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Statement of Problem: Volunteers are a valuable asset for non-profit organizations and represent a valuable cost savings to operational expenses. Because of the cost savings volunteers add to NPO's overhead, it is important for non-profit management teams to understand the relationship between embeddedness and volunteers so that they can increase retention, loyalty, and social return on investment.

Sources of Data: Several journal articles on NPO's, Volunteers, and Embeddedness were used in the creation of this project. In addition, an empirical study with one of the West Coast chapters of the Make-a-Wish organization was conducted.

Conclusions Reached: Volunteers donate their time and are embedded to an organization for a variety of reasons. For the Make-a-Wish organization, it would appear that their volunteers are strongly linked through "client contact". However, more research in the area of embeddedness is necessary to fully understand the links between organization, community, and sacrifice for volunteers.

Jessica Bagger, Ph. D., Committee Chair

Date
PREFACE

Right after completing my bachelor’s, I went to work for a high stakes, faced-paced Fortune 500 company and after several years began to ask myself, “What am I doing here? If this company fell off the face of the earth tomorrow, would the world feel its loss?” After a decade and a half, I did eventually leave because I could no longer justify the worth of the time and energy I was putting in to the job. I realized that for me personally, I needed to use my time and talents for an organization or a cause that had the ability to impact humanity. Over the past couple of years, I discovered, I’m not the only one.

More and more studies are revealing that the X and Y generations are being drawn to volunteer work. They are also being drawn to companies that encourage, even support, employees’ involvement in the social sector.

Two years ago, I chose to return to school and enroll in a masters program because I felt that with the additional academic acumen and my prior business experience, I would be better equipped to aid the non-profit sector.

So what is a non-profit? I believe Peter Drucker has penned the preeminent portrayal of the non-profit – “The ‘not-for-profit’ institution neither supplies goods or services nor controls. Its ‘product’ is neither a pair of shoes nor an effective regulation. Its product is a changed human being.”
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this paper is to explore embeddedness factors in the non-profit sector. Specifically, I am interested in discovering what factors embed volunteers into the organizations they choose to donate their time and skills.

It has been stated that “Of the 61.2 million people who volunteered in 2006, 21.7 million – more than one-third – did not donate any time to a charitable cause the following year. Because these volunteers gave about 1.9 billion hours in 2006, and the value of their donated time was about $20 per hour – that calculates to about $38 billion in lost volunteer time in one year.”¹ Since volunteers are one of the primary assets in most non-profit organizations (NPO) and their value, as noted above, is substantial, it is both essential and advantageous for NPO’s to learn as much as they can about how to attract, sustain, and embed quality volunteers. It is my feeling that when these three areas are met, NPO’s will have a greater impact in their community, be consistently adding social value, and achieve a positive social return on investment (SROI).

A large amount of research has already been conducted to determine factors that draw people to volunteer and recently there has been a great deal of literature on what NPO’s can do to keep volunteers, however no research has yet been attempted to look at factors that embed volunteers to NPO’s. I am interested in looking at factors that embed volunteers so deeply that

they forgo other volunteer opportunities. Further, I am interested in factors that cause a volunteer to choose a primary NPO; a NPO that receives the bulk of their time and energy, and is the recipient of additional volunteers and resources because of that original embedded volunteer. Finally, with this information, I would like to build a volunteer embeddedness construct for NPO’s that could one day provide data to build a tool to measure “impact” or social value.

As of today, there does not exist a standard measurement tool for social value and there is increasing pressure on NPO’s to be able to systematically integrate cost into measuring social impact. It is believed that

“any high-fidelity approach the social sector develops to integrate costs into measuring social value will be limited by and directly affected by the sector’s ability to produce high quality data. Ultimately, the sector’s largest efforts will not be about choosing the right model or method. Rather, the most significant effort will involve getting the right data to make whichever model or methodology a foundation or nonprofit organization chooses useful. Without high quality data, any practitioner’s results will be based on one assumption after another or – layers and layers of garbage. If the social sector is interested in creating more precise, meaningful approaches to measuring and/or estimating social value, foundations will need to invest in increasing the quality of the social and cost data infrastructure across the various program areas represented in the social sector.”

