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ABSTRACT

The two research questions presented in this study are: (1) What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges? and (2) How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges?

This constructivist grounded theory study (Charmaz, 2006) uses the data coding technique proposed by Corbin and Strauss (2008). Themes in the data are uncovered through the coding process, which includes open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The triangulated data for this study derives from two types of sources: extant texts and key informant interview transcripts from the 39 key informant interviews conducted for this study. The criterion-based purposive sample (Patton, 2002) for this study includes 39 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 that participated in key informant interviews through elected or appointed officials. The Cities of Service coalition is made up of over 100 cities that have subscribed to a Declaration of Service resolving and committing to engage citizens in strategies to address local challenges (Cities of Service, 2010). The Cities of Service initiative specifically promotes the use of volunteer service in addressing local challenges.

This study makes a theoretical contribution to the scholarship on volunteering by proposing a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand. The findings of this study suggest that the motivational bases for local governments to engage volunteers in
strategies to address local challenges are economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-based motivation. Additionally, certain feasibility considerations bear on volunteer service demand by local governments. Those feasibility considerations relate to the liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability of impact, and resources. Using data from city organizational charts and 2010 U.S. Census data, the researcher explored whether differences existed as to motivational bases for volunteer service demand relative to city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. No statistically significant differences existed with respect to city size or mayoral political affiliation. The data for this study suggest that cities organized according to the council-manager form of government are less likely to report aspirational motivations for volunteer service demand than cities organized according to the strong mayor-council or weak mayor-council form of government ($\chi^2=14.36; df=2; p\text{-value}=0.007$). Additionally, as to need-driven motivations, cities organized according to the council-manager form of government were less likely to be motivated to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges based on citizen need than cities with the strong mayor-council or weak mayor-council forms of government ($\chi^2=6.59; df=2; p\text{-value}=0.036$).

According to the findings in this study relative to the second research question, cities assess the impact of service in a variety of ways. Specifically, cities report assessing the impact of volunteer service initiatives in three ways: (1) by creating metrics; (2) by measuring outcomes; and (3) by telling qualitative stories. Notably, two cities report that
they applying a mix of methods to assessing the impact of volunteer service. The grounded theory model for volunteer service demand and the coded data presented in this study were used to create a generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address pressing local issues.

Additional findings were made on the data. In particular, a typology for citizen service for cities grounded in the data for this study is presented as an additional finding. The typology identifies four ways citizens serve cities through volunteerism: (1) by serving as ambassadors; (2) by giving money; (3) by supporting city function; and (4) by delivering services. Differences between cities with respect to citywide volunteer coordination based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government were also explored. A statistically significant difference was observed between small and large cities with respect to the existence of citywide volunteer coordination ($\chi^2=5.68; df=1; p\ value=0.007$). No statistically significant relationships between mayoral political affiliation or form of government and citywide volunteer coordination were found in this study. Finally, non-thematic observations on the data are presented. These non-thematic observations are comprised of data that did not emerge as a core category of data with respect to the research questions.

In sum, cities drive demand for volunteer service, and that demand can be explained through certain motivational bases—economic, aspirational, and need-based—together with various feasibility considerations. Citizens meet the demand for volunteer service in a variety of ways, as the typology offered in this study suggests. The impact of this service
demanded by cities and supplied by citizens can be assessed in a multitude of ways. This study shows that, while assessing the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges may be inherently difficult, employing a logic model may be useful to effectively communicate the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Our nation has a longstanding tradition of service. National strategies embodied in federal legislation and initiatives have relied on service to achieve a wide range of policy goals including creation of an engaged citizenry, promoting individual career development, strengthening social capital in communities, and addressing unmet needs in communities (Frumkin & Miller, 2008). By way of example, in the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps as part of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal legislation, service was employed as a strategy to create jobs and provide career training to young men during the Great Depression (Pasquill, 2008). The Peace Corps, created by executive order in 1961 by then-president John F. Kennedy, relies on national service to promote diplomacy goals. In 1964 the Economic Opportunity Act created the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program which, at that time, relied on the voluntary efforts of individuals to aid in the effort to bring down the national poverty rate. The Corporation for National and Community Service (the Corporation) was created in 1993 as part of the National and Community Service Trust Act. The VISTA program has been expanded and is now housed in the Corporation as part of the AmeriCorps program. The AmeriCorps program relies on service as a strategy to “meet[] critical public needs and fill[] gaps created by government and market failures” (Frumkin & Miller, p. 441, 2008).

The Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act (P.L. 111-13) (the Serve America Act) was enacted in 2009. This legislation significantly expands the programs administered by the
Corporation including AmeriCorps, SeniorCorps, and Learn and Serve America. Specifically, the Serve America Act is designed to expand service opportunities in national priority issue areas. A detailed overview of the Serve America Act is given in Appendix A.

Problem Statement

Strategies that rely on volunteer service to address challenges have not been systematically employed at the local level (Sagawa, 2010). Research is needed to better understand the factors that bear on decisions by local governments to employ volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges. As budget constraints force local governments reconsider and reevaluate the ways in which they deliver services and address local challenges, use of volunteer service emerges as an attractive and potentially viable strategy.

Sagawa (2010) suggests that volunteers have been ignored when it comes to governmental efforts to solve society's biggest problems and that this failure to include volunteers in problem-solving approaches hinders the development of effective problem-solving strategies. Sagawa also notes that most research related to volunteerism focuses on volunteer supply and little research has been done to understand how volunteers can be leveraged in problem-solving strategies. In other words, there is a need to understand volunteer demand from the perspective of local governments to develop service opportunities responsive to the needs of the community.
Sagawa (2010) further highlights the problem studied here by asserting that governments need to be more proactive in creating meaningful opportunities for citizens to volunteer in their communities in ways that impact on local problems. Sagawa sees a two-part supply-and-demand solution to this problem. First, citizens with needed skills should be identified. This is the supply side of the equation, and Sagawa believes the supply is available. Hurst (2009) would confirm that the supply is available. Second, and more critically, volunteer demand must be created. This means governments need to find ways to integrate volunteers into problem-solving strategies. Minimal research has been conducted to explain demand for volunteer service. This study aims to more fully develop the scholarship on volunteer demand, particularly with respect to local governments. Additionally, this study aims to understand how cities assess the impact of volunteer service.

**Study Overview**

The primary goals of this qualitative constructivist grounded theory study are two-fold. The first objective of this research is to develop a grounded theory model to describe volunteer service demand. In this study, volunteer service demand is examined from the perspective of cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service. Additionally, this study will explore how those cities perceive the impacts of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.
By way of background, the Cities of Service initiative is a coalition of over 100 cities that have subscribed to a Declaration of Service, thereby resolving and committing to engage citizens in strategies to address local challenges (Cities of Service, 2010). The Cities of Service initiative specifically promotes the use of volunteer service in addressing local challenges. This initiative was borne from the Serve America Act's recognition of service as a strategy to impact on important issues. In essence, the Cities of Service initiative applies the intent of that federal legislation to the local level. An overview of the Cities of Service initiative is provided in Appendix B. Data for this study derives in significant part from interviews with elected and appointed officials in cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition. Additional data derives from extant texts, specifically documents prepared and published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition.

**Research Questions**

The research questions explored in this study are as follows.

**Research Question #1**

What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges?

This purpose of this research question is to illuminate factors that explain volunteer service demand on the part of local governments. Ferris (1988) considers the demand factors that bear on decisions by local governments to rely on volunteer efforts to deliver
services. Using data collected by the International City Management Association (now known as the International City/County Management Association) (ICMA) as part of its 1982 survey relating to service delivery arrangements in cities with populations greater than 25,000 (n=714), Ferris concludes that among the 43.5% of local governments in the sample that delivered some service through volunteers, such service delivery was more likely under certain conditions. Specifically, Ferris found that 65% of those local governments that relied on volunteer efforts operated under the manager form of government. Ferris further found that increasing local tax burdens are predictive of a local government's increasing reliance on volunteers. Volunteering, in Ferris' study includes “self-help”—meaning service delivery whereby individuals are involved in producing services for themselves. The term “self-help”, according to Ferris (1988), includes activities carried out by similarly situated individuals working together in response to a common problem. Such “self-help” activities might include a group of neighbors building a community garden where there is limited availability of fresh foods or a group of neighbors working together to improve housing conditions in the neighborhood. This study is narrower in scope, focusing only on local government reliance on volunteer efforts as a governance strategy. However, the grounded theory approach to this study may elucidate additional indicators of volunteer demand.

Handy and Srinivasan (2005) explore factors that may explain demand for volunteers in publicly subsidized hospital settings from an efficiency perspective. Their work reveals that more than half of the 28 hospital chief executive officers they
interviewed consider the cost of resources (namely, volunteer coordination resources as well as supplies) that must be expended when using volunteers in making decisions to use volunteer labor in their hospitals. Handy and Srinivasan's work is highly relevant to this study. This study, however, seeks to understand volunteer demand from the perspective of local governments. Local governments may be more influenced by equity considerations than efficiency considerations (Warner, 2011).

Research Question #2

How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges?

Much of the existing scholarship on volunteer service, as well as service more generally, relates to inputs and outputs. Little research has been conducted on the impact of service as a strategy to address challenges at the local level. Hotchkiss, Fottler, and Unruh (2009) studied the impact of volunteers in hospital settings. From a cost-benefit perspective the authors found that cost savings resulted to hospitals that rely on volunteers to do things such as interacting with patients and their families, fund-raise, and run gift shops. Additionally, patient satisfaction scores were higher in hospitals that relied on comparatively greater numbers of volunteers. In the study by Hotchkiss et al. (2009), the term impact carried a somewhat different meaning than the term carries in this study. Hotchkiss et al. (2009) define impact as a function of patient satisfaction. In this study, the term impact describes the viability of volunteer service to address local challenges.
Similarly, by exploring this research question, an aim of this study is to identify the impacts of local governments' decisions to rely on volunteer service.

**Study Significance**

Problems that can be defined and framed in the relevant literature merit exploration (Creswell, 2002). Based on a review of the relevant literature, the scholarship on volunteer demand is developing. For that reason, there exists a need to more fully explore volunteer service demand as well as the related impacts of service as a governance strategy.

This study has the potential to inform further development of the Cities of Service initiative. Additionally, this study can help local officials (including mayors, commission members, city managers and/or chief administrative officers) develop problem-solving strategies using volunteers. This research can also help volunteer-using organizations understand the demand for volunteers. Finally, this study can inform ways in which local governments can be motivated to rely on volunteer service as a viable and effective mechanism to address local challenges.

**Theoretical Approach to this Study**

Crotty (1998) urges qualitative researchers to identify four essential aspects of their research at the outset, namely: (a) the epistemological perspective that informs the research, (b) the theoretical perspective underlying the methodology, (c) the methodology
that will be employed in the study, and (d) the methods that will be used to collect and analyze data in the study. This study is approached from a constructivist epistemological perspective, applying an interpretive theoretical lens. The grounded theory methods described by Charmaz (2006) provide a methodological framework for this study. Data are culled from documents and key informant interviews which are content analyzed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Straus, 1967; Charmaz, 2006).

Conclusion

This qualitative grounded theory study asks how volunteers can be both included and impactful in strategies to address local challenges. Data derives from documents prepared by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition (including published High-Impact Service Plans, Cities of Service Leadership Grant applications, and city organizational charts) and structured key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service.

The general research plan proposed by Krippendorff (2004) is adopted in this study. First, the unit of analysis for the study is identified. For this study, the unit of analysis is the city. Then, the sampling plan for the study is identified. The sample for this study is a purposive sample selected according to a criterion sampling strategy (Patton, 2002). Data collection is the third step in the research plan proposed by Krippendorff (2004). Qualitative data for this study is collected from three sources: Those are: (1) High-Impact Service Plans prepared and published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition;
(2) grant applications made by cities that received Cities of Service Leadership Grants; and
(3) key informant interviews with elected and appointed officials in cities belonging to the
Cities of Service coalition. After data are collected, the researcher codes for the
phenomenon of interest. This study employs the coding protocol described by Corbin and
Strauss (2008) and the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss &
Corbin, 1998; Charmaz, 2006). The coding protocol for this study consists of open coding,
followed by axial coding, and concludes with selective coding. Open coding involves
processing the data in small units to reveal embedded concepts and categories. Axial
coding is intended to reveal the major properties of a category of data. Selective coding
involves developing a framework for explaining the data. The constant comparative
method is a component of grounded theory methodology whereby the researcher begins
developing theoretical concepts and categories early in the data collection process and the
researcher continues to refine those concepts and categories as data collection proceeds.
Once the data are summarized, at the selective coding stage, the researcher draws
inferences from the data. Finally, the researcher makes conclusions about the data in
response to the research questions posed. The objectives of this research plan are to (a)
develop a grounded theory model to explain demand for volunteer service by local
governments and (b) demonstrate how local governments perceive the impacts of
volunteerism as a governance strategy.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Grounded theory methodology is defined by its objective: developing theory from data and not describing theory that applies to a set of data. A grounded theory-generated theory should “explain[] the preponderance of behavior in a substantive area” (Glaser, 2004, p. 11). Researchers using grounded theory must be careful not to force “extant theoretical overlays” (p. 12) on data collection or analysis. The role (and timing) of a literature review in a grounded theory study is a source of significant debate. In one of the earliest iterations of the grounded theory method Glaser and Strauss (1967) urged researchers to conduct a literature review after collecting data so as to avoid threats to the researcher's creativity in developing new theoretical propositions. Corbin and Strauss (2008) also suggest that the literature review is best left to the end of the research process because, as they put it, “something new to discover” (p. 36) lies in the data. By consulting the literature after collecting data, the function of the literature review is to validate rather than frame the study. Charmaz (2006), however, sees the role and timing of a literature review in a grounded theory study differently. To Charmaz (2006), a literature review serves to orient the study within related and relevant bodies of existing scholarship. Framing the study in view of the relevant literature may bound the study. What is lost in terms of the boundlessness of the Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Corbin and Strauss (2008) grounded theory methods by conducting a literature review before undertaking a study is ameliorated by the ability of the method to yield increased understanding in a problem area.
where the application of existing theory is underdeveloped. In this way, the grounded theory that results from the study can enhance existing theory.

Lukerhoff and Guillemette (2011) visited the issue of when to conduct a literature review in a grounded theory study and offer seven reasons why a literature review should be done before data collection. First, simply enough, grounded theory researchers should consult the literature to ensure that what they are not doing has already been done. Second, the literature can serve to clarify the researcher's methodological perspective. The third reason the authors advance for an early literature review is to ensure that the researcher is using (and recognizing) language—including jargon—that is commonly used in the area of study. Additionally, researchers need theoretical sensitivity in the area of study. Theoretical sensitivity refers to an ability to explicitly render “the subtleties of the relationships” in data that is collected (Glaser, 1978, p. 72). As a fifth reason for conducting a literature review before collecting data, the authors note that doing so will better enable the researcher to collect relevant data. The literature review will also, according to the authors, provide the researcher with the tools he or she needs to appreciate abstract ideas in the data and relate those abstract ideas to the field. Finally, by conducting a literature review before engaging in data collection, grounded theory researchers can conduct their studies with a view toward “shedding light on the contributions of the [existing] research and the critical challenges it can offer to other theories” (Lukenhoff & Guillemette, 2011, p. 407).
Before beginning data collection, scholarship in volunteering, coproduction, civic engagement, social capital, democratic theory, governance, and public service motivation (PSM) was consulted. The researcher's decision to conduct a literature review before data collection in this study was guided by the rationale set forth by Charmaz (2006) and Lukenhoff and Guillemette (2011). Conducting a literature review at the outset of this study served the researcher's objectives of framing the study within the relevant literature and gaining theoretical sensitivity in the area of study. Because extensive consultation of the literature in the substantive area of the study can, in the view of Glaser (2004), impede a researcher's ability to remain open-minded about the emergence of a core category in the data that is not prominent in existing scholarship, this disclosure is necessary and pertinent.

The balance of this chapter provides a review of the literature consulted before beginning this study, and is presented in two parts. First, the grounded theory approach to qualitative research is discussed. Then, a review of the substantive literature used to frame this study is offered.

**Grounded Theory**

Grounded theory is a social science research methodology that “uses comparison as an analytic tool to generate concepts and hypotheses and to interrelate them through core variables which are both parsimonious and broad in scope” (Mullen and Reynolds, 1994, p. 129). It is said that grounded theory methodology harmonizes positivism and pragmatism (Charmaz, 2006).
Glaser (2004) advises that grounded theory researchers should exhibit theoretical sensitivity. The notion of theoretical sensitivity is comprised of two component parts. First, the researcher must be able to extract non-explicit concepts from data sources and, second, the researcher must be able to relate those concepts to the substantive area under study. In extracting concepts, the researcher is charged with maintaining emotional and analytical distance from the data “while remaining open [and] trusting to preconscious processing and to conceptual emergence” (p. 10). Relating concepts to the substantive area being studied requires the researcher to wholly conceptualize the abstract connections present in the data.

Grounded Theory Origins

*The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was the product of work by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss' study of interactions between hospital patients dealing with terminal illness and the healthcare professionals treating those patients. Grounded theory methodology, first proposed in that seminal work, is a rigorous and orderly inductive approach to developing theory from data. As the methodology of grounded theory matured, three prominent lines have emerged: classic grounded theory (sometimes also called Glaserian grounded theory), Straussian grounded theory, and constructivist grounded theory. Classic and Straussian grounded theory both ascribe to the positivist view that theory is embedded in data and not in the preconceived assumptions of researchers. Charmaz (2006) has advanced constructivist grounded theory methodology.
Somewhat unlike classic or Straussian grounded theory, Charmaz ascribes to the view that researchers should construct theory on the basis of their “past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives, and research practices” (p. 19) and provide an interpretation of what is studied. Constructivist grounded theory is widely practiced and accepted in social science research (Mills, Bonner, & Francis, 2006).

Other less widely accepted grounded theory methodologies have also been advanced. Those other grounded theory methodologies include feminist grounded theory (Wuest, 1995), post-positivist grounded theory (Annells, 1996), critical grounded theory (Kushner & Morrow, 2003), participatory grounded theory (Teram, 2005), and critical realist grounded theory (Oliver, 2012).

Because the various grounded theory methodologies—Glaserian, Straussian, constructivist, and others—have distinct attributes, researchers employing grounded theory should make known the particular perspective adopted (Morse & Richards, 2002).

*Overview of Classic Grounded Theory Methodology*

Classic grounded theory methodology was borne out of Glaser and Strauss' collective position that studies undertaken for the purpose of theory development belong on equal footing with studies undertaken to verify theory. Glaser and Strauss (1967) maintain that relative to theory generation, researchers have not “focused directly on how their theory emerged; as a result, they have not explored how they could have generated more of it more systematically, and with more conceptual generality and scope” (p. 27). Their view
of the logico-deductive approach to research is, in a word, cynical, describing it as little more than an “a priori assumption and a touch of common sense, peppered with a few old theoretical speculations” (p. 29). To that end they maintain that overly focusing on the importance of theory testing impedes generation of robust theory.

Classic grounded theory views theory as a process. It is “an ever-developing entity” and not a “perfect product” (p. 32). The process by which theory unfolds is what Glaser and Strauss call the constant comparative method. The constant comparative method is the method of continually culling the data as it is collected and developing categories of data. In particular, a category is a conceptual element of the grounded theory that results from a grounded theory study. There are four stages to the constant comparative method. Those are:

- Comparing accounts or incidents that relate to the categories to one another. In other words, the researcher should look for similarities and differences in how the categories are described in the data.
- Weaving together categories and properties. As the data are collected the researcher should begin to develop notions about the categories and properties of those categories that may ultimately emerge from the data. These conceptions of categories and properties should be captured in memoranda, through a process called memoing.
• Delimiting the grounded theory. In delimiting the theory the researcher should begin to make abstract connections between categories and properties. What should additionally be achieved in the process of delimiting the theory is parsimony of the variables contained within the grounded theory and expanded scope such that the grounded theory may be applicable to a full spectrum of situations.

• Writing the substantive theory. The final phase of the constant comparative method is writing the grounded theory.

Purposive and theoretical sampling strategies are preferred in classic—as well as Straussian and constructivist—grounded theory studies. Patton (2002) identifies 16 strategies for purposive sampling. Those purposive sampling strategies include: (1) extreme case sampling, which is intended to yield information about atypical manifestations of the phenomenon under study; (2) intensity sampling, wherein the cases selected for study exhibit intense, but not unusual, manifestations of the phenomenon studied; (3) maximum variation sampling, a sampling strategy by which cases are selected on the basis of their dissimilarity to one another; (4) homogenous sampling, which, by contrast to maximum variation sampling, cases are selected on the basis of their similarity to one another; (5) typical case sampling, whereby cases are selected for study on the basis of their normality in the area of study; (6) stratified purposive sampling, which is intended to draw comparisons between particularly identified subgroups of cases; (7) critical case sampling, whereby a case is selected on its ability to be generalized to a larger population; (8) snowball sampling, a sampling technique where one case informs the possible source of
another case for study; (9) criterion sampling, a sampling strategy whereby cases are selected on the basis of meeting one or more criterion established by the researcher; (10) operational construct sampling, whereby one or more cases are selected for study based on the researcher's conclusion that the case will likely yield information about the construct under investigation; (11) confirming cases sampling, which is a sampling strategy intended to confirm initial conclusions made by the researcher or to seek out variation in the phenomenon being studied; (12) opportunistic sampling, whereby the researcher obtains data from the most readily available sources; (13) random purposeful sampling, which is a method of reducing bulk in the data whereby the researcher randomly selects cases from within a previous sample; (14) politically important cases, which is intended to eliminate cases that might be considered politically sensitive; (15) convenience sampling, whereby the researcher simply draws data from the most convenient, but not necessarily credible, sources; and (16) mixed purposeful sampling, which, as its name suggests, is a mix of the aforementioned sampling strategies. Germane to this study is criterion sampling, which is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3. Theoretical sampling, on the other hand, is a sampling procedure whereby the sample is not pre-defined at the outset of the research. Instead, the researcher determines a point of departure for gathering data and at the conclusion of each data collection effort the researcher must allow the data to point the direction to the next data source. This process continues until the point of theoretical saturation, the point in time that the researcher determines there is redundancy in the data and that further data collection will not yield new information about the categories.
Glaser (2004) lumps all non-classic grounded theory methodologies into what he calls “remodeled” grounded theory. The first of those “remodeled” methodologies discussed here is Straussian grounded theory.

**Overview of Straussian Grounded Theory Methodology**

Straussian grounded theory departs from classic grounded theory in a significant way. Classic grounded theorists must essentially abandon any prior knowledge they may have about the focus of their research in order to remain as open as possible to the theory grounded in the data. Strauss and Corbin (1998) acknowledge that, as grounded theorists, whether “we want to admit it or not, we cannot completely divorce ourselves from who we are or what we know. The theories we carry within our heads inform our research in multiple ways, even if we use them quite un-self-consciously” (p. 47). Accordingly, Straussian grounded theory departs from classic grounded theory's requirement that the researcher abandon all prior knowledge of potentially relevant theory. After all, in the view of Strauss and Corbin (1998), the researcher must be guided in the initial data collection. Beyond that, there are many methodological similarities between classic grounded theory and Straussian grounded theory. For example, Straussian grounded theory employs the constant comparative method and purposive and theoretical sampling techniques are favored in Straussian grounded theory studies. As such,Straussian grounded theory is a preferred methodological approach in studies designed to building on existing theory.
Overview of Constructivist Grounded Theory

Constructivist grounded theory, which is adopted in this study, assumes that the researcher's experiences, values, and prior knowledge of relevant theory will surface in the grounded theory that emerges from the study. Particularly, constructivist grounded theory “explicitly assumes that any theoretical renderings offers an interpretive portrayal of the studied world, not an exact picture of it” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 10). In this way, constructivist grounded theory is co-constructed by the researcher and the research participants. Kathy Charmaz is widely regarded for her work in developing constructivist grounded theory methodology (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Accordingly, the methods for this study are informed by Charmaz (2006).

Data collection in a constructivist grounded theory study begins with the researcher. “Grounded theorists' background assumptions and disciplinary perspective alert them to look for certain possibilities” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 16) and points of departure for data collection. Charmaz (2006) places paramount importance on richness rather than quantity of data. In her view, the quality of the study and the robustness of the resulting grounded theory directly relate back to the data.

As a data collection method, interviews garner particular favor with Charmaz (2006). Charmaz also acknowledges that data derived from text is also a valuable and potentially rich source. It is however noted that distinctions should be drawn between extant texts and elicited texts. When extant texts are used as a data source, the researcher
should be mindful of the fact that “[p]eople construct texts for specific purposes and they do so within social, economic, historical, cultural, and situational contexts” (p. 35). For that reason, a critical perspective should be applied to extant texts. Elicited texts, on the other hand, “involve the research participants in writing the data” (p. 36) and, therefore, are developed within the research context.

Constructivist grounded theory employs a coding protocol for data reduction similar to the coding process first proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Charmaz (2006), however, applies different labels to the coding phases. Open coding, the initial process of going line-by-line through the data to reveal categories and properties embedded therein is what Charmaz coins simply line-by-line coding. After line-by-line coding, Charmaz applies a focused coding strategy. “Focused coding requires decisions about which initial codes make the most analytic sense to categorize your data inclusively and completely” (p. 57). Focused coding is conceptually similar to axial coding as described by Corbin and Strauss (2008). Axial coding is the process of illuminating an “axis” of a data category. Corbin and Strauss' axial coding process is described with more particularity than Charmaz' focused coding protocol. Axial or focused coding should make linkages between conditions of the phenomenon being studied, the actions or strategic responses described by study participants, and the consequences of those actions (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Selective, or what Charmaz (2006) calls theoretical, coding is the final step in the coding process. At this point, the researcher should be able to theorize about the data. Charmaz (2006) makes an important contribution to coding by highlighting what are called in vivo
codes. *In vivo* codes are “symbolic markers of participants' speech and meaning” (p. 55). This is bundled or packed language that may have meaning to the speaker, the importance of which may not be immediately apparent to the researcher. When the researcher uncovers *in vivo* codes, the data and the codes applied to the data should be revisited so as to capture the full meaning of that language.

Charmaz (2006) tackles the question: What is theory? This is an important consideration before embarking on a grounded theory study. According to Charmaz, positivists treat theory as a mechanism for defining relationships. Theory, from a positivist perspective, may serve an explanatory function or may make the knowledge base in a discipline more systematic. In this way positivists use theory to create parsimony. Interpretive theory, on the other hand, “calls for the imaginative understanding of the studied phenomenon...[and] assumes emergent, multiple realities; indeterminacy; facts and values as linked; truth as provisional; and social life as processual” (p. 126). From a constructivist perspective, theory arises from a shared relationship between the researcher and the participant, both being influenced by their experiences, beliefs and values. Objectivist theories, in contrast to constructivist theories, are premised on the belief that data are real and a real view of a studied phenomenon can be gained from it. Regardless of the theoretical perspective, Charmaz claims that theories are rhetorical in that they operate to “present arguments about the world and relationships within it, despite sometimes being cleansed of context and reduced to seemingly neutral statements” (p. 128).
Table 1 provides a summary of the grounded theory literature discussed in this first section of the literature review chapter.

Table 1  
Summary of Grounded Theory Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classic grounded theory</td>
<td>Classic grounded theory is conducted with an open mind and before a literature review; designed to yield theory embedded in data; traditionally used in qualitative studies but can handle a wide range of qualitative and quantitative data</td>
<td>Glaser &amp; Strauss, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straussian grounded theory</td>
<td>Straussian grounded theory can be carried out without abandoning prior knowledge of context and/or theory; designed to reveal theory embedded in data; traditionally used in qualitative studies but suitable for use in quantitative studies</td>
<td>Strauss &amp; Corbin, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corbin &amp; Strauss, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist grounded theory</td>
<td>Constructivist grounded theory is designed to uncover theory in interactions, perspectives, and research practices; best suited for qualitative studies</td>
<td>Charmaz, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of the next section of this literature review is devoted to the substantive areas of volunteering, coproduction, civic engagement, social capital, democratic theory, governance, and public service motivation.
Substantive Literature

A review of the literature germane to the problem space follows. Specifically, the substantive literature that bears consideration relative to the research questions presented in this study includes:

- volunteering;
- coproduction;
- civic engagement;
- social capital;
- democratic theory;
- governance; and
- public service motivation (PSM).

Literature was selected for review on the basis of presumed relevance to the research questions presented in this study. In this constructivist grounded theory study presumed relevance is based on the researcher's experiences, values, and prior knowledge of theory (Charmaz, 2006). The research questions seek to understand the factors that motivate cities to incorporate volunteer service into strategies to address local challenges and how the impact of those strategies is assessed. In other words, this study seeks to uncover the factors that drive volunteer demand from local governments. Volunteer demand cannot be studied without delving into the volunteering literature. Much of the literature on volunteerism studies the phenomenon from the individual unit of analysis (i.e., what factors
motivate individuals to volunteer, who volunteers, what benefits flow to volunteers as a resulting of their volunteering experience). Increased social capital and effective citizen engagement are cited as benefits flowing from volunteering (Frumpkin & Miller, 2008; Morse, 2006). Accordingly, social capital may emerge as a factor motivating cities to engage volunteers in problem-solving strategies. Similarly, because coproduction is also hailed as an effective engagement strategy as well as a strategy for service delivery during periods of budget constraints, coproduction may surface as a factor motivating cities to engage volunteers in service delivery (Morse, 2006; Brudney & England, 1983).

Democratic theory underpins social capital and civic engagement theories and thus is an important perspective to consider before undertaking this study (Denhart and Denhart, 2003). Volunteer-using initiatives often rely on effective collaboration between local governments, citizens, non-profit organizations, faith-based organizations, and even private businesses. Governance strategies “enable the provision of publicly supported goods and services” (Lynn, Heinrich, & Hill, 2001, p.7) through these relationships and collaborations. Motivations to include volunteers in problem-solving strategies may reside with individuals advocating for these arrangements. For this reason, governance theories are included in this literature review. Public service motivation (PSM) literature, and particularly affective motivations toward the social importance of certain causes, may also suggest factors motivating cities to strategically engage volunteers.
As Figure 1 below shows, the literature reviewed here is interrelated. The relative size of each oval in Figure 1 corresponds to the researcher's presumed relevance of each substantive area of the literature to this study.

Figure 1: Problem Cloud

Volunteering

The literature on volunteering is vast. Hustinx, Cnaan, & Handy (2010) describe volunteerism as an innately multi-disciplinary and multi-theoretical phenomenon that is studied across public administration, economics, social work, psychology, and management science. While volunteerism is an object of interest across multiple fields, no single theory of volunteerism has emerged.
Theories of volunteering aggregate into three main categories: explanatory theories, narrative theories, and enlightenment theories (Hustinx et al. 2010). Explanatory theories seek to understand why people volunteer (i.e., the determinants of volunteering). Narrative theories seek to understand how volunteers are engaged and the relationship between volunteering and social change. Enlightenment theories critically assess whether volunteering and volunteerism have negative impacts as well as the social inequalities that exist in who volunteers and social inequalities that are exacerbated by volunteering.

Volunteer Process Model

Wilson (2012) offers a comprehensive review of the major literature in volunteerism research. In his review, Wilson focuses on methodologically rigorous studies. Wilson organizes his review using the volunteer process model first described by Musick and Wilson (2008), which is comprised of three stages. The first stage of the volunteer process model, antecedents of volunteering, is perhaps the most extensively covered in the volunteerism literature. The second stage of the volunteer process model is the experience of volunteering. The third and final stage of the volunteer process model is the consequences of volunteering. The unit of analysis in the volunteer process model is the individual volunteer. The theoretical categories of volunteering described by Hustinx et al. (2010) align with the volunteer process model described by Musick and Wilson (2008).
Antecedents of Volunteering

The explanatory theories or antecedents of volunteering relate to the causes or conditions of volunteering. Wilson (2012) describes three primary antecedents of volunteering: subjective dispositions, human capital resources, and social context.

Subjective dispositions, according to Wilson (2012), “refer to how people interpret themselves and the world around them” (p. 179). Studies on the subjective dispositions of individuals focus largely on identifying volunteer profiles (i.e., demographic and personality traits), motivating factors, and values. Interestingly, Wilson notes that identity theory explains much in the way of subjective dispositions of volunteers. Individuals who identify with the role of volunteer are more committed to volunteering both in terms of their intention to volunteer their time and their length of service.

Human capital resources are what Wilson (2012) refers to as “master statuses” (p. 183). These “master statuses” include gender, age, and race. In relation to gender, women volunteer at higher rates than men. Putnam (2000) calls the generation of people born in the first third of the twentieth century in the United States the long civic generation and notes that this generation volunteers at a higher rate than later generations. Studies on volunteering rates by race—which largely conclude that Caucasians volunteer at higher rates than minorities in the United States—are often criticized for failing to recognize informal types of volunteerism. Informal volunteering may occur at higher rates than formalized, organization-based volunteering in minority communities (Wilson, 2012).
Social context is, as Wilson (2012) notes, often overlooked in volunteerism research. Social context refers to network ties gained through school affiliations, faith-based affiliations, neighborhood affiliations, and employment and professional networks. Social context can be studied at the individual unit of analysis. Additionally, consideration of social context lends an ecological perspective to volunteerism and enables researchers to study volunteerism on a macro-level.

The Experience of Volunteering

Individual volunteers, through volunteering, create shared experiences with other volunteers, members of the community, volunteer organizers, and individuals who may benefit from services delivered by volunteers. Narrative theories of volunteering explain the experience of volunteering from the perspective of the individual volunteer. As Wilson (2012) points out, the experience a volunteer has while volunteering with a particular cause or organization is strongly predictive of volunteer turnover if that experience is negative. Positive experiences reported by volunteers are likewise predictive of volunteer retention. Factors that contribute to positive volunteer experiences include allowing the volunteer to determine his or her time schedule, providing competent supervision, recognizing the volunteer for his or her contribution of time, recognizing the impact the volunteer made as a result of his or her contribution of time, and providing training so that the volunteer can be effective.
Consequences of Volunteering

The consequences of volunteering are often studied from an individual perspective. Individuals who volunteer report lower rates of symptoms associated with mental illnesses, and increased longevity has also been associated with volunteering (Wilson, 2012). According to Wilson (2012), more studies are needed on volunteering from an ecological perspective.

Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives on Volunteering

Within the theoretical categories—explanatory, narrative, and enlightenment—of volunteering described by Hustinx et al. (2010), many different perspectives are present. Hustinx et al. (2010) discuss volunteering from an economic perspective, a sociology perspective, a psychology perspective, and a political science perspective. The authors note that volunteering is an important construct to study from each of these perspectives. From an economics perspective, it is difficult to reconcile the concept of volunteering. Economists generally operate under the assumption that individuals act rationally and on self-interest resulting in undertaking actions only when the benefits of those actions are not outweighed by the costs. The private benefits model of explaining volunteering from an economics perspective posits that benefits flow to individuals who volunteer. There are two types of private benefits that have been described in the volunteering literature—investment in social capital, and gaining a feel-good “warm glow”. The investment model of explaining volunteering from a private benefits economics perspective suggests that
individuals who volunteer increase social capital and in this way are investing in future opportunities that may flow from their initial investment into social capital. The consumption model of volunteering from a private benefits economics perspective posits that individuals who volunteer enjoy a “warm glow” from giving their time. The private benefits theory of volunteering from an economics perspective is contrasted by the public goods model. The public goods model suggests that individuals who volunteer do so in order to increase the availability of public goods and services that those individuals personally value. It is theorized that if the public goods model offered a complete explanation of volunteering from an economics perspective that there would be a “crowding out” effect whereby no opportunities to volunteer would exist. The so-called middle ground between the private benefits model and the public goods model is that volunteers are “impure altruists” (p. 416). Impure altruism suggests that individuals give their time on a voluntary basis to causes that are important to them because of the private benefits—whether investment in social capital or a “warm glow”—that flow to them.

Hustinx et al. (2010) maintain studying volunteerism from an economics perspective necessarily includes supply and demand. To that end, they further note that much of the scholarship on supply and demand considerations focuses on supply and less on demand.

Sociologists are interested in studying volunteering because volunteers form social relationship through their volunteer experiences. Sociologists have also been interested in studying who volunteers. Additionally, sociologists have studied how volunteerism has supplemented governmental service delivery (Hustinx et al., 2010).
Psychologists have an interest in studying prosocial behaviors, with volunteering being among those behaviors. Additionally, psychologists have studied the characteristics, personality traits, and dispositions of individuals who volunteer. Based on research of volunteering from a psychological perspective, certain personality traits—including agreeableness and extroversion—have been associated with likelihood of volunteering (Hustinx et al., 2010).

From a political science perspective, volunteering is associated with citizenship and democracy. Along the political perspective, volunteering is seen as an important activity whether as a supplement to or a substitute for government service delivery (Hustinx et al., 2010).

Individual motivation to volunteer has been widely studied. The literature on individual motivation to volunteer follows perspectives: symbolic and functional. The symbolic perspective of motivation to volunteer suggests that motivation stems from an individual's cultural understandings. In other words, motivation to volunteer is a value decision (Dekker & Halman, 2003). The functional perspective on motivation to volunteer posits that certain individual are predisposed to volunteer based on personality traits rather than (as the symbolic approach would suggest) prior experiences (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998).
The terms service and volunteering are sometimes used interchangeably. Service can be broadly described as any activity that is done for the public good. Public service, military service, national service and volunteer service all reside under the broad category of service. Service exists in many forms and is performed for a range of goals. As a form of individual engagement, service is a conduit for individuals to contribute in important geographic or issue areas. As a governance tool, service can educate citizens on principles of democracy. As pedagogy, service (or, more particularly, service-learning) enriches educational programs, promotes notions of social justice, and aims to instill a lifelong commitment to service in young people. Additionally, service can be a form of political engagement intended to impact political action (Walker, 2002). Importantly, service is not synonymous with non-paid work. Individuals who engage in service may be paid, their work may be subsidized with stipend funds, or the work may be non-paid.

Volunteering is a distinct subset of service. On the whole, volunteering refers to any action or activity performed freely without a promise of remuneration for the purpose of benefiting another person, a group of people, or contributing to a particular cause. Individuals volunteer in different ways and for different reasons. Additionally, individuals may derive benefits from volunteering (Wilson, 2000). Individuals may volunteer as part of an employer-sponsored volunteer initiative, in connection with a school-based service-learning project, as part of a faith-based initiative, or on a wholly self-directed basis.
There is little research chronicling volunteer service as a governance strategy at the local level. However, service has been employed as a strategy in addressing issues at the national level. There is some level of disagreement about how the purposes and goals of national service should be framed. For example, to some service should serve the primary goal of encouraging citizen engagement. Others view service as a means by which young people in particular can gain workplace skills. Still others maintain that service is important chiefly because of its contribution to creation of social capital. A final competing view on the purpose of service is that service is designed to address unmet social needs. Despite this problem of definition, national service enjoys broad political support and has been hailed as an important component of a democratic society (Frumkin & Miller, 2008).

Frumkin and Miller (2008) offer a conceptual framework of national service based on a set of 48 key informant interviews with “policy and practice leaders in the field of national service across the country” (p. 436). The authors describe national service as a form of citizenship, national service as a contributor to personal growth, national service as a form of social capital, and national service as public work. Frumkin and Miller's research reveals that although no national service program mandates any formal citizenship training, individuals who engage in voluntary service activities gain an understanding around what it means to be a citizen through their actions in helping others in their community and seeing
or learning about how change can be effectuated in the political process. The authors are not willing to assert any link between national service and civic engagement because prior research finds no correlation between national service and civic engagement. In terms of personal growth, national service, through programs such as AmeriCorps, can create opportunities for individuals to do work in areas of great public concern and great personal importance to them. The authors note that many national service programs are “animated by a culture of idealism” (p. 438). When individuals, particularly young people, enter national service programs, an often-cited motivation for doing so is to have an impact or make a change in the world in which they live. One interviewee in the Frumkin and Miller study noted that personal growth in some individuals who engage in national service is achieved by way of gaining a broader understanding of “their place in society and the way in which they can make a contribution to the community” (p. 439). Furthermore, personal growth may also relate to workplace and interpersonal skill-building as well as gaining leadership skills. National service has potential as a mechanism for building social capital according to the authors. One way in which national service can strengthen social capital is through development of networks of people who share a common goal of making a difference in a particular issue area. However, the authors note that it is most commonly what Putnam (2000) describes as the bonding type of social capital (whereby people associate with others who share a similar demographic background or similar interest) not the bridging type of social capital that crosses demographic and interest-area divides between people that most often stems from national service. One view expressed in the
Frumkin and Miller (2008) study relating to national service as a source of social capital development is that social capital may inure to the community on the whole. The community may benefit from the social capital that is created through collaborations of organizations in the community that come together because of a national service program. Those inter-organizational relationships may both survive or expand in scope beyond the national service program. National service as public work is a strategy to meet otherwise unmet needs in a community. In other words, where there has been a perceived failure of government or a market failure resulting in a gap in needed service in a community, national service may, according to the authors, help fill that gap. National service as public work is easier to gauge than, for example, national service as a social capital builder because it can be documented in terms of outputs rather than outcomes. Partly on this basis, Frumkin and Miller (2008) conclude that each of their four conceptions of national service—as a form of citizenship, as a mechanism for personal growth, as a source of social capital, and as public work—must coexist. Accordingly, volunteer service as a strategy for meeting a need within a community is but one of multiple objectives of service. Nonetheless, this is a serious goal of service that warrants further study at both the national and local levels.

Some cities have used volunteers effectively to target pressing issues. Mann and Rozsa (2010) showcase several volunteer programs that have demonstrated success in responding to local challenges. Relating Frumkin and Mann's (2008) national service framework to the city-level examples of volunteer service initiatives described by Mann
and Rozsa (2010), the varying ideologies on the goal of service is illustrated. Each of the city initiatives discussed by Mann and Rozsa (2010) rely on wholly unpaid volunteer service. The City of Dublin, Ohio created a city-wide volunteer program in 1995 called Leadership Dublin (Mann & Rozsa, 2010). This continuing program offers lessons in citizen empowerment and the development of community leadership skills. As such, this type of volunteer initiative can be said to exist for the purpose of increasing citizenship skills. Personal growth is one of the primary goals of a volunteer initiative called Hampton's Youth Civic Engagement in Hampton, Virginia (Mann & Rozsa, 2010). In the Hampton's Youth Civic Engagement program, high school students are taught decision-making and leadership skills. Building social capital in Oxnard, California through a volunteer initiative called Operation Peaceworks resulted in a reduction of violent crimes in that city (Mann & Rozsa, 2010). As public work, volunteer service was employed as a strategy in Ashland, Kentucky to repair homes of residents in that city belonging to underserved populations (Mann & Rozsa, 2010). Between 2000 and 2010, approximately 195 homes in Ashland that exhibited deferred maintenance were repaired (Mann & Rozsa, 2010).

D'Agustino (2008) maintains that volunteers are an untapped resource available to governments that are under-staffed and facing constrained budgets. Sagawa (2010) offers policy prescriptions relative to volunteer service as a governance strategy. Specifically, Sagawa (2010) suggests that volunteer-using organizations must value volunteers as a human capital resource. Additionally, governments and volunteer-using organizations need
to be result-oriented in volunteer engagement practices. Governments and volunteer-using organizations also, according to Sagawa (2010), need to use resources to develop mechanisms for using volunteers to meet problem solving objectives. Further, volunteers need to have a clear understanding of the impact of their service. Finally, according to Sagawa (2010), governments, volunteer-using organizations, volunteers and citizens need to change their conception of volunteers from being no-cost and begin to understand that the use of volunteer labor comes with associated costs. These recommendations, according to Sagawa (2010), focus on the demand for volunteers and the mechanisms for using volunteers in meaningful ways and keeping them engaged in addressing challenges at the local level.

Demand for Volunteer Service

Much attention has been paid to who volunteers. In other words, the supply of volunteers has been studied extensively. Less attention, however, has been paid to the demand side of the equation. This represents a significant gap in the scholarship on volunteering for the reason that traditional economic models that might explain supply and demand for paid labor cannot be applied to volunteer service (Freeman, 1997).

Ferris (1988) discusses supply and demand considerations in the context of public service coproduction. Ferris (1988) maintains that local budget constraints may spark interest in the use of volunteer labor for delivery of public services, or coproduction. For purposes of his study, Ferris (1988) adopts a broad view of coproduction that involves
donations of both time and financial resources that are used for delivery of public services. The logic applied to inclusion of both human capital resources and financial resources is that financial resources are often made available to nonprofit organizations in the community. Those organizations are able to use those financial resources to augment governmental service delivery.

On the demand side of the equation, Ferris (1988) posits that a “local government’s propensity to involve volunteers in public service production is likely to be related to the adequacy of public sector resources, the receptivity of public employees, and the objectives of public managers” (p. 5-6). On whether or not public employees are likely to be receptive to the use of volunteer labor in service delivery, Ferris (1988) suggests that the costs of managing volunteers, perceived job security threats on the part of public employees, and potential issues of liability are likely driving forces behind receptivity. Form of government is also, Ferris (1988) suggests, a factor that may influence the decision to engage volunteers in public service delivery. Specifically, Ferris (1988) suggests that local governments with the manager form may be more likely than local governments with other forms to use volunteers for public service delivery for the reason that managers are often motivated to deliver service in the most efficient ways possible and they are sometimes less inclined to cater to political pressure from certain interest groups, such as public employees for example, that may oppose use of volunteers for delivery of public services.
The study conducted by Ferris (1988) uses data from a 1982 survey conducted by the International City Management Association (ICMA). The ICMA data relates to the various ways in which cities deliver service, including public-private partnerships, intergovernmental agreements, contracting, use of volunteers, and service delivery through partnerships with nonprofit organizations. Ferris (1988) additionally employed data from multiple sources for measures of local government finances and community demographic features. Ferris (1988) found that of the 714 local governments included in his study, 43.5% relied on volunteers in the delivery of at least one public service. Sixty-five percent of those volunteer-using cities were organized as manager forms of government. Additionally, Ferris (1988) concluded that local governments with higher tax burdens were more likely to use volunteers for at least one type of public service delivery.

Handy and Srinivasan (2005) studied the demand for volunteers in non-profit hospitals by conducting key informant interviews with 28 hospital chief executive officers (CEOs). At the outset, the authors note that “there is a paucity of literature on organizational demand for [volunteer] labor” (p. 492). The objective of their research was to test whether a volunteer-using organization would consume an unlimited supply of volunteer labor if available and, if not, what factors contribute to the organization's decision to employ volunteer labor. The authors conclude that, from a cost-benefit perspective, hospital CEOs make decisions about employing volunteers based on the costs associated with doing so. In their study, Handy and Srinivasan (2005) note that volunteer labor is not free labor. There are costs associated with using volunteer labor attributable to
the capital and human resources necessary to screen volunteers for potential background issues that might result in potential liability exposure to the organization, resources to train volunteers to perform particular tasks, and resources to manage volunteers.

Hotchkiss, Fottler, and Unruh (2009) note, however, that in hospital settings, the costs of using volunteers are outweighed by the benefits. In addition to the cost saving benefit that volunteers provide in hospital savings as found by Handy and Srinivasan (2005), volunteers “add to the quality of a hospital by contributing to the happiness and comfort of patients, their families, and visitors” (Hotchkiss et al., p. 120, 2009). This was demonstrated in a sample of 37 hospitals across the state of Florida through improved patient satisfaction scores in those hospitals that used relatively more volunteers (Hotchkiss et al., 2009).

Coproduction

Coproduction refers to citizens and governments working together (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). Marschall (2004) maintains that coproduction is “a relatively unknown theory from public administration...which focuses on the role of citizen involvement in the provision of local public goods and the ways in which institutional arrangements foster this participation” (p. 231). Coproduction “depends on both the voluntary actions of citizens and the existence of meaningful opportunities and arrangements for their participation...[and] without active citizen participation the capacity of government to provide public goods and services is severely compromised” (p. 232).
The concept of coproduction was developed in tandem with much of the seminal work on citizen participation in government during the late 1960s and 1970s. Coproduction, as a citizen engagement and perhaps a citizen empowerment mechanism, operates to achieve a number of desirable results including improving the quality and/or increasing the quantity of government services (particularly when budget constraints might otherwise hinder the delivery of those services), engaging citizens, and increasing social capital (Ottmann, Laragy, Allen, & Feldman, 2011). Coproduction is potentially an effective strategy for jurisdictions facing budget constraints. (Morse, 2006; Brudney & England, 1983). In this way, coproduction is one means of accommodating opposing citizen concerns of greater service delivery and lower tax burden. The scholarly literature is largely in agreement around the notion that when citizens are engaged in coproduction of public goods, the result is those citizens become more invested in their communities. Accordingly, there are dual primary benefits of coproduction: increasing civic engagement and increasing the level of service the residents of that community receive.

Ostrom's (1996) “tragedy of the commons” work is tangentially related to coproduction. In Ostrom's view, messy societal problems cannot be solved by governmental actors alone. Citizens must be engaged, via coproduction, in responding to these issues. Coproduction leverages citizen skills in service delivery (Cahn & Gray, 2005).

Similar to the volunteerism literature, the coproduction literature is robust relative to individual characteristics and motivations and less developed relative to pull or demand considerations. Paarlberg and Gen (2009) discuss the supply and demand considerations relative
to coproduction. At the outset the authors note that the “demand perspectives on the development of the nonprofit sector and supply perspectives on the activation of civic engagement suggest potentially contradictory explanations of collective coproduction” (p. 291). Interestingly, Paarlberg and Gen (2009) suggest that demand is driven by the preference of service beneficiaries and by population heterogeneity. As to population heterogeneity driving demand for coproduction, Paarlberg and Gen (2009) note that individuals belonging to more heterogeneous communities are somewhat less apt to contribute to public goods. Accordingly, in those communities, nonprofits will organize to meet those unmet needs or preferences. Specifically, Paarlberg and Gen (2009) conclude that “[i]n those communities in which service levels or quality are not adequate, nonprofits will coordinate the donation of time and dollars to meet excess demand” (p. 392).

Public Service Motivation

Perry and Wise (1990) first described public service motivation (PSM). PSM refers to “an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (p. 368). As the authors point out, “[p]ublic service is often used as a synonym for government service embracing all those who work in the public sector. But public service signifies much more... [it] is a concept, an attitude, [and] a sense of duty” (p. 368).

Perry and Wise (1990) differentiate between rational motives (i.e., motivations based on maximizing individual utility), norm-based motives (i.e., motivations based on a
desired to achieve conformity), and affective motivations (i.e., motivations rooted in emotion). Specific behaviors that might be associated with rational motives are a desire to participate in the policy process, identification with or commitment to a particular public program, or the desire to advocate for a cause. Norm-based motivations are characterized by a different set of exhibited behaviors. Carrying out a desire to serve the public interest or demonstrating loyalty to the government and carrying out notions of social equity are associated with norm-based motivations. Affective motivations are different still. The examples of affective motivations offered by Perry and Wise (1990) are genuine commitment to the social importance of a cause or program and passion for protecting the rights of others.

The theoretical work of Perry and Wise (1990) has been tested out in a number of contexts. Perry (1996) developed a scale of PSM. Perry's (1996) initial scale consisted of 24 items across six dimensions: attraction to policy making, commitment to the public interest, social justice, civic duty, and compassion. Four of those dimensions—attraction to policy making (associated with rational motivations), commitment to the public interest (associated with norm-based motivations), compassion and self-sacrifice (both associated with affective motivations)—remained after confirmatory factor analysis of the original model. Perry (1997) further studied the antecedents of PSM and found that socialization (including parental and religious), professional identification, political ideology, and demographic traits influence PSM. Interestingly, and perhaps counter-intuitively, Perry (1997) found that religious socialization is negatively associated with PSM. PSM was
positively associated with higher age and higher education level but negatively associated with income level in Perry's (1997) study.

Brewer, Selden, and Facer (2000) conceptualize PSM somewhat, but not drastically, differently than Perry (1996) and Perry and Wise (1990). To Brewer et al. (2000), PSM is exhibited on the individual level in four ways: by Samaritans, Communitarians, Patriots, and Humanitarians. Samaritans are chiefly motivated by a desire to help others, particularly underprivileged persons. Communitarians are motivated by a sense of civic responsibility. Patriots advocate for causes and expect public officials to act in a manner consistent with community-wide interests. Humanitarians are primarily motivated by a sense of social justice.

Important in the context of this study, PSM has been positively associated with volunteering (Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2007) and volunteer experiences (Perry, Brudney, Coursey, & Littlepage, 2008). Individuals who exhibit higher levels of public service motivation also demonstrate higher rates of intention to volunteer. Additionally, individuals who report having engaged in volunteer experiences show higher public service motivation.

Governance Theories

The literature is peppered with various definitions of governance. Some of those definitions are specific to a particular discipline while others are more expansive. Appendix C includes definitions from the literature summarizing the governance
perspective in the context of various disciplines and practice areas. In sum, governance “can be seen as the totality of theoretical conceptions on governing” (Catlaw, 2007, p. 240). Catlaw’s (2007) broad multidisciplinary definition is favored over the more discipline-specific definitions provided elsewhere in the literature (Myers, Smith, & Martin, 2005).

The particular governance theories discussed in this section are network governance, collaborative public management, new urban governance, and collaborative governance. Governance theories overlap with other theoretical perspectives presented in this literature review. For example, collaborative governance, according to Sirianni (2009), overlaps with coproduction and civic engagement theories.

Most of the literature discussing the governance perspective accumulates around the notion that governance does not redefine the goals of government. Instead, the governance perspective provides new ways and tools to achieve those goals. Salamon (2002) describes these tools. Broadly, tools of government are all of those “identifiable method[s] through which collective action is structured to address a public problem” (Salamon, 2002, p. 19). In determining which of the many available tools should be considered viable, certain familiar evaluation criteria—or “dimensions”—should be considered. Those are: effectiveness, efficiency, equity, manageability, legitimacy and political feasibility (Salamon, 2002). Salamon (2002) further suggests four measures which can be used to guide decision makers who are charged with weighing the merits of any number of viable tools. The four measures of the dimensions of tools are: (1) degree of coerciveness, which is the extent certain behavior will be
restrained through regulation rather than encouraged or discouraged through economic consequence; (2) directness, which relates, essentially, to which the government will be involved; (3) automaticity, which considers whether the necessary government structure is in place or will have to be created; and, (4) visibility, which is not, in this case synonymous with transparency, but means the degree to which the implementation resources are included in normal budgeting processes (Salamon, 2002).

Catlaw (2007) suggests that the shift toward the governance paradigm arose from a “perceived failure of the marketization of government, which was itself a partial response to the perceived failure of centralized bureaucracy and government-led social engineering” (p. 235). To that end, the shift toward the governance perspective is characterized by a move away from programs and agencies as the primary unit of analysis in favor of using tools for implementation; a preference for networks over hierarchies; collaboration between public and private entities to achieve service delivery; reliance on negotiation and persuasion instead of command and control; and, use of activation, orchestration, and modulation skills instead of classic management (Salamon, 2002). Salamon (2002) reveals that this paradigm shift happened quietly.

Network Governance

Powell (1990) provides a typology for networks in his validation of the network as a form of organization. Networks—being “neither market not hierarchy”—are comprised of multiple actors. Ideally, the attributes of those various actors should complement one
another. In other words, the weakness of one partner should be ameliorated by the strength of another network partner. “[F]irms with strictly defined boundaries and highly centralized operations are quite atypical. The history of modern commerce...is a story of family businesses, guilds, cartels, and extended trading companies—all enterprises with loose and highly permeable boundaries” (Powell, 1990, p. 298). Moreover, networks can rely on both informal and formal communication. Informal communication is believed to result in greater information sharing. Reciprocity, as a normative value, is essential between actors if the effort in a network is to be successful (Ostrom, 1998). To that end, common interest or objective and reliance on each other are also key defining features of a network. Finally, it is noted that sanctions are typically normative, and not imposed by operation of law. A violation of trust or critical failure in meeting an objective in a network will invite repercussion from other actors in the network (Powell, 1990).

Network types refer largely to the function the network serves. Milward and Provan (2006) describe four types of networks: service implementation networks, information diffusion networks, problem-solving networks, and capacity building networks. The primary characteristics of a service implementation network are: (1) government funds the service contract; (2) services are jointly produced by two or more organizations; (3) management is horizontal; and (4) management is tasked with encouraging cooperation, negotiating contracts, and planning network expansion. By contrast, an information diffusion network is focused on sharing information and is commonly used in disaster or emergency situations. The problem-solving network is intended to set an agenda for
existing policy issues. Finally, community capacity building networks are designed to build social capital by focusing on existing and future policy issues and problems.

When building a network, the following considerations should be taken into account: existing relationships, environmental conditions, strategic orientations of participants, and the available and/or preferred network governance structure (Milward & Provan, 2006). Existing relationships suggest time invested in and trust between the network participants. Environmental conditions are those factors, such as uncertainty, unanticipated events, resource constraints or political climate that might influence or hinder the ability of the network to operate or achieve its goals. Strategic orientations can be bureaucratic, entrepreneurial, or community-based (Milward & Provan, 2006; Herranz, 2008).

Network governance structure refers to the management of the network. There are three types of network governance structures. The first type of network governance structure discussed here is the self-governance structure where decision-making is decentralized and there is little or no formal organization or management. Self-governed networks are largely viewed as being inefficient. The lead organization network governance structure, on the other hand, is defined by one network participant having centralized decision-making authority. While this provides efficiency and clear direction for the network, domination by a lead organization can result in lack of commitment by network participants. The network administrative organization governance structure provides that decision-making is vested in a few participants. Most typically, each of the
decision-making organizations represents the broader interests of other network participants and acts in a representative capacity. This network structure provides efficiency, however it sometimes lends to perceptions of bureaucracy, it is complex, and can increase the transaction costs of the network (Milward & Provan, 2006).

**Collaborative Public Management**

Collaborative public management theory rests on the notion that co-action between various agencies and organizations results in greater opportunities to solve complex or otherwise un-solvable problems (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). Collaborative public management is an important perspective in governance. Bingham and O'Leary (2009) note that the ideas that various governmental agencies are working together in furtherance of common goals and working with nongovernmental organizations continue to garner significant attention in the governance literature. Within collaborative public management, collaboration has been measured by five dimensions: joint decision making, administration, autonomy, mutuality, and trust. The outcomes of collaboration fall into the general categories of perceived effectiveness, perceived improvement in working relationships, expansion of views on issues, increased network density, and equalization of power in relationships (Thompson, Perry, and Miller, 2008). Moreover, the why and how questions surrounding public manager collaboration are not only still timely and relevant, but they are spawning a great deal of empirical research in collaborative public management (Bingham & O'Leary, 2009).
New Urban Governance

New urban governance is defined by the “evolution of innovative strategies, procedures and instruments of how to coordinate, manage and govern...and stimulate the formation of new formal and informal actor networks” (Hohn and Neuer, 2006, p. 291) and is “particularly appropriate for managing the relationship between people and their environment” (Bingham, 2006, p. 816). In other words, the perspective has a somewhat narrow focus on issues such as land use planning and sustainability. Concerning new urban governance, Bingham (2006) suggests that we need not only new governance tools, but also new modes of implementation. Those new modes of implementation should be directed at empowering citizens and stakeholders within the community to become effectively engaged in the governance process.

What new urban governance contributes to the literature on collaborative governance is the idea that collaborative strategies should continue to seek out new, innovative, and more effective ways to work across a network of actors. In this way, new urban governance suggests that collaborative governance should be continually evolving.

Collaborative Governance

Conversations about governing have moved “toward theories of cooperation, networking, governance, and institutional building and maintenance” in response to the “declining relationship between jurisdiction and public management” in a “fragmented and disarticulated state” (Frederickson, 1999, p. 702). Although this transition went almost
unnoticed, it has had an important impact. Salamon (2002) notes that collaborative governance approaches require soft skills like negotiation, conflict resolution abilities, and leadership abilities that did not belong in the toolbox of the traditional public administrator.

Collaboration is the “new normal”. To that end, Koontz and Thomas (2006) have gone so far as to declare that the “21st century may be the era of the collaborative state” (p. 111). Bingham (2006) uses the term “collaborative governance” to describe “a family of processes” (p. 816) employing collaboration. There are a number of different particular perspectives described in the literature, such as those just discussed, which employ collaboration.

Sirianni (2009) offers a “normatively grounded and empirically generated typology theory of collaborative governance” (p. 25). Each of the various components of Sirianni’s framework for collaborative governance is discussed next.

Employ Citizens in Coproduction of Public Goods

According to Sirianni (2009), citizens should contribute to the production of public goods in their communities as a form of citizen engagement. When citizens are engaged in coproduction of public goods, they become more invested in their communities. In this way encouraging citizens to volunteer at the library or join a neighborhood watch can provide dual overall benefits to the community by increasing civic engagement and increasing the level of service the residents of that community receive.
Leverage Community Assets

In the collaborative governance approach, citizens and nongovernmental organizations in the community should be encouraged to mobilize assets found in the community when the community is responding to a local challenge. The assets and resources in the community could be social capital, human capital, or more tangible assets. Even communities that may outwardly appear impoverished have important assets. “Communities possess many kinds of underused assets—local knowledge, hidden skills, vacant land, small businesses, everyday purchases, religious congregations, public buildings, private institutions, civic associations, friendship networks—that can be mobilized in fresh ways and with new synergies” (Sirianni, 2009, p. 45). When the community draws on its own assets and resources in the problem-solving process, the community will be strengthened because it becomes empowered by not having to look outward or elsewhere for help resolving localized problems.

Empower Citizens

Noveck (2009), like many scholars, calls for individuals to be empowered in the democratic process. In furtherance of the goal of increased citizen engagement, Sirianni (2009) suggests that public officials and administrators should not hoard their specialized knowledge. Rather, they should share their expertise so as to professionalize the citizenry and empower citizens to engage in the governance process in a meaningful way. Noveck (2009) makes a similar point in the assertion that public administrators are the weak link,
so to speak, in the democratic process because they do not use their specialized knowledge effectively and, additionally, they do not “engage in information gathering, information evaluation and measurement, and the development of solutions for implementation” (p. 39). The knowledge sharing process could ideally happen alongside other citizen engagement techniques such as coproduction of public goods. To this point, Sowell (2009) would interject that no single person possesses the full scope of knowledge currently available in a particular subject area. Furthermore, as Sowell points out, there is a infinite amount of knowledge that has not yet been uncovered. To that end, “[t]he idea of interdisciplinary collaboration among lawyers, technologists, and policymakers might seem like a self-evident good, yet it is rarely practiced in government” (Noveck, 2009, p. 98).

Morse (2006) reminds us that citizens are a product of society. Accordingly, we cannot expect that the community will be made up of professional citizens with a good concept of how to contribute meaningful input to the workings of governance unless efforts have been taken to create civic-mindedness in the citizenry. Creation of such internal efficacy, also called citizen capacity, requires effort on the part of the jurisdiction (Cooper, Bryer, and Meek, 2006).

Employ Deliberative Problem Solving Techniques

The collaborative governance perspective also advocates engaging citizens in deliberation around policy alternatives. Furthermore, deliberation should explore more than epithelial self-interests (Sirianni, 2009). Morse (2006), citing Mary Parker Follett
(1918), offers the poignant advice germane to deliberation that “[t]he best answer...is found between the two sides, it is found where differences can be united into something new” and both parties to the deliberative effort are satisfied with the integrative decision and the outcome (p. 7). Cooper et al. (2006) corroborate the notion that collaborative governance should be deliberative. Additionally, the authors inform that deliberative citizen engagement “seek[s] joint action across sectors of society, classes of people, or types of individuals” (p. 82). The goal of deliberation in the governance process is to create “shared responsibility for outcomes” (p. 82). Deliberative citizen engagement is favored over other types—adversarial, electoral, information exchange, and civil society—as a means of achieving increased trust on the part of citizens in the government and vice versa, enhancing citizen efficacy and competence, and enhancing government legitimacy and responsiveness.

*Build Sustainable Relationships*

The idea that sustainable relationships should be fostered dovetails with employing deliberative problem-solving techniques. Lukensmeyer (2009) points out that “[p]eople are hungry for real conversations instead of divisive partisan arguments. When they have that experience, they take ownership in what comes out of it, so they are ready to take actions that, if you had asked them five days before, they couldn't have imagined themselves taking” (National Civic Review, 2009b, p. 9). By valuing input from network partners (whether organizational or citizen), both legitimacy and acceptability of policy decision are
improved and stakeholders have a greater sense of accountability in the outcomes. Additionally, by valuing input from network partners, relationships are strengthened and become more sustainable over time and across other challenges. According to Powell (1990), long-range cooperation is the cornerstone of sustainability in the network form of organization.

The role of experts in the governance structure should also be carefully considered. Experts should be retained not “to pass their expertise to stakeholders. Rather, their role is to engage in relationship building and problem solving so they can proceed to implement plans and agreements” (Goldstein and Butler, 2010, p. 239-240).

*Form Strategic Alliances*

Sirianni (2009) recommends that the governments should engage in “strategic field-building” (p. 57) as part of collaborative governance strategies. In other words, governments should seek out strategic alliances and form and strengthen network capacity. The idea behind this strategy is that partners and networks will be in place to achieve an “optimal degree of complementarity and division of labor” in collaborative efforts (p. 57). The advice that government actors should form strategic alliances aligns with the basic motivation behind the network form of organization identified by Powell (1990); namely, to compensate for weaknesses and expand the scope of organizational effectiveness.
Embrace Collaboration

The idea that governments should embrace collaboration represents organizational maturation that is taking place in the name of collaborative governance. To increase the effectiveness of the collaborative effort, the ethos of the government should be to harbor a favorable view of collaboration and the value of citizen input (Handley & Howell-Moroney, 2010). The same advice holds true for nongovernmental organization partners. Sirianni (2009) sees the adoption of this mindset as requiring somewhat of a cultural transformation within many governments.

Collaborative practices must be embraced by the government partner, must be implemented in such a way that the citizen partner is actually part of the process, and the parties need to be driven by a motivation to achieve a greater good rather than a good outcome for just one side of the equation. Many citizens want to be engaged (National Civic Review, 2009a). “Democracy is often thought of in terms of institutions when the focus should be on people” (Morse, 2006, p. 9). Accordingly, in this way, by embracing collaborative practices, the government is simply being responsive to the wants of the citizen.

Reciprocal Accountability

Determining and implementing an appropriate, not to mention feasible, accountability mechanism in a governance strategy is a significant challenge (Powell, 1990; Salamon, 2002). The traditional bureaucratic model of accountability does not
transfer well—or perhaps at all—to collaborative networks. However, Sirianni (2009) does offer two possible solutions to the issue of developing an accountability mechanism based on models advanced by Archon Fung and Edward Weber. Fung, according to Sirianni, postulates that “accountable autonomy” (p. 63) where parties, including citizens, maintain accountability for their own contribution to the collaborative effort in exchange for autonomy is an effective accountability model for collaborative networks. Edward Weber, on the other hand, advances a notion of “multiple, simultaneous accountability” (p. 64) whereby the various actors in the network maintain some degree of oversight as to the other actors in the network. At any rate, accountability should be reciprocal between the actors since, as Agranoff & McGuire (2003) point out, collaboration rests on the normative value of reciprocity.

Non-governmental actors such as private businesses and non-profit organizations are called upon to provide and organize volunteer efforts, make (or possibly generate) resources for service delivery, and utilize their own networks, as well as report to and maintain accountability to government agencies. Individual citizens are called upon to be engaged in their community by providing resources (tangible and intangible), human capital and meaningful input into the policy formulation process, to think in terms of greater good for the community and not out of self-interest, and to maintain accountability for the community-level outcomes of the decisions that are made (Sirianni, 2009).
Civic Engagement

Civic engagement and social capital are supplementary to one another from a democratic theory perspective. Some scholars treat civic engagement and social capital as variations on a theme of citizens working hand-in-hand with each other and/or with governmental actors in furtherance of a common good. Schneider (2007), though, discusses the relationship between civic engagement and social capital as well as the distinctions that should be drawn between these concepts. To Schneider (2007), civic engagement and social capital are similar in that they share an element of trust and that functional democratic societies depend on both civic engagement and social capital. However, from the perspective of the beneficiary, there is a key distinction to be drawn. Civic engagement is presumed to benefit society as a whole whereas social capital benefits individuals in a particular network. In this literature review civic engagement appears first. A review of the major social capital literature follows. The ordering of these sections is in no way an indicator of priority or relevance to this study.

Civic engagement calls for "people participating together for deliberation and collective action within an array of interests, institutions and networks, developing civic identity, and involving people in the governance process" (Cooper, 2005). Citizen participation is an important consideration in a discussion of civic engagement. In her seminal work, Arnstein (1969) describes a ladder of participation that serves as a typology for citizen participation. According to Arnstein's ladder of participation, two forms of non-
participation—manipulation and therapy—form the lowest two rungs of the ladder. Manipulation is illusory participation because citizens do not exert any influence although they are led to believe their input is valued. Therapy is the work of governments changing the minds of citizens. Forms of token participation—informing, consultation, and placation—are those where citizens have a voice in government and appear next on the ladder of participation. Informing citizens of rights or responsibilities they may have begins to involve citizen participation in government. Consultation means, simply enough, asking for citizen opinions. This can be accomplished through surveys and public meetings or public hearings. Placation is the first rung along Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation where citizens begin to have some measure of influence. At the partnership level, citizens are working with governments and there is some transfer of power to the citizen. Delegated power is the second highest rung on the participation ladder. When power is negotiated between citizens and governments, delegation is achieved. The top rung represents citizen control. Arnstein (1969) suggests citizen control is not necessarily desirable. However, citizen control is a necessary component along the spectrum of citizen participation.

