solve these confusions, the following model is suggested to measure volunteer motivation and encourage future testing.

**A Proposed Model to Measure Volunteer Motivation Better**

After completing the current study and reviewing the literatures concerning volunteer motivation in sporting events as well as general management, the author will conceptualize two major motives to volunteer such as “altruism” and “egoism.” The first motivation is “altruism.” Volunteers offer their services to an organization purely based on their altruistic motives without any expectation of benefits accruing from such an involvement. For example, Clary et al. (1998) noted that a six-dimensional scheme of functions served by volunteering include both personal (career-related benefits, protective, and enhancement) and social functions (values, understanding, and social). Among these, value (opportunities to express one’s altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others) is altruistic. In the sporting context, of the four factors of motivation of volunteers proposed by Farrell et al. (1998), the purposive factor (a desire to do something useful and contribute to the community and the event) relates to altruism. The remaining three factors (solidary factor, external traditions, and commitment factor) reflect egoistic reasons or personal benefits to the sport volunteer. In addition, the altruistic factor of the five-factor model by Strigas (2001) is the purposive factor. The other factors (social/leisure, material, egoistic, and external influences) relate to egoistic reasons or personal benefits to volunteer in sport events.

Throughout a thorough review of the literature, as mentioned above, the conceptualization contends that there are two major motives (two subcategories per each
motive) to volunteering in sport events; they include altruistic (helping others) and egoistic motives (personal benefits). Altruistic motives can be divided into volunteer attachment and organization attachment. The purposive factor, which was the only altruistic factor that included both scales by Farrell et al. (1998) and Strigas (2001), is conceptually separated into two subcategories in this proposed model. Volunteer attachment involves incentives related to concern for others and society. Organization attachment indicates pride in and love of the organization, allegiance to the organization, and the success of the event. For example, the item, “I want to help make the event a success” by Farrell et al. and the item, “I am genuinely concerned about the particular club I am serving” by Strigas can be categorized as organization attachment, while the item “volunteering creates a better society” by Farrell et al. can be loaded in volunteer attachment.

Egoistic motives can be divided into internal benefit and external benefit. As mentioned above, three factors of Farrell et al.’s four-factor model (1998) and four factors of Strigas’ five-factor model (2001) are related to egoistic motives to volunteer in sport events. The author combines these factors with one major factor (egoism) and two subcategories. Internal benefit indicates gaining new experiences and career contacts, feeling important and needed, and career development. Internal benefit can be supported in the items such as “I want to gain some practical experience” by Farrell et al., and “volunteering experience will look good on my resume” by Strigas. External benefit includes motives such as getting free uniforms, food, and admission, meeting and interacting with others, and forming friendships. Similar to this factor, the examples of the items shown in past sport motivation models include, “I wanted to an opportunity to meet the players and see the games” by Farrell, and “I wanted to interact with others” by Strigas.

In summary, the author would suggest a four-factor model to measure volunteer motivation in sport events (see Table 5.1). The proposed four-factor model includes: (1) Altruism-Organizational attachment (OA), (2) Altruism-Volunteer attachment (VO), (3) Egoism-Internal benefit (IB), and (4) Egoism-External benefit (EB). This model is based
on an experience of the current study and a thorough review of the literature in the context of sport management as well as general management; it is focused on sport research.

Table 5.1
A Proposed Model to Measure Volunteer Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factors</th>
<th>Explanation of Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism (Helping Others)</td>
<td>Organization Attachment (OA) pride in and love of the organization/ allegiance to the organization/ the success of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Attachment (VA) concern for others and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism (Personal Benefits)</td>
<td>Internal Benefits (IB) (Personal Growths) gaining new experience and career contacts &amp; skill/ feeling important and needed, career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Benefits (EB) Getting free uniforms, food, and admission/ meeting and interacting with others/ forming friendships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volunteer service is a valuable product of our society; according to Williams et al. (1995), volunteer service plays a tremendous role in the overall success of various sport events. From this perspective, it is important that additional study should be undertaken in relation to volunteerism. It is critical that event managers, marketers and volunteer administrators clearly understand the motivation and commitment for sport volunteerism to more fully enhance volunteer participation.
APPENDIX A
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
CONSENT LETTER

Dear Survey Respondent:

I am a doctoral student under the supervision of Dr. Jerome Quarterman, in the Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management, and Physical Education at Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to examine the motivation and commitment of volunteers at the sport event.

