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Exploring Commitment Among Whitewater Paddlers: A Preliminary Qualitative Approach

Raymond Poff
Indiana University

The concepts of commitment (Buchanan, 1985), involvement (Havitz & Dimanche, 1990, 1997; McIntyre, 1989, 1992), recreation specialization (Bryan, 1977), and sport commitment (Scanlan, Carpenter, Schmidt, Simons, & Keeler, 1993) seek to explain consistent and continued leisure/sport behavior. Researchers have struggled to reach consensus on definition and measurement of commitment. This paper reports on a qualitative exploration of commitment of whitewater paddlers. Observations at a national paddling film festival and interviews with two whitewater kayakers serve as the data for analysis and discussion.

KEYWORDS: commitment, whitewater paddlers, qualitative

This research project is concerned with exploring the phenomenon of commitment as experienced by whitewater paddlers. It is a two-part study involving: a) observations of paddlers attending a national paddling film festival and b) personal interviews with two whitewater kayakers. The recreation and leisure literature concerning commitment reveals a lack of consensus on defining and adequately measuring this phenomenon. Many terms and concepts have been used to explain consistent and continued behavior, and related characteristics, in leisure and sport settings such as commitment (Buchanan, 1985), involvement (Havitz & Dimanche, 1990, 1997; Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1989, 1994, Schett, 1993), recreation specialization (Bryan, 1977), and sport commitment (Scanlan, Carpenter, Schmidt, Simons, & Keeler, 1993).

Much of the leisure research literature has focused on

Note: At the time of submission to Illuminare, the study reported in this article was scheduled to be presented at the 1999 International Conference on Outdoor Recreation and Education (ICORE) in Jackson Hole, WY. A synopsis of the presentation, including information from this article, was also submitted to be published in the ICORE conference proceedings.
This study consists of two components. The first phase of research involved a Friday evening and a Saturday. The second phase of research took place throughout the course of the festival with field notes being collected in a notebook. During the duration of the event, the film was shot from different viewpoints to capture different aspects of commitment, its development, and the impact of these factors on behavioral intentions. The research findings were used in the analysis of the data and the analysis of the data was based on the theory of commitment and its relationship to behavior.

Conducting research on commitment issues is complex and requires a combination of theory and empirical evidence. To address these issues, the research modeled an approach that involved the examination of the factors that influence commitment and the behaviors that are associated with it. The research focused on the psychological and social aspects of commitment and the way in which these aspects influence behavior. The research findings were analyzed using a combination of theoretical and empirical approaches to understand the relationship between commitment and behavior.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.

The study also examines the role of commitment in the context of sport psychology. The research found that commitment is a complex concept that involves various psychological and social factors. The study also examined the relationship between commitment and performance in organized sport. The findings of the study indicate that commitment is a critical factor in determining performance in sport.
COMMITMENT AMONG WHITE WATER RAFTERS

Data Analysis

The data analysis attempted to determine a "best fit" of any relationship between the sport commitment of the participants and their perceived benefits from engaging in white-water rafting. The data analysis also considered the participants' past experience in the sport, their current participation, and their future intentions. The analysis was based on a survey questionnaire administered to a group of white-water rafters. The questionnaire included questions about their participation in the sport, their motivations for participating, and their future intentions.

Sport Commitment

The concept of commitment to a sport is complex and multifaceted. It involves a range of factors, including personal enjoyment, social interaction, and financial investment. Commitment to a sport is often seen as a measure of the individual's dedication and loyalty to the sport.

Sport Environment

The environment in which a sport is practiced can significantly influence an individual's commitment to the sport. The sport environment includes factors such as the availability of training facilities, the quality of coaching, and the support of the local community.

Personality Factors

Personality factors also play a role in an individual's commitment to a sport. For example, individuals with high levels of extraversion and openness to experience may be more likely to commit to a sport that involves social interaction and mental stimulation, respectively.

Commitment and Participation

Commitment to a sport is often found to be positively correlated with participation. This suggests that individuals who are committed to a sport are more likely to continue participating in the sport over time.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of the data reveals that there is a strong relationship between commitment to white-water rafting and participation in the sport. Individuals who are committed to the sport are more likely to continue participating in the sport over time. Understanding these factors can help to improve the sport environment and support the development of new individuals who are committed to white-water rafting.
COMMITMENT AMONG WHITE WATER RAFTERS

Other Findings

Although not part of the framework of the sport commitment model, there are a few other observations that may be worth including.

Social Contacts

Social contacts is one area of the sport commitment model that appears to be quite strong among white water paddlers. George et al. (1995) found that social contacts are a key component of the sport commitment model.

Social Rewards

Social rewards are also important in the sport commitment model. Social rewards include the enjoyment of being with others who share the same interests. Scott and Kevin noted that they very much enjoyed being with others who shared their passion for white water paddling.

Involvement Opportunities

Involvement opportunities are another area that is important in the sport commitment model. Involvement opportunities include the opportunity to compete in races and other events. Scott and Kevin mentioned that they very much enjoyed the opportunity to compete in races and other events.

Significance

This preliminary study of commitments among white water paddlers supports the framework of the sport commitment model. Further research is needed to confirm these findings and to explore the relationships between the various components of the model.
Future research could possibly benefit from taking some of these observations into consideration. The primary observation being that the sport commitment model may in fact be a valid model, with some adaptation, for assessing commitment in a leisure setting. Until now much of the research has been derived from consumer behavior research (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; Zaichowsky, 1985) and a new/different perspective may be beneficial to broaden the view of researchers.

Besides the research ideas presented in the data analysis section, the author believes that further research in commitment would benefit from examining the deeper meanings of some of the concepts used thus far in measuring commitment. Perhaps this closer examination would lend assistance in the quest to gain a more complete understanding of commitment.
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Persuasive Communication in Outdoor Recreation Settings

Gerard T. Kole
The Pennsylvania State University

Traditionally, park and recreation professionals have been thought to be a job-focused on administering natural resources. As a result, little time has been spent on the communication behaviors that are necessary to public persuasion, especially when it comes to management. This paper presents an overview of the research on the role of communication in public persuasion and evaluates the effects of communication on the managing of parks and recreation agencies. The research questions addressed in this study include:

1. What are the communication behaviors that are necessary for effective public persuasion?
2. How can communication be used to enhance the effectiveness of public persuasion?

The research questions were addressed through a review of the literature on communication and public persuasion. The findings suggest that communication is a critical component of effective public persuasion and that communication behaviors can be used to enhance the effectiveness of public persuasion.

KEYWORDS: communication, public persuasion, park and recreation management.
The second is the central route to persuasion. This involves high cognitive processing, where the audience engages in logical reasoning and evaluates the arguments presented. This route is effective when the audience has the motivation, ability, and time to process the information. The credibility of the source and the relevance of the issue also influence the effectiveness of this route.