Fung (2006) sees Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation as valuable for understanding varying types of citizen participation. However, Fung (2006) maintains that by citizen control is not always desirable. Additionally, by now Arnstein's (1969) work is no longer useful with respect to criticisms of early citizen participation efforts that were
not inclusive or representative because participant selection techniques have been
developed and effectively employed to address this problem (Fung, 2006).

Volunteering is a form of civic engagement (Ramakrishnan & Baldassare, 2004). Jones (2006) examines the relationship between civic engagement and volunteering from a community integration perspective. To Jones (2006), “[w]hen ties overlap in a community, making a person highly integrated into a physical place, he or she is pulled into public life in multiple ways, and civic engagement becomes more likely and more important” (p. 252). Volunteering works to effectuate that integration and so the implication is that volunteering encourages greater engagement within the community.

Social Capital

The social capital literature is robust. Social capital "refers to connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (Putnam, 2000, p. 19). Social capital also, according to Halpern (2005), refers to “the social networks, norms and sanctions that facilitate co-operative action among individuals and communities” (p. 39). Lin (2001) views social capital slightly in a broader sense. To Lin, social capital is comprised of “the resources embedded in social networks accessed and used by actors” (p. 25).

The main thrust of social capital is benefits flow from investing in social relationships. Social capital is often viewed as an intangible benefit of volunteering.
However, some scholars have identified certain tangible aspects such as when wealth is increased in a community (Svendsen & Sorensen, 2006).

Halpern (2005) describes the components, levels of analysis, and functions of social capital. The components of social capital are networks, norms, and sanctions. Networks are the interconnecting relationships that exist between people. Norms are those rules and values that are applied to those interconnecting relationships. Sanctions operate to enforce norms by rewarding adherence or punishing deviation from those norms. The three levels of analysis of social capital are the micro level, the meso level, and the macro level. At the micro level of analysis, social capital between individuals with close ties is examined. The meso level of analysis of social capital is concerned with communities and organizations. At the macro level of analysis, state or national connections are examined. Halpern acknowledges that there is "some functional equivalence between the different levels" (p. 19). Accordingly, declining social capital on one level can be ameliorated by increasing social capital on another level. By way of example, declining family ties (micro-level social capital) that might be offset by increasing community involvement (meso-level social capital). Social capital has a bridging function, a bonding function, and a linking function. Bridging social capital is comprised of networks that are "outward looking and encompass people across diverse social cleavages" (p. 19). Bonding social capital, on the other hand, is comprised of networks that are "inward looking and tend to reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups (p. 19). Linking social capital "is a vertical bridge across asymmetrical power and resources" (p. 25).
Halpern (2005) advocates for the position that policy makers should "consider social capital, along with many other factors, when drawing up and implementing policy" (p. 288). Halpern also suggests that new and creative ways increasing positive forms of social capital must be developed.

Paxton (2002) views social capital similarly to Halpern. Paxton (2002) maintains that social capital is comprised of two component parts: (1) “objective network of ties among individuals” and (2) that those ties must be “trusting, reciprocal, and emotionally positive” (p. 255). Additionally, Paxton asserts that there are multiple levels at which social capital can be measured—individual, group, and community. As such, social capital can yield returns at multiple levels.

Lin (2001) posits why social capital works and offers four explanations. The first such explanation is that social capital serves to improve information flow. Social capital, according to Lin (2001), also influences decision making at both the individual level and at the organizational level. Additionally, social capital serves a credentialing function of sorts in that social capital can be an indicator of the social and physical resources available to an individual. Finally, social capital operates to solidify role identities of individuals (Lin, 2001).

Although Putnam (2000) definitively draws a distinction between social capital and volunteering by the assertion that “[d]oing good for other people...is not part of the definition of social capital” (p. 117), other scholars have found that social capital and volunteering are linked in important ways. For example, Goss (1999), Brooks (2005), Brown and Ferris (2007), and
Paik and Navarre-Jackson (2011) have all advocated the position that social capital is a determinant of volunteering. Similarly, Brooks (2005) and Wang and Graddy (2008) found a relationship between social capital and charitable giving.

Democratic Theory

The Tocquevillian democratic ideal of citizens actively engaged in the work of making society better underpins democratic theory (Hoover & Donovan, 2004). And, that democratic ideal of active engagement has been linked to volunteering. Specifically, volunteerism rates in democracies are higher than in countries with other forms of government or in early stages of democratization (Voicu & Voicu, 2009).

Denhardt and Denhardt (2003) sum up the democratic ideal as "persons actively engaged in the work of the community or nation, benefiting both the society and themselves as they become more complete human beings through their involvement in the political system" (p. 48). Mary Parker Follett (1918) presumed citizen engagement was a predicate for a healthy democracy. She writes that “[d]emocratic ideals will never advance unless we are given the opportunity of constantly embodying them in action, which action will react on our ideals” (p. 51). Follett (1918) continues by stating that “[c]itizenship is not a right nor a privilege nor a duty, but an activity to be exercised every moment of the time. Democracy does not exist unless each man is doing his part fully every minute, unless every one is taking his share in building the state” (p. 335). Shapiro (2005) offers a more contemporary view of the basic tenets of democratic theory. To Shapiro (2005)
democratic theory is comprised of procedural democracy and substantive democracy. Procedural democracy refers to the framework of enforceable rules and norms that enable citizens to elect and impose accountability on leaders. Substantive democracy, by contrast, refers to the ways in which citizens can exert influence over policy and law.

Table 2 summarizes the theoretical foundations underpinning this study.

Table 2
Summary of Substantive Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Vast literature; can be summed up by the volunteer process model (antecedents, experience, and consequences). Theories of volunteering include explanatory, narrative and enlightenment</td>
<td>Wilson, 2012; Hustinx et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction</td>
<td>Broadly, coproduction refers to citizens or non-governmental agencies working with governmental actors to produce and/or deliver public goods</td>
<td>Agranoff &amp; McGuire, 2003; Morse, 2006; Brudney &amp; England, 1983; Ostrom, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Motivation (PSM)</td>
<td>PSM generally describes an individual’s motivations to serve public interests’ PSM is not limited to government employment</td>
<td>Perry &amp; Wise, 1990; Perry, 1996; Brewer, Selden, &amp; Facer, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Governance literature describes the full spectrum of theories on governing</td>
<td>Salamon, 2002; Catlaw, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Literature | Summary | Source
--- | --- | ---
Network Governance | Network governance refers to multiple actors working in furtherance of a common objective; the structure of the network relates to function | Powell, 1990
| | | Milward & Provan, 2006

New Urban Governance | Concerns governance issues in land use and planning | Hohn & Neuer, 2006
| | | Bingham, 2006

Civic Engagement | Civic engagement calls for meaningful citizen participation, deliberation, and collective action in governing | Arnstein, 1969
| | | Cooper, 2005

Social Capital | Investment in trust-based relationships with an expectation of return on that investment; components are networks, norms and sanctions; measured at micro-, meso- and macro-levels; serves bridging, bonding and linking functions | Putnam, 2000
| | | Halpern, 2004
| | | Lin, 2001

Conclusion

In sum, the literature reviewed for this study is suggestive of potential factors that might bear on demand for volunteer service by local governments. Empirically, however, despite the breadth of the research in the field of volunteering in particular, little can be concluded about demand for volunteer service by local governments. Similarly, inferences, but not conclusions, may be drawn about what the data in this grounded theory study may ultimately reveal as to the impacts of service as a strategy. On this basis, a qualitative
study identifying the indicators of volunteer service demand and the methods of assessing the impacts of such volunteer service is needed. This study seeks to fill that need by informing the development of a conceptual model for volunteer service demand by local governments and shedding light on the ways of assessing the impacts of that service.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Central to this constructivist grounded theory study is the question of how volunteers can be both included and impactful in strategies to address local challenges. The specific research questions guiding this study are two-fold:

Research Question #1: What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges?

Research Question #2: How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges?

Study Overview

This constructivist grounded theory study uses content analysis of various documents prepared by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition and key informant interview transcripts as sources of qualitative data. Descriptive data on the cities in the sample for this study are obtained from city organizational charts and city size is obtained from 2010 U.S. Census Data (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). In the absence of theoretical concepts that would guide the development of quantitatively testable hypotheses, approaching the research from a qualitative grounded theory perspective creates the ability to flesh out unknown variables and identify themes in the data (Creswell, 2002). Grounded theory studies aim to develop theory through an inductive approach (Patton, 2002).
**Rationale for Grounded Theory Approach**

A grounded theory approach is appropriate where, as here, there is a lack of theory to guide *a priori* development of testable hypotheses (Glaser, 1978). Additionally, a grounded theory approach allows the researcher to explore data for the purpose of theory development. The inquiry central to this research explores how volunteers can be included and be impactful in strategies to address local challenges. The literature review conducted for this study reveals potential indicators of volunteer service demand by local governments that may be confirmed by this study. However, volunteer demand has not been widely studied, particularly with respect to local governments. Accordingly, a qualitative grounded theory study on volunteer demand on the part of local governments is important. Likewise, the methods of assessing the impacts of service as a strategy at the local government level have not been extensively studied. Therefore, a qualitative grounded theory study suggesting the ways of assessing the impacts of such volunteer service at the local level is worthwhile.

**Data Sources**

Data for this study derives from multiple sources. Those are:

- the High-Impact Service Plans prepared and published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition;
- Grant applications seeking Cities of Service Leadership Grant funding made by cities that received such funding; and
• key informant interviews with elected and appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service.

Additionally, descriptive data on the cities included in the sample for this study are obtained from:

• city organizational charts, and
• 2010 U.S. Census data.

The particular portion of the High-Impact Service Plans relevant to this study is the preface material called “Message from the Mayor.” Data from this source is converted from portable document format (.pdf) into Microsoft Word format. The “Message from the Mayor” portion of each of the published High-Impact Service Plans is relevant to this study because it is the portion of the plan where the various mayors that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service have an opportunity to state their motivations for doing so as well as their expectation for the initiative. Other portions of the published High-Impact Service Plan are largely based on the Cities of Service Play Book and may be of limited utility in uncovering any motivation on the part of the city to subscribe to the Cities of Service initiative.

Grant applications made by cities who received a Cities of Service Leadership Grant are content analyzed and coded in this study for a similar purpose. Namely, grant applications are used in this constructivist grounded theory study to address the research questions posed.
Thirty-nine structured key informant interviews were conducted with elected or appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service. Permission was requested from each of the key informant interviewees to audio record the interview for later transcription into Microsoft Word format. In the event that the interviewee declined the request to audio record the interview, as did each of the 39 interviewees for this study, the interview was transcribed by hand contemporaneously with the interview. Interview transcripts were content analyzed and coded together with the data from extant text sources.

City organizational charts in each of the 119 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 are reviewed to provide descriptive data in this study. In particular, city organizational charts are employed in this study to determine the form of government and existence of citywide volunteer coordination in the city.

City size for each of the cities in the sample for this study was obtained from 2010 U.S. Census data (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.).

**Data Triangulation**

When data derives from multiple sources it is said to be triangulated. Data triangulation is a validity tool (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009). Triangulation of data reduces the chance that conclusions reached in the study “reflect only the systematic biases or limitations of a specific source or method” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 93) and further enables the researcher to develop a more robust understanding of the data. Additionally, data
triangulation improves confidence in the study's validity by reducing uncertainty about conclusions drawn on the data (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Data for this study, as explained above, is collected from multiple sources. Accordingly, the data are triangulated and the validity of the conclusions reached in this study should enjoy improved confidence.

**Research Plan**

Krippendorff (2004) recommends a general research plan for qualitative research studies employing content analysis. That strategy involves: (1) identification of the unit of analysis for the study; (2) creation of a sampling plan; (3) data collection (4) coding for the phenomenon being observed in the data; (5) reducing or summarizing the data; (6) drawing inferences from the data; and (7) reporting on the data in response to the research questions posed. The general research plan proposed by Krippendorff (2004) is adopted for purposes of this study. Figure 2 visually depicts the research plan for this study.
Figure 2: General Research Plan
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**Institutional Review Board Approval**

This study is considered exempt research. Nonetheless, prior to collection of data by key informant interview, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was required. A copy of the exemption letter for this study is found in Appendix D.

At the University of Central Florida (UCF), a continually constituted IRB reviews proposed study protocols to ensure that ethical research principals are maintained and that human study participants are protected. In carrying out its function, the IRB promotes the ethical principles set forth in the Belmont Report (The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1979). The Belmont Report states that three ethical principles are critical in carrying out research with human study participants. Those ethical principles are: (1) respect for persons; (2) beneficence; and (3) justice. Maintaining respect for persons involved in research involves preserving individual dignities and personal autonomy as well as ensuring that proper informed consent is obtained in connection with the study. Beneficence in human research requires the researcher to weigh the risks and benefits of conducting a study and engage in research only if the benefits outweigh the potential risks. In this way human study participants are protected from harm. Justice requires fairness in the selection of study participants and necessitates that those individuals involved in research as study participants should come from the population of individuals who stand to benefit from the research (University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board, n.d.).
The ethical considerations raised by reason of this study are relatively few. Interviewees, or study participants, are elected or appointed city officials. Communications with such elected or appointed officials constitute public record so there is no expectation of privacy or anonymity on the part of the interviewees in this study. However, as a matter of good research practice, the interviewees in this study were made aware of how the data collected in connection with this study would be stored, handled, and ultimately reported. Appendix E sets forth the explanation of research provided to the interviewees in this study. The identities of the interviewees will remain confidential (unless they expressly agree to have their identities known). The principles set forth in The Belmont Report (The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1979) regarding research involving human subjects are adhered to in conducting this research.

Sample Selection

A constructivist grounded theory study begins with what the researcher knows and learns (through interactions and observations) about a particular topic. The sample in a grounded theory should be selected for its ability to inform the development of theory. Population representativeness is not a primary sampling concern in a grounded theory study (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The sample for this study is a purposive sample selected according to a criterion sampling strategy (Patton, 2002).
Criterion sampling is a sampling strategy that is used to select cases on the basis of one or more criterion established by the researcher. Program participation is, for example, a criterion that can be used to establish this type of purposive sample (Patton, 2002).

The cities included in the sample for this study (n=39) were identified according to their membership in the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 and consent to participation in a key informant interview for this study. As of June 2012, 119 cities were members of the Cities of Service coalition. The basis for proceeding with the cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as part of the criterion-based purposive sample (Patton, 2002) for this study is the fact that these cities have experience with volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges. Cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition meet the test for ability to inform the development of theory in the substantive area of volunteer service (Charmaz, 2006). The researcher's introduction to and personal knowledge of the Cities of Service initiative is described in Appendix F.

This study aims to construct a grounded theory model concerning volunteer service, and more particularly demand for volunteer service. Additionally, this study aims to explore the ways cities assess the impacts of that service. Participants included in the purposive sample for this study require certain characteristics according to the researcher’s judgment. Participants should have official capacity and familiarity with service as a strategy to address local challenges. With over 30,000 cities and towns in the United States (National League of Cities, 2011) with officials who might fit the profile for this study, a sampling strategy is needed to narrow the field to information rich cases (Patton, 2002).
Each of the cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition has demonstrated, by committing to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service, perceived need for volunteer service to help address pressing issues in their cities (Cities of Service, 2010). Therefore, whether through conscious calculation or otherwise, the cities in the Cities of Service coalition have considered their need—i.e., demand—for volunteer service. Taking that logic a step further, these cities have likely also created expectations for the impact and benefit of volunteer service. The cities in the Cities of Service coalition have also resolved to increase engagement opportunities (Cities of Service, n.d.).

Cities in the Cities of Service coalition, therefore, have relevant knowledge and experience in the subject of this grounded theory study.

Thirty-nine (39) cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition agreed to participate in key informant interviews for this study. Accordingly, the sample for this study consists of those 39 cities. Redundancy, and thus saturation of the data, became apparent in the key informant interviews no later than the conclusion of the twenty-second interview. At that time, 17 additional interviews had already been scheduled. Out of consideration for those interviewees who had agreed to participate in this study and in an effort to obtain rich data, those remaining 17 interviews were conducted. No further sampling was required for this study and the data collection concluded at the end of the thirty-ninth interview.
Data Collection

Qualitative data were collected from three sources in this study: High-Impact Service Plans published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition, grant applications seeking Cities of Service Leadership Grant funding, and key informant interview transcripts. Data from the High-Impact Service Plans, grant applications, and key informant interview transcripts were content analyzed. Data from city organizational charts and 2010 U.S. Census data were used to explore differences in numbers of coded data excerpts according to city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Additionally, city organizational charts were used to determine the existence of citywide volunteer coordination in the city. Differences between cities with respect to the existence of citywide volunteer coordination were explored relative to city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government.

Data Collection from High-Impact Service Plans

The particular portion of the published High-Impact Service Plans that was content analyzed in this study is the preface material called “Message from the Mayor”. Each of the published High-Impact Service Plans contains a “Message from the Mayor”. The reason for selecting only this portion is that the “Message from the Mayor” is developed independently by each of the mayors in the cities that have developed a High-Impact Service Plan. Much of the rest of the content contained in the various High-Impact Service Plans was supplied by Cities of Service and is not or does not appear to be wholly original.
to the various cities. For this reason, data relating to independent motivations for subscribing to the Cities of Service initiative and/or statements relating to expectations for its impact are more likely, in the researcher’s view, to be contained in this portion of the High-Impact Service Plan. This conclusion was made only after reading the full content of each of the published High-Impact Service Plans.

Data Collection from Grant Applications

Cities with populations of 100,000 or more with a 4-year degree granting college or university were eligible to seek Cities of Service Leadership Grants in 2010. Nearly 100 applications were made for funding. Only those grant applications made by grant recipient cities were included in this study. Limiting the grant applications included as data in this study to those prepared by cities that received Cities of Service Leadership Grants was a practical necessity because the full population of cities that made Cities of Service Leadership Grant applications could not be identified.

Grant applications were initially sought through interviewees. However, the interviewee in the second key informant interview conducted for this study viewed the request as antagonistic. After that second interview, the interview guide was revised (Appendix I) and grant applications were obtained by public records requests to records custodians in the Cities of Service Leadership Grant recipient cities.
Data Collection from Key Informant Interviews

Elected or appointed officials in each of the cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition were invited to participate in this study on behalf of their city. A copy of the email letter sent to these officials inviting their participation is attached as Appendix G. Elected or appointed officials in 12 of the 20 cities that received Cities of Service Leadership Grants responded to the email inviting participation in this study. Telephone calls were placed to the Chief Service Officers in the remaining eight cities that received Cities of Service Leadership Grants. As a result of that effort, 19 of the 20 cities that received a Cities of Service Leadership Grant participated in this study. In addition to the aforementioned 19 Cities of Service Leadership Grant cities, elected or appointed officials in 20 cities that did not receive Cities of Service Leadership Grants responded to the email requesting their participation in this study. Accordingly, of the 119 cities in the Cities of Service coalition, 39 cities participated and thus are included in the criterion-based purposive sample for this study.

A structured interview is preferred in this study because it allows the researcher to draw more inferences from the data across multiple interviews. Each interview was expected to be completed in 15 to 30 minutes. The questions presented in the key informant interviews are set forth in Appendix H. Those questions were revised after the second interview to remove requests for documents. The revised key informant interview questions are set forth in Appendix I.
Data Collection from City Organizational Charts

City organizational charts were obtained for each of the cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition. In large part these city organizational charts were obtained through official websites maintained by the cities. City organizational charts for eight cities were obtained through public records requests to records custodians.

The purpose of obtaining city organizational charts in this study was to: (1) ascertain the form of government for each city belonging to the Cities of Service coalition, and (2) determine whether the city had a staff position for citywide volunteer coordination. Where it could not be determined from the city organizational chart if the city had a staff position for citywide volunteer coordination, phone calls were placed to city clerks to determine if such a position existed within the city. Through city organizational charts and city clerks, information about the form of government and existence of citywide volunteer coordination was obtained for each of the 119 cities in the Cities of Service coalition. A summary of the Cities of Service coalition members identified by form of government and existence of citywide volunteer coordination is given in Appendix L. This data were subjected to analysis using chi-square ($\chi^2$) analysis to explore difference between cities that do and do not have citywide volunteer coordination based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. This data were also used to explore differences in the number of responses in each core category of the coded data.
Data Collection from 2010 U.S. Census Data

City size for each of the cities in the Cities of Service coalition was determined according to 2010 U.S. Census data (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). Differences in the number of coded data excerpts in each of the categories of data in this study were explored relative to city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Along these dimensions, differences between cities with respect to the existence of citywide volunteer coordination were also explored and presented as an additional finding of this study.

Data Storage

Stake (1995) recommends identification and maintenance of a reliable data storage system. In this study data were stored electronically. Specifically, data obtained from the various High-Impact Service Plans and grant applications was converted from portable document format into Microsoft Word and stored in .doc format and saved on a password protected hard drive as well as in Dropbox, a secure online document storage utility. Key informant interviews were immediately transcribed into Microsoft Word and saved in the manner just described. Each of these Microsoft Word files were also uploaded to Dedoose and stored in a password protected online account. Microsoft Word is the preferred format for data analysis in Dedoose. City organizational charts were stored on a password protected hard drive.
All of the electronic data files for this study were accessible only by the researcher, the researcher’s dissertation committee members, and the second coder.

**Explanation of Data Analysis and Research Tools**

Each of the research tools employed in this study are discussed below.

**Content Analysis**

Content analysis involves "qualitative data reduction and sense-making...that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings" (Patton, 2002, p. 453). Core consistencies, as that term is used by Patton (2002), are more commonly called themes or categories (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Content analysis is a method of text analysis that "bridges statistical formalism and the qualitative analysis of the materials" (Bauer, 2000, p.132). As a research tool, the purpose of content analysis is to make "replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use" (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). Content analysis is further useful in describing behavioral responses, yielding information about political patterns, and revealing trends (Weber, 1985). Here, content analysis of the Message from the Mayor entries in the High-Impact Service Plans developed by Cities of Service coalition member cities, the grant applications and key informant interview transcripts is intended to draw out information about motivations to include volunteers in strategies designed to addressing local challenges, and ways of assessing the impacts of that volunteer service.
As it relates to content analysis, grounded theory seeks to develop categories of statements that have systematic and logical interrelations for the purpose of forming a theoretical framework to explain a phenomenon (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Three types of coding in content analysis are relevant to this study: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. The purpose of open coding is to uncover concepts within the data. Open coding can further be used to uncover the dimensions of those concepts. Accordingly, open coding primarily yields descriptive data. Axial coding enables the researcher to explore relationships between categories identified within the data. Selective coding enables the researcher to develop conclusions about relationships in the data and develop explanatory frameworks (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

A more granular explanation of the coding process is offered. Before beginning the coding process, the researcher is advised to read the material to be coded and makes notes in order to develop an understanding, albeit tentative, about the categories and relationships that may emerge in the data (Maxwell, 2005). Open coding is the first step in the coding process. During open coding the data are read again and major themes in the data are identified. This process is what might be called preliminary coding. Codes are attached to segments or excerpts of the data by the researcher during open coding. Core codes are those codes that have higher frequencies in the data. In this study, core codes were identified with respect to each of the two research questions in the open coding process.
The objective of the axial coding process is to identify categories in the data that influence the core categories. Once the categories of data that influence the core categories or themes have been identified, the researcher can develop a coding paradigm. A coding paradigm is an illustration of the relationships between categories or themes in the data (Creswell, 2002).

Selective coding is the final coding phase. During selective coding, the researcher discerns relationships in the themes identified in the data. At this point, the researcher can develop a grounded theory model based on the qualitative data. In a grounded theory study, the resulting model provides and explanation an observed phenomenon grounded in the data (Creswell, 2002).

Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service are employed as a research tool to gain a deep understanding around motivations to engage volunteers in strategies to address local challenges. Key informant interviews, when conducted as in-depth interviews, are "meaning-making endeavor[s]" (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009, p. 94) and are often conducted for the purpose of generating theory. In-depth key informant interviews are an appropriate research tool to employ when the researcher wants to explore a particular issue or focused topic with an individual respondent (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009).
As a data collection tool, Yin (2003) views interviews as "one of the most important sources" of information in qualitative research (p. 89). Hesse-Biber & Leavy (2009) describe a process for designing and conducting interviews for qualitative research purposes. That process proceeds in a linear fashion as follows: (1) selection of a research topic; (2) interviewee (sample) selection; (3) establishing interview protocol, i.e., whether the interview will be conducted in-person, telephonically, electronically, or by email, with email recommended only when time or resource constraints make it the only feasible option because depth and spontaneity of the communication are diminished; (3) coordinating the interview with the interviewee; and (4) conducting the interview.

A structured interview whereby each of the interviewees is asked the same series of questions is preferred for this research for the reason that such interviews allows more comparisons to be made between the various interview responses (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009).

In this research structured key informant interviews were conducted by telephone. Because Cities of Service coalition cities are spread throughout the country, conducting interviews by phone made completion of this research feasible.

An interview guide (Appendix H) was developed to aid in conducting the structured key informant interviews. The interview guide was developed such that each interview would last approximately 15 to 30 minutes. During the second interview the interviewees, as per the interview guide, was asked if he was willing to provide a copy of his city's Cities of Service Leadership Grant application. The response was antagonistic and the interview...
ended very shortly thereafter. At this point a change in strategy was made. Instead of seeking grant applications from interviewees, those documents were obtained through public records requests to each of the cities that received Cities of Service Leadership Grants. This was done to avoid the possibility that later interviewees would respond negatively to the request to provide the grant applications thereby causing those interviewees to go cold, so to speak. The revised interview guide, which eliminated the document request is attached as Appendix I. The strategy of obtaining documents through formal records requests to records custodians may have resulted in more data being obtained through the final interview question, wherein interviewees were invited to share or add any other information about volunteer service in their city not already covered in the interview.

The shortest interview was 16 minutes and the longest was 1 hour and 12 minutes. The average time for each interview was 24 minutes.

A total of 39 interviews were conducted with appointed or elected officials in cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition for this study. Of the 39 interview informants, 11 were elected officials and 28 were appointed officials. The interview response rate was 33 percent. Appendix J provides a summary of the interview informants for this study.

Inter-rater Reliability

Cohen's kappa (κ) is used to measure inter-rater reliability in this study (Cohen, 1960). This statistic evaluates inter-rater agreement based on the codes applied by two
coders and takes into account a hypothetical probability that some coding agreement is due to chance. In qualitative studies where more than one code is applied to the data, $\kappa$ is an appropriate measure of inter-rater reliability (deVries, Ramrattan, Smorenburg, Gouma, & Boermeester, 2008). In terms of indicating agreement between coders, a $\kappa$ of less than 0.20 reflects poor agreement between the coders' application of codes; a $\kappa$ between 0.21 and 0.40 indicates fair agreement; a $\kappa$ between 0.41 and 0.60 suggests moderate agreement; a $\kappa$ between 0.61 and 0.80 indicates acceptably good agreement; and a $\kappa$ between 0.81 and 1.0 represents very good agreement between the coders' application of codes (Landis & Koch, 1977). For this study, a $\kappa$ greater than 0.61 is achieved between the coders' application of codes, representing an acceptably good level of agreement.

An overview of the coding process in this study is shown in Figure 3. An expanded view of the coding process for this study is set forth in Appendix K.
Figure 3: Overview of Coding Process
Prior to undertaking the coding process, the researcher and second coder discussed the goals of the research, the data sources, the relevant literature, and the coding process. During that discussion, the importance of independent code creation and application was discussed.

It is important, however, to note that in this study the first coder and the second coder were not at the same coding stage at various times during the coding process. This resulted in the second coder being able to see the axial codes developed by the first coder in the shared software application before the second coder finished open coding the data. This was an unanticipated consequence flowing from the selection and use of the Dedoose software, and could have resulted in the second coder's codes being influenced by the codes developed by the first coder. The researcher consulted with the second coder after reporting the findings in this study to determine whether the second coder in fact viewed the initial codes applied to the data by the researcher. The second coder confirmed that she did view the open and axial codes applied to the data by the researcher before she completed the open coding process. However, the second coder did not view the underlying data segments to which those initial codes were applied. Further, the second coder confirmed that the codes developed and applied to the data during her open and axial coding process were independently created according to her knowledge of this study and relevant literature.
Qualitative Data Analysis

Data collected in connection with this study was analyzed using Dedoose. Dedoose is a web-based qualitative research tool designed to manage, analyze and synthesize qualitative data. (SocioCultural Research Consultants LLC, 2012). Dedoose was developed by researchers in the Fieldwork and Qualitative Research Laboratory in the Semel Institute Center for Culture and Health at the University of California Los Angeles.

By utilizing Dedoose, codes and descriptive data can be attached to the data collected in this study while keeping that data in context. This allows the researcher to maintain greater contextual meaning during the coding process. Once coded, Dedoose allows the researcher to create visual models of the data. The types of visual models that can be created include code trees that depict the coding process (from open coding to axial coding to selective coding), frequencies of various themes in the data, and cross-code occurrence charts. These tools are designed to aid the researcher in identification of patterns in the data and communicating those results effectively.

Chi-Square Analysis

Chi-square ($\chi^2$) analysis was used to analyze and explore the data collected in connection with this study. Specifically, chi-square analysis was used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in the number of coded data excerpts in each category of data based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Additionally, chi-square analysis was used to explore differences between cities that have
citywide volunteer coordination—whether grant funded or budgeted—based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government.

Chi-square analysis, a non-parametric statistical tool, is an appropriate test for use in this study because the data does not need to be normally distributed and because the data are reported in frequencies. A chi-square analysis is a comparison between observed and expected frequencies of groups. The test statistic ($\chi^2$) is compared to critical values based on the $\alpha$ level for the study to determine significance (Spatz, 2008).

A 95% level of confidence, which translates to a .05 level of significance, is used for this study. At the .05 level of significance the probability of drawing the conclusion that a statistically significant difference was observed when in fact that difference was attributable to chance is five percent. The likelihood of making an error of this kind is known as Type I error. Lowering $\alpha$ reduces the probability of making a Type I error, but increases the probability of making a Type II error ($\beta$). A Type II error occurs when the researcher fails to reject a null hypothesis (here that there is no difference between citywide volunteer coordination based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, or form of government) when in fact such a difference exists. In social science research $\alpha=.05$ is generally acceptable for balancing Type I and Type II error (Spatz, 2008).

**Study Feasibility**

Feasibility is a primary concern when undertaking research. The feasibility of this study is supported by the relatively small sample of cities in the criterion-based purposive
sample (n=39) and the low costs of undertaking this research because much of the data can be gathered through publicly available documents and telephone interviews. A challenge to the feasibility of this study was presented by issues related to gaining access to interviewees.

**Audit Trail**

Maintenance of an audit trail, namely documentation of “how the study was conducted, including what was done, when, and why” (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006, p. 628), allows data collected in connection with the study to be independently confirmed. In this way the fidelity of the data collected during the study can be preserved. Appendix M sets forth a condensed audit trail for this study.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study**

The trio of measures typically applied to assess the quality of quantitative studies—reliability, internal validity, and external validity—are not generally appropriate measures to assess the methodological quality in qualitative studies. Instead, methodological quality and the rigor of qualitative studies is more appropriately assessed relative to the data collection tools and conclusions drawn on the data.

Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach, and Richardson (2005) identify five indicators of methodological quality germane to this constructivist grounded theory study. First, the codes applied to the data should be meaningful. To this point, Charmaz (2006)
and Corbin and Strauss (2008) maintain that the constant comparative method, which is employed in this study, is designed to yield meaningful codes by analyzing data as it is collected and capturing categories of data through the process of memoing. Additionally, the researcher should be able to articulate rational bases for the inclusion and exclusion of data. In this study, data contained in the various High-Impact Service Plans other than the preface material called “Message from the Mayor” was excluded based on the researcher’s conclusion that the material in those documents did not appear to be independently created by the city. The third and fourth quality indicators identified by Brantlinger et al. (2005) relate to the trustworthiness and credibility of the data. Each of the interviews for this study was transcribed word-for-word. Additionally, two coders coded the data collected for this study and an acceptably good level of agreement in coding application was achieved ($\kappa = .66$) as to the data in categories coded for the first research question and overall good agreement was achieved ($\kappa = .92$) as to data in categories coded for the second research question. The conclusions in a qualitative study should, according to Brantlinger et al. (2005), be supported by sufficient quotations from the data. Attached as Appendix N to this study are the coded excerpts from the data that support the conclusions made here. Finally, connections should be made to existing research. In this study, connections are made to the volunteer process model (Musick and Wilson, 2008), Arnstein (1969), Ostrom (1996), and Perry and Wise (1990).

Kaufmann and Denk (2011) discuss the credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability of grounded theory studies. Lincoln and Guba (1985) also point to
credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability as measures of methodological quality in quantitative research. To both Kaufmann and Denk (2011) and Lincoln and Guba (1985), these measures—credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability—make up the trustworthiness of a study. Credibility of a grounded theory study, according to the Kaufmann and Denk (2011), begins with the research questions and the data collection tools. The research questions and the data collection tools should be accessible to the study participants, meaning that the study participants should be able to readily understand the purpose of the study. Dependability of a grounded theory study hinges on the coding process. The codes that are applied to the data should capture as much of the data as practical without overreaching to force additional data into the coding scheme. Dependability means that the data and the process are presented in a transparent way. Similarly, confirmability relates to the transparency of the process, as well as providing sufficient explanation around the process and the links between the codes applied to the data. Finally, grounded theory studies are transferable if they result in new theory, new explanations for existing theory, or identify future research (Kaufmann & Denk, 2011).

Charmaz (2006) stresses the importance of credibility in constructivist grounded theory studies. To Charmaz (2006) credibility relates to originality, resonance and usefulness. In a grounded theory study, originality means that the research provides an expanded, new, or alternative theoretical concept. A study with resonance is one that is both logical and nuanced. In other words, do the findings of the study fully portray the phenomenon under investigation? Finally, in order for a study to demonstrate usefulness, it should contribute to the existing
scholarship and inform future research (Charmaz, 2006). Figure 4 below illustrates the general standards for methodological quality for qualitative studies according to the guidance provided by Brantlinger et al. (2005), Kaufmann and Denk (2011), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Charmaz (2006).

Figure 4: General Standards for Methodological Quality for Qualitative Studies
The strengths and weakness of this study are discussed below.

Strengths

Triangulation of data sources in this study is a source of strength in its design (Maxwell, 2005).

Additionally, an audit trail was maintained for this study. A condensed audit trail is set forth in Appendix M. Maintenance of an audit trail enables other researchers to critically assess this study's findings and conclusions, thus lending to the strength of this study (Ary et al., 2006). The audit trail and the coded excerpts attached as Appendix N improve the dependability and confirmability of this study (Kauffman & Denk, 2011).