You will be asked to fill out questionnaires and the total time commitment will be about 5-10 minutes. Your participation is totally voluntary and you may stop participation at anytime. All your answers to the questions will be kept confidential to the extent that the law allows and identified only by a subject code number. After reading the consent form and completing questionnaire, please place the survey into the self addressed and stamped envelope and return.

There are benefits for participating in this research project. This research will provide valuable insight into the development of the curriculum in sport management fields. There appear to be no significant risks as a result of participating in this study.

Thank you very much for your help with this study. If you have any questions or are interested in the results of this study, please contact Keunsu Han at (850) 339-2507 or to send e-mail at kh04@garnet.acns.fsu.edu or contact my advisor, Dr. Jerome Quarterman at quarter@coe.fsu.edu

Sincerely,

Keunsu Han

If you have any question about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, of if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633
Survey for Volunteers

Please follow these simple instructions:

a. Answer each question as best as you can
b. **Do not** put your name, telephone, e-mail, or address on the questionnaire

**QUESTIONS:**

1. Your gender is:  male (  )  female (  )
2. Your current marital status:
   - married (  )
   - divorced (  )
   - other (  )
   - single (  )
   - widowed (  )
3. Race:
   - White/Caucasian (  )
   - Hispanic (  )
   - Native-American (  )
   - African-American (  )
   - Asian-American (  )
   - Other (specify):
4. The yearly household income is (yours or your family’s if you are still supported):
   - less than $18,000 (  )
   - $18,001 - $25,000 (  )
   - $25,001 - $35,000 (  )
   - $35,001 - $50,000 (  )
   - $50,001 - $75,000 (  )
   - over $75,000 (  )
5. Your employment status is:
   - full-time employee (  )
   - unemployed (  )
   - disability benefits (  )
   - part-time employee (  )
   - retired (  )
6. Education (high level completed):
   - no high school (  )
   - some high school (  )
   - high school graduate (  )
   - bachelor degree (  )
   - master degree (  )
   - doctoral degree or above (  )
7. Answer this question only if you are a student:
   - high School (  ) undergraduate (  ) graduate (  )
8. Past volunteer experiences: years of service _____ / service hours per month _____
9. Your volunteer title? ______________________________
10. What is your exact age in years? _________
11. Indicate below **TO WHAT EXTENT** each **MOTIVE CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR DECISION TO VOLUNTEER** at this sport event

Rate each item (X) on a scale of:  
1 (not important at all for you)  
2 (not important)  
3 (neutral)  
4 (important)  
5 (extremely important for you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. I want to challenge my abilities

19. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself /helps my self esteem

20. Volunteering in this sport event is worthy of my efforts and attention

21. It is fun and exciting to volunteer for this sport event

22. Volunteer activities energize me

23. Volunteering for this sport event enables the organizational committee to provide more services for less money

24. I wanted to volunteer because I am genuinely concerned about this sport event and the participants of this sport event

25. I adhere to the organizational committee’s special goals

26. I wanted to put something back in to the community

27. I wanted to volunteer because this sport event promotes our national values, image, or heritage

28. Because I was asked by others to volunteer in these games

29. I wanted to be appreciated by my significant other/family/community members

30. My friends /family/ significant other are also volunteering at these events

12. Indicate below **TO WHAT EXTENT OF YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT BEING A VOLUNTEER** at this sport event:

   1. (Strongly Disagree)
   2. (Disagree)
   3. (neutral)
   4. (Agree)
   5. (Strongly Agree)