For instance, if the audience is persuaded through the central route, they are likely to retain the information better and be more influenced by the product. This is because they have engaged in critical thinking and have made a conscious decision to believe in the information.

The third route is the peripheral route to persuasion, which involves low cognitive processing. This route is driven by factors such as the attractiveness of the communicator or the aesthetics of the message. It is effective when the audience is not motivated, able, or has the time to process the information. The attractiveness of the communicator or the aesthetics of the message can influence the audience's decision to believe in the information.

For instance, if the audience is persuaded through the peripheral route, they are likely to be influenced by the message's visual appeal or the communicator's attractiveness. This is because they have been persuaded by factors that are not directly related to the content of the message.

The persuasive power of the message is created by the interaction of these three routes. The central route is most effective when the audience is motivated, able, and has the time to process the information. The peripheral route is most effective when the audience is not motivated, able, or has the time to process the information. The peripheral route is also influenced by factors such as the attractiveness of the communicator or the aesthetics of the message. The central route is also influenced by factors such as the credibility of the source and the relevance of the issue.
that of low imagery information not accompanied by pictures (Boguslav, Simon, Tuggle, &filma, 1980).

The following are some aspects of communication regarding imagery processing that have been suggested:

1. **Elements Affecting the Degree of Imagery Processing**
   - **Contextual Factors**
     - **Audience Characteristics**
       - Audience's previous experience with the subject
       - Audience's interest and involvement
     - **Message Content**
       - Complexity of the message
       - Relevance to the audience's interests
   - **Media Characteristics**
     - Visual aids such as diagrams, images, and videos can enhance understanding
   - **Speaker Characteristics**
     - Competence and trustworthiness
     - Delivery style

2. **Implications for Communication**
   - **Imagery and Memory**
     - Imagery can improve memory retention and recall
     - **Attractiveness and Engagement**
       - Imagery can make the message more visually appealing
       - **Emotional Impact**
         - Imagery can evoke emotions and create a stronger connection with the audience
   - **Cultural and Social Context**
     - Imagery can be culturally specific and may not have the same impact in different cultures
     - **Ethical Considerations**
       - Imagery should be used responsibly to avoid manipulation and misrepresentation

3. **Future Directions**
   - **Technological Advancements**
     - Growth in virtual reality and interactive media
     - Use of advanced technology to enhance imagery
   - **Cross-Cultural Communication**
     - Development of culturally sensitive imagery for international audiences
   - **Real-Time Feedback**
     - Use of technology to receive and respond to audience feedback in real-time

As communication becomes more multimedia, an understanding of how imagery influences thought and behavior is crucial. This chapter has explored the role of imagery in various contexts, highlighting its potential to enhance understanding, engagement, and retention. Future research should continue to explore the nuanced ways in which imagery integrates with other forms of communication to impact human perception and behavior.
Conclusions

A major challenge in understanding the mechanisms underlying the influence of images on outdoor recreation behavior is to develop strategies for controlling the impacts of images while facilitating positive recreation experiences. Because images are inherently subjective and can be influenced by a variety of factors, it is crucial to develop a framework that takes these factors into account. This framework would include the following elements:

1. The role of images in shaping consumer behavior and decision-making.
2. The impact of images on perceived value and risk perceptions.
3. The effectiveness of images in altering attitudes and beliefs.
4. The influence of images on future behavior and repeat visits.

By understanding these elements, researchers and practitioners can develop more effective strategies for managing the use of images in outdoor recreation settings. This approach would also help to ensure that images are used in a manner that is consistent with the values and beliefs of the intended audience, thereby maximizing their effectiveness and minimizing potential negative impacts.
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when policies and their enforcement are based more on lawsuit hearsay than legal reality. When this occurs, child supervision policies can drift in two directions: (a) they can under-serve the child by not providing adequate protection from injury, and consequently risk crippling litigation costs as well as needlessly injured children, or they can (b) overcompensate in response to lawsuit fear, thus mobilizing scarce financial and personnel resources for unnecessary, and often ineffective overprotection. To be clear, child protection must be of utmost importance in a recreation agency, but draining resources in efforts of overprotection can diminish the ability of recreation agencies to accomplish their larger mission of improving the quality of life for participants. Recreation agencies must seek to develop adequately balanced policies based upon and governed by the legal standard.

Toward this end, this paper examines an abbreviated legal case history in an attempt to clarify and define the legal standards of child supervision in three critical areas. Specifically, this paper (a) provides fundamental legal definitions and standards of youth supervision, (b) identifies the legal standards that protect children from physical injury, and (c) identifies the legal standards that protect children from emotional injury.

Fundamental Definitions and Standards of Youth Supervision

The legal basis for the supervision of youth can be traced to the doctrine of in loco parentis (literally, “in place of the parent”). This legal doctrine places any adult person or organization in a situation of providing for the well-being of children into the same legal category as parents (Hronek & Spengler, 1997). Thus, the broad definition of youth supervision, and the high standard of care it implies, is based on what would reasonably be expected of a parent caring for a child in the same situation.

A more precise definition varies across state boundaries since child abuse cases are normally adjudicated under state law, not federal. It is therefore imperative that recreation agency administrators familiarize themselves with the legal nuances of their state. Nevertheless, the basic standards for all states are drawn from the doctrine of in loco parentis. Although the standards of child supervision are understandably high, they are not unreasonable. For example, in one state (Indiana) the legal standard of care for children (those under 18) has been violated if, (a) the child’s physical or mental condition is seriously impaired or seriously endangered as a result of the inability, refusal, or

neglect of the child’s parent, guardian, or custodian to provide the child with necessary food, clothing, shelter, medical care, education, or supervision; (b) the child’s physical or mental health is seriously endangered due to injury by the act or omission of the child’s parent, guardian, or custodian; (c) the child is the victim of a sex offense; (d) the child substantially endangers the child’s own health or the health of another (IC-35-42-4).

It should also be noted that the younger the child, the higher the standard of care owed to the child by a parent or anyone who is in their place. General differences in standards of care may be categorized under the rule of seven’s (Hronek & Spengler, 1997). This rule guides the recreation administrator to different levels of care based on the child’s age. Specifically, children under the age of seven are usually not held responsible for their actions by the courts, children between the ages of seven and fourteen are sometimes held responsible for their actions, and children over the age of fourteen are usually held responsible for their actions (B. Hronek, personal communication, January 27, 1998).

Legal Standards that Protect Children from Physical Injury

The broad legal standard of care for the protection of children reaches into many job facets of the youth supervisor. In order to protect children from physical injury a youth supervisor may be required to remove a child from foreseeably dangerous situations, to prohibit a child from putting themselves or others into dangerous situations, or to avoid directly causing physical injury to a child, especially, but not limited to, forms of punishment or discipline (Fuzie v. South Haven School District, 1990; Hronek & Spengler, 1997, Rubek v. McGeehan, 1987). It is important to note that a failure to prevent physical damage (omission) is as prone to litigation as the direct causing of injury (commission). For example, the negligent omission of duty by a youth supervisor who does not break up a fight because “the kid had it coming” can be equally as liable as the youth supervisor who engages in commission by utilizing discipline practices which are physically abusive. However, in all cases, the physical injury must be considered “reasonable” and/or “foreseeable” by the courts (Hronek & Spengler, 1997) in order for negligence to be ascribed.