Figure 5 summarizes the ways this study demonstrates methodological quality along the trustworthiness measures described by Kaufmann and Denk (2011), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Charmaz (2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustworthiness Measure</th>
<th>Demonstration of Trustworthiness in this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Credibility             | • Originality – Study addresses an area that has not been extensively studied  
                          | • Resonance – Logical connections can be drawn between the findings of this study and prior research  
                          | • Usefulness – Future research is informed by this study |
| Dependability           | • An audit trail was maintained for this study; data were coded by two coders |
| Confirmability          | • The coded data are made part of this study |
| Transferability         | • Grounded theory for volunteer service demand is proposed; Grounded theory may be applied and studied in other contexts in future studies |

Figure 5: Demonstration of Trustworthiness in this Study

Weaknesses

The weaknesses of this study include implications of its trustworthiness, reliability, validity, and generalizability. Each of these potential sources of weakness in the research design is discussed.
Trustworthiness

Just as this study demonstrates certain elements of trustworthiness, there are other aspects of this study that may be attacked on trustworthiness grounds. This constructivist grounded theory study aimed to (a) develop a grounded theory model to explain demand for volunteer service on the part of local governments and (b) demonstrate how local governments assess the impacts of volunteer service as a governance strategy. A grounded theory model for volunteer service demand emerged from the data in this study. Additionally, this study produced a generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.

Credibility

Although the data in this study was coded by two coders, the grounded theory that emerged from this study was not submitted to member checking. Member checking is the process of submitting the conclusions of a study to experts in the field for review, scrutiny, and comment (Morse, Barrett, Mauan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002; Charmaz, 2006). Because the grounded theory that emerged from the data in this study was not submitted to member checking, the findings and conclusions suffer from a credibility limitation.

Originality

While the scholarship in volunteering is vast, few studies have addressed the factors that drive volunteer demand. Handy and Srinivasan (2005) conducted a qualitative study
on the demand for volunteers in non-profit hospitals. The authors concluded that hospital CEOs make decisions about employing volunteers based on the costs of using volunteers. Those costs are volunteer coordination and management costs, screening and background check costs, and training costs. The grounded theory model for volunteer service demand that emerged from the data are comprised of various motivating factors—economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-based motivation—and feasibility concerns. These categories arguably re-cast the motives described by Perry and Wise (1990) toward public service. Public service motivation is comprised of three types of motives toward public service. Those are rational motives, norm-based motives, and affective motives. The motivational categories in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand in this study are not wholly original because they are drawn significantly from the work of Perry and Wise (1990).

**Resonance**

Because this study was conducted according to the constructivist grounded theory methodology (Charmaz, 2006), the findings and conclusions are not intended to be an absolute rendering of the phenomenon under study. Instead, the findings and conclusions are one of many possible renderings, or constructions, of the data based on the researcher's experiences, values, and prior knowledge of relevant theory (Charmaz, 2006). For this reason, other researchers in the field may reasonably disagree with the reasoning applied to this study and/or the robustness of the study, thus implicating the resonance of this study.
Usefulness

This study attempted to contribute to the scholarship on volunteering, and more particularly demand for and impact of volunteer service at the local government level. This study may have little relevance, and accordingly little usefulness, outside of the context for this study. The findings and conclusions have also not been empirically tested.

Reliability

A particular concern in this study is maintenance of the fidelity of the information being communicated by the study participants. In qualitative research, the researcher's point of view, values and perceptions should not interfere with the information being delivered by the study participant in a way that changes the meaning of that information (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009). This concern is addressed by having two coders code all of the data collected in this study. Reliability in studies that employ content analysis can be improved by using multiple coders (Krippendorff, 2004). This study employs two coders—the researcher and a Ph.D. candidate—in an effort to optimize reliability. Overall, a good level of agreement was achieved between the coders as to the data coded into categories for this study.

The reliability of this study may be additionally implicated on the grounds that the interviews, which served as a significant source of data for this study, were transcribed contemporaneously with conducting the interviews. The possibility exists that errors in transcription may have altered the meaning of data interviewees attempted to communicate.
Validity

Three types of validity concerns merit discussion in relation to studies that employ content analysis: substantive validity, conceptual validity, and methodological validity. Substantive validity relates to maintaining the contextual meaning of data during the coding process. If the researcher ascribes a meaning to data that was not intended by its source, the substantive validity of the study is compromised. Conceptual validity relates to the fact that data sources may contain elements of meaning that are not explicit. To the extent that there is hidden meaning in the data source that is not captured in the coding process, the conceptual validity of the study is implicated. The methodological validity of any study that employs content analysis can be criticized on the basis that there exists no standard by which to gauge the inferences the researcher draws on the data (Krippendorff, 2004).

Krippendorff (2004) proposes three kinds of “validating evidence” for researchers who employ content analysis (p. 318). The first such type of validating evidence is content-based meaning the researcher can point to segments of the data that explain or provide justification for the researcher's coding treatment of the data. The second type of validating evidence is also content-based but provides justification for any inferences the researcher may make into the meaning of the text based on its context. The last type of validating evidence is demonstration that the themes in the data are somehow inter-related. Inter-relations between themes in the data can be supported by related theory.
In qualitative studies more generally, communicative validity is of important concern. In qualitative research, interpretations of and conclusions on the data are subject to the researcher's subjective rendering (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009). By using Dedoose, as opposed to another qualitative research analysis tool, the data segments remain in context. Because the data remains in context, it is anticipated that the communicative validity of this study is not compromised.

Generalizability

Strauss and Corbin (1990) state explicitly that theories derived from grounded theory studies “specify the conditions that give rise to specific sets of action/interaction pertaining to a phenomenon and the resulting consequences. It is generalizable to those specific situations only” (p. 251). Accordingly, this study may not be generalizable beyond the sample.

Figure 6 summarizes the ways this study demonstrates methodological quality along the trustworthiness measures described by Kaufmann and Denk (2011), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Charmaz (2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Measure</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>• Findings and conclusions not scrutinized through member checking process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>• Categories in the grounded theory drawn on prior research by Perry and Wise (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance</td>
<td>• Findings represent one of many potential constructions of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>• Limited in context to local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>• Interviews transcribed by researcher contemporaneously with conducting interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>• Researcher may have ascribed meaning to data not intended by source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizability</td>
<td>• Small sample; grounded theory studies not typically generalizable beyond context of study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Weaknesses of this Study

Conclusion

Two research questions are presented in this study. Those are: (1) What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges? and (2) How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges?
This study's research plan is adopted from Krippendorff (2004) and employs the coding technique for reducing the data and identifying themes in the data proposed by Corbin and Strauss (2008).

The data for this study derives from two types of sources: extant texts prepared by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition (including High-Impact Service Plans, grant applications, and city organizational charts) and key informant interview transcripts. The data (collectively consisting of the extant text sources and key informant interview transcripts) are content analyzed. In this way the data sources are triangulated. Data are content analyzed for purpose of identifying themes around the research questions presented. Themes in the data are uncovered through the coding process (which includes open coding, axial coding, and selective coding), will be communicated as the findings of this study in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The two research questions posed in this study are: (1) What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges? and (2) How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges? In this study data were collected from extant documents prepared by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition (including published High-Impact Service Plans, Cities of Service Leadership Grant applications, and city organizational charts) and transcripts of key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service. The purposive criterion sample (Patton, 2002) for this study included the 39 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 that further agreed to participate in key informant interviews for this study. Elected or appointed officials in these 39 cities participated in key informant interviews for this study. The qualitative data obtained from the High-Impact Service Plans, grant applications, and key informant interview transcripts were content analyzed (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and coded according to the coding protocol described by Corbin and Strauss (2008). The coding process revealed major categories in the data. Those major categories of data are reported in this chapter as findings on the research questions.

This chapter is organized in the following way. First, the purposive criterion sample (Patton, 2002) for this study is described. Next, the findings on the first research question
are set forth. In particular, the major categories of data that emerged during the coding process suggesting the factors that motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges are presented. The number of coded data excerpts and the level of agreement between the two coders as to each category of data are provided. The coded data excerpts relating to volunteer service demand were separated according to the source of the excerpt along the dimensions of city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if differences in the number of coded statements in each data category and subcategory exist between the cities in this study on the basis of city size, mayoral political affiliation, or form of government. The major categories of data suggesting the factors that motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies to address local challenges are incorporated into a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand. Next, the findings of this study on the second research question are presented. Particularly, those coded data excerpts that suggest the ways in which cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges. The data in this study would suggest that cities assess the impact of volunteer initiatives by developing metrics, by measuring outcomes, and by telling qualitative stories. The total number of coded data excerpts and the level of agreement between the two coders are provided as to each of these data categories. A generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service as a strategy for addressing local challenges is proposed based on the impact assessment methods suggested by this study and the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand presented in this study.
Sample Description

In this study qualitative data were collected through extant texts and key informant interviews. The purposive criterion sample for this study was comprised of 39 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 that further agreed to participate in key informant interviews through elected or appointed officials. As of June 2012, there were a total of 119 cities in the Cities of Service coalition.

The National League of Cities describes large cities as those having a population of 200,000 or more, medium cities of those having between 70,000 and 200,000 residents, and small cities as those that have less than 70,000 residents (National League of Cities, n.d.). Those parameters are adopted for purposes of this study. Thirty-four (29%) of the cities in the Cities of Service coalition are small cities, meaning the total population is less than 70,000. Thirty-one (26%) cities in the Cities of Service coalition are medium cities with population counts between 70,000 and 200,000. The remaining 54 cities (45%) are large cities with populations over 200,000.

Sixty-five percent (n=77) of the mayors in the sample for this study are Democratic mayors and 35% (n=42) are Republican mayors.

Of the 119 cities in the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012, 67 (56%) are organized with a strong mayor-council form of government. The large portion of cities organized as strong mayor-council form of government is possibly attributable to the fact that the Cities of Service initiative advocates for volunteer coordination at the executive
level and has provided grant funding to 20 cities to hire a Chief Service Officer to serve at the executive level. In this way, the Cities of Service further advocates for volunteer coordination in strong partnership with the mayor's office. Accordingly, the Cities of Service initiative may find more favor with mayors in cities with the strong mayor-council form of government. In addition to the 67 strong-mayor council cities, 44 (37%) are organized according to the council-manager form of government. The remaining 8 cities (7%) are organized as weak mayor-council governments.

Elected and/or appointed officials in each of the 119 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition were invited to participate in a key informant interview for this study. Elected or appointed officials in 39 cities participated in interviews for this study, resulting in a 33% key informant interview response rate. Compared to the sample for this study, the cities that participated in key informant interviews for this study did not differ from the population of cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition in a statistically significant way in terms of size ($\chi^2=3.13; \ df=2; \ p\text{-value}=0.209$). The proportion of democratic mayors who participated in key informant interviews for this study (79%) was higher than the proportion of democratic mayors in the Cities of Service coalition (65%). However, this difference was not statistically significant compared to the population of cities in the Cities of Service coalition at the 0.05 level ($\chi^2=2.97; \ df=1; \ p\text{-value}=0.085$). In terms of form of government, the cities that participated in key informant interviews for this study were very similar to the population of cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition ($\chi^2=0.744; \ df=2; \ p\text{-value}=0.689$).
Findings on Research Question #1

The first research question presented in this study is: What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges? To address this research question, the qualitative data collected for this study—consisting of High-Impact Service Plans, grant applications, and key informant interview transcripts—were content analyzed by coding the data according to the coding protocol described by Corbin and Strauss (2008). Coding the data in this way allows the researcher to identify categories within the data (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Categories of data can be used to develop a grounded theory model to explain a phenomenon observed in the data (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The data categories that emerged in the coding process were used to develop a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand.

From the various High-Impact Service Plans, grant applications, and key informant interview transcripts comprising the qualitative data for this study, a total of 112 data excerpts were coded for volunteer service demand. Eighty-three (74%) of the total coded data excerpts derive from key informant interview transcripts, 27 data excerpts derive from High-Impact Service Plans, and two (2) data excerpts derive from grant applications. The total number of coded data excerpts for each category of data represented in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand is set forth in Figure 7. For each category of data where one coder coded more excerpts than the other coder, the greater number of coded excerpts was included. Data excerpts coded similarly by both coders were counted only once.
The major categories that emerged from the data suggest the factors that drive demand for volunteer service as well as feasibility considerations important to cities implementing strategies that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges. The motivating factors, collectively referred to as strategic service motivations, include economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-driven motivation. Economic motivation is further comprised of motivation stemming from local budget constraint and motivation stemming from a desire on the part of the city to achieve cost savings. Budget constraint and cost savings were coded as subcategories of economic motivation in this study. Two subcategories of aspirational motivation were coded. Those are service culture and civic engagement. Data coded for service culture include those data excerpts that would suggest a desire on the part of the city to create a culture of service in the city through volunteer service. Data coded for civic engagement include those data excerpts that would suggest a desire on the part of the city to increase civic engagement in the city through volunteer service. Need-driven motivation relates to city need and citizen need. Data coded for city need suggest a motivation on the part of the city toward use of volunteer service to address staff or resource shortfalls. Data coded for citizen need suggest a motivation on the part of the city toward the use of volunteer service to address gaps in service delivery resulting in unmet citizen needs. The feasibility considerations germane to volunteer service demand on the part of the city according to the findings of this—and coded as data categories—include liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th># Coded</th>
<th>% Data Contribution of 112 Coded Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Motivation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Constraint</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74% of coded data on Economic Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26% of coded data on Economic Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirational Motivation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Culture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57% of coded data on Aspirational Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43% of coded data on Aspirational Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-Driven Motivation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56% of coded data on Need-Driven Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Need</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44% of coded data on Need-Driven Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12% of coded data on Strategic Service Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Climate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16% of coded data on Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Volunteer Supply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9% of coded data on Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Opportunities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19% of coded data on Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20% of coded data on Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16% of coded data on Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20% of coded data on Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8% of coded data on Volunteer Service Demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Percentages of coded data by category
Coding Agreement

For each category of data coded for the first research question, acceptably good agreement was achieved between the two coders for this study (Cohen, 1960). Cohen’s kappa was used in this study as a measure of inter-coder agreement. Cohen’s kappa expresses observed agreement between two coders but also takes into account a hypothetical probability that some coding agreement is attributable to chance alone. Figure 8 sets forth the Cohen’s kappa score for each category of data contained in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand. The overall Cohen's kappa score across all categories of data represented in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand was 0.66. Cohen's kappa scores between 0.41 and 0.60 represent moderate agreement between the coders and Cohen's kappa scores between 0.61 and 0.80 represent acceptably good agreement between the coders (Cohen, 1960).

In addition to acceptably good overall agreement between the coders across the categories of data represented in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand presented in this study, acceptably good agreement was achieved for each data category and each subcategory of data with the exception of cost savings and citizen need. As to each of those categories of data, moderate agreement was achieved between the coders. Acceptably good overall agreement between the coders was achieved as to feasibility.

The researcher notes that in each coded data category (with the exception of liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, and partnership opportunities) the first coder coded more
data excerpts than the second coder. Of the 112 total coded data excerpts coded for volunteer service demand, 83 coded data excerpts derived from key informant interview transcripts, 27 coded data excerpts derived from High-Impact Service Plans published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition, and 2 coded data excerpts derived from grant applications prepared by cities that were awarded a Cities of Service Leadership Grant. A possible explanation for this phenomenon, therefore, lies in the fact that the first coder conducted the key informant interviews for this study. It is possible, then, that the first coder relied on context gained during the various key informant interviews to attach codes during the content analysis phase of this study.
### Data Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th># Coded Data Segments (Coder #1)</th>
<th># Coded Data Segments (Coder #2)</th>
<th>Cohen's kappa score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTEER SERVICE DEMAND</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>κ=0.66 (overall inter-rater reliability score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Service Motivation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>κ=0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Motivation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>κ=0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Constraint</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>κ=0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>κ=0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirational Motivation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>κ=0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Culture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>κ=0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>κ=0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-Driven Motivation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>κ=0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>κ=0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Need</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>κ=0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>κ=0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Climate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>κ=1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Volunteer Supply</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>κ=0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>κ=0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>κ=0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>κ=0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>κ=0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Cohen’s kappa scores for data categories contained in grounded theory model for volunteer service demand

Categories of Data Coded on Research Question #1

The categories of data coded for the first research question include factors that motivate cities to engage citizens in strategies to address local challenges and certain
feasibility considerations. The motivational bases toward volunteer service include economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-driven motivation. These motivational bases are referred to collectively as strategic service motivation. The feasibility considerations that emerged as categories in the data include liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources.

_Strategic Service Motivation_

Strategic service motivation in this study refers, quite simply, to a city's motivation to include volunteer service in strategies intended to impact on challenges at the local level. In this study, three categories of data were coded for strategic service motivation. Those are economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-driven motivation. Development of the categories for strategic service motivation was significantly informed by the literature on Public Service Motivation ("PSM") (Perry & Wise, 1990). Although the work of Perry and Wise (1990) is sometimes viewed narrowly as a means of understanding the motivations of individuals to work in the public sector, PSM, according to the authors, is a motivation toward "a sense of public morality" (p. 368). In this way, PSM is logically extended from the individual unit of analysis to the city as a unit of analysis for this study. Perry and Wise (1990) describe three types of motives toward public service. Those are ration motives, norm-based motives, and affective motives.
Rational motives are those that draw individuals to public service in order to gain a particular advantage such as advocating for a personal cause. In carrying out this study, the researcher was sensitized to the concept of rational motives. In analyzing the data according to the constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2006), the researcher was inquisitive of the rational motives of cities to rely on volunteers to impact on pressing needs of the city. In other words, what advantage would a city gain by including volunteers in strategies to address local challenges? One such possible advantage that served as a sensitizing concept in this study was suggested by Ferris (1988). Ferris (1988) suggests that budget constraint may motivate cities to rely on volunteers for service delivery. As discussed in greater detail below, cities in fact are rationally motivated to engage volunteers in problem-solving strategies inasmuch as volunteer service may result in cost savings to cities, can potentially address gaps in service delivery due to budget constraint, and perhaps meet direct needs of the city by supporting city function.

Norm-based motives are motivations toward public service based on “a desire to serve the public interest” (Perry & Wise, 1990, 368). The notion of norm-based motives from the PSM literature spawned a number of questions in this study. Does the data show that the use of volunteers improves social equity? Does the data show that engaging volunteers in problem-solving strategies promote democratic ideals? How are cities serving the public interest through the strategic use of volunteers? Are cities motivated to engage volunteers in strategies to address local challenges because of an expectation on the part of citizens to do so? Each of these questions was captured during memoing as part of...
this constructivist grounded theory study and presence of mind as to each of those questions ultimately shaped the analysis of data in this study. Norm-based motives on the part of cities ultimately emerged as part of the grounded theory for volunteer service demand in this study. In particular, this study suggests that cities are motivated to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges as a means of meeting unmet citizen needs and as a means of increasing civic engagement. These motivations can likely be classified as norm-based motives described by Perry and Wise (1990).

Affective motives are motives toward public service that stem from a “genuine conviction about its social importance” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 369). Service is an activity that is done for the public good. On that basis, data analysis in this study was guided by a desire to uncover affective motives on the part of cities to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges. The questions captured during the memoing process in this constructivist grounded theory study related to affective motives of cities in this regard include: Does the data show that cities see volunteering as a way to serve the public good?; Do cities report a commitment to service as a strategy?; and Do cities identity with a volunteerism ethic? The grounded theory for volunteer service demand that emerged in this study suggests that cities demonstrate affective motives for relying on service as a strategy to address local challenges. Specifically, cities are motivated to engage volunteers in problem-solving strategies in order to create or sustain a culture of service and increase civic engagement.
Economic Motivation

Economic motivation in this study accounted for the greatest number of coded excerpts in the data set describing strategic service motivation. Specifically, 40% of the coded excerpts on strategic service motivation (n=68) related to economic motivation. Two types of economic motivation were prevalent in this study. Those are budget constraint and cost savings. Data coded for budget constraint suggest a motivation on the part of the city toward including volunteer service in strategies to address local challenges based on the inability of the city to deliver a particular level of services due to a limited budget. Budget constraint accounted for a majority (74%) of the coded data excerpts describing economic motivation for cities to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges. Data excerpts suggesting a desire on the part of the city to achieve cost savings through the use of volunteer service were coded as such. Cost savings accounted for 26% of the coded data excerpts describing economic motivation for cities to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges.

Ferris (1988) postulates that local budget constraint may motivate cities to rely on volunteer service for public service delivery. This study confirms Ferris' (1988) work. In fact, budget constraint emerged as one of the most frequently coded categories in the data for this study. It is noteworthy, however, that this study was conducted during a contracted economic climate. This reason alone could account for the large number of coded excerpts on economic motivation, and particularly budget constraint. While seemingly less likely, the economic climate could have contributed to economic motivation emerging as a
category. In other words, but for the economy at the time this study was conducted, economic motivation may not have emerged as a category in this grounded theory study.

Figure 9 provides selected references to the data related to economic motivation. The full set of excerpts relevant data excerpts is set forth in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Constraint</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “So we've had 10 years of budget shortfalls, we've deferred maintenance, we've had program cutbacks. As we look at volunteers what we see is a way how we might be able to restore services that the city can no longer provide. Some of those services that are now being delivered by volunteers that were once provided by the city.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Funding has been substantially low especially for things like environmental programs. That's one of the reasons we are engaging volunteers in that area.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We know that with diminishing funds, shrinking budget line items that service as a nicety is something that we are going to see less of and we really need to look to service as a strategy. Resources have been diminished but the need doesn't diminish. If anything, in times like these we are seeing the need in our community increase.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Savings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Well, there is always some part of what we do in the city that needs attention. There is never enough staff, never enough resources to do everything we are asked to do. Plus, we want to be able to deliver services without overburdening taxpayers. That's where volunteers come in.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “For us volunteers are a way for citizens to help shoulder the burden of costs in difficult economic times.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Selected Data Excerpts Describing Economic Motivation for Service
Aspirational Motivation

In this study aspirational motivation accounted for the second greatest number of coded excerpts in the data set describing strategic service motivation. In particular, 23 (34%) of the coded excerpts on strategic service motivation (n=68) related to aspirational motivation. The two types of aspirational motivation that were ultimately coded as subcategories in this study relate to reported desire on the part of the city to create a sustained service culture or to increase civic engagement through volunteer service. Cities reporting a desire to create a service culture accounted for 57% of the coded data excerpts on aspirational motivation with civic engagement accounting for the other 43% of the coded data excerpts on aspirational motivation.

With respect to creation of a service culture, Ansell and Gash (2008) is potentially instructive. Ansell and Gash (2008) note, that from a collaborative governance perspective, “[a] history of successful past cooperation can create social capital and high levels of trust that can produce a virtuous cycle of collaboration” (p. 11). Applied to the creation of a service culture, it is plausible that successful volunteer service initiatives can increase social capital and strengthen partnerships in communities thus spawning future initiatives that are postured for success.

The notion that volunteer service initiatives can potentially increase civic engagement in communities is consistent with the civic engagement literature. Volunteering is a form of civic engagement (Ramakrishnan & Baldassare, 2004). When local governments create demand for volunteer service, opportunities for engagement are
potentially created. An individual that donates time to meet demand for volunteer service in his or her community becomes integrated in to public life and connected to pressing issues within the community (Jones, 2006).

Selected interview excerpts describing cities' aspirational motivation to rely on volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges are given in Figure 10. The full set of excerpts from the data related to aspirational motivation for relying on volunteer service as a strategy is given in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We don't want that engagement to be a one shot deal. One shot deals are not enough. We need to find ways that make people continue in their service effort.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We introduce kids to volunteering in school, they learn about what their city government does, they learn that they have an important role and responsibility to their community. By doing this we capture them in this service ethic. We want them to be involved when they are home for summers from college and we want them to raise families here and get them, get their families involved in volunteering as adults. We want them to be an important member of the community and we want our city government to have a wonderful relationship with the people who live here and we see that we can do that through volunteering.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Engagement is important and it was really forward-thinking of our city to recognize that getting people involved in solving problems and being engaged.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I see service as part of this whole civic engagement continuum, to get people at the end of the day connected to their communities.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Selected Data Excerpts Describing Aspirational Motivation for Service
**Need-Driven Motivation**

Need-driven motivation in this study accounted for the least number of coded excerpts in the data set describing strategic service motivation with 18 (26%) of the 68 coded excerpts on strategic service motivation being related to need-driven motivation. Need-driven motivation for cities to rely on volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges was coded in two ways: citizen need and city need. Interestingly, a majority (56%) of the coded excerpts in this study related to city need rather than citizen need. Data coded for city need include excerpts from the data suggesting that cities are motivated to use volunteer service to address staffing or resources needs within the city. On the other hand, data coded for citizen need in this study include excerpts from the data suggesting that cities are motivated to rely on volunteer service to address unmet needs of citizens for service delivery.

Certain factors have been shown to bear on local governments’ decisions to partner with organizations for service delivery. Those factors include legislative mandate, local government need, policy objectives, and unmet need in the community (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). With respect to the findings of this study, cities may be motivated to engage citizens in strategies to address local challenges based on city need and unmet need in the community, or citizen need. Accordingly, the findings of this study relating to volunteer service demand are consistent with collaboration scholarship.

Figure 11 provides the references to the data related to need-driven motivation to rely on service as a strategy to impact on local challenges. The full set of excerpts from the
data related to need-driven motivation for relying on volunteers as part of a strategy to address challenges at the local level can be found in Appendix N.

### Selected Data Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It's always based on one thing: need. Obviously volunteerism happens everywhere. It happens in the faith-based community, it happens in the schools, it happens everywhere. And it happens because there is a need.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We know that with diminishing funds, shrinking budget line items that service as a nicety is something that we are going to see less of and we really need to look to service as a strategy. Resources have been diminished but the need doesn't diminish. If anything, in times like these we are seeing the need in our community increase.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“First, we look to what the need is. We don't go about service without focusing on how doing so is going to address a need we have in our city. While service is great for getting involved in their community we know that we only have so many resources available to kind of facilitate that activity so what we want to do is make sure that we are really harnessing that effort in a way that will address a true need in our city.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There was a need for expertise but no money to hire for or fill positions.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Selected Data Excerpts Describing Need-Driven Motivation for Service

**Feasibility**

The feasibility concerns related to volunteer service demand that emerged in this study are liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources. Each of these feasibility concerns is discussed and related to relevant existing literature. In this study 44 (39%) of the coded data excerpts
related to volunteer service demand concerned feasibility concerns. The data that was
coded included High-Impact Service Plans prepared and published by cities belonging to
the Cities of Service coalition, grant applications seeking Cities of Service Leadership
Grant funding, and key informant interview transcripts. Of the 44 coded data excerpts, 43
derived from key informant interview transcripts. One coded data excerpt on partnership
opportunities derived from a High-Impact Service Plan. None of the coded data excerpts
on feasibility derived from grant applications.

*Liability Climate*

The local liability climate, particularly whether a volunteer is treated as an
employee, is an important practical consideration when including volunteers in strategies to
address local challenges. Just as the liability climate may impact the availability of
medical care (Coco, Cohen, Horst, & Gambler, 2009), the potential for liability may
dissuade local governments from relying on volunteers to address challenges in the
community. In this study, seven of the 44 (16%) of the coded data excerpts related to
feasibility considerations were coded for liability climate.

Selected excerpts from the data coded for liability climate are set forth in Figure 12.
The full set of excerpts from the data related to liability climate can be found in Appendix
N.
Liability Climate

- “One thing that comes up here is liability. We have a state statute that for legal reasons volunteers are considered basically the same as employees. So if a volunteer gets hurt or whatever, you have a worker's comp issue. This is definitely a big enough deal to give us pause. What we do, so we know we want our volunteers to be safe and effective. We provide real training and education to our volunteers to address the liability issue.”

- “First, we are a self-insured city so we have to look at the potential for liability.”

Figure 12: Selected Data Excerpts Related to Liability Climate

With respect to compensation for time, volunteers are not considered employees if volunteering for a public agency provided the volunteer's work meets a certain litmus test set forth in the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”). The volunteer will be considered exempt when giving time to a public agency if such service is: (1) in furtherance of a civic, charitable, or humanitarian purpose and performed without receipt or promise of financial compensation except reimbursement of actual expenses incurred by the volunteer; (2) offered freely and without coercion on the part of the public agency; and (3) performed by an individual not otherwise employed by the public agency (29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(4)(A)). Individuals are exempt from the provisions of the FLSA when volunteering for private not-for-profit organizations if the volunteer gives his or her time for a civic, charitable, or humanitarian purposes without promise, expectation, or actual receipt of compensation (29 U.S.C. 203(5)).
More critically, with respect to liability for potential injury, individuals who volunteer for an organization—whether public or private—are not generally entitled to workers' compensation benefits if that individual is injured while volunteering unless volunteers are treated as employees under state or local law. Many states have in fact legislatively protected volunteers by extending workers' compensation benefits to them. Appendix P provides a summary of the laws of the states that have brought volunteers within the definition of an employee for purposes of workers' compensation benefits. The state laws identified in Appendix P fall into three general categories. The first is comprised of state laws that permit local jurisdictions to pass laws or ordinances recognizing volunteers as employees for purposes of workers' compensation in case of injury. The second is comprised of state laws that automatically recognize volunteers as employees for workers' compensation purposes when the individual is volunteering for a political subdivision or public agency. The third type of state law addressing workers' compensation for volunteers provides an exception, and thus benefits coverage, for volunteers engaged in emergency response for a county, city, town, municipality or special district. This latter type of state law is the most prevalent (having been enacted in some form in Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon and Tennessee). Many of these state laws are modeled on the Uniform Emergency Volunteer Health Practitioners Act, which was proposed in 2006 by the Uniform Law Commission in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 (Foxhall, 2008).
In sum, the potential liability concern deserves serious attention as a practical consideration when engaging volunteers in efforts to address pressing needs in the community. Local governments and partner organizations need to be cognizant of the liability climate. Local governments and partner organizations should further address liability concerns with counsel, insure against potential claims, and develop appropriate liability waivers.

**Skilled Volunteer Supply**

A significant body of research exists describing the various reasons why individuals volunteer. Hustinx et al. (2010) discuss the explanatory, narrative, and enlightenment theories of volunteering from an economic perspective, a sociology perspective, a psychology perspective, and a political science perspective. These theoretical and disciplinary perspectives relate to volunteer supply.

In this constructivist grounded theory study, skilled volunteer supply emerged from the data as an indicator of volunteer service demand. Of the 44 coded data excerpts related to feasibility considerations, 4 (9%) were coded for skilled volunteer supply. Cities that participated in this study were not overly concerned with the sheer availability of volunteer supply. Hurst (2009) notes that “Americans' interest in volunteering is so high lately that for many nonprofit groups every day feels like Thanksgiving at a soup kitchen. Far more people are offering their time than can easily be accommodated” (p. 16). Instead of the availability of volunteer supply, this study would suggest that cities are concerned with the skills potential volunteers may possess. This finding is consistent with Sagawa (2010).
Specifically, Sagawa (2010) suggests potential volunteers with needed skills should be identified by cities adopting service as a strategy to address local challenges.

Selected excerpts from the data coded for skilled volunteer supply are set forth in Figure 13. The full set of excerpts from the data related to skilled volunteer supply can be found in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skilled Volunteer Supply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We know we have people in the community with all kinds of skills. We see those skills as something we can put to work to solve issues or identify issues in the first place.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We've got a number of high tech companies here with a lot of expertises, you know, a lot of people with technical expertise. So we looked at asking what folks in the business community can do for us and how they can help us here in the city.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Selected Data Excerpts Related to Skilled Volunteer Supply

**Partnership Opportunities**

In this study, partnership opportunities emerged as a category in the data. Specifically, partnership opportunities are presented in this study as a feasibility concern. A total of 8 data excerpts were coded as relevant to partnership opportunities. Relative to feasibility concerns, this represents 19% of the total number of data excerpts.

According to Hess and Winner (2007), partnerships between local governments and private and nonprofit organizations in the community can lower barriers or perceived barriers to undertaking programs or initiatives that include volunteer service. Private and nonprofit organizations can supply volunteers and, in some cases, coordination capacity. The study by
Hess and Winner (2007) is consistent with the observations on the data in this study. In particular, cities in this study reported looking to partner organizations to provide volunteers, volunteer management capacity, and capacity to measure outcomes. Accordingly, partnership opportunities, as a category of data in this study, refer to the existence of organizations in the community that might provide volunteers, volunteer management capacity, and outcome measurement capacity.

The potential benefits flowing from service delivery partnerships include, among other potential benefits, efficiency, increased quantity of services delivered, improved quality of services (Gazley & Brudney, 2007). However, there are also potential disadvantages to partnerships between local governments and private and nonprofit organizations in the community. For example, such partnerships might invite “mission drift, loss of institutional autonomy or public accountability, cooptation of actors, greater financial instability, greater difficulty in evaluating results, and the expenditure of considerable institutional time and resources in supporting collaborative activities” (p. 392).

The work by Gazley (2010) is relevant to this study. Gazley (2010) considers the challenges presented by service delivery partnerships between local governments and nonprofit organizations. According to Gazley (2010), consideration of these challenges is important because the literature on partnerships between local governments and nonprofit organizations underestimates barriers to collaboration. In her study, Gazley (2010) found that, from the perspective of nonprofit managers, partnerships with local governments may be perceived as disadvantageous if past partnerships have been unsuccessful, if the collaborative capacity—
specifically, the organization’s ability to manage the partnership—of the organization is low, or if the organization has not partnered with a governmental partner in the past. Gazley hypothesized that nonprofit organizations that have less resource dependence on the governmental partner may perceive greater barriers to service delivery partnerships. However, the data in her study did not support that hypothesis. Other studies have suggested the reverse, namely that availability of funding from the governmental partner may motivate nonprofit organizations toward service delivery partnerships (Gazley & Brudney, 2007).

Figure 14 provides selected references to the data related to partnership opportunities. The full set of excerpts from the data related to partnership opportunities can be found in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We have partnerships with so many organizations here. They really know how to empower the city and that has been an important message that our mayor has tried to get out to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think we have to consider the capacity of our partner organizations, being able to be sure that when we are out there identifying and working with organizations that they know how to manage volunteers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Selected Data Excerpts on Partnership Opportunities

*Manageability*

The data in this study revealed that manageability of volunteer service initiatives is an important concern for cities. Thus, this feasibility concern relates to the demand for volunteer
service on the part of cities. In particular, manageability accounted for 20% of the coded data excerpts on feasibility considerations and 8% of the total number of coded data excerpts on volunteer service demand. Although the data content analyzed were comprised of High-Impact Service Plans published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition, grant applications made by cities seeking a Cities of Service Leadership Grant, and key informant interview transcripts, each of the coded data excerpts on manageability (n=9) derived from key informant interview transcripts.

Vinton (2012) notes that the volunteerism literature is replete with studies that conclude volunteer management is important. Effective volunteer management is so important, according to Vinton (2012), some studies have concluded that the effectiveness of a volunteer initiative rises or falls with the management of that initiative. Volunteer management includes volunteer screening, matching volunteers to appropriate jobs or tasks, training volunteers, and monitoring the work of volunteers.