Thus, quantitative data on embeddedness would not only be useful to NPO’s in their

efforts to understand, retain and embed volunteers but also as an aid in constructing a social value measurement tool.

This brings us back to the volunteer embeddedness construct. In order to begin the process of construction, it is important to first understand what draws individuals to volunteer, as well as what builds satisfaction and retention. Second, we will look at the current construct for embeddedness in the for-profit sector since a construct has not been created for NPO’s. We will then look at the survey data I collected from a large, national NPO and finally, with the aid of all the data, we will build a preliminary construct for the non-profit sector. Let’s begin with the reasons volunteers donate their time.
Chapter 2  
BACKGROUND OF STUDY  
Review of the Research

“Most people volunteer with NPO’s for altruistic reasons – because someone asked them to help (and they identify with the mission of the organization), as a way to reciprocate for help they have received in the past, or because their friends or family are volunteering or have benefited from previous volunteer services. (Others) volunteer for instrumental reasons such as gaining general work experience or specific skills.”\(^3\) But even if the altruistic or instrumental needs are met, a number of other factors must be present in order for volunteers to continue to donate their time. Seven themes are detailed in Wisner, Stringfellow, Youngdahl, and Parker’s (2005) article “The service volunteer – loyalty chain”.

Since volunteers decide when and how long they will volunteer for and typically revolves around other work/life responsibilities, “schedule flexibility” is cited as a key factor in attracting and enabling volunteers. Second, “orientation and training” provide volunteers with the “confidence and skills to understand the fit of their work in accomplishing the goals of the not-

“Client contact” is believed to positively affect volunteer satisfaction because of the altruistic nature of most volunteers. “Empowerment” is another element that draws volunteers to an organization and generally increases satisfaction. Like employees, volunteers want to be able to offer input about how to improve a process or make decisions about how to best do their job. In addition to the altruistic needs volunteers seek to satisfy, there are often social needs that volunteers are trying to meet. “Social interaction” was the fourth area that Wisner, Stringfellow, Youngdahl, and Parker discuss and includes both formal and informal interaction between volunteers and staff. Volunteers stated that they did not need parties or specific social gatherings but social interaction through “buddy assignments” or teams often provided just the right amount of social interaction to keep volunteers satisfied. “Reflection” is the sixth facet and is described as “a way to help volunteers make sense of their experiences – both positive and negative – as they help to accomplish the organization’s mission.” Reflection helps volunteers, especially service volunteers that work with organizations involved in family crisis, hospice, and homelessness to recalibrate and come back to the purpose of the organization even when they feel their efforts are not making a difference. Finally, “Rewards and recognition” is the area of acknowledgement that volunteers typically relate to a positive and supportive work environment. Volunteers often do not put as much value on a “Volunteer Appreciation Party” at the end of the year as they do on

---

4 Wisner, Stringfellow, Youngdahl, and Parker, 147.
5 Wisner, Stringfellow, Youngdahl, and Parker, 148.
regular and sincere words of appreciation regarding their efforts and commitment to the organization.

However, even with this knowledge, current research tells us that many volunteers are choosing not to continue their volunteer service. Why?

Based on a 2003 study by the Corporation of National and Community Service (CNCS), the Urban Institute, and the UPS Foundation, five reasons are stated by volunteers for not returning: The first is the belief that an organization failed to match volunteers’ skills with assignments. Second is the belief that an organization failed to recognize volunteers’ contributions. Third is the perception that an organization did not measure the value of volunteers. Fourth is the perception that an organization failed to effectively train and invest in volunteers and staff. And fifth, is the perception that an organization failed to provide strong leadership.

We now understand why volunteers typically donate their time and common factors that are likely to cause volunteers to leave an organization. Now let’s take a look at the existing embeddedness data.