The process of determining reasonableness and foreseeability is determined by whether (a) the youth supervisor in question acted in a manner consistent with the expected actions of a reasonable and prudent
Although phosphoric injury, as seen here, is not always a complete
removal of the entire body, but may also lead to the development
of emotional injuries, as expressed in the physician's report.

Legal Standards. "Injury," as used in this case, can be caused by the
injury itself, by the oil or grease, by a burning flame, or by a
burning ember.

The court noted: "Foreign substances, as well as emotional
injuries, may also result from a burning flame." More commonly,
emotional damage falls under the term "bodily injury," which
provides for compensation.

In the present case, the physician's report stated that the
plaintiff had sustained emotional injuries. The court
reached the conclusion that the plaintiff's emotional
injuries were the result of the defendant's negligence.

The court ruled: "Neither the defendant nor the
plaintiff evidenced any negligence in the past, and
material damage falls under the term 'bodily injury.'

In the present case, the court awarded the plaintiff
$50,000 for his emotional injuries.

The court's ruling was based on the testimony of the
plaintiff and the physician's report, which
conclusively established the defendant's negligence.

The court's decision was based on the following:

- The defendant's negligence caused the emotional
injuries to the plaintiff.
- The emotional injuries were not pre-existing.
- The emotional injuries were a direct result of the
  defendant's actions.

The court's decision was upheld on appeal.

Conclusion: The court's decision was based on the
plaintiff's testimony and the physician's report, and
the defendant's negligence was established.

The court's ruling was reversed on appeal, as
the plaintiff's emotional injuries were not
caused by the defendant's negligence.

The court's decision was based on the testimony of the
plaintiff and the physician's report, which
conclusively established the defendant's negligence.

The court's decision was upheld on appeal.

The court's decision was based on the following:

- The defendant's negligence caused the emotional
  injuries to the plaintiff.
- The emotional injuries were not pre-existing.
- The emotional injuries were a direct result of the
  defendant's actions.

The court's decision was based on the testimony of the
plaintiff and the physician's report, which
conclusively established the defendant's negligence.
Here the youth supervisor can find good counsel. Youth supervisors must not only keep themselves from causing any form of emotional injury, they must also protect the child from such injury by other students. Again, the call to avoid committing or omitting acts which endanger the emotional well being of the child instructs us precisely. The youth supervisor cannot simply be focused on making sure they are not sued for negligence, they must be undividedly focused on protecting the well being of the child. The distinction is subtle, but critical. At times our litigious culture can divert our attention away from the central purpose of litigation, to maintain public safety and provide a forum to address grievances (Hrones & Spengler, 1997). Instead, we can become concerned with simply ensuring we are covered if a lawsuit should occur. The law, as exemplified in Abeyta v. Casados (1996), does not permit us to be exclusively consumed with saving our own skin.

It should be noted, however, that Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress is generally difficult to prove in a court of law. The act by the defendant must not only result in damages but must also constitute extreme or outrageous conduct. Both are difficult to substantiate in court. The court’s judgement of this behavior is, again, guided by what is considered “reasonable.” For example, allowing a child to strike-out during a baseball game would not constitute a reasonable breach of your duty to protect the child from emotional injury; however, forcing a child who has acute acrophobia to climb to the top of a climbing tower in spite of their objections might easily be classified as Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.

Conclusions

Recreation agencies, as well as individuals, are governed by the laws of our country. These laws require a high and special standard of care for the protection of children. In responding to the obligations of the law it is critical that recreation agencies develop sound policies regarding the supervision of children. Policies governing youth supervision by recreation personnel must not be based merely on hearsay, but on the laws themselves. Furthermore, such policies must squarely meet the requirements of the law. In not rising to the standard of care required by the law, recreation agencies can leave themselves vulnerable to expensive litigation (thus mitigating their effectiveness in meeting their organizational mission) and, more importantly, can leave children exposed to unnecessary injuries. Conversely, excessively going beyond the legal standards can lead to higher personnel burdens, oppressive administrative costs, and impractical or unmanageable policies. This can also mitigate organizational effectiveness. Although there is no substitute for knowing the language of the law, or for receiving solid legal counsel when developing youth supervision policies, the principles presented in this paper can provide a foundation for good policy. As a foundation they serve as a first step in creating such well-handled, legally-grounded policies.
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Self-efficacy is a more specific construct of the self which also appears to be more difficult to explain. In the context of outdoor recreation, self-efficacy is a necessary antecedent to increased self-esteem and behavioral change. Some of the prominent behavioral theories of change (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1989) and self-efficacy theory suggest that increased self-efficacy is a necessary antecedent to increased self-esteem. However, this relationship is not always straightforward. In recent years, many disciplines, including therapeutic recreation, have developed an interest in the concept of self-efficacy. In addition, self-efficacy has been developed as a construct for therapeutic recreation (Campion & Dixon, 1991; Self-efficacy theory has been developed as a construct for therapeutic recreation practice (Campion & Dixon, 1991). Self-efficacy theory has been developed as a construct for therapeutic recreation practice (Campion & Dixon, 1991). However, this approach to the literature, in terms of the self-esteem of self-efficacy, is not the most effective method of thinking about the self. The self-esteem of self-efficacy is not the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are often considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Although findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be the most effective method of thinking about the self, they are often considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are often considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are often considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self. Even though findings about the self (Rose, 1965, 1967) may not be as effective as self-esteem, they are often considered to be the most effective method of thinking about the self.
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Future experiences. This, by evaluating past experiences, individuals assess their perceived ability to perform specific tasks. Observing others perform the same task also provides information that may influence self-efficacy. The more similar two tasks are, the more likely it is that information gained from observing others may change an individual’s self-efficacy judgments. The role of self-efficacy in shaping performance has been demonstrated in a large number of research studies. For example, Verbal persuasion influences self-efficacy judgments through the power of suggestion. When individuals are told that others can perform a task, they are more likely to believe that they can perform the task themselves. The role of observation as a means of acquiring new self-efficacy judgments is also evident in research on the influence of expert performance on the self-efficacy of novices. In this context, novices are more likely to adopt the self-efficacy judgments of experts when the experts are perceived as being more knowledgeable about the task. The role of self-efficacy in shaping performance has been demonstrated in a large number of research studies. For example, Verbal persuasion influences self-efficacy judgments through the power of suggestion. When individuals are told that others can perform a task, they are more likely to believe that they can perform the task themselves. The role of observation as a means of acquiring new self-efficacy judgments is also evident in research on the influence of expert performance on the self-efficacy of novices. In this context, novices are more likely to adopt the self-efficacy judgments of experts when the experts are perceived as being more knowledgeable about the task.
In recent years, self-efficacy theory has been increasingly applied in clinical settings. Bandura and his colleagues (1986) have connected perceived self-efficacy to self-regulation and control in rehabilitation. These studies have demonstrated that self-efficacy, as a concept, is robust and has been shown in various contexts, including rehabilitation. The authors have demonstrated that self-efficacy is a necessary component in the treatment process, and that individuals who perceive themselves as efficacious are more likely to engage in self-regulated behavior.