In this study, manageability encompasses each of the aspects cited by Vinton (2012), those being the ability to screen potential volunteers, matching volunteers to meaningful opportunities that serve a need in the community, the ability to train volunteers to effectively carry out their tasks, and the ability to monitor the work of volunteers. In some respects, manageability is a function of resources or availability of funding to staff a volunteer coordinator or volunteer manager to oversee the volunteer initiative. Manageability, however, is also something more. Manageability is the ability of the local government to use volunteers strategically to address the needs of the community. Volunteers must be managed differently
depending on the issue, cause, or organization to which they are giving their time. Effective volunteer management can maximize the work of volunteers and can produce benefits that outweigh the costs of that management (Bembry, 1996).

Figure 15 provides the references to the data related to manageability. The full set of excerpts from the data related to manageability is included in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manageability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• But, oh my goodness, don't I know that there is a lot of work that goes into having volunteers. I might have someone come in for 5 hours a week for a month and each time this person comes in I have to show them what to do and find something for them to do. I mean I have enough to do and I would like to get my work done and get home at a decent hour. Wouldn't it be easier to just say no, I don't need a volunteer in here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We need to be part of activities that volunteers can be managed effectively to make impact. That's a big factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Selected Data Excerpts on Manageability

**Measurability**

The perceived measurability—or immeasurability—of the impact of a volunteer service initiative is a feasibility consideration for local governments considering service as a strategy to address local challenges. Measurement, according to McDavid and Hawthorn (2006), is a methodology for linking observed effects to dimensions of a program or initiative. McDavid and Hawthorn (2006) further note that measurement is often undertaken for the purpose of providing a basis for evidence-based decision making.
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In this study, a total of 7 data excerpts are coded for measurability. The data set subjected to content analysis for this study included High-Impact Service Plans published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition, grant applications made by cities seeking a Cities of Service Leadership Grant, and key informant interview transcripts. It should be noted, however, that each of the 7 data excerpts coded for measurability derived from key informant interview transcripts. Relative to feasibility, measurability comprises 16% of the coded data. Relative to the entire set of coded data on volunteer service demand, measurability accounts for 6% of the total number of coded data excerpts. The data, therefore, would suggest that the ability to measure the impact or outcomes of a volunteer service initiative, what is referred to here as measurability, is a feasibility consideration that bears on volunteer service demand by local governments. Interestingly, the data in this study would further suggest that measurability is important for cities not to inform evidence-based decision making, but to legitimize the effort and resources dedicated to volunteer service initiatives. Interviewees in this study did not point to performance measurement as a tool for increasing the legitimacy of volunteer service initiatives. According to Ho and Coates (2002), however, performance measurement can increase the legitimacy of taxpayer funded initiatives. In particular, Ho and Coates (2002) advocate for citizen participation in designing and implementing performance measures. By so including citizens in the process, they gain greater understanding of government spending and the services that are produced as a result of that spending. Performance measurement can additionally improve resource allocations when used as a decision making tool (Holzer & Yang, 2004). Accordingly, to the extent that local governments consider whether a volunteer service
initiative can potentially produce measurable impact in order to legitimize the initiative, those local governments may also gain the benefit of creating a tool for future evidence based decisions concerning volunteer service initiatives.

Figure 16 provides selected references to the data related to measurability. The full set of excerpts from the data related to measurability is included in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “On the outcome and impact side, sometimes it is so frustrating and hard to quantify what we are doing. We know that we have made a difference, but sometimes it is just really hard to show it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Impact...this is the so what question. So we lent a hand for the day but does that mean it was at all meaningful? Here we have to look for ways to attach meaning to that service.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Selected Data Excerpts on Measurability

**Resources**

Volunteer labor is not free labor (Handy & Srinivasan, 2005). In this study cities cited the resources that must be committed to volunteer service initiatives as a factor driving volunteer service demand. Those resources include primarily funds for volunteer coordination and supplies that must be dedicated to a volunteer service initiative. A total of 9 data excerpts were coded for resources. Relative to the total number of data excerpts coded for feasibility, resources accounted for 20 percent.
The emergence of resources as a category of data in this study is consistent with previous research in this area. Specifically, Handy and Srinivasan (2005) cite costs of volunteer coordination and supplies required by volunteers as resources. Vinton (2012) speaks particularly to costs associated with volunteer management and coordination and finds that while those costs may be significant, they costs can be justified in terms of the benefits flowing from effective volunteer management.

Figure 17 provides the references to the data related to resources in this study. The full set of excerpts from the data related to resources required to engage volunteers in strategies to address challenges at the local level can be found in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You can't just start up an initiative because it sounds good. You really have to ask what do we want to accomplish here and can it reasonably be done with the resources we have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Those resources are partner resources, coordination resources, money resources, volunteer pool resources. We need to know that the resources we have are the right resources to address the problem. Just because we have a pool of volunteers that might be ready to work on some project doesn't mean that we have all of the ingredients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Selected Data Excerpts on Resources

Chi-Square Analysis of Coded Excerpts

The coded data excerpts relating to strategic service demand were separated according to the source of the excerpt along the dimensions of city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form
of government. Appendix O sets forth the total number of coded data excerpts in each data category and subcategory coded for this study. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if differences in the number of coded statements in each data category and subcategory exist between the cities in this study on the basis of city size, mayoral political affiliation, or form of government. City size was determined using 2010 U.S. Census data (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). Mayoral political affiliation was determined through official city websites. Form of government was determined through city organizational charts obtained through official city websites or public requests where those documents were not readily available.

Motivational Bases for Volunteer Service Demand by City Size

The total number of coded data excerpts related to economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-driven motivation were separated based on city size. Appendix O sets forth the number of coded data excerpts in each category and subcategory of data represented by the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand according to the size of the city that was the source of the data. Using chi-square analysis, the researcher explored whether differences existed in motivational bases toward volunteer service demand based on city size. No statistically significant differences were observed.

Motivational Bases for Volunteer Service Demand by Mayoral Political Affiliation

The coded data excerpts for each motivational category were separated according to mayoral political affiliation. Appendix O contains the total number of data segments by the
political affiliation of the mayor of the city that was the source of the data. Using chi-square analysis, the researcher explored whether differences in motivational bases toward volunteer service demand exist with respect to mayoral political affiliation. No statistically significant differences were observed.

**Motivational Bases for Volunteer Service Demand by Form of Government**

Appendix O sets forth the total number of coded data excerpts based on the form of government for the city that was the source of the data. Chi-square analysis was used to explore whether differences in motivational bases existed based on form of government. The findings in this regard suggest that cities organized according to the council-manager form of government differ from cities organized according to the strong mayor council and weak mayor-council forms of government with respect to aspirational motivations toward volunteer service demand ($\chi^2=14.36; \text{df}=2; p\text{-value}=0.007$). The difference is statistically significant at the .05 significance level. The number of coded data excerpts for aspirational motivation was less than the expected number of coded data excerpts originating from cities organized according to the council-manager form of government. Table 3 sets forth the observed and expected numbers data excerpts coded for aspirational motivation by form of government. Because the expected number of coded data excerpts originating from cities organized according to the weak mayor-council form of government is less than 5, a Fisher's exact test was also performed to determine statistical significance (Spatz, 2008). The Fisher's exact test confirms that the difference observed relative to aspirational motivation is statistically significant at the .05 level.
The subcategories of need-driven motivation consist of city need and citizen need according to the grounded theory model grounded in the data for this study. Within need-driven motivation, a statistically significant difference between city need and citizen need was observed relative to form of government. The difference was statistically significant at the .05 significance level using chi-square analysis. Table 4 sets forth the observed and expected numbers of coded data excerpts according to form of government. Because the expected number of coded data excerpts in each category of coded data is less than 5, a Fisher's exact test was performed to confirm the statistical significance of the observation (Spatz, 2008). A Fisher's exact test confirms the statistical significance of the observations at the .05 significance level.

Table 3
Observed and Expected Values of Aspirational Motivation by Form of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Government</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=119; chi-square value = 14.36; df = 2; p-value = 0.007

Table 4
Observed and Expected Values of Citizen Need by Form of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Government</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=119; chi-square value = 6.59; df = 2; p-value = 0.036
Feasibility Considerations by City Size, Mayoral Political Affiliation, and Form of Government

Each of the feasibility considerations that emerged as a category represented in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand presented in this study were analyzed to determine if differences existed in the number of coded data excerpts based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, or form of government. No statistically significant differences were observed. The total number of coded data excerpts for each feasibility consideration (including liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources) categorized by city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government are set forth in Appendix O.

Volunteer Service Demand

This study demonstrates that volunteer service demand is a function of a city's strategic service motivation as well as certain feasibility considerations. A city's strategic service motivation is further comprised of economic motivation, aspirational motivation and need-driven motivation for including volunteer service in strategies to address challenges at the local level. Additionally, cities address certain feasibility concerns with respect to relying on volunteer service to address challenges at the local level. Those feasibility considerations include liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources.

The grounded theory model for volunteer service demand is given in Figure 18. The grounded theory model for volunteer service demand captures each of the categories of
data coded with respect to the first research question in this study. Accordingly, this
grounded theory model for volunteer service is grounded in the data for this study.
Figure 18: Volunteer Service Demand Grounded Theory

R = Unexplained Variable
D = Disturbance / Prediction Error for Latent Endogenous Variable
In the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand presented here, strategic service motivation is comprised of the various types of city motivations toward the use of volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges. Those types of motivations are economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-driven motivation. Economic motivation is further comprised of motivations on the part of the city to rely on volunteer service because of budget constraint within the city and motivations toward volunteer service as a means of cost savings. The data in this study would suggest that aspirational motivations relate to a desire on the part of the city to create a culture of service through volunteer service and a desire on the part of the city to increase civic engagement through volunteer service. Need-driven motivations are those that motivate a city toward volunteer service because of a need on the part of the city or a need on the part of citizens in the city. For example, a city need might include a need for staffing or staff support for an un-filled position. A citizen need might include a need for service not delivered by the city. In addition to strategic service motivations, cities also weigh various feasibility considerations with respect to strategies that rely on volunteer service. Those feasibility considerations include liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources.

The grounded theory model for volunteer service that emerged from the data in this study has not been empirically tested. However, this grounded theory model represents a contribution to the scholarship on volunteer service and more particularly volunteer service demand. Appendix Q contains hypotheses for testing the theoretical model.
Findings on Research Question #2

The second research question presented in this study asks: How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges? To address this research question, the qualitative data for this study (comprised of High-Impact Service Plans published by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition, grant applications made by cities seeking Cities of Service Leadership grant funding, and key stakeholder interview transcripts) were content analyzed. Content analysis of the data was carried out by coding the data according to the coding protocol described by Corbin and Strauss (2008). The data categories that emerged relative to this research question suggest that cities assess the impact of volunteer service strategies primarily in three ways. Those are by developing metrics, by measuring outcomes, and through qualitative stories. This data together with the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand were used to create a generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service.

The total number of data excerpts coded on the second research question was twenty six. Notably, each of these 26 coded data excerpts derived from key informant interview transcripts. The data suggest that cities assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges in three ways. Those are: (1) through the use of metrics; (2) by measuring outcomes; and (3) by telling qualitative stories. Figure 19 sets forth the total number of coded data excerpts in each category of data. Because of the relatively small number of coded data excerpts, differences in the data categories relative to the source of the data based on city size, mayoral
political affiliation, and form of government were not explored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Total # Coded Data Excerpts</th>
<th>% Data Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50% of coded data on Assessing Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23% of coded data on Assessing Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative (Stories)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27% of coded data on Assessing Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Coded Data Excerpts on Assessing Impact

Coding Agreement

Cohen’s kappa (Cohen, 1960) was used to assess the coding agreement as to each of the categories that emerged from the data for the second research question. Figure 20 sets forth Cohen's kappa (κ) scores representing the level of agreement between the two coders as to the coded data excerpts with respect to the categories of metrics, outcomes, and qualitative stories. With respect to metrics and outcomes, the first coder coded one additional data segment in each of those categories. The greater number of coded data segments were included. Overall, the two coders achieved good agreement (Cohen, 1960) with respect to each category of data related to the ways cities assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.
### Figure 20. Cohen's kappa scores representing inter-coder agreement on Assessing Impact data categories

Before offering a discussion of the coded data categories and generalized logic model for volunteer service impact derived from the data in this study, examples of the potential for volunteer service are provided. Specifically, volunteer service initiatives in the cities of Little Rock, Arkansas, Plano, Texas, and Santa Rosa, California are discussed.

**Potential for Volunteer Service**

As one interviewee put it: “I am just so grateful that our eyes have been opened to what an impact volunteers can have in the community.” Volunteer service holds potential for impacting on local challenges. To illustrate that potential, the volunteer service initiatives in place in the cities of Little Rock Arkansas, Plano, Texas, and Santa Rosa, California are briefly discussed next.

The City of Little Rock, Arkansas received a Cities of Service Leadership Grant to support its Chief Service Officer position and help launch various volunteer service
initiatives. The City of Little Rock's Love Your School initiative targeted childhood obesity and youth educational achievement through nutrition education at two under-served elementary schools. The effort was carried out in significant part by volunteers who provided nutrition instruction, planted gardens, and led walking groups. The initiative produced measurable results according to Little Rock's Chief Service Officer, Michael Drake (Drake, 2012). In particular, of the 413 students that participated, 34.72% experienced a reduction in fat mass. Additional educational achievements were observed. Specifically, 73.53% of the students attending the Love Your School schools demonstrated proficiency on the state's literacy exam—the Arkansas Augmented Benchmark Exam. District-wide, the literacy proficiency rate was 57.35 percent. Accordingly, the Chief Service Officer for the City of Little Rock has concluded that volunteer service has made a significant measurable impact in the community on childhood obesity as well as youth educational achievement (Drake, 2012).

The City of Plano, Texas relies on volunteer service to support staff functions in multiple departments. The office of volunteer service in the City of Plano has been operating since 1983. The City of Plano did not apply for a Cities of Service Leadership Grant. In the City of Plano, volunteer service is seen as a way to improve the scope and quality of city services, encourage partnerships between city government and organizations in the community, as well as impact on priority community issues. The City of Plano estimates that in 2011 the 91,709 hours of volunteer service to the city has a monetary value of $1.7 million and is the equivalent of 44 additional full-time city employees. In
large part, volunteers work alongside city employees in the various departments within the
city. In this way, volunteers in the City of Plano are supporting staff functions (City of
Plano, n.d.).

The examples of Little Rock, Arkansas and Plano, Texas illustrate how service is
incorporated as a municipal governance strategy in cities that have citywide volunteer
coordination. This is not to suggest that volunteer service does not happen or does not
have impact in cities without citywide volunteer coordination. The City of Santa Rosa,
California, for example, does not have citywide volunteer coordination. The Parks and
Recreation Department, however, does coordinate volunteers to work on various projects
that might not receive funding priority. Volunteers in the City of Santa Rosa maintain the
trail system, serve as docents for tours, and provide maintenance services in the rose
garden and preserve a historical cemetery (City of Santa Rosa, n.d.).

Although the foregoing examples suggest the potential for volunteer service, it should be
noted that as the two-year terms for Cities of Service Leadership Grants began to expire
(between January and June 2012), some cities did not renew or continue the effort. For example,
the City of Sacramento, California transferred its volunteer service initiatives to a community
partner, Hands on Sacramento after the expiration of the term of its Cities of Service Leadership
Grant (Hands on Sacramento, n.d.). The City of Orlando, Florida did not abandon the Cities of
Service initiative after the expiration of its grant. However, the City of Orlando did reduce the
number of volunteer service efforts being coordinated by the city from six to four (City of
Volunteer Service Impact

This constructivist grounded theory study posed the research question: How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges? The researcher deliberately avoided the use of the term outcomes in the framing of this research question so as to avoid forcing respondents to report on performance measurement or program evaluation tools. The findings of this study would suggest that cities assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges primarily in three ways. Those are: (1) metrics; (2) outcomes; and (3) stories, or qualitative measures of success. At least two of the 39 cities that participated in this study reported that a mix of methods is needed to fully illustrate the impact of volunteer service. The impacts and effectiveness of some types of programs or initiatives are inherently difficult to evaluate (Axford & Berry, 2006). The impacts and effectiveness of volunteer service as a strategy to address pressing issues at the local level likely suffers from inherent difficulty of evaluation. One interviewee in this study expressed frustration over assessing the impact of service as a strategy to address local challenges in this way: “It's one of those that's hard to measure on how you are being successful. Success is one of those kind of hidden measures.”
Metrics

Metrics, according to the findings of this study, refer to a number of tools for assessing the impact of citizen volunteer service to cities. Among those tools are recording the number of volunteer service hours donated by citizens, recording the number of individual volunteers engaged in a particular initiative, determining the number of full time equivalent staff positions would have been required in order to deliver services delivered by volunteers, setting benchmarks, as well as setting arbitrary goals for volunteer engagement, volunteer time donation, and service delivery. Lenkowsky (2004) recognizes number of volunteers and number of hours donated by volunteers, and the value of those hours as standard measures for volunteerism.

Of the 26 coded data excerpts related to the second research question in this study, 13 (50%) suggested that cities use metrics to assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges. In this study, the sample consisted of cities belonging to the Cities of Service initiative. The Cities of Service initiative promotes the use of metrics. In fact, Cities of Service Leadership cities, namely those that received Cities of Service Leadership Grant funding, are required as a condition of that grant funding to implement the use of metrics. The elected and appointed officials that participated in key informant interviews for this study may have been predisposed to discuss their city’s use of metrics as a tool for assessing the impact of volunteer service. Examining the source of each of the 13 coded data excerpts on the use of metrics to assess the impact of volunteer service would support this hypothesis inasmuch as each of the
coded data excerpts on the use of metrics derived from a key informant interview with an elected or appointed official in a Cities of Service Leadership city. Accordingly, further study is needed with respect to the use of metrics to assess the impact of volunteer service.

Figure 21 provides the selected excerpts related to the use of metrics by cities to assess the impact of volunteer service. Appendix N sets forth the full set of coded data excerpts on metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We try to measure everything coming from a high tech world and a boss that believes in metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We are very data driven in each initiative we set these benchmarks and goals that will tell us are we actually making a difference or are we chasing our tails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metrics...that's the critical one that will guide us into the future. But we have to ask ourselves what those metrics mean. We have engaged over 200,000 people. OK how do we sustain this? We don't want that engagement to be a one shot deal. One shot deals are not enough. We need to find ways that make people continue in their service effort. And we need to know what does this mean to our city, what does it mean to our community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Selected Data Excerpts on Metrics

*Outcomes*

Outcomes, according to the findings of this study, refer to attaching meaning to citizen volunteer service to cities. As one interviewee in this study put it: “This is the ‘so what’ question…was it at all meaningful?” The term outcomes generally refers to results or effects (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006).
In this study, 6 (23%) of the 26 coded data excerpts for the second research question would suggest that cities look to outcomes to assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges. Of these 6 coded data excerpts, 3 derived from key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in Cities of Service Leadership cities and 3 derived from key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in non-Cities of Service Leadership cities.

Figure 22 provides the selected excerpts related to how cities use outcomes to assess the impact of volunteer service to address local challenges. Appendix N sets forth the full set of coded data excerpts on outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Numbers are always great but they only tell you so much. They can show you progress and success especially when you need to recruit foundations. But what I am interested in is the bigger picture. Is that we are doing needed in the community and are we improving the community and are we involving the whole community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think the first thing we want to see is that something good comes out of this for the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Selected Data Excerpts on Outcomes

**Qualitative Stories**

At least seven of the 39 cities that participated in key informant interviews for this study (18%) suggested that in order to demonstrate the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges, the story of that service must be told. To this point, one interviewee in
this study noted: “[Y]ou don’t know if what you are doing is a success until you really hear the story.”

Figure 23 provides the selected excerpts showing how cities use qualitative stories to assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges. Appendix N sets forth the full set of coded data excerpts related to qualitative stories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Stories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On the outcome and impact side sometimes it is so frustrating and hard to quantify what we are doing. We know that we have made a difference, but sometimes it is just really hard to show it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beyond impact metrics that are outlines for goals that should be accomplished, I would say the qualitative feedback from people involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You know it used to be just about numbers. We have X amount of hours or X amount of volunteers. But really you don't know if what you are doing is a success until you really hear the story. In the different departments you can go into the office and ask the managers how volunteers have helped them with what they do and they can just tell you so many stories of how volunteers have come in there and done so many things that just would not have gotten done if they weren't there. They are helping expand services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Selected Data Excerpts on Qualitative Stories

Generalized Logic Model for Assessing Volunteer Service Impact

A logic model is a tool designed to capture program inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes. Martin and Kettner (2010) describe various types of logic models. Logic models can be based on strategic plans, community problems, or programs. Inputs refer to the resources
dedicated to the program. Activities include the work necessary to produce outputs. Outputs, then, are observable achievements. Outcomes can be intended or observed. Intended outcomes are those results that a program is designed to achieve. Observed outcomes, on the other hand, are those results that appear to be attributable to a program (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). It should be noted, however, that the Cities of Service initiative likely does not meet the definition of a program inasmuch as it is implemented in differently city to city.

The generalized logic model proposed here is adapted from the logic models beginning with strategic focus and community problem in Martin and Kettner (2010). More particularly, the generalized logic model for volunteer service is based on the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand presented in this study. The goal of creating savings or efficiency in service delivery relates to the economic motivations toward volunteer service, namely budget constraint and cost savings. The goals of creating a service culture or increasing civic engagement relate to the aspirational motivations toward volunteer service as a strategy as set forth in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand in this study. The citizen need for service and the city need for staff support relate directly to the need-driven motivations on the part of cities to rely on volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.

As to the performance measures presented in the generalized logic model, each can be classified as a metric, outcome, or qualitative story. For example, the number of citizens that receive services as a result of volunteer service would be considered a metric. Increased volunteer service demand may be considered an outcome. Public reaction, citizen feedback or department feedback, on the other hand, would be considered a qualitative story.
Volunteer Service as a Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Output Performance Measures</th>
<th>Outcome Performance Measures</th>
<th>Quality Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Volunteer engagement measures</td>
<td>- Observed increases in civic engagement sustained over time</td>
<td>- Increased reliance on volunteer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Services delivered in the community</td>
<td>- Resulting services to cities and service beneficiaries delivered by volunteers</td>
<td>- Services quality measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>- # Volunteers</td>
<td>- # Individuals who continue to donate time to meet volunteer service demand</td>
<td>- Sustained &amp; Continued volunteerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cost savings</td>
<td>- Increased volunteer service demand</td>
<td>- Reduced instances of unmet need in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Money / resources saved by service recipients</td>
<td>-feedback from departments / staff concerning volunteer service contribution</td>
<td>- Consistency of services delivered by volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- # Citizens served</td>
<td>-feedback from citizens</td>
<td>- feedback from volunteers as to the value of their contribution of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-positive public reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: Generalized Logic Model for Service as a Strategy
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The two research questions in this study ask: (1) What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges? and (2) How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges? Data for this constructivist grounded theory study were collected from extant documents prepared by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition (including published High-Impact Service Plans, Cities of Service Leadership Grant applications, and city organizational charts) and transcripts of key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service. A purposive criterion sampling strategy (Patton, 2002) was employed for this study. The purposive criterion sample included 39 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 that further participated in key informant interviews for this study. The qualitative data obtained from the High-Impact Service Plans, grant applications, and key informant interview transcripts were content analyzed (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and coded according to the coding protocol described by Corbin and Strauss (2008) to reveal major categories in the data.

Relative to the first research question seeking to understand the factors that motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges, the major categories of data that emerged as part of the coding process suggest three types of motivations toward volunteer service as well as a set of feasibility considerations that are
important to cities when considering use of volunteer service. The number of coded excerpts and level of agreement between the coders in terms of Cohen’s kappa scores (Cohen, 1960) are set forth as to each category. The motivating factors, collectively referred to in this study as strategic service motivation, are economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-driven motivation. Economic motivations are comprised of motivations based on budget constraint faced by cities and motivations based on cost savings. Aspirational motivations consist of motivations to create a service culture within the city and motivations to increase civic engagement in the city through volunteer service. Need-driven motivations relate to motivations to include volunteers in strategies as a means of meeting city needs or citizen needs. Additionally, certain feasibility considerations bear on volunteer service demand by local governments. Those feasibility considerations relate to the liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability of impact, and resources. The various motivating factors and feasibility concerns were explored using chi-square analysis to determine if differences exist between cities based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. No differences were observed with respect to city size or mayoral political affiliation. Cities organized according to the council-manager form of government differed from cities organized according to the strong mayor-council and weak mayor-council forms of government with respect to aspirational motivation ($\chi^2=14.36; df=2; p\text{-value}=0.007$) and citizen need ($\chi^2=6.59; df=2; p\text{-value}=0.036$). These differences were significant at the .05 level. The major categories of data that were coded for the first
research question were incorporated into a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand. This study makes a theoretical contribution to the scholarship on volunteering by proposing a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand.

Relative to the second research question seeking to understand the ways in which cities assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges, the findings of this study suggest cities assess the impact of service in a variety of ways. Specifically, cities report assessing the impact of volunteer service initiatives by: (1) creating metrics; (2) measuring outcomes; and (3) telling qualitative stories. Each of these impact assessment methods emerged as major categories on the data. The total number of coded data excerpts in each of these categories is provided, as is the level of agreement between the coders in terms of Cohen’s kappa scores (Cohen, 1960). The grounded theory model for volunteer service demand and the coded data in this study were used to create a generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address pressing local issues. The generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service in city strategies to address local needs relates to the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand proposed by this study. Specifically, the goals and needs identified in the generalized logic model are drawn from the motivational bases for volunteer service demand—economic, aspirational, and need-driven—set forth in the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand.

Prior to this study, the existing scholarship on volunteer service demand was suggestive of potential factors that might bear on demand for volunteer service by local
governments. However, the scholarship on volunteer demand was somewhat limited. Similarly, inferences could be drawn about the impacts of service as a strategy. Again, however, the scholarship in this area was somewhat limited. Accordingly, this study was undertaken for the purpose of expanding the scholarship on volunteer demand and the impact of volunteer service. The findings of this study, therefore, serve to (a) expand the existing scholarship on volunteer demand by proposing a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand and (b) expand the existing scholarship on the impact of volunteer service by identifying assessment methods and offering a generalized logic model for volunteer service.
CHAPTER FIVE: ADDITIONAL FINDINGS ON THE DATA

In addition to the findings on the research questions presented in this study, the study data allowed for further observations. Those additional dimensions are presented here as additional findings on the data. In particular, a typology grounded in the data for how local governments engage citizens in service is proposed. Additionally, the descriptive data obtained from city organizational charts and city size based on 2010 U.S. Census data were explored to determine if there are differences in the existence of citywide volunteer coordination in cities based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Finally, non-thematic observations from the qualitative data are discussed for the purpose of framing future research.

Citizen Service to Cities

Although not directly linked to a research question posed, this study produced many illustrations of how cities are engaging citizens in volunteer service. A typology for how cities are engaging citizens in volunteer service is provided in Figure 25. Specifically, citizens are serving cities in four primary ways: serving as ambassadors, giving money, supporting staff functions, and delivering service. Volunteer service in this way has important implications for cities and citizens. From the perspective of the city, citizens are a source of information flow, they are a source of funding, they supplement the work of staff, and they deliver services in the community. From the perspective of the citizen, volunteer service to cities is a form of citizen
engagement. The typology for citizen service to local governments described below is set forth in steps and is compared to the ladder of participation described by Arnstein (1969), which is depicted in Figure 26.

![Figure 25: Citizen Service to Local Governments](image-url)

Figure 25: Citizen Service to Local Governments
Volunteers serve as ambassadors for cities. By serving as ambassadors, volunteers promote a positive image of the city. In the role of ambassador, in addition to being good public relations for the city, volunteers are a conduit for information sharing. Figure 27 shows how interviewees in this study described volunteers as ambassadors.
Data Excerpts

- “[W]e have a very organized group of volunteers serving as ambassadors of the city in the first place.”
- “While the volunteers do not play a formal role in the tactics in our problem-solving strategy, they are a source of ideas and represent an opportunity of enhanced information sharing with the community.”
- “Personally, I know we have succeeded when I can see that our citizens are out there teaching others how to be good citizens. If that means a neighbor tells another neighbor who to call in the city when they have a particular problem or someone is coming in to sign up for a volunteer opportunity because someone they know had a good experience...”

Figure 27: Data Excerpts Describing Volunteers as Ambassadors

Arnstein (1969) would characterize citizens serving as ambassadors for cities as a form of nonparticipation, most probably manipulation. Manipulation, to Arnstein (1969), happens when citizens are engaged for the purpose of “engineering their support” (p. 218). Whether citizens are engaged by cities as ambassadors for the purpose of influencing, or engineering, citizen opinion of the city or whether volunteers are engaged by cities as ambassadors for the purpose of facilitating information flow, it is apparent that volunteer role is sometimes performed when citizens serve as ambassadors for their local government.
Donating Money

Giving money is important and often overlooked in the context of volunteering. Volunteering is, by many, considered to consist of time and money donations (Choi & Chou, 2010). Donating money is akin to consultation along Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation in that citizens who give money are offered no assurances that their needs or wants will be considered by the recipient. Two interviewees in this study noted that money donation is or should be considered along the spectrum of citizen service to cities. One interviewee described money donation as a form of citizen service in the following way.

Some cities might say that they do not have the capacity to work with volunteers but if you expand your view of what volunteering is and what it can do I think a lot of those cities that say they don't use volunteers actually do. They just might not have a real good sense of the importance of what it means to have citizens serve on boards, donate money, donate time. If you look at it in the broader sense, I think most cities actually do use volunteers and really rely on them to do important things.

Appendix N sets forth the full set of data excerpts related to money donation.

Supporting Staff Functions

Twelve interviewees in this study pointed to instances of how volunteers support staff functions. The full set of data excerpts suggesting that citizens serve cities by supporting staff functions is set forth in Appendix N. In supporting the work of city staff, volunteers offer up expertise, serve a quality assurance function, and work to accomplish goals and tasks that might not receive priority attention from the city. Figure 28 details how interviewees in this study described how volunteers serve by supporting staff.
Selected Data Excerpts

- “They can do things that the city just can't get to. The weeds are going to grow but we might not have a staff person that can go out there are take care of it. We've found that citizens are ready to chip in and help with tasks like that and it really frees up city staff so that they can do the higher level tasks that absolutely have to be done.”

- “As for our ongoing use of volunteers, that happens mostly through our various boards where citizens offer their expertise. For example, we have citizen volunteers on our planning board, code enforcement board, and architectural board. In those cases we see the volunteers as serving two important functions. First, they offer expertise. Second, they serve to look over the shoulder of city staff. In most cases we like to see that the volunteers serving on these boards are from the trade or have expertise to lend to the city. Many times we find that retired persons have a great deal of expertise to lend. Often they are retired from a profession and they are no longer looking to make money from their time but feel that they can still make an important contribution. Working with people that want to give their time in that way is certainly a resource to the city.”

- “As the city grew we noticed that in addition to professional volunteers we could use clerical and event volunteers so we supplemented staff with volunteers and they worked as team. We literally have volunteers in almost every department…”

Figure 28: Data Excerpts Describing Volunteer Service as Supporting Staff Functions

Arnstein (1969) describes board service as a placation tactic. To Arnstein (1969), citizens serving on boards “allow citizens to advise or plan ad infinitum but retain for powerholders the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice” (p. 220).

The interviewees in this study appeared to ascribe significant importance on the role of volunteers in supporting the work of city, particularly in relation to accomplishing tasks that are necessary but not priorities for the city. Importantly, however, when volunteers are serving by supporting staff functions, those volunteers must be trained to be effective. Echoing Emanuele (1996), one interviewee made this point in the following way.
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Something that is important to us is the resources to train people to do certain things. I think citywide our volunteer capacity could be increased a bit and that would be a good thing so we could utilize volunteers across more departments in the city but I think what's holding us back from doing that is we don't have the resources to train those people right now.

Emanuele (1996) considered whether nonprofit organizations would accept an endless supply of volunteer labor if available. He concluded that organizations in fact make determinations about how much volunteer labor to consume based on the cost of training and managing volunteers.

With respect to volunteers supporting staff functions, Brudney (1996) suggests that volunteers can potentially lessen the burden on staff if they are effectively managed. Staff, though, may resist or reject the notion of volunteers supporting their work because of the perception that volunteers cannot or should not be relied on to do a professionalized job. In the event that the volunteer holds credentials (in terms of experience and or formal education) similar to that of staff, the staff may feel threatened by the volunteer inasmuch as the volunteer may be viewed as an eventual replacement (Brudney & Gazley, 2002). Accordingly, the culture of the department must be receptive to the use of volunteers to support staff functions in order for that endeavor to be successful (Wandersman & Alterman, 1993).

Delivering Service

Arnstein (1969) sees partnership as the first rung on her ladder of participation where power between governments and citizens is redistributed. When citizens are
volunteering by delivering service, they are acting in partnership with their local government. This study uncovered many examples of how citizens are delivering services through volunteering. Figure 29 provides selected examples from the data in this study of how citizens are delivering services in their cities through volunteer service. The full set of data excerpts suggesting that citizens serve cities by delivering services is set forth in Appendix N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “We have volunteers in 32 departments in our city. We also have the largest all volunteer EMS in the country. With the exception of a just a couple of guys on staff for EMS to do the administrative work and keep the department going, they are all volunteers. If you look at what it would cost to replace the services volunteers provide to our city we would have to hire 661 people, that's 661 additional staff members and it would cost us 19 million dollars.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I can give you an example of the free clinic here. That clinic is available on a financial-need basis and serves a number of people regularly inside city lines. It is staffed by two retired doctors and a few nurses. They see people that may have a bump or a bruise or a cold, all non-emergency, and are able to keep a number of people out of the emergency room each year by treating them in the clinic. Our hospital benefits from the clinic because of the number of people who do not go to the emergency room for non-emergency treatment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We absolutely don't have the funds to do all the things or deliver all the services we want to. But, what we do have is the commitment or belief that citizens, and particularly volunteers, are important to us. We have evolved as a city and as part of that evolution we see the city and citizens coming together to solve problems and groups of citizens coming together to solve their own problems. I think this is the future of local government. Rather than having people show up at commission meeting and yelling about all the things the city needs to fix the role of the city should be instead to guide people and help organize them in ways that enable them to solve their own problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Data Excerpts Describing Service Delivery through Volunteers

In sum, the additional findings of this study related to citizen service to cities would suggest that cities rely on volunteer service in significant ways. The interviewees in this
study cast volunteer service in a positive light, in the researcher’s view. This study would further suggest that from the perspective of the city, volunteer service is not viewed critically or cynically. Importantly, though, there was little consideration of gradations of volunteer service within individual interviews. Further, volunteer service is an important citizen engagement tool, and should be viewed as such. This study does not investigate volunteer service from the citizen perspective. However, a future study on citizen view of volunteer service, and particularly volunteer service to address local challenges is merited.

**Citywide Volunteer Coordination**

A total of 119 cities were members of the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012. Those coalition members are identified in Appendix L. Appendix L also sets forth the size of the city based on 2010 United States Census population data (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.), form of government, mayoral political affiliation, whether or not the city has citywide volunteer coordination, and whether or not that function is supported by grant funding.