Job embeddedness has been described by Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez (2001) as a mixture of three things: fit, links and sacrifice. “Fit is the extent to which a person’s job meshes with, or complements, other areas of his or her life. Links refer to the extent of an individual’s ties with other people and activities at work. Sacrifice refers to the ease with which
these link can be broken (i.e. what people would have to give up if they left their current positions).”

Because we are interested in volunteers and their embeddedness within an organization, I also considered the term occupational embeddedness as outlined by Feldman and Thomas in their paper “Careers: Mobility, Embeddedness, and Success.” Feldman and Thomas adhere to the same embeddedness construct as originally created by Mitchell et al (2001): fit, links and sacrifice, but redefine the definitions as follows, “Fit refers to the extent to which people’s occupations are similar to (or complement) other aspects of their lives. Links refer to the extent to which individuals have ties to other people and activities in the occupation. Sacrifice is the ease with which links can be broken – what people would have to give up if they changed occupations.”

For our study, we will drill down on these even further to encompass volunteers in the non-profit world.

In order to build an embeddedness construct for volunteers, it is also important to take into account current research on volunteerism in areas related to or associated with embeddedness. A study by Vianen, Nijstad, and Voskuijl (2008) titled “A Person-Environment Fit Approach to Volunteerism: Volunteer Personality Fit and Culture Fit as Predictors of Affective Outcomes,” defines three types of commitment to volunteer organizations: “Affective commitment refers to the emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the

---

7 Feldman and Ng, 353.
organization. *Normative* commitment reflects a feeling of responsibility to stay with the organization. *Continuance* commitment is a calculative form of commitment in that leaving the organization is associated with possible loss.8 This study found that volunteers’ affective commitment and satisfaction is positively related to the level of personality fit.9 Personality fit concerns attributes “that are less easily detectable than surface-level characteristics, such as age and gender. Information about deep-level personality fit is only learned through extended, individualized interaction.”10 It would make sense then than that the research found that personality fit was significantly associated with volunteer tenure and that the longer a volunteer stayed with an organization, the higher the personality fit. However, this relationship did not show to directly affect a volunteers’ decision to stay or leave the organization. So, length of time with an organization adds to personality fit to that organization. As we consider this thought for our research, in order to glean the most benefits of personality-fit, it will be important to study volunteers that have a number of years invested with a single NPO.

In his article “The Strength of Weak Ties,” Mark Granovetter (1973) wrote that many “weak ties” can build a micro-macro bridge - linking levels, societal groups, possibly even

---

9 Personality fit was established by comparing individual’s own personality ratings with the personality of the prototypical volunteer.
10 Vianen, 162.
organizations together. He defines it as “the strength of a tie is a combination of the amount of
time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy, and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie.
Each of these is somewhat independent of the other, though the set is obviously highly
intracorrelated.” We can see from each of these studies that people are connected to social
groups or organizations thru time, emotional intensities, and reciprocal behaviors. Therefore, as
we seek to determine embeddedness factors in volunteers, again, it is important to find an
organization that has a large number of volunteers with several years vested into its program. It
will also be important to build questions into the survey that will help us indentify and measure
“emotional intensity” and “intimacy”.

Chapter 3

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

For the empirical data, I approached the Make-a-Wish Foundation (MAW) and asked if they would be interested in allowing me to study embeddedness factors in their volunteers. MAW is a non-profit organization that grants wishes to children with life-threatening illnesses. They are currently the largest wish granting organization in the United States with thirty-six chapter offices, 25,942 volunteers, 801 full time employees, and 113 part time employees. To date, they have granted over 183,000 wishes. Their main objective is exactly the same today as it was twenty-nine years ago when the first wish was granted, “To give children with life-threatening medical conditions the chance to be anyone or anything, to go anywhere, to have anything, to meet anyone – and to rekindle their belief in themselves and the promise of their future.”12 The organization started with a twenty-dollar donation in 1980 and annual revenue in 2008 surpassed $200 million for the second consecutive year. What is even more impressive is that seventy-six percent of each dollar raised goes directly towards the cost of wishes.