Rate each item (X) on a scale of:

1.  I dislike being a volunteer
2.  I am enthusiastic about volunteering
3.  I regret doing volunteering
4.  I feel a responsibility to volunteering to continue in it
5. I am volunteering because of a sense of loyalty to it
6. People in my community appreciate the contributions that I make to it
7. It would be very hard for me to quit volunteering right now, even if I wanted to
8. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to quit volunteering right now
9. If I had not already put so much of myself into volunteering, I might consider quitting.
10. Right now, continuing as a volunteer is a matter of necessity as much as desire
11. I believe that I have too few options to consider quitting volunteering
12. One of the few negative consequences of quitting volunteering would be the scarcity of available alternatives

If you feel there are additional motives that have influenced you to volunteer your services at the ING Georgia marathon running event, please take the time to report them now…

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
APPENDIX B

FSU HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL LETTER
APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 3/19/2007

To: Keunsu Han
1900 Centre Pointe Blvd. #8
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Dept: SPORT MANAGEMENT/PHYSICAL ED.

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Motivation and Commitment of Volunteers in a Sporting Competition

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b) 2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 3/17/2008 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Dr. Jerome Quarterman
HSC# 2007.173
APPENDIX C

VOLUNTEER MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRES
Leisure Motivation Items (Beard & Ragheb, 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Intellectual** | 1. to expand my interests  
2. to seek stimulation  
3. to make things more meaningful to me  
4. to learn about things around me  
5. to satisfy my curiosity  
6. to explore new ideas  
7. to learn about myself  
8. to expand my knowledge  
9. to discover new things  
10. to be creative  
11. to be original  
12. to use my imagination |
| **Social** | 13. to be with others  
14. to build friendships with others  
15. to interact with others  
16. to develop close friendships  
17. to meet new and different people  
18. to help others  
19. so others would think well of me for doing it  
20. to reveal my thoughts, feelings, or physical skills to others.  
21. to influence others  
22. to be socially competent and skillful  
23. to gain a feeling of belonging  
24. to gain others' respect |
| **Competency/Mastery** | 25. to get a feeling of achievement  
26. to see what my abilities are  
27. to challenge my abilities  
28. because I enjoy mastering things  
29. to be good in doing them  
30. to improve my skill and ability in doing them  
31. to compete against others  
32. to be active  
33. to develop physical skills and abilities  
34. to keep in shape physically  
35. to use my physical abilities  
36. to develop physical fitness  
37. to be in a calm atmosphere  
38. to avoid crowded areas  
39. to slow down  
40. because I sometimes like to be alone  
41. to relax physically  
42. to relax mentally  
43. to avoid the hustle and bustle of daily activities  
44. to rest  
45. to relieve stress and tension  
46. to do something simple and easy  
47. to unstructured my time  
48. to get away from the responsibilities of my everyday life |
## MTV scale (Motivation to Volunteer) by Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It improves attitude on one’s own life situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opportunity to vary activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Opportunity for relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Able to relate to client due to one’s own similar experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Makes one fell better about oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Agency can provide more for less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provides challenging activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Continuing a family tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Agency is prestigious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It creates a better society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Opportunity to work with different age groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Opportunity to return fortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broadening horizons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. People in my community volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Opportunity to change injustices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Excellent educational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Previous contact with professionals in this agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Opportunity to do something worthwhile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Nothing else to do with time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Experience in providing service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is God’s expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My employer/school expects it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Knowing a client of this agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. There would be no on to carry out this volunteer work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Gaining practical experience toward paid employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Adhering to agency’s goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Serving</th>
<th>10. I volunteered to be around people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I volunteered to gain experience working with people/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel good about myself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>13. I Volunteers should be proud of the work they perform as volunteers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I volunteered to help others who are in need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Being a volunteer is as important as donating money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with Group</th>