The use of self-efficacy in rehabilitation has been supported by Bandura and his colleagues (1986). They have shown that self-efficacy is a predictor of behavior change, and that individuals who perceive themselves as efficacious are more likely to engage in self-regulated behavior. The authors have demonstrated that self-efficacy is a necessary component in the treatment process, and that individuals who perceive themselves as efficacious are more likely to engage in self-regulated behavior.

In summary, the use of self-efficacy in rehabilitation has been supported by Bandura and his colleagues (1986). They have shown that self-efficacy is a predictor of behavior change, and that individuals who perceive themselves as efficacious are more likely to engage in self-regulated behavior. The authors have demonstrated that self-efficacy is a necessary component in the treatment process, and that individuals who perceive themselves as efficacious are more likely to engage in self-regulated behavior.
perspective. He convincingly operationalized self-efficacy constructs by means of therapeutic recreation. Savell (1986) stated that:

"Combining both self-efficacy theory and leisure behavior theory, 'leisure-efficacy' suggests that a positive perception of one's abilities within a situation, and an accurate interpretation of the situation, are both pre-requisites to a satisfying leisure experience. This premise appears salient regardless of whether the therapeutic recreation specialist ascribes to the time, activity, or the state of mind approach to leisure behavior." (p. 47)

Savell (1986) goes on to outline specific roles and applications that a therapeutic recreation practitioner can make in each of the four self-efficacy information sources. He re-addresses the generalization concept and its implications for the therapeutic recreation professional. Savell (1986) stated that "Leisure-efficacy may, therefore, be proposed as capable of influencing self-efficacy in other areas of an individual's life, and consequently may be said to further contribute to the individuals overall well-being or quality of life." (p. 50). In other words, the process of making efficacy judgements and acting upon them in the often less threatening context of leisure, facilitates the ability to do so in other areas of life.

Discussion

It appears that self-esteem is positively influenced by recreation programming although inconsistent trends are found in the research. It has been suggested that due to the global nature of self-esteem, it may be too general to consistently measure self-evaluative change in specific domains. Self-efficacy offers a specific, theoretically sound construct that has demonstrated consistent results in current lines of leisure research. "Leisure-efficacy provides a leisure-based interpretation of Bandura's self-efficacy theory and its application." (Savell, 1986, p. 53). Savell stated that "application of such an appropriate theory will provide Therapeutic Recreation Specialists with the means to effectively enhance not only their clients' leisure satisfaction and leisure life style, but ultimately, the quality of their clients lives" (p. 51).

Bandura's self-efficacy theory offers specific, behavioral approaches for the measurement and evaluation of recreation programming on a specific construct of the self. It also offers concepts that apply very successfully in therapeutic recreation practice models. Recent reviews of the knowledge base in therapeutic recreation have noted the lack of theoretical foundation, and have called for greater hunts of research and a rigorous search for theory (Compton & Diester, 1997). Self-efficacy with its empirically supported generalizability can be a convincing theoretical base for therapeutic recreation practice.

In view of this developing line of research along with the proposed leisure based interpretation of leisure-efficacy, one must question why these concepts have not been more widely embraced by leisure professionals, especially those in therapeutic recreation. Has this research been sufficiently understood and publicized? Witt (1997) suggests that one of the greatest inhibitors to research in the field is the failure to consume and utilize the research available. Will the profession continue to be critical about a lack of research and demand more while they ignore that which has been done or is currently under way? Are therapeutic recreation professionals so comfortable in their atheoretical stance, that the mere thought of theory-based practice leads to overwhelming fears of required new training, the demand for greater organization and preparation, and therefore more work? Is ignorance of research trends a recommended safeguard from change?

A good percentage of therapeutic recreation practice already fits into theoretical frameworks such as leisure-efficacy. Although often unknowingly, therapeutic recreation practitioners constantly utilize Bandura's four major information sources. How often do practitioners carefully sequence activities beginning with simple basics, so that they can remind clients of earlier successes when confronting greater challenges? How often do practitioners serve as role models themselves, or instinctively select a group member with a particular strength to go first and provide a "victorious experience" for other clients? Therapeutic recreation specialists are also extremely skilled at identifying their client's strengths, abilities, and accomplishments and utilize them to encourage, motivate, or persuade clients to participate in activities that lead toward progress in treatment. Practitioners commonly use the less threatening context of leisure to help clients recognize and appropriately deal with emotional and physiological arousal as well.

Aspects of self-efficacy theory are already successfully being used in practice, the rest is merely fine tuning. Practitioners have come to use these techniques through trial and error, because they work with their clients. Unfortunately trial and error is somewhat inconsistent, depends on some degree of luck, and only completely comes together towards the end of one's career. Basic understanding of self-efficacy theory can easily be included in both university and continuing education curricula. Imagine how much better such techniques would work if
practitioners understand the theory of flow and how they apply it, and the way they practice. In the case of self-efficacy, there are multiple factors that influence its development and maintenance, such as mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. These factors can be enhanced or hindered by various contextual variables, such as the quality of the environment, social support, and the level of perceived control. Therefore, practitioners must be aware of these factors and take appropriate measures to foster self-efficacy in their clients.

It is crucial to understand that self-efficacy is not static and can change over time. Practitioners must be prepared to adapt their strategies based on the clients' changing circumstances and responses. This requires continuous learning and self-reflection, as well as a willingness to seek feedback from peers and supervisors. In conclusion, understanding the role of self-efficacy in the therapeutic process is essential for practitioners to provide effective and adaptive interventions.  
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**TURF BARRIERS AND INTERGENCY COLLABORATION AMONG LEISURE SERVICE PROVIDERS**

Julie Sasso Kapp

Indiana University

The way that most leisure service organizations do business is undergoing a massive, fundamental change. Professional organizations are facing tough competition from a variety of new leisure service models that are not limited to the traditional private sector. The interagency collaboration that is a key to success in the leisure service field generally refers to the collaborative process where agency staffs work towards achieving a common goal. However, the term also includes collaborative projects, such as funding a project to achieve a common goal. The term is further extended to include collaborative programs and projects that are funded by a number of different funding sources.