Since there is virtually no empirical data on the embeddedness factors of volunteers in NPO’s, we decided it would be best to start with a pilot study and eventually use that data to build a questionnaire for the national study. It was our hope that the pilot study would at least direct us

---

in at least five areas. Those areas included: confirming reasons individuals volunteer, determining the level and longevity of volunteers within the Make-a-Wish organization, establishing some broad “embeddedness” categories specific to volunteers with NPO’s from open-ended questions, identifying fits, links, or sacrifices that had not previously been considered or studied, and determining how volunteers have been impacted by MAW thru the volunteer experience.

The pilot study was administered via an online survey and to volunteers in just one of the thirty-six chapter offices. Respondents were guaranteed confidentiality. Sample size was approximately n=1000, usable survey respondents were n=100. All questions, other than demographic information, consisted of open-ended questions. Respondents had the opportunity to share as much or as little as they choose. The questions used in the pilot study are listed in Appendix A.

By good fortune, MAW turned out to be the perfect NPO to study because they seem to have no problem attracting or sustaining volunteers (59% of respondents had been volunteering with MAW for over three years). It also appears from the pilot that a significant percentage of respondents are already strongly embedded in the organization based on the number and intensity of responses to the open-ended questions.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Unlike prior studies on volunteerism that have generally found volunteers to be unsatisfied or disconnected to the NPO they are working with, our study revealed that a large percentage of MAW volunteers are satisfied, experienced, active and extremely loyal. In fact 96% of volunteers stated they plan to continue volunteering with MAW. When asked how long they expected to continue their volunteer service with MAW, 63% of respondents wrote in the words “Forever”, “Until they ask me to stop”, “As long as I am physically able to”, and “As long as MAW needs my help”. The study revealed that 41% of the respondents had been volunteers with MAW for 0 - 3 years, 30% from 3 – 6 years, and 29% for 6+ years (Appendix B). Additionally, 72% of respondents stated they had prior volunteer experience. 75% stated that MAW was their primary volunteer organization and 68% stated they had participated in some volunteer activity within the past six months.

Since seventy-two percent of the volunteers stated they had prior volunteer experience, this tells us that MAW is working with volunteers that have familiarity in at least one if not several other NPO’s. Therefore, they are knowledgeable about what a volunteer’s responsibilities and commitments typically are. This also means that they probably have a baseline idea on organizational structure and how different NPO’s treat their staff – paid and unpaid. And, this certainly means that these volunteers recognize they have options: options to continue with MAW or donate their time elsewhere. This is something I definitely want to look at more closely in the
national study. I would like to be able to determine if there is a correlation between a volunteer’s embeddedness to MAW and prior volunteer experience. Another way of looking at this might be by studying the relationship between volunteers that have stated MAW as their primary NPO (which is 75%) and the number of those volunteers that have volunteered with other NPO’s. These questions could give us an indication of which volunteers purposefully chose MAW given the variety of other options they have already been exposed to – and even more specifically, insight into why these volunteers have now chosen MAW as their primary NPO.

Volunteers shared a variety of reasons for volunteering from “desire to provide service to community or ‘desire to give back’” to “encouraged by a friend, relative, coworker, or MAW volunteer or employee”. What is interesting to note is that only 4% of respondents were either a Wish child or Wish family and only another 4% had a close friend or relative that had been Wish recipients, which leaves 92% of the volunteers that, in theory, had no connection to MAW through a direct Wish experience.