<th>16. I don’t feel comfortable telling my family that I volunteered for CATF. I don’t feel comfortable telling my family I volunteer for BB/BS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I don’t feel comfortable telling people where I work that I volunteer for CATF. I don’t feel comfortable telling people where I work that I volunteer for BB/BS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>18. Since I became a volunteer, I feel that if I need assistance in the future, I should get it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Sometimes I don’t feel adequately trained to work with PWA. Sometimes I don’t feel adequately trained to work with BB/BS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Since volunteering, I feel that I should have become a professional counselor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The volunteer work I have done with my PWA has had little impact of him/her. The volunteer work I have little impact on him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The volunteer work I have done with my BB/BS has had little impact on him/her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clary et al.’s (1998) VFI (Volunteer Functions Inventory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective</strong></td>
<td>1. No matter how bad I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. By volunteering I feel less lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>6. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I feel compassion toward people in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I feel it is important to help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. I can do something for a cause that is important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career</strong></td>
<td>11. Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Volunteering allow me to explore different career options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Volunteering experiences will look good on my resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>16. My friends volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. People I’m close to want me to volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. People I know share an interest in community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>21. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Volunteering allow me to gain a new perspective on things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. I can explore my own strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement</strong></td>
<td>26. Volunteering makes me feel important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Volunteering increases my self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Volunteering makes me feel needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Volunteering is a way to make new friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Farrell et al.’ (1998) SEVMS (Special Event Volunteer Motivation Scale)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Purposive</th>
<th>Solidary</th>
<th>External Influence</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I wanted to help make the event in success</td>
<td>12. I wanted to broaden my horizons</td>
<td>18. My friends/family were also volunteering</td>
<td>24. My skills were needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I wanted to put something back in the community</td>
<td>13. I wanted to gain some practical experience</td>
<td>19. A relative or friends is involved in curling</td>
<td>25. I am expected to volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I wanted to do something worthwhile</td>
<td>14. I wanted to work with different people</td>
<td>20. I wanted to continue a family tradition of volunteering</td>
<td>26. I have past experience providing similar services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted to feel part of this community</td>
<td>15. I could obtain an educational experience</td>
<td>21. I did not have anything else to do with my time</td>
<td>27. Most people in my community volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Volunteering creates a better society</td>
<td>16. I wanted to develop relationships with others</td>
<td>22. I wanted an opportunity to meet player and see the games</td>
<td>28. Being a volunteer with this tournament is considered prestigious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Volunteering at this tournament makes me feel better about myself</td>
<td>17. I wanted to interact with others</td>
<td>23. I have more free time than I used to have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I wanted to help out in any capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am involved in curling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I wanted to vary my regular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It was a chance of a lifetime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If I did not volunteer, there would be one to carry out this volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items**
APPENDIX D

COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRES
## Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)
*(from Mowday, Steer, & Porter, 1979)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I really care about the fate of this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) Organizational Commitment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Internalization** | 1. If the values of this organization were different, I would not be as attached to this organization.  
2. Since joining this organization, my personal values and those of the organization have become more similar.  
3. The reason I prefer this organization to others is because of what it stands for, its values.  
4. My attachment to this organization is primarily based on the similarity of my values and those represented by the organization.  
5. What this organization stands for is important to me.  |
| **Identification** | 6. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this organization.  
7. I talk up the university to my friends as a great organization to work for.  
8. I feel a sense of ownership for this organization rather being just an employee.  |
| **Compliance** | 9. Unless I’m rewarded for it in some way, I see no reason to expend extra effort on behalf of this organization.  
10. How hard I work for the organization is directly linked to how much I am rewarded.  
11. My private views about the university are different than those I express publicly.  
12. In order for me to get rewarded around here, it is necessary to express the right attitude.  |
Three-Component Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>1. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up (R)</td>
<td>1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I enjoy disusing my organization with people outside it</td>
<td>2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to</td>
<td>2. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>3. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now</td>
<td>3. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one (R).</td>
<td>4. It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now (R)</td>
<td>4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization (R).</td>
<td>5. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessary as much as desire</td>
<td>5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization (R)</td>
<td>6. I feel that I have too options to consider</td>
<td>6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>7. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>7. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization fro most of their careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization (R).</td>
<td>8. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice-another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here</td>
<td>I do not think that wanting to be a ‘company man’ or ‘company woman’ is sensible anymore (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Organizational and Occupational Commitment Scale (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Occupational Commitment Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nursing is important to my self-image.</td>
<td>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I regret having entered the nursing profession. (R)</td>
<td>2. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am proud to be in the nursing profession.</td>
<td>3. I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I dislike being a nurse. (R)</td>
<td>4. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not identify with the nursing profession. (R)</td>
<td>5. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am enthusiastic about nursing.</td>
<td>6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have put too much into the nursing profession to consider changing now.</td>
<td>1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Changing profession now would be difficult for me to do</td>
<td>2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I were to change my profession.</td>
<td>3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It would be costly for me to change my profession now.</td>
<td>4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There are no pressures to keep me from changing professions. (R)</td>
<td>5. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider leaving this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Changing professions now would require considerable personal sacrifice.</td>
<td>6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe people who have been trained in a profession have a responsibility to stay in that profession for a reasonable period of time.</td>
<td>1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I do not feel any obligation to remain in the nursing profession. (R)</td>
<td>2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel a responsibility to the nursing profession to continue in it.</td>
<td>3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel that it would be right to leave nursing now.</td>
<td>4. This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would feel guilty if I left nursing.</td>
<td>5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am in nursing because of a sense of a loyalty to it.</td>
<td>6. I owe a great deal to my organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

VOLUNTEERS’ COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE
Volunteers’ Comments from Questionnaire (Motives to Volunteer)

- I usually participate as an athlete so I like to volunteer when I can
- family running
- Just to see the “behind the scenes” of the event
- Wanted to give something back to running community since I have run so many events
- T-shirts and goody bags are fun
- Contribute society
- My boyfriend is a runner
- E-mail asking me and it was a free weekend
- For God to connect me to other people
- I love running
- I’m running in the marathon and wanted to help
- As a runner myself, I feel it’s important to volunteer at races because I benefit from volunteers who I race
- Fun
- School give me a credit
- Tim Miller/ Train strong
- It sounded interesting
- My aunt is a share holder
- I am an orange account holder
- My husband is running and I thought it would be nice to kill some time
- Since retirement more avid interest in various sports (Marathon)
- I think that volunteering in life is essential for our well being it gives one a sense of helpfulness and self enrichment feeling good about what I am blesses with volunteering allows me to give back to my community
- Set to be near the players
• It’s fun
• Love to meet new people
• Seeing how the organization works
• Studying skills of good marathoners
• Work for a beneficiary
• Very few events have succeeded in this area. It’s such a thrill and very rewarding
to participants in an event that has grown over the years, has become very
prestigious, and has given so much to so many organizations
• School requirement
• Love volunteering for free shirts and bags
• I believe in my committee
• A unique experience
• Good company (working with)
• Meeting the famous marathoner
• Community services
• Could improve my running skill
• Seeing different skills with each player
• Continued support to encourage the tournament to return
• To support the new marathon shoes
• To support the city as a good place to live
• Love marathon
• Want the ING to be a success
• Give back to the community is most important
• Part of my community we live
• Meet people
• Love running
• New experience, fun
• Kill free time
• Volunteering is good for you
• ----- community
• ----- donation
• For the good game
• To encourage young marathoners
• I believe that volunteering at the ING running event ultimately aid me in my plan of taking over the World
• I like to watch people wearing ING shirts
• Just to have fun
• Assist a handicapped marathoners
• The players (all of them) are the nicest group of athletes I have ever had had contacted with
• Because of my family tradition
• Volunteer requirement from school
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