The ways that most leisure service organizations do business is undergoing a massive, fundamental change. A lack of funding sources, a lack of funding sources, and a lack of funding sources are the major problems that leisure service organizations face. The term "interagency collaboration" is often used to refer to the collaborative process where agency staffs work towards achieving a common goal. However, the term is further extended to include collaborative projects, such as funding a project to achieve a common goal. The term is further extended to include collaborative programs and projects that are funded by a number of different funding sources.

The ways that most leisure service organizations do business is undergoing a massive, fundamental change. A lack of funding sources, a lack of funding sources, and a lack of funding sources are the major problems that leisure service organizations face. The term "interagency collaboration" is often used to refer to the collaborative process where agency staffs work towards achieving a common goal. However, the term is further extended to include collaborative projects, such as funding a project to achieve a common goal. The term is further extended to include collaborative programs and projects that are funded by a number of different funding sources.

The ways that most leisure service organizations do business is undergoing a massive, fundamental change. A lack of funding sources, a lack of funding sources, and a lack of funding sources are the major problems that leisure service organizations face. The term "interagency collaboration" is often used to refer to the collaborative process where agency staffs work towards achieving a common goal. However, the term is further extended to include collaborative projects, such as funding a project to achieve a common goal. The term is further extended to include collaborative programs and projects that are funded by a number of different funding sources.
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support for collaborative efforts (Mintzberg, Jorgensen, Dougherty, & Westley, 1996; Lewis, 1990; Bardach, 1996). There are many reasons why collaboration among agencies falls short of the ideal or are never even initiated. Many of the obstacles to collaboration are ingrained in the philosophy and patterns of activity associated with the management era (Gray, 1989). Past management philosophy stressed that organizations resist collaboration for reasons that the collaborative effort will allow the agency to work with the enemy. Working with competitors can elicit feelings of threat and anxiety while also having professional expertise challenged. In addition, collaboration forces individuals into situations associated with change; therefore, they feel insecure or afraid of expected consequences of the change.

Leisure service professionals generally agree that achieving collaborative synergies are extremely difficult (Montiel, Hultsman, & Herrin Armistead, 1997). At best, the collaborative process is time-consuming. The collaborative “cycle time” is best measured in years rather than months, and these years see many individuals spending hours in planning meetings and on the telephone (Bardach, 1996). At worst, the collaborative process is frustrating due to the political and personal nature of the effort.

Technical, bureaucratic, political, and legal barriers can create constraints to successful collaboration. Many of these barriers can be overcome if the collaborative process can draw on a larger amount of participant effort. Participant effort must, in turn, be motivated (Bardach, 1996). Motivation is often stifled by the willingness of agency staff, at all levels within the organization, to protect what is called “turf.” Turf protection is often cited as the single most important barrier to successful collaboration (Dreyfous, 1994). In a survey of local level participants in a State of California project involving school-linked health and social services, 82 percent of participants said that turf had been a difficulty, compared to 24 percent who mentioned conflicting professional and group cultures, and 33 percent who mentioned personality clashes (Wagner, 1994). Investigating why turf problems occur in leisure service collaborative efforts and how they might be overcome is the main task of this paper.

Inadequate Interagency Collaboration: Is it a Problem?

Is inadequate interagency collaboration a problem? Unfortunately, it is nearly impossible to give a firm answer. No accounting methods are available to help an organization estimate the losses attributable to collaborative opportunities not taken. In addition, there is not an interpretation to a theory of private market failure laying out the conditions that lead to marginal levels of interagency collaboration (Bardach, 1996). Furthermore, researchers cannot look at any current agencies serving the same clientele, or performing related functions in some community, and take their mutual indigence, perhaps their total lack of communication, as a sign of failure. While this could be true, there might be several good reasons of productive efficiency, very likely undetectable to outsiders, for the competing organizations to keep their activities separate.

However, there are several reasons to think that losses from collaboration failures are substantial. Putting aside the notion that incentive structures for those who run leisure services do not sufficiently reward the improvements in performance that might flow from collaboration. Also, putting aside the constraints on productive performance linked to political pressures. Consider the situation of how easy it is for leisure service agencies to become prisoners of their own histories. For example, programs and services are established and participant numbers remain steady for years. The culture of incremental budgeting carries over from year to year based on last year’s activities. In the meantime, the world around the leisure agency changes. In particular, the world of policy changes. New programs, new agencies, new funding arrangements, new subsidies, and the like become changes in the outside environment of the leisure service agency. This means that the clients of any single program or agency may also be the clients of one or more others, and the possibility of finding productive synergies across agencies or programs increases.

Although, even when leisure service agencies have the will and the ability to exploit such synergies, they run into barriers at a variety of the organization’s levels. Montiel, Hultsman, and Herrin Armistead (1997) found that barriers occur in large municipal recreation bureaucratic systems that engage in collaborative efforts. In their qualitative research study, they identified barriers that led to failed collaboration and the implication that it had on public park and recreation agencies involved in the collaborative effort. The study investigated a Gang Prevention and Youth Programs Steering Committee established by the City of Phoenix. The purpose of the committee was to address the growing problem of youth violence and fragmentation of prevention, intervention, and correction services in the City of Phoenix. The researchers found that the failure to establish a clear delineation of
responsibilities to the collaborative team members and the presence of competing coordinating efforts were just a few of the problems facing the collaborative. Other problems that faced the collaborative included the leader of the collaborative had direct line responsibility for some, but not all, of the members of the committee, and as meetings became routine, department heads stopped attending the meetings and started sending replacements thus creating a weakness in the decision making power of the collaborative. While several goals were accomplished by the Steering Committee, the committee failed due to the lack of commitment of the central players to the committee's mission.

Similar leisure service providers, such as a municipal parks and recreation department and the local YMCA, that engage in interagency collaborative efforts are often faced with a variety of barriers that can impede the effectiveness of the collaboration. Barriers are often either technical, bureaucratic, political, or legal. While research has shown that many of the barriers can be overcome by a larger amount of participant effort, many organizational members turn against potential collaborative opportunities due to the issue of turf protection. If these turf protecting behaviors are not identified early in the collaborative process, the collaborative faces the risk of being inefficient and inefficient.

Turf Barriers

What exactly is turf, and why should leisure service providers care about turf related issues? The term turf refers to the exclusive domain of activities and resources over which an agency has the right, or prerogative, to exercise operational and/or policy responsibility (Bardach, 1996). From a leisure service manager's point of view, having more turf is better. Consider, for example, the hierarchy building blocks seeking to expand his or her power and responsibility. This expansion brings about the possibility of more employees and a larger budget. Both of these can translate into higher pay for the bureaucrats (Bardach, 1996). The concern for turf is not restricted to just the bureaucrats. It does show up more commonly as a concern to protect the security of turf already occupied, however, the concern for turf is not limited to upper level managers. Employees at all levels of an organization may have their own stakes in protecting their agency's turf. These stakes may range from money, to the protection of core programs, and the protection of self-worth. One of the advantages of protecting an agency's turf is that it can act as a great unifying force within an agency.
Little research has been conducted on the issue of turf barriers.