While this seems remarkable, there might be a plausible explanation for these results: A significant number of these volunteers could have developed a personal connection, or tie, to MAW by viewing another’s Wish experience either through local media coverage, national advertising, or ESPN (which frequently highlights wishes that are related to sports figures). This area warrants further exploration in the national study because one of the first steps in determining embeddedness factors is learning more about what originally triggered people’s response enough to cause them to sign up as volunteers for the organization. It would seem that for some, simply “viewing” (as opposed to experiencing first hand) a wish, triggers enough
empathy to get people involved in the mission. Eventually, direct connection to a wish experience through volunteer service, seems to embed individuals to the organization. One of the areas I would like to further explore in the national study is whether there is a direct correlation between wish grantors and donors. In other words, are wish grantor volunteers more likely to also be donors? It might be that individuals that have first-hand experience with a wish child and family are more deeply embedded to the mission of MAW and therefore more likely to also support the organization financially. From the pilot, it appears that MAW is able to attract volunteers by filling their altruistic and/or improvement needs. Volunteers seem to be extremely satisfied with MAW and their volunteer experience, so MAW is also successful at retaining them. Furthermore, it appears that they have been able to take it one step further by tightly embedding them.

The pilot study revealed that 48% of the respondents are Wish Granters and 52% are classified as “other”, meaning they are involved in doing all other volunteer work except Wish Granting (i.e. office support, fundraising, event coordination, and Board positions). This is another area we hope to explore in the national study for two reasons, first, to determine if this is in fact the national trend or isolated to this specific chapter (The corporate office was surprised by these numbers because their national numbers show 15,709 Wish Granters and 9,173 classified as “other”). I believe that one of the strongest links to volunteer embeddedness with MAW is “link to organization” through “contact to client” or direct involvement with a wish experience and/or family. If volunteers are demonstrating a strong organizational embedded relationship to MAW
and are not Wish Grantors, then it is important to identify what other factors are creating embeddedness.

One of the questions in the pilot, asked volunteers to comment on areas that they were not satisfied with or areas MAW could improve on; only a couple of respondents mentioned they no longer felt their volunteer contributions were appreciated by the chapter office. None of the respondents listed any of the other four reasons stated in the 2003 study by CNCS: organization failed to match skills with assignments, feeling that organization did not measure the value of volunteers, organization failed to train and invest in volunteers and staff, and organization failed to provide strong leadership. Therefore, the majority of volunteers appear to be very satisfied.

With the above data, I have begun the process of building a preliminary volunteer construct: Fit Organization will refer to the extent to which a volunteer’s altruistic or instrumental needs are satisfied. It will reflect the tie to the NPO’s mission both philosophically and emotionally. It will also reflect volunteers’ satisfaction with the management and operations of the organization. Fit Community will reflect the comfort level volunteers have about traveling to and from the organizations offices and how safe they feel working there. We included this one because nonprofits are often not located in desirable neighbors and that may or may not affect volunteer’s willingness to spend time there. Links Organization will refer to the extent to which volunteers have ties to people and activities in the organization. Ties in this area are built through client contact, reflection opportunities and/or awareness, personality fit, emotional intensity to mission and volunteer work, intimacy, amount of time a volunteer spends volunteering, rewards and recognition, schedule flexibility, and social interaction. Links Community will be the
influence that family and friends have on an individual’s decision to volunteer. Often we see individuals volunteer because their parents modeled a life of service to community. Other times, we see parents volunteer to model the behavior of service to their school-age children. The sacrifice section will be loosely defined as the ease at which links can be broken – what volunteers give up by not volunteering. This is the area of volunteer embeddedness that currently has no available research or theories, so we will establish some basic questions for the national study and hope that the data from that study will help solidify this area of the construct. Again, this construct is by no means complete at this point - it is just the building block for the national study. Appendix C displays the preliminary Volunteer Embeddedness Construct and Appendix D displays the same Construct with a question associated with three embeddedness categories and several respondents’ responses for each question.

I believe that for MAW, direct client interaction is an area of service that powerfully embeds volunteers. Through the wish experience, volunteers become directly aware that their contributions create a once in a lifetime wish experience for a child. Responses from volunteers such as, “It’s an awesome experience to provide the opportunity for a child to briefly step out of his/her world and into a fairy tale that you helped create,” tell us how rewarding this experience is. Another comment was, “I’m making a difference! Think about it, how many times in your life can you say that? I get to say that every time I deliver a wish to a child - that, I helped to create one of the most memorable moments in a child’s life. I have a part in sharing the power of a wish!” It is quite clear from these comments that volunteers that work directly with wish children visibly see the effects of their efforts and strongly feel that they are positively affecting the world
around them through the experience the wish child is able to enjoy. I believe because of that, they are emotionally linked to the cause and often to the wish children as well.