The descriptive data collected on the cities in the sample for this study allowed the researcher to explore whether there are differences in frequencies of citywide volunteer coordination based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. In sum, a statistically significant difference was observed between small and large cities with respect to the existence of citywide volunteer coordination ($\chi^2=5.68; df=1; p$ value=0.007).
When non-grant funded position were excluded, a statistically significant difference between small and large cities was also observed ($\chi^2=1.62; df=1; 0.203$). No statistically significant relationships between mayoral political affiliation and citywide volunteer coordination were found in this study. Likewise, no statistically significant relationships between form of government and citywide volunteer coordination were revealed in this study. This finding departs from the findings in the study conducted by Ferris (1988). Ferris (1988) found that local governments with a manager form of government rely on volunteer efforts to coproduce services at higher rates than local governments with other forms of government.

Citywide Volunteer Coordination by City Size

Among cities in the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 (n=119), 60 (50%) have some form of citywide volunteer coordination and 59 have no citywide volunteer coordination. Citywide volunteer coordination is described as volunteer coordination across multiple city departments or agencies performed by a city staff person.

Grant funding supports the citywide volunteer coordination in 27 (23%) cities in the Cities of Service coalition.

In large cities (n=54), 39 (72%) have citywide volunteer coordination. Citywide volunteer coordination is carried out by a Chief Service Officer whose position is supported by a Cities of Service Leadership Grant. Excepting these 18 cities, 21 of the remaining 36 (58%) large cities have citywide volunteer coordination.
In medium cities (n=31), 12 (39%) have citywide volunteer coordination. In two medium cities a Chief Service Officer whose position is supported by a Cities of Service Leadership Grant is responsible for citywide volunteer coordination and in another medium city citywide volunteer coordination is performed by a volunteer. Excepting these three cities from consideration, 9 of the remaining 28 (32%) medium cities have citywide volunteer coordination.

In small cities (n=34), 9 (26%) have citywide volunteer coordination. That function is performed by a volunteer in six of those small cities. Excepting out these six cities, three of the remaining 28 (9%) have a city staff person performing citywide volunteer coordination.

The relationship between city size and citywide volunteer coordination was explored using a chi-square ($\chi^2$) analysis to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between cities with citywide volunteer coordination and those without related to the size of the city. Table 5 sets forth the observed and expected instances of citywide volunteer coordination based on city size.

As between small (n=34) and medium cities (n=31), no statistically significant difference exists between the observed and expected instances of citywide volunteer coordination ($\chi^2=0.567; df=1; p \text{ value}=0.451$). Likewise, no statistically significant difference exists between the observed and expected instances of citywide volunteer coordination between medium and large cities (n=54) alone ($\chi^2=2.47; df=1; 0.116$). The
difference between small and large cities on this measure is statistically significant at both the .05 and .02 levels ($\chi^2=5.68; df=1; p$ value=0.007).

Table 5
Observed and Expected Values of Citywide Volunteer Coordination by City Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Cities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Cities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n=119$; chi-square value = 6.62; $df=2$; $p$-value = 0.036

A statistically significant difference is shown when this analysis is performed with grant funded citywide volunteer coordination positions excluded. Table 6 shows the expected and observed instances of non-grant funded volunteer coordination positions in small, medium and large cities.

As between small ($n=28$) and medium cities ($n=28$), no statistically significant difference exists between the observed and expected instances of citywide volunteer coordination ($\chi^2=2.49; df=1; p$ value=0.115). The same can be said for the observed and expected instances of citywide volunteer coordination between medium and large cities ($n=36$). The difference is not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2=1.62; df=1; 0.203$). The difference between small and large cities, however, is statistically significant at both the .05 and .01 levels ($\chi^2=7.47; df=1; p$ value=0.006).
Table 6
Observed and Expected Values of Non-Grant Funded Citywide Volunteer Coordination by City Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Cities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Cities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: b=92; chi-square value=7.74; df=2; p value=0.021

Citywide Volunteer Coordination by Mayoral Political Affiliation

The political affiliation of the mayor in each of the Cities of Service cities was determined for purposes of exploring relationships between political affiliation and the findings of this study. Seventy-seven mayors (65%) in the Cities of Service coalition identify as Democrats and 42 mayors (35%) in the coalition identify as Republicans.

No statistically significant relationships between mayoral political affiliation and citywide volunteer coordination were found in this study. Table 7 shows the expected and observed instances of citywide volunteer coordination by mayoral political affiliation and Table 8 shows expected and observed frequencies of citywide volunteer coordination by mayoral political affiliation excluding grant funded positions.
Table 7
Observed and Expected Values of Citywide Volunteer Coordination by Mayoral Political Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=119; chi-square value=2.65; df=1; p value=0.103

Table 8
Observed and Expected Values of Non-Grant Funded Citywide Volunteer Coordination by Mayoral Political Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=92; chi-square value=0.506; df=1; p value=0.477

Citywide Volunteer Coordination by Form of Government

Among the 119 cities in the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012, 67 (56%) have a strong mayor-council form of government, 8 (7%) have a weak mayor-council form of government, and 44 (37%) have a council-manager form of government.

No statistically significant relationships between form of government and citywide volunteer coordination were revealed in this study. This finding departs from the findings in the study conducted by Ferris (1988).
Table 9 sets forth the observed and expected frequencies of citywide volunteer coordination by form of government. As shown in Table 10, the $p$-value was high (0.575). There was also no statistically significant difference between cities when grant funded citywide volunteer coordination positions were excluded from consideration. Table 10 sets forth the expected and observed frequencies of non-grant funded citywide volunteer coordination by form of government. The $p$-value when non-grant funded citywide volunteer coordination positions were excluded was high (0.436).

Table 9
Observed and Expected Values of Citywide Volunteer Coordination by Form of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Government</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=119; chi-square value=1.11; $df=2$; $p$-value=0.575

Table 10
Observed and Expected Values of Non-Grant Funded Citywide Volunteer Coordination by City Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Government</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=92; chi-square value=1.661; $df=2$; $p$-value=0.436
Non-thematic Observations

The core categories that emerged from the data in this study are captured in the qualitative findings reported in Chapter Four. Additional observations were made on the data that are not captured in the core categories. Those additional observations relate to: (1) volunteer service an innovative strategy for cities; (2) the role of the volunteer; (3) needs assessment; (4) citizens taking ownership of local challenges; and, (5) citizen view of service as a strategy. Each of these non-thematic observations is discussed below. These non-thematic observations serve to frame future research.

Volunteer Service as an Innovative Strategy

Volunteer service as an innovative strategy merits exploration in future studies. Figure 30 provides the references to the data related to volunteer service as an innovative strategy. The data in this study obtained in connection with the interview question asking how cities came to know about the Cities of Service initiative was thin. As such, volunteer service as an innovative strategy did not emerge as a core category in this grounded theory study. Nonetheless, it is apparent from the data that cities are looking to other cities for successful volunteer service models.
Figure 30: Diffusion of Service as an Innovative Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “We look at how and what different groups do to get returns on volunteer-using initiatives.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “One thing that we do quite often is we look at what people are doing around the country.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of the Volunteer

The relative infrequent use of the word “help” to describe what volunteers do suggests real reliance on volunteers on the part of cities. It also suggests directionality. Cities need volunteers to do meaningful work. Cities do not engage volunteers for the purpose of accommodating citizen need for engagement. Instead of using the word “help”, interviewees used language such as “involving citizens” or “engaging citizens in solutions” to describe the role of the volunteer. Figure 31 sets forth the language used by interviewees to describe the role of volunteers as well as each reference to the word “help”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer Role</th>
<th>Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relied Upon</td>
<td>“There are a number of projects that rely on volunteer service in the city.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don't know what we would do without our volunteers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We have relied on volunteers for many years.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There are also so many ways that volunteers are involved in maintaining the health, safety and welfare of our community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>“For us volunteers are a way for citizens to help shoulder the burden of costs in difficult economic times.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“One thing or one area in our city where we recognized that citizens could help is focusing on environmental issues.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“So the department heads got together and said, yes, we have need for additional support and we are willing to look to citizens to help with that need.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We are a community of people helping people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The thing that we really want to see is service helping do the things and solve the problems that can't be done without getting people involved.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“So we looked at asking what can folks in the business community do for us and how can they help us here in the city.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We believe that people are a resource and that to continue to carry on and do the things that we want to do as goals for the city, we need to look to people to help us do those things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We have volunteers here that with their help the city was able to do a summer camp program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“These volunteers can help green our city, they can help meet our goals on education policy, they can help us alleviate some of the important problems in our city.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31: Role of the Volunteer
Needs Assessment

Need-based motivation for including volunteer service in city governance strategies emerged as a core data category in this constructivist grounded theory study. However, what was not explored in this study is the mechanism for identifying needs—whether those needs are city needs or citizen needs. The interviews contained references to the mechanisms for identifying needs. Those references are contained in Figure 32, separated by formal mechanisms for identifying needs and informal mechanisms for identifying needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Need</th>
<th>Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formal Needs Assessment** | • “We did an actual visioning process to set the stage and let that visioning process tell us what the various stakeholders in our city saw as the place for volunteering.”  
• “We often use focus groups to help us identify and define problems. We also use those focus groups as opportunities to solve or stay ahead of issues that might be bubbling up.”  
• “What we did is we actually held community forums to see what the community was looking for. It was interesting and unique process. Some of these nonprofits had never had the opportunity to give their input to the mayor's office. What resulted was something that we would not have anticipated.”  
• “We had open public forums. Through those forums the city identified 11 core causes where volunteering could have an impact.” |
| **Informal Needs Assessment** | • “Somebody may come to a department in the city and say 'hey' we have a problem here and that's how it gets on our radar. Or, sometimes it might be a staff member who says we really need to be supported in this area or there is something that would be done.”  
• “Probably the most common thing that gets something on our radar is when we see that there. So when there is an identified problem. That can get our attention in any number of ways.”  
• “Other ways that we might see an issue is if the mayor is speaking somewhere in the community. The other day the mayor was at the Chamber and some of the chamber members were asking the mayor how do groups find out about opportunities. It may be question that comes up at a place that the mayor goes.” |

**Figure 32: Mechanisms for Assessing Need**

**Citizens Taking Ownership of Local Challenges**

Six of the 39 interviewees in this study noted that for volunteerism strategies to be effective, it is important for citizens to take ownership of the challenges in their area.
communities. Figure 33 sets forth the specific data excerpts relating to citizens engaging as part of the solution to the challenges in their communities.

Ostrom's (1996) “tragedy of the commons” work is germane to citizens taking ownership of challenges in their communities. Specifically, Ostrom (1996) suggests that messy societal problems cannot be solved by governmental actors alone. Citizens must be engaged, perhaps via coproduction, in responding to these issues. Additionally, Sirianni (2009) would suggest that when the community draws on its own assets and resources in the problem-solving process, the community will be strengthened because it becomes empowered by not having to look outward or elsewhere for help resolving localized problems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “One that I can remember in particular is that a neighborhood in kind of a rough area had a school right in the middle of the neighborhood. As part of an effort to revitalize that school we looked to volunteers within that neighborhood to clean up the sports fields, clean up and paint a hand ball court that had been tagged a bunch of different times, someone from the neighborhood painted a mural on an outside wall, fixed up the playground, put down fresh mulch. Basically made this school that was pretty run-down a little jewel in the neighborhood. Since then nobody has re-tagged the walls or broken any windows. The neighbors are looking out for the school and the school has been left alone. I think the people that were out there looking to do that kind of activity, tagging, breaking windows, have moved on and said this is not the place for that because the neighbors organized around the school.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Many people in the community that is facing the challenge need to be involved in solving that problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “It's been really good to see people working together to take ownership of where they live. Our city struggles with high crime and areas that are pretty depressed. Love Your Block is helping make people feel good about where they live and we are seeing that it is really helping to curb the problem with crime.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “We absolutely don't have the funds to do all the things or deliver all the services we want to. But, what we do have is the commitment or belief that citizens, and particularly volunteers, are important to us. We have evolved as a city and as part of that evolution we see the city and citizens coming together to solve problems and groups of citizens coming together to solve their own problems. I think this is the future of local government. Rather than having people show up at commission meetings and yelling about all the things the city needs to fix the role of the city should be instead to guide people and help organize them in ways that enable them to solve their own problems.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “This is something that we need to look at and look at hard because if we are going to turn this ship around we need everybody, we really need everybody to do their part and get involved and help be part of the solution.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Why wait on the government to do something in other words why wait for a governmental response to a problem or an issue if you have the power to make it better.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33: Citizens Taking Ownership of Local Challenges
Citizen View of Service as Strategy

This study did not examine how citizens view service as a strategy to address challenges in their communities. However, the interviews conducted for this study produced at least three perceived perspectives on the part of citizens. One interviewee noted that volunteerism is met with cynicism. Another interviewee noted that citizens want assurances that volunteerism is a viable strategy such that resources expended for coordination and other costs of engaging volunteers would produce returns. Still another interviewee suggested that there might be a lack of education on the part of citizens and that many do not recognize the role of the volunteer in city government. Figure 34 summarizes these perceived citizen viewpoints. A future study on the citizen view of service as a strategy to address local challenges would likely be highly relevant to local governments considering adopting such a strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Citizen View</th>
<th>Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynical View</td>
<td>“Right now our efforts are kind of being looked at a little cynical. People don't get that what we are really driving at can change the future of our city. Instead what they are hearing is that because we are in a re-election year that this call to service is nothing more than a re-election tactic. People see it as a campaign initiative not as something to help this city meet the needs of people here. So it's hard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You know it's been rather challenging, I don't want to say a challenge, but it has been to get people in Baton Rouge committed 100% and really bought in to the idea of service and planning with service being a component of that planning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Adequate Assurances</td>
<td>“First because of the conservative, politically conservative climate where we are, there is a lot of skepticism, distrust of government in general, they know what we are doing but in order to get anything off the ground there has to be buy-in in the beginning. People here, in order to get that buy-in want to know that we are not just having that volunteer come out once, but that it's going to be something sustained and meaningful and has value to the city. If we have someone come out just once, people see that as more for the individual, the volunteer, than the city. That's the challenge.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Education About Role of Volunteerism</td>
<td>“So we hear back from people in our community that you know I didn't know what an important function it was to serve on a board like the telecommunications board. People don't know that what they or others are doing is so critical to the city and that the city could not function without that citizen input until they are really engaged in giving that service to the city. People look at citizens on these boards and say 'OK' they show up for half a day and they sit up there but it is so much more than that. The work that they do is a tremendous amount of work and that's one part of it but they are also helping to shape policy and the future of this city. So for us, we need to hear back from people in our community that what we are doing is important but we also need to hear back from them that they feel that the service and their time are important and making a difference.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34: Citizen View of Service as a Strategy
Conclusion

The additional findings presented in this chapter do not relate to the research questions set forth in this study. However, the data presented additional dimensions worthy, in the researcher's opinion, of communicating as additional findings. In particular, the qualitative data for this study suggest that citizens meet the demand for volunteer service created by local governments by serving as ambassadors, giving money, supporting staff functions, and delivering service. These dimensions of citizen service to cities are analogous to Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation. Additionally, the descriptive data collected on the cities in the sample for this study allowed the researcher to explore whether differences in the existence of citywide volunteer coordination exist based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. A statistically significant difference in the existence of citywide volunteer coordination was observed at the .05 significance level with respect to city size. In particular, a difference between small and large cities with respect to the existence of citywide volunteer coordination was observed ($\chi^2=5.68; \text{df}=1; \text{p value}=0.007$). When non-grant funded position were excluded, a statistically significant difference between small and large cities was also observed ($\chi^2=1.62; \text{df}=1; 0.203$). Finally, non-thematic observations on the data for this study are presented. These non-thematic observations consist of data that was not coded for a core category of data but present interesting phenomenon grounded in the data which can inform future research.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This constructivist grounded theory study aimed to explore (a) demand for volunteer service on the part of local governments and (b) how local governments assess the impacts of volunteer service. Two overarching research questions guided this study. Those are: (1) What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies designed to address local challenges? and (2) How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges? As gleaned from the research questions, the city served as the unit of analysis for this study. To address the research questions, data were collected from extant documents prepared by cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition (including published High-Impact Service Plans and Cities of Service Leadership Grant applications) and transcripts of key informant interviews with elected or appointed officials in cities that have committed to the Cities of Service Declaration of Service. Cities included in the purposive sample for this study (n=39) were selected according to a criterion sampling strategy (Patton, 2002) and identified based their membership in the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012. Thirty-nine cities participated in key informant interviews for this study, making the key informant interview response rate for this study 33 percent. The qualitative data (including the High-Impact Service Plans, the grant applications, and key informant interview transcripts) were content analyzed coded according to the coding protocol described by Corbin and Strauss (2008).
Summary of Findings on Research Question #1

The first research question in this study asks: What factors motivate cities to include volunteer service in strategies to address local challenges. To address this research question, the qualitative data for this study were content analyzed and coded (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Acceptably good agreement between the two coders for this study was achieved for each category of data. Coder agreement was measured using Cohen's kappa (Cohen, 1960). A Cohen's kappa score is given for each category of coded data.

The findings of this study with respect to the first research question suggest that cities are motivated to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges based on certain economic motivations, aspirational motivations, and need-based motivations. Additionally, feasibility considerations (including liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, manageability, measurability, and resources) bear on volunteer service demand on the part of local governments.

The number of observed and expected coded data excerpts in each category that emerged from the data were analyzed using chi-square analysis to determine if differences exist between cities within the categories of data based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Appendix O sets forth the total number of coded data excerpts by city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Using chi-square analysis and Fisher's exact test where the expected number of coded data excerpts was less than 5, the data show that a statistically significant difference exists between cities
with respect to aspirational motivation based on form of government. Specifically, cities organized according to the council-manager form of government are less likely to report aspirational motivations for volunteer service demand than cities organized according to the strong mayor-council or weak mayor-council form of government ($\chi^2=14.36; df=2; p$-value=0.007). Additionally, as to need-driven motivations, cities organized according to the council-manager form of government were less likely to be motivated to include volunteers in strategies to address local challenges based on citizen need than cities with the strong mayor-council or weak mayor-council forms of government ($\chi^2=6.59; df=2; p$-value=0.036).

A grounded theory model of volunteer service demand is presented in this study. The grounded theory model for volunteer service derives from the core categories that emerged from the coded data in this study. According to the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand presented in this study, cities are motivated to include volunteers in strategies designed to address local challenges based on economic motivations, aspirational motivations, and need-driven motivations, as well as a set of feasibility considerations.

Economic motivations are comprised of motivations on the part of the city to address budget constraints or to achieve cost savings. Accordingly, budget constraint and cost savings are subcategories of economic motivation. Economic motivations accounted for the greatest number of coded data excerpts related to volunteer service demand with a total of 27 (24%) data excerpts being coded in this category. As to the two subcategories
within economic motivation—budget constraint and cost savings—budget constraint accounted for 74% of economic motivation and cost savings accounted for 26% of economic motivation. A possible explanation for this observation relates to the fact that this study was conducted in 2012, during what is widely regarded as a contracted economy.

Aspirational motivation was the second most frequently coded category in the data. Aspirational motivation accounted for 21% of the coded data on volunteer service demand with 23 data excerpts being coded in this category. Within aspirational motivation two subcategories of data were coded. Those are service culture and civic engagement. Thirteen of the 23 data excerpts on aspirational motivation relate to an expressed desire on the part of the city to create a service culture within the city. The remaining 10 data excerpts coded for aspirational motivation relate to an expressed desire on the part of the city to increase civic engagement through volunteer service.

Need-driven motivation relates to motivations on the part of the city to engage volunteers in strategies to address local challenges based on needs of the city and needs of the citizens. City need encompasses needs of the city for staff support or service delivery. Citizen need, on the other hand, relates to gaps in service delivery. In this study, city need was more frequently coded than citizen need. In particular, city need accounted for 10 of the 18 coded data excerpts related to need-driven motivation.

In addition to the motivational bases for volunteer service demand on the part of local governments, the data in this study would suggest that certain feasibility considerations are important to cities when including volunteers in strategies to address
local challenges. Those feasibility considerations include liability climate, skilled volunteer supply, partnership opportunities, manageability, measurability, and resources. Figure 17 in Chapter Four sets forth the total number of coded data excerpts related to each of these feasibility considerations.

Summary of Findings on Research Question #2

The second research question in this study asks: How do cities describe the impact of initiatives that rely on volunteer service to address local challenges. The findings on the second research question suggest that cities assess the impact of volunteer service primarily in three ways. Those are: (1) through the use of metrics; (2) outcomes; and (3) qualitative stories. These categories (metrics, outcomes, and qualitative stories) were developed based on the coded data for this study. The two coders for this study achieved good agreement in each of these categories as demonstrated by the Cohen's kappa scores (Cohen, 1960).

Metrics, according to the findings of this study, refer to a number of tools for assessing the impact of citizen volunteer service to cities. Among those tools are recording the number of volunteer service hours donated by citizens, recording the number of individual volunteers engaged in a particular initiative, determining the number of full time equivalent staff positions would have been required in order to deliver services delivered by volunteers, setting benchmarks, as well as setting arbitrary goals for volunteer engagement, volunteer time donation, and service delivery. Of the 26 coded data excerpts related to the second research
question in this study, 13 (50%) suggested that cities use metrics to assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.

Outcomes, according to the findings of this study, refer to attaching meaning to citizen volunteer service to cities. The term outcomes generally refers to results or effects (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). In this study, 6 (23%) of the 26 coded data excerpts for the second research question would suggest that cities look to outcomes to assess the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.

In this study, 7 of the 39 cities that participated in key informant interviews for this study (18%) suggested that in order to demonstrate the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges, the story of that service must be told. A qualitative story may be good press about a particular volunteer service initiative, feedback from volunteers as to the value of their work, citizen feedback, or feedback from department staff as to the value of volunteer service. Accordingly, the use of qualitative stories emerged as a category of data in this study to describe the ways in which cities assess the impact of volunteer service.

The data for this study together with the grounded theory model for volunteer service demand proposed by this study were used to develop a generalized logic model for assessing the impact of volunteer service.

Summary of Additional Findings on the Data

The data presented additional dimensions not directly related to the research questions posed in this study. These additional dimensions in the data suggest a typology
for citizen service to cities. The typology for citizen service to cities presented as an additional finding of this study identifies four primary categories of service. Citizens serve their cities by serving as ambassadors, giving money, supporting city function, and delivering services. Descriptive data collected on the cities in the Cities of Service coalition allowed the researcher to explore whether there is a difference in the existence of citywide volunteer coordination based on city size, mayoral political affiliation, and form of government. Non-thematic observations on the data are also presented as additional findings. These non-thematic observations represent data that did not emerge as core categories but potentially inform future research.

**Correlations to Existing Scholarship**

In a grounded theory study, correlations to existing scholarship should be drawn (Charmax, 2006). Drawing correlations to existing scholarship serves multiple purposes. First, the exercise serves to orient the study within related and relevant bodies of existing scholarship (Charmaz, 2006). Additionally, the exercise can shed light on, or further explain, existing theories (Lukenhoff & Guillemette, 2011). Further, the exercise may serve to call existing theories into question (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

With respect to the substantive literature reviewed before undertaking this study, certain theoretical propositions ultimately exhibited greater relevance to the grounded theory that emerged from this study while others exhibited seemingly less relevance to the findings of this study.
The findings of this study together with the additional findings on the data align with the volunteer process model (Musick and Wilson, 2008). Specifically, the volunteer process model suggests three stages of volunteering. Those are: antecedents of volunteering; experience of volunteering; and, consequences of volunteering. In this study, the various motivations toward volunteer service demand were significantly informed by the public service motivation (PSM) literature (Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry, 1996; Brewer, et al., 2000). Those motivational bases--economic motivation, aspirational motivation, and need-based motivation--are what might be considered antecedents of volunteer demand. The ways in which citizens serve their cities was described as an additional finding on the data. Citizen service to cities is likened to Arnstein's (1969) ladder of citizen participation and is suggestive of the experience of volunteering as that concept is described by Muscik and Wilson's (2008) volunteer process model. Finally, the ways in which cities assess the impact of volunteer service is likened to the consequences of volunteering.

Much of the volunteering literature concerns individual motivations toward volunteering. Similarly, although multiple levels of social capital are described in the literature, much of the scholarship in social capital focuses on micro-level social capital (Halpern, 2005). This study did not address individual volunteer perceptions of volunteer demand or the potential micro-level social capital effects of volunteer service. Therefore, a more holistic orientation of volunteer demand within the volunteering literature and social capital literature might be realized by a study on citizens' perceived demand for service.
Challenges Presented by this Study

In carrying out this study, the researcher was presented with certain challenges, primarily in connection with data collection from key informant interviews. Describing these challenges may be helpful to grounded theory researchers and researchers conducting studies where data will derive from interviews.

In the opinion of the researcher, significant portions of the data deriving from key informant interview transcripts were not directly responsive to the interview questions posed. From the researcher's point of view, interviewees tended to share information not particularly relevant to the questions asked. On one hand, the task of coding the data was rendered more complicated by the additional volume of text. On the other hand, the additional data resulted in the ability of the researcher to identify interesting non-thematic themes in the data. Those non-thematic themes in the data were used to frame future research questions.

Furthermore, while content analyzing the data drawn from key informant interview transcripts, the researcher formed the opinion that data collected later in the study was more frequently coded for a core category of data. This opinion is based on the researcher's reflection on the interview transcripts. When reviewing the interview transcripts as a whole, it became apparent that the researcher's skill in conducting key informant interviews improved with each successive key informant interview. Particularly, the researcher was better skilled at keeping interviewees on topic in their responses. This
may have resulted in more coded data deriving from later interview transcripts than earlier
interview transcripts.

But for the fact that the cities participating in this study were part of the Cities of Service coalition, the researcher is of the opinion that access to key informant interviewees may have been challenging. The camaraderie of the Cities of Service coalition cities is believed by the researcher to have facilitated access to key informant interviewees in this study.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, recommendations are offered for local governments, philanthropic organizations, volunteer-using organizations, policymakers, citizens, and grounded theory methodologists. This study suffers certain limitations, however, which may limit the applicability of the recommendations set forth here. Additionally, the findings of this study have not been empirically confirmed.

Recommendations for Local Governments

A set of recommendations for local governments is offered. The recommendations include: (1) invest in volunteer coordination; (2) invest in volunteer training; (3) encourage citizen participation in developing volunteer service initiatives; (4) encourage citizen participation in developing performance measurement metrics; (5) develop metrics
contemporaneously with developing initiatives; and (6) market successes of volunteer service initiatives.

Citywide Volunteer Coordination Can Produce Benefits Outweighing Costs

Investing in volunteer coordination, specifically by funding a staff position to coordinate volunteer service citywide can potentially produce benefits that outweigh the costs of supporting the staff position. This recommendation may have particular relevance to small and medium sized cities as well as cities experiencing budget constraint. Investing in citywide volunteer coordination may be one way for cities to maximize budgets and resources. This recommendation flows from the findings of this research. Particularly, as one interviewee put it: “Cities cannot afford not to use volunteers. You need one or two people to act as a liaison between the city departments and the people and look what you get for that” [referring to the benefits of volunteer service].

Bembry (1996) studied the potential benefits of volunteer coordination in an urban setting. According to the findings of his study, effective volunteer coordination can produce benefits that exceed the costs of funding a volunteer coordinator position in terms of the value of services delivered to the community. Accordingly, Bembry (1996) is consistent with the findings of this study, and the recommendation set forth here.
In this study, one key informant interviewee suggested that training was important for liability avoidance. Two other key informant interviewees suggested that training efforts are undertaken specifically for the purpose of increasing volunteer skill. Yet another key informant interviewee expressed concern about volunteer retention and the loss of training resources when a volunteer discontinues service to the city. To this end, cities may be well advised to invest volunteer training.

Prior research has suggested that effective volunteer training can increase volunteer skill and also result in greater adherence to safety procedures thereby reducing potential for liability. Volunteer training has also been shown to increase volunteer retention (Nedder, 2009).

Encourage Citizen Participation in Developing Initiatives

The Cities of Service initiative is largely a top-down initiative, with the mayor’s office setting the agenda for volunteer service initiatives. Whether subscribing to the Cities of Service initiative or developing another approach for volunteer service as a strategy to address challenges at the local level, cities may consider the ways in which citizens can be involved in the process of shaping the initiative.
According to Fung and Wright (2003), increasing citizen participation in the development of governmental responses to novel or complex issues can increase creativity in the process. Significantly, Fung and Wright (2003) also suggest that encouraging citizen participation in this way can result in increased legitimacy of the response.

While none of the data in this study relates directly to increasing creativity in or legitimacy of volunteer service initiatives designed to address local challenges, the data would suggest that citizens may harbor some cynical views of such volunteer service initiatives. The references to the data for this study that suggest cynical citizen views of volunteer service are set forth in Figure 34 in Chapter Five.

Encourage Citizen Participation in Developing Performance Measurement Metrics

Some cities in this study suggested that metrics are established more or less arbitrarily. A potential hazard of this approach is that the metrics that are ultimately used to convey the impact of a particular volunteer service initiative may lack perceived legitimacy.

Ho and Coates (2002) suggest that performance measurement can increase the legitimacy of taxpayer funded initiatives. Further, Ho and Coates (2002) advocate for citizen participation in designing and implementing performance measures. When citizens are included in this process, according to the authors, they gain greater understanding of government spending and the services that are produced as a result of that spending.
Develop Metrics Contemporaneously With Developing Initiatives

As just mentioned, some cities reported that metrics or methods of assessing the impact of volunteer service as a strategy to meet pressing local issues were established in an un-systematic fashion. One interviewee in this study described the process in the following way: “Well, I mean when we sat and developed our initiatives, we set benchmarks and then we looked at whether those were reached. Based on what we were seeing there we also asked what opportunities from those might come forth.”

According to the Chief Service Officer for the City of Little Rock, Arkansas, that city developed evidence-based initiatives. By developing initiatives based on models from literature, the City of Little Rock was able to establish metrics that relate back to dimensions of the program instead of those metrics being an afterthought (Drake, 2012).

Isett, Mergel, LeRoux, Mischen, and Rethemeyer (2011) suggest that many researchers and academics are “preaching what is already in practice” (p. i159). To that end, they advise scholars to engage with practitioners. In this way, research will be directed to real issues that communities face instead of research agendas. Cities may look to local colleges or universities for assistance in developing evidence-based volunteer service initiatives. This strategy can produce dual benefits. First, this approach may inform research relevant to real issues in the community. Second, initiatives will be developed in such a way that metrics can be established that relate back to the dimensions of the initiative thereby contributing to the measurability.
Market Successes

Interviewees in at least four cities for this study reported that citizens often don't know how volunteering makes a difference in the community. Figure 35 provides selected excerpts from the data in this study related to the challenges of communicating the value of volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “What I think the challenge is telling people or making people realize the value of volunteers. People just don't see it or just don't appreciate it. So say for example that we have volunteers in the courthouse or the city clerk's office, and we do, and those volunteers are there directing people, visitors to the right office, telling them where they need to go to deal with a ticket or get something to the right department. People see that as a nice service but they don't realize that if those volunteers weren't there that people would constantly be going to the wrong office, interrupting the work of whoever was there, and then that staff person is getting less done and is less efficient. So what is the value of that? We know what it would cost to have a greeter there paid, but there is even more value there because they are making other staff more efficient.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Something else that we would like to bring into that is as part of our next community survey we are going to want to know how many people knew about volunteer opportunities in the community and whether they actually went out and volunteered.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I have started work on developing a multimedia piece that we can start presenting showing people in the community how valuable our volunteers are.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35: Data Excerpts Concerning Communicating Service Impact

Consistent with this recommendation, Ewing, Govekar, Govekar, and Rishi (2002) suggest that using promotional strategies to attract or motivate volunteers to give time to cause or organization is advisable. Such promotional strategies may relate to the non-
tangible benefits that may flow from the volunteer opportunity such as networking opportunities or building social capital. Or, volunteer-using organizations, according to the authors, can showcase the productivity of previous volunteers to send the message that “their 'gifts of time'” (p. 73) will be meaningful. Ewing et al. (2002) additionally suggest that during contracted economic times, volunteer-using organizations can attract volunteers by promoting the job skills that volunteers may gain as a result of volunteering.

Recommendations for Policy Makers

This study would suggest that the benefits of volunteer service may outweigh the costs of implementing volunteer service initiatives. In that connection, policy makers may consider the returns on investment in volunteer service initiatives. However, policy makers are cautioned not to consider returns on investment to the detriment of de-valuing potential intangible or non-quantifiable benefits of volunteer service.

Consider Returns on Investment

Volunteer service may produce benefits that outweigh the costs of implementing initiatives that rely on volunteer service. For that reason, policy makers are recommended to consider potential returns that may be realized on investments in volunteer service initiatives.
Consider Non-quantifiable Benefits

As the data in this study might suggest, certain benefits of volunteer service—such as increased civic engagement—may be inherently difficult to quantify. While those benefits may not be readily considered in a traditional cost-benefit analysis, they are nonetheless important and should not be excluded from consideration.

Recommendations for Philanthropic Organizations

The findings and data for this study guide the recommendations for philanthropic organizations presented here. Specifically, the recommendations for philanthropic organizations considering supporting volunteer service initiatives include providing support to small and medium sized cities and allowing for flexibility in initiatives, particularly with respect to the volunteer coordination function.

Fund Small and Medium Sized Cities

The additional findings in this study suggest that small cities in particular do not invest in citywide volunteer coordination at the same rate as large cities. Presumably, this is a function of smaller budgets in smaller cities. According to one interviewee in this study, “Cities cannot afford not to use volunteers.” However, at least two interviewees in this study expressed doubt about the viability or of service as a strategy to address local challenges. As one such interviewee put it: “To be honest with you, I was dubious. I didn’t know what we were going to see or find or if this would work at all. Given, though, what we were facing in
tough economic times though, we had to try even if we did not get the grant. Now we are really committed to this strategy and convinced of its impacts.”

Philanthropic organizations, then, promoting service as a strategy to address local challenges should make funding available to small and medium sized cities. Those cities may not otherwise have available budget to test the viability of service as a strategy.

Allow for Flexibility in Volunteer Coordination

As a condition of the Cities of Service Leadership Grant cities are required to create a Chief Service Officer position within the mayor’s office. The City of Plano, Texas may serve as an example of how citywide volunteer coordination can be successful outside of the mayor’s office. For that reason, philanthropic organizations providing grant funds to cities for citywide volunteer coordination may consider allowing flexibility in the way the citywide volunteer coordinator position is staffed.

Recommendations for Volunteer-using Organizations

Recommendations for volunteer-using organizations are offered based on the data and findings from this study. The recommendations for volunteer-using organizations include increasing measurement capacity, conducting formal needs assessments to identify needs in the community that may be address through volunteer service, and aligning services delivered through volunteers with needs of the city.
**Increase Measurement Capacity**

At least one city that participated in this study reported vetting partner organizations based in significant part on the organization's ability to report credible outcomes. In particular, that city reported: “

When we vet a nonprofit we always vet their outcome measurements as well. Some of those agencies are amazing in engaging people but not so much in outcome measurement. So the agencies that fit that description we are willing to go in there and get them set up to do the right kind of outcome measurement for us.