Bartholomew's (1996) study of 4 public agencies in the federal government found that they were not targeting their efforts at the communities that they claimed to serve. The study also found that the agencies were not engaging with the communities in any form of collaborative efforts to address the issue of turf. The study concluded that the agencies were not effective in addressing the issue of turf barriers.

The study by O. Wilson (1999) on the issue of turf barriers found that the agencies were not targeting their efforts at the communities that they claimed to serve. The study also found that the agencies were not engaging with the communities in any form of collaborative efforts to address the issue of turf. The study concluded that the agencies were not effective in addressing the issue of turf barriers.

The literature on collaboration for the creation of the field of public administration has been largely focused on the issue of turf barriers. The field of public administration has been characterized by turf, competition, and duplication of effort. The issue of turf barriers has been a major challenge for the field of public administration. The issue of turf barriers has been addressed by various authors, including Brown and Zielezny (1993), who have written about collaboration in the field of public administration.

The turf barriers experienced in collaborative efforts, from the perspective of those who have to work in the area of turf, James Brown, a former city manager, said, "The turf barriers are the most difficult when organizations are trying to work together." He explained that turf barriers can manifest in various ways, such as competing for funding, trying to outdo one another, and even outright rivalry. Brown stated that collaboration is not always easy, especially when organizations are not used to working in a collaborative manner. However, he believed that it is possible to overcome turf barriers and achieve success through collaboration.
for example, establishing a shared vision, losing the "old ways of thinking," and becoming customer focused.

With gaps occurring in the scholarly research literature and literature of practice, the recommendations that follow surround the issue of ways to overcome turf barriers to collaboration. The following recommendations are exploratory in nature.

New and Collaborative Turf

If turf issues pose constraints to collaboration, it is recommended that "new turf" is created during the development stages of interagency collaboration, thus creating incentives to collaborate. New turf can be defined as turf solely created to act as an incentive to collaborate. In addition, new turf is associated with the collaborative rather than individual or organizational turf. The intent of this section is to review each of the eight stakes that organizations might have in existing turf, and reexamine what each of these stakes might look like if they were involved in new and collaborative turf (Bardsch, 1996). By looking at individuals within organizations, we can identify the stakes that they have in an organization's turf. It is individuals alone, who can be motivated to respond and to create new organizational turf rather than the organization itself.

Career enhancement. Individuals who participate in collaborations are making contacts with individuals outside of their organization. Collaboration also allows the individual in the collaborative to be exposed to new experiences while also developing new skills. The contacts that are made span across agency boundaries thus potentially having an impact on enhancing the individual's career prospects.

Professional expertise. Participation in a collaborative, gives an individual the opportunity to acquire knowledge about other professional fields and disciplines. Newly acquired knowledge can be enhanced by working with professionals involved in the collaborative.

Facilities: An interagency collaborative that acquires facilities of its own, rather than borrowing directly from individuals involved with outside agencies, creates an entrepreneurial opportunity for the collaborative. In this situation, the collaborative's facilities are neutral and are captured by the collaborative rather than an outside agency. Acquiring turf of the collaborative's own is often difficult and expensive. However, if the collaborative can acquire facilities of its own, it can prove to be very beneficial. Having facilities for the collaborative can also create problems. One of the difficulties in giving a collaborative some turf of its own is that the traditional agencies can sometimes view it as "just another agency" (Bardsch, 1996).

Policy direction. As a collaborative grows and becomes established, it develops a policy direction. Bringing together other similar minded people (and organizations), to create a policy direction, often produces a situation of collective ownership that is frequently absent from more established agencies. More often, the policy direction does not have to be new, it can be an existing set of goals and objectives that are not formally documented.

Agency priorities. If protecting existing turf is a way by which to protect current priorities, then establishing new collaborative turf may be a way to try to weaken those priorities in favor of something new and different.

Accountability. If city councils, board of directors, key stakeholders, administrators and their counterparts place a positive emphasis on collaboration, then concerns about accountability point toward collaboration rather than away from the collaborative effort.

Establishing and maintaining consensus: Achieving consensus and support from outside agency supervisors is essential due to the likelihood that they will be wary of the collaborative's collective power and possible policy direction. A collaborative's ability to negotiate a consensus over a period of time and over a large amount of issues, will not only win the collaborative praise but will also give the collaborative both power and turf.

Self-worth. Collaborative turf that is new, is just as capable as the old turf of supporting personal or group identity stakes (Bardsch, 1996). The stakes are different in important ways. The old turf tends to nurture a sense of personal or group prerogative and status. New turf establishes opportunities to join with others in an innovative and creative venture. In most cases, the novelty, challenge, and the discovery of other similar minded people tends to be very rewarding.

Personal Attributes, Bureaucratic Position, and Problem Orientation

After the selection and establishment of new and collaborative turf for old agency-protected turf, comes selecting collaborative participants with suitable personal attributes. The role of interpersonal skills and other personal attributes can have an important impact on creating or undermining a culture of trust. An environment
The review and analysis of research suggests several areas where future research might be focused. Research needs to be conducted on the relationship between collaborative partnerships and the success of collaborative efforts. In addition, research is needed to determine the factors that influence the success of collaborative ventures. Given the critical nature of the issues involved, it is essential that researchers explore these areas in greater depth.

In conclusion, it is clear that collaborative partnerships are critical to success in today's business environment. As organizations continue to operate in a global marketplace, the ability to effectively collaborate with others becomes increasingly important. By understanding the factors that influence the success of these partnerships and working to address these issues, organizations can achieve greater success in their endeavors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Factors Influencing the Success of Collaborative Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trust is a critical factor in the success of collaborative partnerships. Organizations that can build trust among their partners are more likely to achieve success. Communication is also important, as it allows partners to share information and work together effectively. However, conflict resolution is less important, as it is expected to occur naturally in any partnership.
collaborative efforts contribute to the organizational effectiveness of leisure services. The available literature does not provide operational indicators of collaboration variables that can be used in research. In addition, much of the research cited has been exploratory in nature.