MAW has over 25,000 volunteers nationwide and thankfully not 30,000 children in need of wishes each year, so what embeds volunteers that are not wish grantors? I believe the pilot study suggests that volunteers that are not Wish Grantors are also strongly embedded based on their comments and level of commitment to the organization but this is area that was not deeply explored in the pilot study. I would like to delve into this area with greater intensity in the national study.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

The findings in the pilot study have solidified for us that MAW is the perfect organization to study for non-profit embeddedness. MAW has already created an organizational system that cultivates volunteer satisfaction and retention so we know we are surveying volunteers that are passionate and committed to what they do. This allows us to take the next step, which is to isolate areas that create strong organizational embeddedness.

I will continue to explore factors of embeddedness in the national study this fall. It will invite all 25,000 plus volunteers across all fifty states and responses should give us an accurate view of the width and breadth of the entire organization. Questions will be delivered via an online survey with most questions using a typical five-scale Likert item of:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

The broad areas I plan to hone in on include drilling down further on the non-profit embeddedness construct. I would like to solidy a basic construct for NPO’s based on empirical research. I would also like to determine which embeddedness links are most likely to foster a strong impact experience or connection. Also, I would like to explore how many links are
necessary to motivate someone to first volunteer. Finally, I would like to look into what links embed “non-wish granting” volunteers.

Recent studies tell us that young people are looking to make a difference in the world around them. Likewise, baby-boomers are also looking for worthwhile activities to do in their golden years and many are turning to volunteer work. In fact, “older American volunteers will increase 50 percent by 2020. Boomers are also healthier and more educated.”13 It’s clear that a new wave of volunteer talent is upon us and that non-profit sector has a gold carrot in front of them; will they reach for it or will they let it pass by?

Understanding what embeds volunteers to an NPO is critical to attracting and securing the new wave of volunteer talent on the horizon. It is also critical to achieving a positive ROI in relationship to the time and resources dedicated to training volunteers. Additionally, there is increasing pressure on NPO’s to quantifiably demonstrate positive SROI to philanthropists in order to acquire funding; embeddedness and impact data will help NPO’s tell their stories in measureable ways.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

One of the major limitations of this study was that there is virtually no existing data on embeddedness factors in volunteers. Because of that, open-ended questions were chosen in order to throw out a broad net with the hopes of catching as many cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitudes of MAW volunteers as possible. About half of the questions on the pilot study probably will not be listed in the national study because they really didn’t turn out to offer additional or useful information on embeddedness. However, we probably need to add roughly fifteen new questions to the national study in order to truly encompass the embeddedness factors elucidated in the pilot study.

Another minor, but necessary limitation as stated above were the open-ended questions. Some of the questions generated such a vast variety of answers that it was nearly impossible to categorize them without compromising the answers themselves. Also, in hindsight, several of the questions, especially the demographic and time questions could have been set up in categories which would have made the tabulating process easier.

Additionally, because the pilot was conducted out of a single chapter in a specific geographical location, some of the data might be skewed either because of geography or because of the management style of that single chapter.

Finally, in hindsight, the pilot survey probably did not have enough questions. At the time, it was difficult to determine exactly how to phrase what we were looking for without leading respondents too much. We also did not know anything about MAW volunteers and
neither did MAW’s corporate offices because they had never nationally surveyed their volunteers.