Volunteer-using organizations seeking partnerships with local governments may be well advised to invest in training and technology for measuring outcomes of volunteer service.

**Conduct Formal Needs Assessments**

This data in this study suggests that cities are employing formal and informal mechanisms for identifying needs in the community. Figure 32 in Chapter Five sets forth the references to the data on the variety of ways cities identify needs. Conducting formal needs assessments may result in more equitable distribution of services and better use of limited resources.

Needs assessments are formalized processes of determining individuals or groups of individuals that may benefit from services and the services likely to have the most impact on that service need (Finlayson, 2007). Although funds for conducting formal needs assessments may be substantially low, formal needs assessments serve an important
function. According to Eschenfelder (2010), needs assessments guide resource allocations and help prioritize service delivery to address unmet needs in the community. Cities may be able to realize the greatest impact from service as a strategy to address local challenges if the services delivered as part of that strategy are identified through needs assessments.

*Align Services with City Needs*

The data in this study would suggest that cities can benefit from citizen service particularly with respect to supporting staff functions. Volunteer-using organizations seeking out partnerships with local governments may see greater success in those partnerships when providing volunteers that meet the needs of the city.

*Recommendations for Citizens*

Citizens can become more engaged with their cities through volunteer service. The recommendations for citizens based on the findings of this study are to (1) engage with local governments through volunteer service and (2) leverage the volunteer role. Because the unit of analysis for this study was the city, limited data were obtained with respect to citizens. Accordingly, the recommendations set forth here are based on the prior research of others.

*Engage Through Volunteer Service*

Volunteer service is a form of citizen engagement (Frumpkin & Miller, 2008). Citizens can effectively engage through volunteer service. Additionally, by serving in a way that can impact on pressing needs in the community, the value of that service may be
recognized by local governments such that the demand for volunteer service is increased.
An increased demand for volunteer service may create more engagement opportunities.

**Leverage the Volunteer Role**

The volunteer role can be used to signal the importance of an issue to local governmental officials, or it can be used to advocate for a particular policy response (Walker, 2012). Citizens may be well advised to use or leverage the volunteer role in such a way to exert influence at the local level.

**Recommendations for Grounded Theory Methodologists**

The recommendations for grounded theory methodologists presented here are based on the researcher's experiences in conducting this study. In particular, the recommendations for grounded theory methodologists include identifying non-thematic observations in the data for the purpose of framing or informing future research and adhering to the strictures of the grounded theory method for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the method.

**Identify Non-thematic Observations**

Included in the findings of this study is a set of non-thematic observations. These non-thematic observations are comprised of data excerpts that were not coded for inclusion in the findings of this study. Nonetheless, these data excerpts are potentially valuable for informing future research. By setting forth these non-thematic observations, other researchers may be able to form interesting and relevant research questions.
Adhere to the Method

Grounded theory is a rigorous and orderly inductive approach to developing theory from data. Grounded theory researchers often point to the flexibility of the method as a reason for using grounded theory in qualitative research (Lukerhoff & Guillemette, 2011). Flexibility of the method should accommodate researcher reflexivity. It should not, however, be used as an invitation not to adhere to the strictures of the method. As part of the researcher’s preparatory work for conducting this study, a number of grounded theory studies were reviewed. The researcher is of the opinion that the grounded theory methodology label is sometimes misapplied in qualitative research. By adhering to the method, grounded theory will enjoy greater deference as a valuable and viable research methodology.

Propositions for Future Research

This constructivist grounded theory study uncovered a number of interesting observations which inform future research. The questions uncovered but unanswered by this study are as follows.

Future Research Question #1

What are the equity considerations related to the ways in which needs are identified?

Eschenfelder (2010) considers the importance of conducting formal needs assessments when making resource allocations and prioritizing services directed at under-
met needs in the community. Needs assessments are a “systematic process of determining what a group of individuals, an organization, or community requires to achieve some basic standard or to improve its current situation” (Finlayson, 2007, p. 29). As Eschenfelder (2010) points out, the primary objectives of conducting a needs assessment are to: (1) gauge the number of individuals in the community that are in need of or would benefit from a particular service; (2) understand the types and levels of service that would provide the greatest benefit within available resources; (3) measure needs of the community relative to other communities; (4) identify existing services that may be underutilized; (5) coordinate existing services to maximize the impact of those services; and (6) respond to diverse needs in the community with an appropriate mix of services. It is this last prong relating to meeting diverse needs in the community that raises the question proposed here. If, for example, needs in the community are identified through informal needs, what assurance can there be that diverse needs or needs of underrepresented populations are being met or adequately addressed?

The data in this study shows that some cities have formal mechanisms for identifying needs in the community (i.e., focus groups and community forums). Other cities rely on informal and unsystematic methods for identify needs in the community. Figure 32 in Chapter Five contains excerpts from the data in this study describing the formal and informal methods cities identify needs. In light of Eschenfelder (2010) and the observations in this study, understanding the equity impacts of the ways in which needs are identified would likely prove an interesting and important research endeavor.
Future Research Question #2

What cross-sectoral partnerships are most effective in responding to pressing needs at the local level?

Andrews and Entwistle (2010) point out the cross-sectoral partnership is increasingly seen as the answer to big societal problems. One of the primary driving forces behind this trend is the pressure on the public sector to maximize limited resources. This begs the question: Are some cross-sectoral partnerships more effective than others in responding to pressing needs at the local level?

Future Research Question #3

Does the strength of the relationship between local governments and partner organizations affect volunteer service demand?

A network analysis of the various connections between the city and partner organizations may be able to shed light on the ways in which cities are motivated to include volunteer service in strategies intended to address local challenges (Milward & Provan, 2006). Specifically, cities may be motivated toward reliance on volunteer service as a strategy for addressing local needs based on the strength of relationships with partner organizations.
Future Research Question #4

Is the grounded theory for volunteer service demand proposed in this study supported?

The grounded theory for volunteer service demand presented in this study has not been tested out. Accordingly, a quantitative study using the grounded theory for volunteer service demand proposed by this study would be useful for furthering the scholarship on volunteer service demand.

Future Research Question #5

What factors contribute to the creation of a culture of service?

This constructivist grounded theory study yielded a grounded theory model for volunteer service demand. One of the factors included in the grounded theory for volunteer service demand is aspirational motivation. Cities, according to the findings of this study, are motivated to include volunteer service in strategies to address local challenges based on an expressed desire to create a culture of service in the city. Appendix N sets forth the references to the data for this study that relate to the creation of a service culture. Lines of inquiry not explored in this study, however, include: (1) how cities define service culture; (2) the factors that contribute the creation of service culture; and (3) how cities can sustain a service culture.
Future Research Question #6

What is the role of service learning in creating a culture of service?

Service learning in the Serve America Act receives special attention as a tool for “improv[ing] the education of children and youth and to maximiz[ing] the benefits of national and community service, in order to renew the ethic of civic responsibility and spirit of community for children and youth throughout the United States” (42 U.S.C. § 12501(b)(9)). The unstated intent of the Serve America Act with respect to service learning would seem to relate to the creation of a sustainable culture of service beginning with impressing upon young people the value of service. Accordingly, a study aimed at understanding the role of service learning in creating a culture of service is worthwhile.

Future Research Question #7

How do citizens view service as a local governance strategy?

This study examined volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges from the perspective of the city. While some cities in this study suggested various citizen views of service as a strategy to meet needs in the community, this study did not explore the citizen view of volunteer service in this regard. Figure 29 in Chapter Four provides references to the data suggesting certain possible citizen views of volunteer service as a local governance strategy. Some views suggested by cities are quite critical.
Future Research Question #8

What is the differential impact of the various motivational bases for volunteer service demand presented in the grounded theory model in this study?

The data in this study suggest various motivational bases for volunteer service demand on the part of local governments. The number of coded data excerpts relative to economic motivation accounted for the greatest portion of data (40%), aspirational motivation accounted for the second greatest portion of data (34%), and need-driven motivation accounted for the least portion of data (26%) on motivational bases. This study did not address, however, whether these various motivational bases have differential impact with respect to resulting volunteer service demand.

Future Research Question #9

Does the motivational basis upon which a city demands volunteer service affect the success of an initiative that relies on volunteer service to address a local challenge?

A city that demands volunteer service on the basis of an economic motivation or need-driven motivation may implement an initiative that relies on volunteer service to address a local challenge because of resource scarcity. A city that implements a volunteer service initiative to address a local challenge based on an aspirational motivation may be less concerned with quantifiable impacts. Exploring the success or perceived success of volunteer service initiatives based on the underlying motivation for launching that initiative potentially represents an interesting proposition for future research.
Future Research Question #10

Does un-paid citywide volunteer coordination result in the same level of success as to volunteer service initiatives as paid volunteer coordination?

Some cities in the Cities of Service coalition have installed un-paid Chief Service Officers. As a proposition for future research, the success of volunteer service initiatives in cities that have un-paid Chief Service Officers versus those cities that have a paid Chief Service Officer or other staff performing citywide volunteer coordination may be explored.

Limitations of this Study

The limitations of this study are related largely to four aspects of the study. The first limitation arises relative to the sample size. The purposive criterion sample (Patton, 2002) for this study included 39 cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as of June 2012 that further participated in key informant interviews for this study. A majority of the coded data excerpts for this study derived from key informant interview transcripts. In particular, 112 data excerpts were coded for the first research question. Of those 112 data excerpts, 83 (74%) derived from key informant interview transcripts. Twenty-seven coded data excerpts were from High-Impact Service Plans, and 2 were from grant applications. Each of the 26 coded data excerpts on the second research question derived from key informant interview transcripts. Accordingly, because of the small number of cities, the generalizability of this study may be significantly limited. The second limitation arises relative to the sample selection method. This constructivist grounded theory study
employed a purposive sample. Specifically, a criterion sampling strategy was used (Patton, 2002). Being a non-probability sampling technique, purposive samples have inherent disadvantages. For instance, because the sample cannot be said to be representative of a larger population, inferences cannot be drawn based on the sample and the generalizability of the study is limited. Additionally, the study may suffer from sampling bias, whereby certain characteristics of cities may have been over-represented, rendering the findings and conclusions of this study invalid (Patton, 2002). The third limitation of this study relates to the constructivist grounded theory methodology used in this study. Strauss and Corbin (1990) caution that theories emerging from the data in grounded theory studies “specify the conditions that give rise to specific sets of action/interaction pertaining to a phenomenon and the resulting consequences” (p. 251). Grounded theory theories are generalizable to the context of the study only (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The fourth limitation arises relative to the data collection tools employed in this study. Data for this study was collected through key informant interviews and extant texts. With respect to data collected from interviews, the possibility exists that those interviews, or the meanings that interviewees attempted to communicate, were not accurately captured. This implicates the credibility of the study (Charmaz, 2006). With respect to data collection from extant texts, those were created for specific purposes other than as a source of data for this study. Accordingly, findings and conclusions drawn on data from extant texts in this study may not be credible.
APPENDIX A:
SERVE AMERICA ACT OF 2009 OVERVIEW
Serve America Act of 2009 Overview

Signed into law on April 21, 2009 by president Barack Obama and effective on October 1, 2009, the Serve America Act (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.) has been called a “national call to service” (Obama, 2011, p. 1). The Serve America Act identifies key issue areas that are national priorities. Among those key issue areas are:

- meeting the needs of low-income and rural communities;
- promoting clean energy alternatives, energy conservation and energy efficiency;
- engaging students (from elementary grades through university) in service-learning to promote student achievement and demonstrate the importance of service to young people;
- ensuring access to health care; and
- ensuring availability of services to military veterans.

Meeting Needs in Low-Income and Rural Communities

The stated purpose of the Serve America Act, as the legislation relates to impacting low-income and rural communities, provides that service in those communities should be directed to serving specific goals. Among those goals are helping “develop and carry out financial literacy, financial planning, budgeting, saving, and reputable credit accessibility programs” (42 U.S.C. § 4953(9), “initiating and supporting before-school and after-school programs, serving children in low-income communities” (42 U.S.C. § 4953(10)), and
“establishing and supporting community economic development initiatives...in rural areas” (42 U.S.C. § 4953(11)).

Clean Energy Goals

With respect to promoting clean energy as a national priority, the Serve America Act creates the Clean Energy Service Corps. The Clean Energy Service Corps is authorized to carry out national service programs that “identifies and meets unmet environmental needs within communities” (42 U.S.C. § 12572(3)(A)). Specific service projects undertaken by the Clean Energy Service Corps may include providing weatherizing services and energy audits in low-income communities to improve the energy efficiency of homes in those communities, building new energy efficient homes in low-income communities, conducting service-learning projects to teach young people about the importance of energy conservation, developing recycling programs, maintaining green spaces, and providing environmental clean-up services (42 U.S.C. § 12572(3)(B)).

Service Learning

Significant portions of the Serve America Act are dedicated to promoting and innovating in the area of school-based and community-based service-learning. Service-learning programs under the Serve America Act are viewed as integral to “improv[ing] the education of children and youth and to maximiz[ing] the benefits of national and community service, in order to renew the ethic of civic responsibility and spirit of community for children and youth throughout the United States” (42 U.S.C. § 12501(b)(9)).
Healthcare Access

Expanding and improving access to health care is identified as an important national issue under the Serve America Act. National service fellowships are created under the act to achieve this goal (42 U.S.C. § 12653(b)(1)(B).

Veteran Services

Service to military veterans and their families should, according to the Serve America Act, be directed at “establishing or augmenting programs that assist such persons with access to legal assistance, health care (including mental health care), employment counseling or training, education counseling or training, affordable housing, and other support services” (42 U.S.C. § 4953(13)).

In addition to the aforementioned national priority issues, the Serve America Act is designed to “recognize and increase the impact of social entrepreneurs and other nonprofit community organizations that are effectively addressing national and local challenges” (42 U.S.C. § 12501(b)(15) and “increase public and private investment in nonprofit community organizations that are effectively addressing national and local challenges” (42 U.S.C. § 12501(b)(16)).
APPENDIX B:
CITIES OF SERVICE INITIATIVE OVERVIEW
Cities of Service Initiative Overview

The Cities of Service initiative is a volunteer service initiative designed to promote "impact volunteering" in cities. This initiative was developed in response to the Serve America Act. Impact volunteering means "volunteer strategies that target community needs, use best practices, and set clear outcomes and measures to gauge progress" (Cities of Service, n.d.). Mayors in 119 cities across the nation have committed to the Cities of Service initiative as of June 2012. The Cities of Service initiative is distinctive over other volunteerism initiatives in a number of key dimensions. Specifically, Cities of Service seeks to find ways to engage and activate volunteers in ways that address significant local issues. This means Cities of Service focuses not on narrow measures such as number of volunteers or volunteer hours logged, but on more substantial measures such as the ways in which a Chief Service Officer (CSO)--a city official dedicated to coordinating and evaluating local volunteer efforts--can create sustained and meaningful volunteer service impact in areas of local need and ways in which cities can work together in developing best practices for engaging volunteers. The Cities of Service initiative is supported by Bloomberg Philanthropies and the Rockefeller Foundation. As of June 2012, thirty-four of Cities of Service cities have a CSO. Grant funding supports the CSO positions in 20 cities, local funds support the CSO position in two cities, and the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) is working with seven additional cities to install volunteer CSOs. Cities that have received a grant (called a Cities of Service Leadership Grant) from Cities of Service are called Leadership Cities. The remaining cities subscribe to the Cities of
Service initiative without grant support, thereby underscoring the perceived importance of the Cities of Service initiative (Cities of Service, n.d.).

The blueprint for the Cities of Service initiative was developed based on the volunteer service initiative undertaken in New York City by Mayor Michael Bloomberg in 2009. New York City's volunteer service initiative is called NYCService. NYCService is built on three premises. First, people in the city should be able to readily connect to meaningful service opportunities. Second, service opportunities should be concentrated in areas where the city has the greatest need for service. And, third, service should promote citizenship. The development of NYCService was guided by best practices literature in volunteer engagement (NYCService, n.d.).

The Cities of Service initiative advances a set of four goals. The first goal relates to creation a mechanism designed to match volunteers with volunteer-using organizations that deliver services in an area of local need. The Cities of Service initiative does not prescribe that mechanism. Rather, the various Cities of Service cities have discretion in development of their volunteer matching mechanism. The second goal of the Cities of Service initiative is to encourage mayors and other local government officials to collaborate in the development of best practices on how to encourage impact volunteering. The third goal of Cities of Service is expansion of the initiative. The final stated goal of the Cities of Service initiative is to further the policy agenda and legislative intent of the Serve America Act, namely promoting greater citizenship and producing "tangible benefits" through volunteering in areas of unmet need (42 U.S.C. 12501 § 2). Each Cities of Service
Leadership City is required to do two things: (1) develop a High-Impact Service Plan that describes how it plans to meet designated service goals, and (2) hire a Chief Service Officer to coordinate and management the city's service goals.

The term “impact volunteering” means engaging volunteers in service in ways that have meaningful impact on local challenges and/or unmet need in the community. Impact volunteering cannot be gauged by service hours. Instead, impact volunteering must be gauged by measures designed to determine whether the challenge area or unmet need was remedied in any way. By way of example, volunteers in Little Rock, Arkansas and Los Angeles, California have planted and are maintaining community gardens to improve the availability of healthful food options in those cities. (Cities of Service, 2011). Sloane, Diamont, Lewis, Yancey, Flynn, Nascimento, McCarthy, Guinyard, & Cousineau (2003) have found less availability of healthful foods in grocery stores located in areas with majority or near majority African-American populations versus the availability of healthful foods in areas with lower concentrations of African-American residents. Accordingly, increasing availability of healthful food options through service is one way in which service can impact on an important issue in some communities.

The Cities of Service initiative has developed an implementation guide called the Cities of Service Play Book. The Cities of Service Play Book is made available online to leadership cities and non-leadership cities. Specifically, the Cities of Service Play Book guides cities in the development of a High-Impact Service Plan (Cities of Service, n.d.).
The Cities of Service Play Book is comprised of six parts, or steps in developing a High-Impact Service Plan.

The first step in developing a High-Impact Service plan is to invest in leadership. Investing in leadership, according to the Cities of Service Play Book, means convening the bully pulpit power of the mayor behind the commitment to service and assign a person to be accountable to the mayor for the city's service efforts and initiatives. In Cities of Service Leadership Cities, this person is the Chief Service Officer. The Cities of Service Play Book provides an example job description for the Chief Service Officer position. As set forth in the example job description, the responsibilities of the Chief Service Officer include: (1) bringing together experts in the mayor's administration and stakeholders in the community—including nonprofit organizations, universities, donors, and others—in developing a High-Impact Service Plan for the city; (2) producing a High-Impact Service Plan for the city; (3) identifying opportunities for collaborative relationships in the community and working toward developing those relationships; (4) seeking out and securing funding for the city's service initiatives; (5) planning, coordinating and promoting the city's service initiatives; and (6) tracking the progress and impact of the city's service initiatives (Cities of Service, 2011).

The second step in the High-Impact Service Plan development involves identification of priority needs areas and specific challenges in the city. At the same time the city is determining its priority need areas and specific challenges, the city should also consider the resources and opportunities available in the community. In order to determine
priority need areas, the Cities of Service Play Book recommends conducting focus groups and surveys to gain stakeholder input. In order to identify stakeholders, the Cities of Service Play Book recommends asking the following questions. What existing non-profit organizations in the community are connected individuals to service opportunities? What organizations in the community currently use volunteers? What are the sources of volunteers in the community? The first objective of using focus groups and surveys is to reach an agreement about what the priority areas are in the city. The next objective is to identify the specific challenges within the city's priority areas that can be impacted by service. Then cross-cutting challenges should be identified. Cross-cutting challenges are challenges that are associated with more than one priority need area. In most instances, cross-cutting challenges are associated with lack of infrastructure to support service initiatives in the city. For example, a cross-cutting challenge may be that the city lacks the financial resources to coordinate service initiatives. (Cities of Service, 2011).

The third step in developing a High-Impact Service Plan is to develop and plan for the specific initiatives the city will undertake to address its priority need areas and specific challenges. Based on the data that is collected in connection with the focus groups and surveys in step two, which should yield the city's priority need areas and challenges, a set of potential initiatives is developed. The Cities of Service Play Book identifies two types of service initiatives. The first type of service initiative is what is known as an Impact Service Initiative. Impact Service Initiatives are intended to address the city's priority need areas. The other type of service initiative is known as an Infrastructure Initiative.
Infrastructure Initiatives are those service initiatives that are designed to address the cross-cutting challenges present in the city. The set of potential service initiatives should be assessed for risk (including legal risk and risk of failure), whether the initiative will impact the priority need area in a relatively long time or a reasonably short time, and balance to ensure that the city's efforts are being appropriately allocated across all of the priority need areas (Cities of Service, 2011).

Step four in developing a High-Impact Service Plan is to develop a framework for measuring the impact of the city's service initiatives. The Cities of Service Play Book recognizes that most service initiatives are measured in terms of inputs, for example, number of hours served or number of individuals engaged in a particular activity. Because the focus of the Cities of Service initiative is impact volunteering, these input measurements are not appropriate. Instead, cities are charged with developing ways to measure the impact of service on priority need areas and cross-cutting challenges. Measuring impact rather than inputs is important for several reasons. For example, revisions or adjustments cannot be made to the city's initiatives unless the city has reliable impact data. Impact data allows the city to effectively communicate successes attributable to the city's service initiatives. Additionally, with impact data, cities will presumably be better positioned to obtain future funding from various sources to continue the initiatives. Measuring service impact also importantly contributes to the scholarship on service (Cities of Service, 2011).
Step five is an important pre-implementation planning step and involves clarifying the city's expectations for its service initiatives and getting buy-in from stakeholders (Cities of Service, 2011).

The sixth and final step in developing a High-Impact Service Plan is to publish the plan and to formally launch the city's service initiatives (Cities of Service, 2011).
APPENDIX C:
SUMMARY OF GOVERNANCE THEORIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank, 1992, p. 58, n.1</td>
<td>Governance, in general, has three distinct aspects: (a) the form of political regime (parliamentary or presidential, military or civilian, and authoritarian or democratic); (b) the processes by which authority is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources; and (c) the capacity of governments to design, formulate, and implement policies, and, in general, to discharge government functions.</td>
<td>Developing nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stoker 1998, p. 18   | 1. Governance refers to a set of institutions and actors that are drawn from and also beyond government.  
2. Governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues.  
3. Governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationships between institutions involved in collective actions.  
4. Governance is about autonomous self-governing networks of actors.  
5. Governance recognizes the capacity to get things done that does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools to steer and guide. | Public Administration |
| Salamon, 2002, p. 19 | [G]overnance…calls for the development of a systematic body of knowledge that can help policymakers, public managers, and others engaged in the increasingly collaborative business of public problem solving take advantage of the special opportunities and cope with special challenges that these new tools [of government] entail. | Government studies |
| Majette, 2009, p. 602, n. 135 | [I]mposing a duty upon clinicians and managers to establish a system that continuously improves the quality of care and that ensures delivery of high-quality care. | Healthcare |
| Vaughn, 2010, p. 60  | [A]lternative sites of authority above and below nationstates that challenge the national governments’ ‘monopoly on collectively binding decision-making’. | Criminal Justice |
| Frahm & Martin, 2009, p. 417 | [H]aving more of an external network focus because [social work] institutions interact with and depend upon others to jointly achieve community-level outcomes. | Social Work |
APPENDIX D:
IRB EXEMPTION LETTER
Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00000138

To: Brandy C. Hill

Date: June 18, 2012

Dear Researcher:

On 6/18/2012, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

- **Type of Review:** UCF Initial Review Submission Form
- **Project Title:** Cities of Service: A Grounded Theory Exploration of Volunteer Service
- **Investigator:** Brandy C. Hill
- **IRB Number:** SBE-12-08486
- **Funding Agency:** None

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in IRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Sophia Dzegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Janice Turchin on 06/18/2012 03:37:59 PM EDT

IRB Coordinator
EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH

Title of Project: Cities of Service: A Grounded Theory Explanation of Volunteer Service

Principal Investigator: Brandy C. Hill

Faculty Supervisor: Thomas A. Bryer, PhD

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Whether you take part is up to you.

- The purpose of this research is to understand how cities use volunteer service in problem-solving strategies.

- You are being asked to take part in a telephone interview about your city's involvement with the Cities of Service coalition. With your permission the interview will be audio recorded. You may decide not to allow an audio recording of the interview. The primary focus of the interview will be on:
  - how your city decides to use volunteers to address local challenges;
  - how volunteer-using initiatives in your city have met areas of local need; and
  - how your city determines if a volunteer-using strategy is successful.

Your responses to the interview questions should reflect your city's position and not your own. You may decline to answer any question you are not comfortable answering on your city's behalf and you may decide to end the interview early without that decision being held against you. You will also be asked to share certain documents and reports your city may have prepared in connection with its involvement with the Cities of Service coalition. Those documents include your city's grant application to the Cities of Service organization and reports you have delivered to the Cities of Service organization.

The expected time required to complete the interview is approximately **30 minutes**. You may be asked to participate in a follow-up interview for the purpose of clarifying understanding of your initial interview responses. The time to complete any follow-up interview is not expected to exceed 15 minutes. You are not obligated in any way to participate in any follow-up interview or provide further clarification of your initial responses.
It is anticipated that the findings of this study will be published as part of my dissertation research. You will not be identified by name, title or position. Your city, however, may be identified or identifiable by your responses.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

**Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem:** If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, please contact Brandy C. Hill, Graduate Student, Public Affairs PhD Program, College of Health and Public Affairs (Phone: 407-310-5456; Email: brandy.hill@knights.ucf.edu) or Dr. Thomas A. Bryer, Faculty Supervisor / Assistant Professor, College of Health and Public Affairs, School of Public Administration (Phone: 407-823-0410; Email: thomas.bryer@ucf.edu).

**IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint:** Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.
APPENDIX F:
RESEARCHER CONNECTION TO CITIES OF SERVICE
Researcher Connection to Cities of Service

I was introduced to the Cities of Service initiative through a service learning project during the Fall 2010 semester in a seminar taught by my now dissertation co-chair, Dr. Thomas Bryer. As part of our service learning project I worked with several other graduate students to conduct a landscape analysis on the challenges and opportunities surrounding volunteer service in the City of Orlando, Florida. I also participated in a focus group held for the purpose of proposing possible volunteer service initiatives to address Orlando's priority need areas. At that time I met one of the Cities of Service professional staff members and the Chief Service Officer for the City of Orlando. As I learned more about the Cities of Service initiative I came to realize that volunteer service as a strategy for addressing challenges at the local level presented an intriguing topic for my dissertation research. After researching the relevant literature and learning more about the initiative, I came to appreciate the need to study the demand side of volunteer service. As the research plan for this study started to unfold, the Cities of Service coalition members emerged as a likely purposive criterion sample for this grounded theory study. The foregoing notwithstanding, the basis for proceeding with the cities belonging to the Cities of Service coalition as the purposive sample for this study is the fact that these cities have experience with volunteer service as a strategy to address local challenges.
APPENDIX G:
INTERVIEW REQUEST LETTER
Dear [NAME]:

I am writing to request your participation in a telephone interview about the use of volunteers in city government strategies to address local challenges. Because your city is a member of the Cities of Service coalition, your city's experience with volunteer-using strategies to address priority need areas is invaluable to my research. In particular, I hope to explore how cities use volunteers in meaningful ways and the impact of volunteers in addressing local challenges.

Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. The name and position of the person participating in the interview will be kept confidential but your city may be identified or identifiable. Additionally, I may request your permission to audio record the interview. I invite you to contact me if you have any questions about my research or your participation in an interview. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Thomas Bryer (phone: 407-823-0410; email: Thomas.Bryer@ucf.edu).

Please contact me by phone (407-310-5456) or email (Brandy.Hill@knights.ucf.edu) to schedule an interview time.

Thank you for considering my request for participation in this study. I appreciate, in advance, your time in providing thoughtful responses.

Sincerely,

/s/ Brandy Hill
Brandy Hill
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Central Florida
Phone: 407-310-5456
Email: brandy.hill@knights.ucf.edu
APPENDIX H:
INTERVIEW GUIDE
**Initial Interview Questions**

1. How did your city learn about the Cities of Service initiative?

2. What motivated your city to join the Cities of Service coalition?

3. What factors does your city consider when deciding to implement a volunteer-using initiative to address a local challenge?

4. Please provide examples illustrating the ways in which volunteer-using initiatives in your city have met areas of local need.

5. How does your city determine if a volunteer-using initiative is successful in meeting an area of local need?

6. Are you willing to share your city's Cities of Service Leadership Grant application?

7. Are you willing to share reports your city has prepared relating to the Cities of Service initiative?

8. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Revised Interview Guide

1. How did your city learn about the Cities of Service initiative?

2. What motivated your city to join the Cities of Service coalition?

3. What factors does your city consider when deciding to implement a volunteer-using initiative to address a local challenge?

4. Please provide examples illustrating the ways in which volunteer-using initiatives in your city have met areas of local need.

5. How does your city determine if a volunteer-using initiative is successful in meeting an area of local need?

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?
APPENDIX J:
SUMMARY OF KEY INFORMANTS INTERVIEWED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City Size (per 2010 US Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>466,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>204,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1,547,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>2,257,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>191,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>225,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Fayetteville, AR</td>
<td>77,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Chula Vista, CA</td>
<td>223,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>8,391,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>3,831,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Chattanooga, TN</td>
<td>171,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>454,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>249,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>New Bedford, MA</td>
<td>91,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Dubuque, IA</td>
<td>57,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>156,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Nacogdoches, TX</td>
<td>33,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Palm Bay, FL</td>
<td>100,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Salinas, CA</td>
<td>144,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Ventura, CA</td>
<td>104,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
<td>36,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>244,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>157,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>165,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>482,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>193,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City Size (per 2010 US Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>270,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>273,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>432427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Harrisburg, PA</td>
<td>47,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>1,373,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td>433,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>183,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>964,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>356,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>620,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>56,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Official</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>311,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>York, PA</td>
<td>40,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K:
EXPANDED CODING PROCESS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coder #1 Initial (Line-by-Line) Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answering call to service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Experience with Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped by Service in Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Scale Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Volunteer Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating Commitment to Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to Engage Citizens in Problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Volunteer Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers are Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Commitment to Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Part of Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing new initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Other Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing challenges to using volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to local challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memoing
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Motivating Factors
- Economic Motivation
  - budget constraint

- Aspirational Motivation
  - creating service culture
  - increasing citizen engagement
  - increasing citizenship skills

- Need Driven Motivation
  - formal need assessment
  - informal need assessment
  - what are the equity considerations related to how needs come to attention of city?