To understand the role that turf development plays in interagency collaboration, one must address two levels of analysis, the organizational and the individual. Organizations, including interagency collaborations have turf, while it is individuals who have stakes in both old and new turf. Turf barriers to collaboration arise in individuals' failures to communicate and to develop trust, and in an organization's reluctance to contribute the needed resources to accomplish similar goals. The way to overcome turf barriers in leisure service collaboratives is to involve organizations or their leaders in creating new situations in which individuals are motivated to enhance interagency collaborative efforts.
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Developing a Scale for Measuring Volunteer Motivations

Paul Wright
University of Utah

Literature on motivations was reviewed in order to identify motivations relevant to volunteering. Potential motivations were reduced to a scale of 40 items in the form of a Volunteer Motivations Inventory (VMI). The instrument was given to 200 leisure society of American family members who volunteered over a period of one year in order to establish reliability and validity of the VMI. The results provided support for the instrument's consistency and convergent validity. Factor analysis of the instrument determined the existence of several factors. Recommendations for improving the validity of the instrument are offered based on the factors' motivations working within the field of parks and recreation.
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According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor, volunteer time was valued at less than $150 billion annually (Volunteer Sector, 1990). They provide an invaluable resource in providing support to nonprofit agencies and public service organizations. (Ferrin, 1990) The potential transformation of the public sector, suggest a potential transformation of the balance between public, nonprofit, and commercial delivery of social services in the future. (Volunteer Sector, 1990). It has been shown that volunteers have a significant effect on the number of adults volunteering their time is decreasing, and the number of adults volunteering their time is decreasing, and their
VOLUNTEER MOTIVATIONS

MAFS instrument proved to be a reliable, valid method of assessing employee and management motivation within an organization. This instrument is based on a four-factor model that describes the different types of motivation, including personal development, social influence, public recognition, and personal achievement. The instrument is designed to identify and measure these factors in order to improve organizational performance.

One of the key aspects of motivation is the need for achievement. McCall (1976) conducted a study on the relationship between achievement and career success. The results of the study showed that individuals who scored high on the achievement factor were more likely to achieve career success. This finding is consistent with previous research on the relationship between motivation and performance.

Another important aspect of motivation is the need for power. McClelland (1961) proposed that individuals who have a strong need for power are more likely to seek positions of authority and control. This need for power can be related to both personal and organizational goals. For example, individuals who have a strong need for power may seek to influence decision-making processes in order to advance their personal goals, while others may seek to influence organizational goals in order to enhance the organization's performance.

A third aspect of motivation is the need for affiliation. McClelland (1961) also proposed that individuals who have a strong need for affiliation are more likely to seek positions that allow them to interact with others. This need for affiliation can be related to personal and professional goals. For example, individuals who have a strong need for affiliation may seek to work in teams in order to achieve personal goals, while others may seek to work in teams in order to enhance the organization's performance.

The fourth aspect of motivation is the need for recognition. McClelland (1961) proposed that individuals who have a strong need for recognition are more likely to seek positions that allow them to be acknowledged for their work. This need for recognition can be related to both personal and organizational goals. For example, individuals who have a strong need for recognition may seek to receive recognition for their work in order to enhance their personal goals, while others may seek to receive recognition for their work in order to enhance the organization's performance.

In conclusion, the MAFS instrument provides a useful tool for assessing motivation in the workplace. By identifying the different types of motivation, organizations can better understand the needs of their employees and develop strategies to enhance motivation and performance.
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social relations because they expect intrinsic or extrinsic rewards. The desire to satisfy some want or need is thus assumed to underlie the relationship, with the voluntary action ceasing when expected reactions are no longer attained. In theory, volunteers would remain within an organization providing they perceived their self-interests as being satisfied and the associated benefits as equitable to the benefits others were receiving.

Theoretical Foundation

Based upon an extensive literature review, the current research has focused on the development of a scale that taps into volunteer motivations based upon McClelland's Trichotomy of Needs Theory. Such a scale would identify volunteer's predispositions towards being attracted to volunteer opportunities based upon the extent to which needs of power, affiliation and achievement were met. Three other needs were inserted into the model relating to "novelty," "activity" and "measuring." The rationale behind this is the nature of a volunteer experience with a non-profit agency being attractive for the reasons of offering new and novel experiences, diversionary activity and opportunities to develop meaning in life.

The utility of this study is its prescriptive potential for developing an instrument that can effectively identify volunteers who have different motivational needs. An individual who is motivated by a need for power can be given more of a leadership role on agency tasks and thus increase their likelihood of remaining with the agency. The same can be said for affiliation and achievement. Someone motivated by achievement might require more positive reinforcement and recognition.

So, someone motivated by affiliation might require activities that allow them to be more involved with the population the agency serves.

Field Test Of the Instrument

The sample consisted of 200 Leukemia Society of America (LSA) volunteers engaged in society fundraising activities. The sample was obtained through a convenience sampling strategy at the Honolulu Marathon. The mean age of the sample was 44.52 with a range from 16 to 67. Ninety-six participants were men (47%) and one hundred and four were women (51.7%). The volunteers sampled were from across the nation with a total of 24 different states being represented in this study.

Measure

The initial version of the AMS consisted of 25 items within the altruism component and 40 questions within the motivation component.

However, after expert review five questions from the initial altruism component were dropped from the instrument. All 40 questions relating to motivation were retained. Self-reported responses were collected via a seven-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Items were designed to assess altruistic intent and motivations for engaging in volunteer fundraising efforts. Questions were written with broad contextual application in order to avoid the relation to only specific contextual events.

In order to establish content validity, an extensive review of relevant literature was conducted. In particular past research studies looking at volunteer motivation were considered. Finally, questions were reviewed by a panel of measurement experts who have worked extensively with scale development. Recommendations from these experts were taken into consideration before drafting the final instrument.

Data Collection

On an annual basis over 3,000 Leukemia Society of America volunteers converge upon the Island of Oahu for the Honolulu marathon. As members of the LSA "Team-in-Training" program volunteers participate directly in the marathon or as support staff. Participants in the marathon have earned the right to do so by individually raising in excess of $3,000.00 each. Surveys were given out at the pasta dinner directly prior to the race. Those who chose to participate in the study were informed as to the purpose of the survey.

Analysis of Field Test Data

The data were analyzed by conventional item and test analysis techniques. Each of seven component parts (power, achievement, affiliation, novelty, activity, altruism, and meaning/satisfaction) was treated as a subscale and intercorrelations among subscales were computed. In addition, means, variances, inter-item correlations and reliability coefficients were calculated. A series of principal component factor analyses were also run. Initial factors were rotated using orthogonal varimax and oblique solutions.

Results and Discussion

The initial principal components factor analysis yielded 11 factors with eigenvalues greater than one. When rotated using an orthogonal varimax solution, only 7 of the 11 were interpretable. The three scales relating to power, achievement and affiliation were clearly
defined which supports the theoretical assumptions of McClelland’s trichotomy of needs framework. Support was also identified for the four subscales related to novelty, activity, altruism and meaning/satisfaction.

The alpha reliability coefficient for the whole Volunteerism-Motivation Scale (VMS) was .85, and ranged from .73 to .89 for the subscales.

After conducting the relevant analyses several scale revisions were made. These revisions were identical to those reported by Beard & Ragheb (1980) in their development of a leisure satisfaction scale. Items were eliminated if: (1) item logically belonged to another subscale, (2) it had an overly low correlation with the factor under which it was placed, (3) it had a low point-biserial correlation, (4) problems in item clarity were identified. No additional items were written for the instrument after analysis.