If I were to do it over again, I would have doubled the questions on the pilot study.
APPENDIX A: Pilot Study Questions

1. Why do you currently volunteer for MAW?
2. Why did you originally decide to volunteer for MAW?
3. What kind of volunteer work do you do for MAW?
   a. With this chapter?
4. How long have you been a volunteer with MAW?
5. Do you do volunteer work with other non-profits? Which ones?
6. If yes, to answer 4, is your volunteer work at MAW your primary volunteer service (you spend the most volunteer hours with MAW or with another non-profit)?
7. When was the last time you volunteered at MAW?
8. Is there anything you hope to get from your MAW volunteer experience?
9. In terms of your experience as a volunteer, what do you believe MAW does really well?
   a. What can they improve on?
10. What would make your volunteer experience more enjoyable?
11. Do you believe that your volunteer work is critical to the ongoing mission of MAW?
12. Do you feel supported and/or appreciated by MAW in your volunteer efforts?
   a. Do you feel supported by family and friends in your volunteer efforts?
13. Are you a working or retired professional (lawyer, accountant, business professional, trained in a specialized skill)?
   a. Are you currently using those skills in your volunteer activities with MAW?
14. Do you plan to continue to volunteer with MAW?
   a. If not, why?
15. Gender?
16. Age?
17. Race?
18. Vocation?
19. Would you be willing to speak with us directly if we have additional questions?
   a. If yes, add name and email address or phone number.
APPENDIX B: Years of Volunteer Service Pie Chart

Years of Volunteer Service

- 0-3 years: 41%
- 3-6 years: 30%
- 6+ years: 29%
## APPENDIX C: NPO Embeddedness Construct

| Organizational Embeddedness | Fit Organization | Extent to which a volunteer’s altruistic or instrumental needs are satisfied.  
|                            |                  | • Connection to mission both philosophically and emotionally  
|                            |                  | • Satisfaction with how the organization is run  
|                            | Fit Community | Is this an area the volunteer feels comfortable and safe traveling to and from and working in?  
|                            | Links Organization | Extent to which volunteers have ties to people and activities in the organizations.  
|                            |                  | • Client contact  
|                            |                  | • Reflection opportunities  
|                            |                  | • Personality fit  
|                            |                  | • Emotional intensity  
|                            |                  | • Intimacy  
|                            |                  | • Amount of time spent volunteering  
|                            |                  | • Rewards and recognition  
|                            |                  | • Schedule flexibility  
|                            |                  | • Social interaction  
|                            | Links Community | The influence family and friends have on an individual’s decision to volunteer.  
|                            | Sacrifice Organization | Ease at which links can be broken and what volunteers give up by not continuing to volunteer.  
|                            |                  | • Feelings about letting organization or clients down  
|                            |                  | • Altruistic needs may no longer be met  
|                            |                  | • Loss of social outlet  

## APPENDIX D: Survey Answers Aligned with Embeddedness Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embeddedness Categories</th>
<th>Questions and Answers from Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Fit Organization**    | Question: In terms of your experience as a volunteer, what do you believe MAW does really well?  
|                         | - “From what I’ve seen, the MAW staff works hard to ensure a child’s wish is granted. They are an enthusiastic group that truly cares about the work they do.”  
|                         | - “I believe they truly value and appreciate the children and the children’s rights.”  
|                         | - “They provide phenomenal volunteer training and support. Excellent communication and staff availability.” |
| **Links Organization**  | Question: Is there anything you hope to get from your volunteer experience?  
|                         | - “A general good feeling and a part of something bigger than myself.”  
|                         | - “It makes me keep my priorities in order.”  
|                         | - “I know I will gain an even greater appreciation for good health and life in general.”  
|                         | - “To slow down and enjoy your family and friends and be thankful for what you have, your health and family.”  
|                         | - “The smile on the face of a tragic situation is a great reward.”  
|                         | - “I just want to feel like I’m contributing and making a difference in our community.”  
|                         | - “The satisfaction of a hard day’s work for someone other than myself.” |
| **Sacrifice Organization** | Question: Do you believe that your volunteer work is critical to the ongoing mission of MAW?  
|                         | - “Absolutely. Without the volunteers, many wishes would not be granted and the funding would be stretched if only paid employees were involved in making wishes come true.” |
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