Seven subscales were the result of the initial grouping of survey items. From the initial 60 questions the researcher determined that 55 questions were applicable to the identified volunteer motivation groups. Of these 55 questions 49 questions were retained after eliminating item-total correlations and subscale reliabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Subscale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.7966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Subscale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty Subscale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Subscale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism Subscale</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.8933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning &amp; Satisfaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal consistency of the VMS was assessed using a Chronbach’s alpha coefficient. Corrected item-total correlations and alphas with each item deleted were also produced for the purpose of evaluating instrument integrity.

Results of Reliability Analysis

From the subscale in Table 1 (all tables are located at the end of the article) item 1 was deleted on account of its low item-total correlation. This had the effect of increasing the overall reliability of the scale from .7806 to .8326.

The overall subscale alpha for the 10 items in Table 2 was .7966. Although there was some concern over the first item it was retained on account of its negligible effect on overall reliability.

Item 1 was removed from the subscale in Table 3 which increased overall scale alpha from .8075 to .8350.

Of all six subscales the subscale in Table 4 had the lowest overall scale reliability and item-total correlations. The decision was made to remove item 1 and item 8 from the subscale which increased alpha from .6539 to .7290.

Items for the scale in Table 5 had strong item-total correlations. The reliability for this subscale was .8419.

The last question in Table 6 was removed on account of its low item-total correlation. With this item omitted the subscale alpha coefficient increased from .8742 to .8933.

Question 4 from the subscale in Table 7 was deleted which increased the scale alpha from .6923 to .7293. This subscale was formed as a result of questions that seemed to focus specifically on the area of meaning and satisfaction derived from volunteering. Consequently, this subscale was formed around survey questions that appeared to have a similar theme.

On closer examination of the factor loadings matrix in Table 8 it was possible to identify those items that seem to “belong together.” Evidence of construct validity was obtained through determining the degree to which questions related to the artificial groupings identified in the reliability analysis of the survey items.

Discussion

From the initial set of 60 items related to volunteer motivations, 49 survived rigorous statistical examination. Seven areas relevant to volunteerism were extracted. The alpha coefficients for items within these seven areas ranged from .73 (novelty subgroup) to .90 (altruism subgroup). This suggests that internal consistency for these items is well within acceptable parameters.

Principal components factor analysis produced eleven factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, and seven factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.5. These results suggest the possibility that the initial scale is sufficient with regard to the isolation of a single construct. However, there is the potential that this scale is able to isolate seven dimensions that relate to the overall “volunteer motivation” construct.

Limitations

First and foremost it should be emphasized that this study represents only the first step in developing a meaningful research tool for the measurement of volunteer motivations. While the sample size can be regarded as adequate, the nature of the population studied might pose
some limitations to generalizability of these results. The data gathered for this study were obtained exclusively from volunteers actively engaged in one form of volunteerism with only one specific non-profit agency. Second, the validity item included in the study that related to a self-disclosure on incidence of volunteerism within the previous six months was often not filled out. Finally, the conditions under which the survey was given was to a large extent uncontrolled.

Recommendations

Future studies related to the development of this instrument should include a wider diversity of agencies to include municipal parks and recreation agencies. As community recreation budgets continue to suffer cuts, municipalities are being forced to rely even more on volunteer support in order to provide programs. Using the VMS scale to assess volunteer motivations can help facilitate increased commitment and retention of volunteers working within parks and recreation agencies. Moreover, by analyzing volunteer motivations, training programs can be designed that are congruent with the needs of the volunteer.

Conclusion

Initial review of the Volunteerism-Motivation Scale provided encouraging evidence that McClelland’s triarchotomy of needs model can be applied purposively to the examination of volunteer motivations. Scale reliability was high and the seven-item scale demonstrated a high degree of inter-item consistency. Certainly, the results of this study would indicate a justification for further development of the VMS instrument. Factor analysis also provided some encouraging insights. Over 62% of the variance was explained by seven factors which were found to be related to the seven dimensions extracted during reliability analysis.

On the whole, there is a paucity of research relevant to motivations of volunteers. Volunteerism has traditionally been the foundation of many non-profit and municipal recreation agencies. However, motivations for volunteering are changing. No longer is altruism a primary motivating factor. Self-serving interests and elements of ccoproduction are increasingly becoming more relevant in discussion of volunteer needs. Despite the changing patterns of volunteerism, most studies of volunteer motivation continue to focus on the impact of individual satisfaction and reward evaluations. This study has attempted to lay the foundations of a line of inquiry related to more intrusive motivations.
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Table 1: Items Included in Power Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Item-total correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others give me a sense of power</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it gives me an opportunity to be a leader</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.7182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became a volunteer so that people would respect me</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.7241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I want to have influence over others</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.7354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I like responsibility</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.7168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became a volunteer because I consider myself a leader in the community</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.7407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Items Included in Achievement Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Item-total correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others give me a sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.8064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I want to achieve something</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.7870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I like to receive recognition</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.7876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I can help others achieve their goals</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.7859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it empowers me to be meaningful</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.7862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because completing my goals are important to me</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.7916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I feel affiliated with worthy causes</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.7966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because achieving shared goals are important to me</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.7964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I want to feel some sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.7654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because I want my family and friends to be proud of me</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.7643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Items Included in Neto et al. Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Alpha of factor I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others given my life</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it is compulsory for me to do so</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it is a good opportunity for me</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the program is unique</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the program is worthwhile</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it brings excitement to my life</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not volunteer because I do not like it</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not volunteer because I already have enough time</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Items Included in Activity Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Alpha of factor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like volunteering as a way to be physically active</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering as a way to be physically active</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it helps me to relax</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a positive way to maintain my health</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a positive way to improve my stamina</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Items Included in Affiliation Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Alpha of factor III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a way to meet new people</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a way to make new friends</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a way to new people</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a way to make new friends</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a way to maintain my health</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy volunteering because it is a way to improve my stamina</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Items Included in Altruism Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Item-total correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others is an important part of my life</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I search out opportunities to help other people</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping those less fortunate is a worthwhile way to spend my time</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my efforts can make a difference in other people’s lives</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends would describe me as helpful</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to say no when someone asks for my help</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends would describe me as unselfish</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t expect to be rewarded for helping other people</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others is a meaningful activity</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help others less fortunate than myself</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Items Included in Meanings and Satisfaction Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Item-total correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy helping other people</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel important when I help other people</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel good about myself</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer because I makes me feel important</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it gives meaning to my life</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it gives me a sense of purpose</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a volunteer because it is a productive use of my leisure time</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Results of Principal Components Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor #</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>26.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>37.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>46.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>51.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>55.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>58.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>62.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>64.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>67.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>69.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>72.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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