Practical Considerations
Resources
- coordination resources (staff or partner organization)
- Volunteer skills
  - also volunteer commitment (not “one-shot deal”)
- supplies
- liability

MEASURING SUCCESS

- Service-related Accomplishments
  - how many people volunteered
  - how many hours

- Resulting Services
  - i.e., how many roofs were painted, how many meals delivered, how many miles of trail cleaned

- Impacts / Outcomes
  - qualitative default – tell the story when hard to quantify
  - outcome measurement
**Coder #2 Initial (Line-by-Line) Coding**

Mayor Life Event – commitment to volunteer service  
Mayor Life Event – service beneficiary  
Mayor Life Event – as public servant  
City—benefit of service  
City—need for service  
City—citizen desire to engage  
City—citizen desire to serve  
City—partnership opportunities  
City—history of service  
City—need  
City—economic constraint  
Citizen—need to engage  
Citizen—skill  
Citizen—commitment to volunteer service

---

**Memoing**

---

**Coder #2 Axial (Focused) Coding**

**MOTIVATING FACTORS**  
City Needs Volunteers for Service Delivery  
City Needs Volunteers to Address Budget Shortfalls  
Engagement Strategy

**SUCCESS FACTORS**  
Many Factors Define Success  
Metrics  
Outcomes
Selective (Theoretical) Coding

(Antecedents)
STRATEGIC SERVICE DEMAND
- Economic Motivation
- Budget Constraint
- Cost Savings

- Aspirational Motivation
  - Service Culture
  - Civic Engagement

- Need-Driven Motivation
  - Citizen Need
  - City Need

FEASIBILITY
- Partnership Opportunities
- Liability
- Skilled Volunteer Supply
- Manageability
- Measurability
- Resources

(Experience)
SERVING
- City Ambassador
- Giving Money
- Supporting City Function
  - Service Delivery

  (Consequences)

  VOLUNTEER SERVICE IMPACT
  - Metrics
  - Outcomes
  - Stories (Qualitative)
  - A Mix
APPENDIX L:
SUMMARY OF CITIES OF SERVICE COALITION CITIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Government Form</th>
<th>Mayoral Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</th>
<th>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, OH</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, PA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis, MD</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck, ND</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant, AR</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga, TN</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohoes, NY</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christie, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport, IA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, OH</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque, IA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton, PA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin, IL</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood, CO</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River, MA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, AR</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale, FL</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wayne, IN</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glens Falls, NY</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie, TX</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, OH</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg, PA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg, MS</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke, MA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo, MI</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsport, TN</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster, CA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney, TX</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian, MS</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa, AZ</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey, CA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon, WI</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacogodoches, TX</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford, MA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Bay, FL</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, PA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre, SD</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, PA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, CA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton, WY</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas, CA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, NM</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton, PA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville, TX</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville, MA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise, AZ</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, NJ</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophy Club, TX</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica, NY</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Government Form</td>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
<td>Grant Support for Citywide Volunteer Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion, SD</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicksburg, MS</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre, PA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York, PA</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Activity Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/31/10</td>
<td>Participate in Cities of Service focus group for to identify priority need areas for City of Orlando</td>
<td>Introduction to Cities of Service initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/10</td>
<td>Begin Literature Review</td>
<td>Develop study plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/09/11</td>
<td>Download Cities of Service Publications and High-Impact Service Plans</td>
<td>Initial Content Analysis (to frame study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>Review first year Cities of Service “Impact Report”</td>
<td>Study framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/11</td>
<td>Initial Methodology Plan</td>
<td>Develop study plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/12</td>
<td>Refine Initial Methodology Plan</td>
<td>Address feasibility issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/12</td>
<td>Develop Interview Guide</td>
<td>Pilot test interview questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/12</td>
<td>Brief Second Coder on Research</td>
<td>Develop Coding Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/12</td>
<td>IRB Application</td>
<td>Exempt status determination requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/12</td>
<td>Public Records Requests</td>
<td>Grant Applications non-CoS cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/12</td>
<td>IRB Application Correction</td>
<td>Clarify source of documentary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/12</td>
<td>IRB Approval</td>
<td>Exemption determination letter issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/12</td>
<td>Scheduling Email Sent</td>
<td>Begin scheduling interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/12</td>
<td>Interview #1</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/12</td>
<td>Interview #2</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/12</td>
<td>Public Records Requests</td>
<td>Grant Applications Cities of Service cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Initial Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/12</td>
<td>Interview #3</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/12</td>
<td>Interview #4</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/12</td>
<td>Interview #5</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/12</td>
<td>Interview #8</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/12</td>
<td>Interview #9</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/12</td>
<td>Interview #10</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/12</td>
<td>Interview #11</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/12</td>
<td>Interview #12</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/12</td>
<td>Interview #13</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/12</td>
<td>Interview #14</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/12</td>
<td>Interview #15</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/12</td>
<td>Interview #16</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/12</td>
<td>Interview #17</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/12</td>
<td>Interview #18</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/12</td>
<td>Interview #19</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/12</td>
<td>Interview #20</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/12</td>
<td>Interview #21</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/12</td>
<td>Interview #22</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interviews</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interview #1-#22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/12</td>
<td>Initial Coding</td>
<td>Interviews #1-#22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/12</td>
<td>Axial Coding</td>
<td>Interviews #1-#22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Initial Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Redundancy and saturation observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/12</td>
<td>Second Coder Coding</td>
<td>Interviews #1-#22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/26/12</td>
<td>Interview #23</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/26/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interview</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interview #23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>Interview #24</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>Interview #25</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>Interview #26</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interviews</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interviews #24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/12</td>
<td>Discussion with T.Bryer</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/12</td>
<td>Retrieve City Organizational Charts</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Interview #27</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interview</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interview #27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Interview #28</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Interview #29</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Interview #30</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Interview #31</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interviews</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interviews #28-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/12</td>
<td>Axial / Focused Coding</td>
<td>Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/12</td>
<td>Telephone calls to city clerks to determine existence of citywide volunteer coordination</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/12</td>
<td>Interview #32</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/12</td>
<td>Interview #33</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interviews</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interviews #32-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/12</td>
<td>Telephone call to T.Bryer</td>
<td>Reporting issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/12</td>
<td>Interview #34</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/12</td>
<td>Interview #35</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/12</td>
<td>Interview #36</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interviews</td>
<td>Create transcript for Interviews # 34-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/12</td>
<td>Interview #37 – Canceled</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/12</td>
<td>Interview #38</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interview</td>
<td>Create Transcript for Interview #38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/12</td>
<td>Interview #37 – Rescheduled</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/12</td>
<td>Interview #39</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/12</td>
<td>Transcribe Interview</td>
<td>Create Transcript for Interview #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/12</td>
<td>Memoing</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/12</td>
<td>Theoretical Coding</td>
<td>Revise emerging grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/12</td>
<td>Meeting with L.Martin</td>
<td>Discuss dissertation research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/12</td>
<td>Meeting with T.Bryer</td>
<td>Discuss dissertation research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/12</td>
<td>Report findings</td>
<td>Revise / draft findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### STRATEGIC SERVICE DEMAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health and Human Services and Education budgets are being slashed to the bone at a time when most of our safety net organizations and agencies are being pushed beyond their capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our city is in receivership and I know that there is something to this service as a strategy. This is something that we need to look at and look at hard because if we are going to turn this ship around we need everybody, we really need everybody to do their part and get involved and help be part of the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We had a huge budget deficit for like the 5th year in a row. The city was furloughing employees and making cutbacks in public safety, fire, first responders. All the areas that we really resisted making cuts until there was no other choice. At the same time we were seeing things like rising obesity rates in our community and diminishing health indicators. The idea of using service and really directing service in a focused way was very appealing to our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• So we've had 10 years of budget shortfalls, we've deferred maintenance, we've had program cutbacks. As we look at volunteers what we see is a way how we might be able to restore services that the city can no longer provide. Some of those services that are now being delivered by volunteers that were once provided by the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding has been substantially low especially for things like environmental programs. That's one of the reasons we are engaging volunteers in that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With the cuts we've made in budget and maintenance staff, each park staff person would have more than 100 acres to maintain each. That's impossible. There simply is not enough resources to maintain our parks without volunteers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We've been using volunteers but now we are really having a new appreciation for how volunteers help with the budget. They can do things that the city just can't get to. The weeds are going to grow but we might not have a staff person that can go out there are take care of it. We've found that citizens are ready to chip in and help with tasks like that and it really frees up city staff so that they can do the higher level tasks that absolutely have to be done.

So I guess the number one thing is that we need citizens to volunteer because we could not afford to do all the things we do without them.

We are supposed to have 90 something nurses on city staff but because of budget cuts and shrinking what we can do we only have 19. So how do we deal with something if we have a major disaster here and nobody to respond?

We have had to make just unbelievable budget cutbacks. So some things, some city service, that we used to take for granted don't get done. Unfortunately, things like graffiti removal don't always receive high priority so we started looking to other solutions.

We absolutely don't have the funds to do all the things or deliver all the services we want to.

Resources to dedicate to that upkeep, though, are scarce. In order to meet the needs there, we actually had a group of prisoner volunteers go out and take care of the space. This might not be how you traditionally think of volunteering but let me tell you, these guys were glad to get out and glad to do the work.

Also, our Fire Department has started fire corps. This is more of a citizen education, but it is important right now because we don't have an emergency services coordinator anymore. We don't have one because of budget cuts. So the fire department has helped launch COPE. That stands for citizens organized to prepare for emergencies. COPE is pretty much running on its own now. The fire corp graduates and volunteers are training other volunteers.

Like a lot of cities, though, we just don't have the resources we once did so we have to do a lot of prioritizing.

When the city could no longer afford to keep a botanist on staff we looked to volunteers and residents to do that work. We trained residents, volunteers to be essentially volunteer botanists.
• Using the talent that we have in our immediate area, and engaging them is helping us through these trying budget times. Like many cities we are being asked to do more with less and there has been a lot of restructuring in the city.

• So what I want to say here is that it is really important emphasize citizen led initiatives because they can have an impact. For me to say this is really something because to be honest with you, I was dubious. I didn't know what we were going to see or find or if this would work at all. Given, though, what we were facing in tough economic times though, we had to try.

• We know that with diminishing funds, shrinking budget line items that service as a nicety is something that we are going to see less of and we really need to look to service as a strategy. Resources have been diminished but the need doesn't diminish. If anything, in times like these we are seeing the need in our community increase.

• There was a need for expertise and but no money to hire for or fill positions.

• Today the global economic crisis has tested our collective resolve, and across our great nation, has forced all of us to make the most of our resources. Our cities are uniquely positioned to meet this challenge, as cities are where our nation’s resources are concentrated; our businesses, nonprofits, cultural institutions, our people.

• Detroit has many challenges, and the economy has affected every aspect of life in our city. For this reason, Detroit Service will play an important role in bridging gaps, enhancing existing programs and encouraging Detroiters to lift up our community by sharing skills, hard work and energy.

• In 2009, Forbes magazine named Omaha the city recovering the fastest from the economic downturn. With our local businesses spanning a range of industries such as financial services, transportation and distribution, and information technology, Omaha’s diversified economy has led to one of the lowest unemployment rates in the nation. But, like all cities, Omaha still faces many challenges. From youth gang activity to poverty and homelessness, our City has dealt with struggles typical of midsize urban communities in America. Government and the private sector can only do so much to alleviate the problems facing us. We need citizen service if we hope to achieve urban renewal and community improvement.
• This is especially important during a downturn, as volunteers are key to addressing pressing city needs, and in some cases can be the only resources available to do this important work.

Cost Savings

• Well, there is always some part of what we do in the city that needs attention. There is never enough staff, never enough resources to do everything we are asked to do. Plus, we want to be able to deliver services without overburdening taxpayers. That's where volunteers come in.

• It's so many things, it's the need, it's tight budgets, it's how we want to work with citizens to get things done.

• This is especially important during a downturn, as volunteers are key to addressing pressing city needs, and in some cases can be the only resources available to do this important work.

• For us volunteers are a way for citizens to help shoulder the burden of costs in difficult economic times.

Aspirational Motivation

Service Culture

• I know we can make lasting community changes that will affect generations to come.

• We introduce kids to volunteering in school, they learn about what their city government does, they learn that they have an important role and responsibility to their community. By doing this we capture them in this service ethic. We want them to be involved when they are home for summers from college and we want them to raise families here and get them, get their families involved in volunteering as adults. We want them to be an important member of the community and we want our city government to have a wonderful relationship with the people who live here and we see that we can do that through volunteering.
• First we ask: What does Dublin need. Then we ask: What could volunteerism solve knowing that volunteering as a way of life is something we want to champion.

• We see service as a serious strategy for accomplishing the things we want to do as a city and define who we are as a city

• Service to the community is important to me. I grew up in a military family, so I learned early in life about giving back to your country and community. We can nurture this spirit in Chula Vista to make our city a better place to live.

• The Citizens of Kingsport have always had a spirit which makes service a part of who we are. We are a people who work to make our community the very best place to live, work and play.

• As we launch the initial components of Brick City SERVES, our citywide comprehensive service plan, in partnership with the Newark Mentoring Coalition and Playworks, we continue a long tradition of volunteerism in our great City.

• The collective power of volunteerism has helped our City address and overcome many challenges over the years.

• As a young boy growing up outside of Boston, I learned the value of giving back from my parents. My father, a book keeper at a local dairy, didn’t have a lot of extra money, but he often wrote small checks to charity. I once asked him why he was writing a check to the NAACP. He told me that he believed discrimination against anyone was intolerable and should always be rejected. And as an Eagle Scout, I learned first hand how service to your community is a core part of what it means to be an American. Those lessons stuck with me as I grew older and moved to New York City, first for a career on Wall Street and then as I started my own company. Give back. Share with others. Be involved in your community. These values are also what brought me to my third career: public service, which has been the most rewarding of all.

• We hope to build on the spirit of service that already exists in our city.

• The city of Memphis is known for civil rights, blues music, and barbecue but also for our generous people. Memphians take pride in our city and share a strong sense of community. This is what my vision of One Memphis has always been about--people working together, growing together to make our whole city
stronger, safer and better for all. Our One Memphis Service Plan will harness the power of volunteers and direct it towards three specific areas of need—youth wellness, cleaning and greening and senior services. Investing in people and in each other is how we will make our great city even greater.

- Our citizens have always been committed to helping others through service. Each week I see examples of our residents lending a helping hand. Whether volunteering for a personal cause, helping the homeless, serving on a community board or mentoring a child, Orlandoans consistently find meaningful ways to give back to their community and support each other. During my time as Mayor of our great City, instilling a culture of volunteerism and ensuring that residents of our distinct neighborhoods and members of our business and non-profit communities feel that they are invested in our city has become a community-wide priority.

- As volunteers, we can support the efforts of City government, champion the work of Philadelphia’s extraordinary non-profit organizations and follow the example of service set by generations of Philadelphians.

Civic Engagement

- We want to be an engaged community because an engaged community is a healthy community. We want to be the city that nips problems in the bud before they become problems.

- Service is a hallmark of our city. We want to be proactive in engagement.

- Civic engagement is at the core of all our efforts to make an even greater city.

- Civic engagement is about the community, of which my office is only a small part. I look forward to working with all Seattle residents to build a better future for everyone.

- In 2008 our city was involved in a process to redesign our strategic plan. As part of that initiative we wanted to actively involve volunteers, citizens in the community.

- Let me start by saying that volunteering is really important in our community.
• Yes, it's so many things, it's the need, it's tight budgets, it's how we want to work with citizens to get things done.

• The missing piece is community. Imagine if we were able to put together a policy on education or the environment or economic development together, with people who are going to be affected by those policies. And then imaging how we can use service and volunteerism to help shape those policies and then carry out the objectives of those policies. There is tremendous potential for service as a strategy to accomplish both of these goals.

• We were already using service but I think it was really more from a promotional point of view. Kind of that gloss that we are engaging people. So transitioning to something where we were really utilizing volunteer service to go deeper into these issues was something that was timely and we were ready to apply that strategy.

• Engagement is important and it was really forward-thinking of our city to recognize that getting people involved in solving problems and being engaged.

• I see service as part of this whole civic engagement continuum, to get people at the end of the day connected to their communities.

• It's been really good to see people working together to take ownership of where they live.

• Volunteering to help your community is the epitome of good citizenship.

• We don't want that engagement to be a one shot deal. One shot deals are not enough. We need to find ways that make people continue in their service effort.

• Making people connected to their community in this way will make them stronger and will make the community as a whole stronger.

• We want to build on the idea of good citizenship through volunteering.

• He wanted to transform communities and create a way for people to partner with local governments.
• These volunteers can help green our city, they can help meet our goals on education policy, they can help us alleviate some of the important problems in our city. It was an opportunity for us to work with volunteers, citizens to have an important and deep role in the city.

• Atlanta’s secret formula for successful civic engagement resides in the passion and pride of its residents.

• That is why I am committed to building the most important component to our continued success; the impactful civic engagement of our citizens.

• Giving back. Sharing with others. Lending a helping hand. These words describe what it means to volunteer. My parents taught me the importance of sacrificing time, money and possessions in order to help an individual or to support a cause. I passionately believe in volunteering and have been actively involved in giving back to my community.

• Detroit has many challenges, and the economy has affected every aspect of life in our city. For this reason, Detroit Service will play an important role in bridging gaps, enhancing existing programs and encouraging Detroiter’s to lift up our community by sharing skills, hard work and energy.

• I hope Take Action Dubuque inspires you to become actively engaged and to create a more vibrant Dubuque.

• This is an effort to engage each one of us in helping to solve some of our greatest challenges--in education, the environment, poverty alleviation, work force and community development. I come to this campaign as a beneficiary of others’ community service. As the son of a single mother, I spent many days at my public library while my mother had to work. It was our family’s version of childcare. I was befriended by the volunteers there who instilled in me a love of reading.

• Over the coming months Little Rock Serves will engage hundreds of our citizens in volunteer opportunities that we will lead and support, with partners from every corner of our city, to together move the needle on pressing local challenges in measured, quantifiable ways.
• As mayor, I am deeply proud of the strong ethic of civic engagement and volunteerism that we as a city demonstrate. By way of the hundreds of non-profit organizations and altruistic corporations providing critical services to our citizens, in addition to a wide range of government initiatives such as the Mayor's Youth Academy and our coalition against truancy, the City of Richmond is a pinnacle of philanthropy and a success story in the making of civic engagement at its finest.

• We are all in the same boat.” Through volunteering to help the least of us, we increase the chances of keeping the boat afloat. Volunteer, volunteer, volunteer!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need-Driven Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• It is always need based. How can I explain it? I go in to all the departments and meet with department head and staff. We just sit down and brainstorm about how we could use volunteers. Once we figure out how we can use volunteers to meet a need that we have we create a job description for the volunteer position together with the department head or someone from the staff of that department. That way we know if there is a certain expertise we are looking for we can really market for that and try to find that skill in the community.

• We might not have something for everyone, though, because we want to make sure that the volunteer opportunities out there are aligned with the core needs of the city.

• At the end of the year, any volunteerism is successful but what I am really trying to show is that we have matched volunteerism to the true need of the city. I hope to show that I have talked to all of our departments and found out what they needed and we are able to use volunteers to take something off their plate.

• It's so many things, it's the need, it's tight budgets, it's how we want to work with citizens to get things done.

• First, we look to what the need is. We don't go about service without focusing on how doing so is going to address a need we have in our city. While service is great for getting involved in their community we know that we only have so many resources available to kind of facilitate that activity so what we want to do is make sure that we are really harnessing that effort in a way that will address a true need in our city.
• I think there is sometimes a strong pull to always find something, I mean to try to accommodate everyone who comes in and wants to volunteer. But I think it is more important to figure out what your needs are and then work on filling that. Ideally you would stay close to your needs instead of only accommodating volunteers. This is better for the city and better in the long run for volunteers because they know they have actually made a difference.

• There was a need for expertise but no money to hire for or fill positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It's always based on one thing: need. Obviously volunteerism happens everywhere. It happens in the faith-based community, it happens in the schools, it happens everywhere. And it happens because there is a need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We know that with diminishing funds, shrinking budget line items that service as a nicety is something that we are going to see less of and we really need to look to service as a strategy. Resources have been diminished but the need doesn't diminish. If anything, in times like these we are seeing the need in our community increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While service is great for getting people involved in their community, we know that we only have so many resources to kind of facilitate that activity so what we want to do is make sure that we are really harnessing that effort in a way that will address a true need in our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well, the first thing is, first comes the need. Is this a pressing community need?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liability Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One thing that comes up here is liability. We have a state statute that for legal reasons volunteers are considered basically the same as employees. So if a volunteer gets hurt or whatever, you have a worker's comp issue. This is definitely a big enough deal to give us pause. What we do, so we know we want our volunteers to be safe and effective. We provide real training and education to our volunteers to address the liability issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, we are a self-insured city so we have to look at the potential for liability.

Here it's a liability and supervision concern. We want to be assured that each individual that comes out to work on a city project and that we get involved in a city project are coach-able and accountable and that it will be worthwhile to the city to embark on that effort.

There was just too much process with liability waivers and whatnot. So we have had to figure out how to plug people in and then get out of the way.

We are working on getting a single liability release form online so volunteers have to do it one time, and the same thing for background checks when those are needed. Citizens can do that one time online and then be done with it.

On the liability side, we are working to change the culture around city staff that assuming the risk of using volunteers is too great. It's not a viable reason to keep volunteers out of the fold. In the nearly 8 years that I have been with the city every time we meet in closed session the first 90 minutes are all about who is suing us, why, and what we are going to do. Not once has one of those claims been volunteer related.

### Skilled Volunteer Supply

- We know we have people in the community with all kinds of skills. We see those skills as something we can put to work to solve issues or identify issues in the first place.

- It's a few things, and it's a weighing process for us. We only work with organizations to supply volunteers on city projects if those organizations have a screening process.

- Volunteers are paired with their interests and capabilities with a need within the department. Rarely are volunteers turned away because of a lack of skill.

- We've got a number of high tech companies here with a lot of expertises, you know, a lot of people with technical expertise. So we looked at asking what folks in the business community can do for us and how they can help us here in the city.
Partnership Opportunities

- In order to do that we need to connect them with partners to provide training, funds, and additional volunteer base. We're lucky to have some organizations that do good work in our community.

- We have partnerships with so many organizations here. They really know how to empower the city and that has been an important message that our mayor has tried to get out to the community.

- When we vet a nonprofit we always vet their outcome measurements as well. Some of those agencies are amazing in engaging people but not so much in outcome measurement. So the agencies that fit that description we are willing to go in there and get them set up to do the right kind of outcome measurement for us.

- I think we have to consider the capacity of our partner organizations, being able to be sure that when we are out there identifying and working with organizations that they know how to manage volunteers.

- The mayor's office recognizes the importance of community building and she and her staff wanted to have opportunity through partnership to raise awareness about the potential for service and to use it as a way to hone in on challenges in our community.

- Those resources are partner resources, coordination resources, money resources, volunteer pool resources. We need to know that the resources we have are the right resources to address the problem. Just because we have a pool of volunteers that might be ready to work on some project doesn't mean that we have all of the ingredients.

- As volunteers, we can support the efforts of City government, champion the work of Philadelphia’s extraordinary non-profit organizations and follow the example of service set by generations of Philadelphians.

- We are trying to get those people mobilized now through the help of United Way. We have United Way at the table at every meeting.
### Manageability

- We also only work with organizations that are able to effectively supervise volunteers.

- But, oh my goodness, don't I know that there is a lot of work that goes into having volunteers. I might have someone come in for 5 hours a week for a month and each time this person comes in I have to show them what to do and find something for them to do. I mean I have enough to do and I would like to get my work done and get home at a decent hour. Wouldn't it be easier to just say no, I don't need a volunteer in here.

- We need to be part of activities that volunteers can be managed effectively to make impact. That's a big factor.

- The cost of managing is generally off set by saving of personnel time at a rate of approximately $1 to $3 plus.

- Staff trains our volunteers and provide them with ongoing support so that they have a strong foundation kind of before blowing ahead with anything related to volunteering.

- Those resources are partner resources, coordination resources, money resources, volunteer pool resources. We need to know that the resources we have are the right resources to address the problem. Just because we have a pool of volunteers that might be ready to work on some project doesn't mean that we have all of the ingredients.

### Measurability

- On the outcome and impact side, sometimes it is so frustrating and hard to quantify what we are doing. We know that we have made a difference, but sometimes it is just really hard to show it.

- Impact...this is the so what question. So we lent a hand for the day but does that mean it was at all meaningful? Here we have to look for ways to attach meaning to that service.
• You don't want to put something out there that's too remote because then people start to look at it skeptically.

• I want to see that we have the proof to back up what we are hearing.

• We set benchmarks and then we looked at whether those were reached. Based on what we were seeing there we also asked what opportunities from those might come forth.

• We develop a framework for our goals with every single one of our initiatives. This is an intensive process and we put a lot of work into developing that framework.

• We have volunteers log hours and then we use those numbers as the best possible measure of a full time equivalency staff position.

---

**Resources**

• You can't just start up an initiative because it sounds good. You really have to ask what do we want to accomplish here and can it reasonably be done with the resources we have.

• Those resources are partner resources, coordination resources, money resources, volunteer pool resources. We need to know that the resources we have are the right resources to address the problem. Just because we have a pool of volunteers that might be ready to work on some project doesn't mean that we have all of the ingredients.

• It starts first with assessing our needs, then we look at what resources we have.

• Something that is important to us is the resources to train people to do certain things. I think citywide our volunteer capacity could be increased a bit and that would be a good thing so we could utilize volunteers across more departments in the city but I think what's holding us back from doing that is we don't have the resources to train those people right now. Another thing that is important to us is retaining volunteers. We are training volunteers and so retention is important to us.
• We don't go about service without focusing on how doing so is going to address a need we have in our city. While service is great for getting involved in their community we know that we only have so many resources available to kind of facilitate that activity so what we want to do is make sure that we are really harnessing that effort in a way that will address a true need in our city.

• The average person may not realize the importance of the volunteer function or that volunteers are not free. Someone has to coordinate people, give them supplies, be there to be accountable for the supplies and liability waivers, and manage the equipment so I would say cost and someone being able to be there to manage the volunteers.

• ROI. Return on investment. We want to know that we are going to get some kind of return on our investment of resources.

• Resources have been diminished but the need doesn't diminish. If anything, in times like these we are seeing the need in our community increase.

• Resources to dedicate to that upkeep, though, are scarce. In order to meet the needs there, we actually had a group of prisoner volunteers go out and take care of the space. This might not be how you traditionally think of volunteering but let me tell you, these guys were glad to get out and glad to do the work. I should point out, though, that before we allowed these prisoners to go out and do this work, we had to screen them. We needed to do a screening process to make sure that they would be committed to doing the work, that they were not likely using this as an opportunity to flee, and that the liability risk was not too great.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service to Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Money Donation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

• There are people who donate time and there are people who donate money. Both of those things are important parts of the equation.
Giving back. Sharing with others. Lending a helping hand. These words describe what it means to volunteer. My parents taught me the importance of sacrificing time, money and possessions in order to help an individual or to support a cause. I passionately believe in volunteering and have been actively involved in giving back to my community.

**City Ambassador**

- We have a very organized group of volunteers serving as ambassadors of the city.

- Personally, I know we have succeeded when I can see that our citizens are out there teaching others how to be good citizens. If that means a neighbor tells another neighbor who to call in the city when they have a particular problem or someone is coming in to sign up for a volunteer opportunity because someone they know had a good experience or I hear from one of our guys over in building services that they had a citizen tell them they were doing a good job, that's when we can say what we did was a success.

- We were already using service but I think it was really more from a promotional point of view. Kind of that gloss that we are engaging people.

- Citizens need to have an important and deep role in the city.

**Supporting Staff Functions**

- We try to integrate volunteers into aspects within staff jobs, so even when you look at internships those jobs will really align with staff jobs.

- We have volunteer opportunities that have been around for years to help with maintenance issues in our parks especially. With the cuts we've made in budget and maintenance staff each park staff person would have more than 100 acres to maintain each. That's impossible. There simply is not enough resources to maintain our parks without volunteers so we work with Boy Scouts and service clubs to do some of the maintenance work. This helps free up staff to do more technical stuff.
• As the city grew we noticed that in addition to professional volunteers we could use clerical and event volunteers so we supplemented staff with volunteers and they worked as team. We literally have volunteers in almost every department: data entry, research, database design, graphic arts, writing, the basics, interpreters, front desk reception. The neat thing here is that our volunteers work along side the staff.

• We have about 100 volunteer positions at the zoo to assist with animal care, teaching classes, taking care of the grounds. We know that the value of those services is significant in addition to the fact that it contributes greatly to the experience that patrons have at the zoo.

• We try to integrate volunteers into aspects within staff jobs, so even when you look at internships those jobs will really align with staff jobs.

• In almost every aspect of what the city does and the services that the city provides, volunteers are involved.

• The constantly changing needs of the community require that the agency be able to quickly adapt. Having resources such as volunteers has allowed the agency to address developing concerns.

• We don't want to send volunteers out there just to do the thankless jobs. We need to show that they are appreciated by giving them service opportunities that are meaningful. It's that knowledge of appreciation and validation that makes integrating volunteers strategic.

• Those kids, most of them were young people, they worked hard. They did what would have taken three or four city staff three or four days to do in a weekend. Not to mention the fact that it would have taken the city some time to get out there and get the clean-up started in the first place.

• We have assigned Block Captains in neighborhoods around the city. They work with the cops that I have put back on the street and walking the beach to deter any of that bad activity that might be going on.
There was a need for expertise and but no money to hire for or fill positions.

The department follows a 3 – E system of problem solving – Evaluate, Educate, and Enforce. Volunteers, especially those patrol support volunteers that are active in the community are a constant resource for the agency to evaluate the activities occurring within community neighborhoods and the perception of safety/crime. While the volunteers do not play a formal role in the tactics in our problem-solving strategy, they are a source of ideas and represent an opportunity of enhanced information sharing with the community.

We had volunteers in almost all departments. All departments in the city participate in having volunteers.

As volunteers, we can support the efforts of City government, champion the work of Philadelphia’s extraordinary non-profit organizations and follow the example of service set by generations of Philadelphians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have volunteers in 32 departments in our city. We also have the largest all volunteer EMS in the country. With the exception of a just a couple of guys on staff for EMS to do the administrative work and keep the department going, they are all volunteers. If you look at what it would cost to replace the services volunteers provide to our city we would have to hire 661 people, that's 661 additional staff members and it would cost us 19 million dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can give you an example of the free clinic here. That clinic is available on a financial-need basis and serves a number of people regularly inside city lines. It is staffed by two retired doctors and a few nurses. They see people that may have a bump or a bruise or a cold, all non-emergency, and are able to keep a number of people out of the emergency room each year by treating them in the clinic. Our hospital benefits from the clinic because of the number of people who do not go to the emergency room for non-emergency treatment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• So the fire department has helped launch COPE. That stands for citizens organized to prepare for emergencies. COPE is pretty much running on its own now. The fire corp graduates and volunteers are training other volunteers. Some of them are ham radio operators so emergency preparedness is part of what they are passionate about but they do not have any kind of training other than fire corp in emergency preparedness.

• When the city could no longer afford to keep a botanist on staff we looked to volunteers and residents to do that work. We trained residents, volunteers to be essentially volunteer botanists.

• We see service as a serious strategy for accomplishing the things we want to do as a city and define who we are as a city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Consequences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTEER SERVICE IMPACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We have our volunteers log hours and then we use those numbers as the best possible measure of a full time equivalency staff position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • We also have some ways of determining what the price of that labor would have been if we had to pay for it like a billable rate to talk about the work that was done. |

| • The more people who are serving and the more hours they are giving will be a measure of success. |

| • We try to measure everything coming from a high tech world and a boss that believes in metrics. |

| • We are very data driven in each initiative we set these benchmarks and goals that will tell us are we actually making a difference or are we chasing our tails. |
• It's really based on baseline and baseline numbers and stated goals whether those are participatory goals or impact goals. As the saying goes, if you don't know where you came from you don't know where you are going.

• We develop a framework for our goals with every single one of our initiatives. This is an intensive process and we put a lot of work into developing that framework.

• Metrics...that's the critical one that will guide us into the future. But we have to ask ourselves what those metrics mean. We have engaged over 200,000 people. OK how do we sustain this? We don't want that engagement to be a one shot deal. One shot deals are not enough. We need to find ways that make people continue in their service effort. And we need to know what does this mean to our city, what does it mean to our community.

• Well I mean when we sat and developed our initiatives, we set benchmarks and then we looked at whether those were reached. Based on what we were seeing there we also asked what opportunities from those might come forth.

• We usually start with the problem. What's the pressing need? How do we define that need? Then we think about whether there is a good impactful role for service. We are very conscious about using volunteers well but not replacing paid staff or expertise. After that we look for whether there is a strong way to evaluate the impact of that service.

• Numbers...how many volunteers did we engage?

• From the city's perspective just having a citywide volunteer policy is a success. The more people who are serving and the more hours they are giving will be a measure of success. Something else that we would like to bring into that is as part of our next community survey we are going to want to know how many people knew about volunteer opportunities in the community and whether they actually went out and volunteered. I also think we are going to want to show things like how many tons of trash were cleaned up this year, how many acres of ivy were removed, how many people were helped.

• What we are doing here is all evidence based practice so I want to see that we have the proof to back up what we are saying and what we are hearing.
Outcomes

- Impact...this is the so what question. So we lent a hand for the day but does that mean it was at all meaningful? Here we have to look for ways to attach meaning to that service. So let's take the example of tax return preparation. We can say that $90M in tax refunds went back into the hands of New Yorkers that need it the most. Looking at it this way is kind of the best way to make it all linear. We know that there are some that get really tough because it's hard to say what was accomplished at the end of the day. You know you want to be able to answer that question but it's really hard. Some of the hardest ones are the education ones. We know how many people read books to kids but do we really know what the impact of that was? There are so many things that you can look at. Graduation rates, graduation rates down the road, test scores, but it's really hard and you don't want to put something out there that's too remote because then people start to look at it skeptically.

- Numbers are always great but they only tell you so much. They can show you progress and success especially when you need to recruit foundations. But what I am interested in is the bigger picture. Is that we are doing needed in the community and are we improving the community and are we involving the whole community.

- I think the first thing we want to see is that something good comes out of this for the community.

- We also need to know how service as a strategy makes a difference.

- I also think we are going to want to show things like how many tons of trash were cleaned up this year, how many acres of ivy were removed, how many people were helped.

- Since then nobody has re-tagged the walls or broken any windows. The neighbors are looking out for the school and the school has been left alone. I think the people that were out there looking to do that kind of activity, tagging, breaking windows, have moved on and said this is not the place for that because the neighbors organized around the school.
Qualitative Stories

- On the outcome and impact side sometimes it is so frustrating and hard to quantify what we are doing. We know that we have made a difference, but sometimes it is just really hard to show it.

- Public reaction. Did we get good press? Are we getting feedback from citizens? Or, it could be nothing at all. By that I mean the absence of a complaint is telling us we did something right.

- Beyond impact metrics that are outlines for goals that should be accomplished, I would say the qualitative feedback from people involved in the project.

- It's one of those that's hard to measure on how you are being successful. Success is one of those kind of hidden measures.

- Feedback from the volunteers who see that they are making an impact and feedback from the community tells us how we are doing.

- What really tells me if what we have done is successful is whether or not we are retaining volunteers and if the volunteers are happy. Our volunteers are happy when they can really see that what they have done is important and making a difference.

- You know it used to be just about numbers. We have X amount of hours or X amount of volunteers. But really you don't know if what you are doing is a success until you really hear the story. In the different departments you can go into the office and ask the managers how volunteers have helped them with what they do and they can just tell you so many stories of how volunteers have come in there and done so many things that just would not have gotten done if they weren't there. They are helping expand services.
A Mix

- It's a little of everything. But if I had to say what I feel is most important in gauging success of an initiative I would say that it's the feedback we get from our non-profit partners. I really trust them. If they tell me that something is making a difference, I trust that we are. We do have metrics but the feedback from our nonprofit partners is something that I think really tells the impact or success.

- Here we are looking at three things: outcome, impact and sustainability. On the outcome and impact side sometimes it is so frustrating and hard to quantify what we are doing. We know that we have made a difference, but sometimes it is just really hard to show it. Personally, I know we have succeeded when I can see that our citizens are out there teaching others how to be good citizens. If that means a neighbor tells another neighbor who to call in the city when they have a particular problem or someone is coming in to sign up for a volunteer opportunity because someone they know had a good experience or I hear from one of our guys over in building services that they had a citizen tell them they were doing a good job, that's when we can say what we did was a success.
APPENDIX O:
ANALYSIS OF DATA CATEGORIES
## Motivational Bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Data Excerpts</th>
<th>Economic Motivation (n=27)</th>
<th>Aspirational Motivation (n=23)</th>
<th>Need-Driven Motivation (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Constraint</td>
<td>Cost Savings (n=7)</td>
<td>Service Culture (n=13)</td>
<td>Civic Engagement (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (n=34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{int}=4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (n=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{int}=14)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (n=54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{int}=21)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat (n=77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{int}=31)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican (n=42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{int}=8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council (n=67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{int}=23)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=44)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## FEASIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Data Excerpts</th>
<th>Liability Climate (n=7)</th>
<th>Skilled Volunteer Supply (n=4)</th>
<th>Partnership Opportunities (n=8)</th>
<th>Manageability (n=9)</th>
<th>Measurability (n=7)</th>
<th>Resources (n=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=34) (n_int=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=31) (n_int=14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=54) (n_int=21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoral Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=77) (n_int=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=42) (n_int=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Mayor-Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67) (n_int=23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Mayor-Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=8) (n_int=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=44) (n_int=14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P:
STATE LAWS TREATING VOLUNTEERS AS EMPLOYEES FOR
WORKERS' COMPENSATION PURPOSES
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STATE LAWS PERMITTING VOLUNTEERS TO BE TREATED AS EMPLOYEES

**Arizona**
Arizona Revised Statutes § 23-901.06

**California**
California Labor Code § 3364.5

STATE LAWS AUTOMATICALLY TREATING VOLUNTEERS AS EMPLOYEES WHEN VOLUNTEERING FOR A PUBLIC AGENCY OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION

**Florida**
Florida Statute § 440.02

**Nevada**
Nevada Revised Statutes § 616A.130

**Utah**
Utah Code § 26-49-202

STATE LAWS TREATING EMERGENCY RESPONSE VOLUNTEERS AS EMPLOYEES

**Arkansas**
Arkansas Code § 12-87-102

**Colorado**
Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-32-2104

**Connecticut**
Connecticut General Statutes § 7-314a

**Georgia**
Code of Georgia § 3-38

**Idaho**
Idaho Code § 46-1017

**Illinois**
Illinois Compiled Statutes § 225-140
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Indiana
Indiana Code § 10-14-3.5

Kentucky
Kentucky Statutes § 96-287

Louisiana
Louisiana Revised Statutes § 10-29

New Mexico
New Mexico Statutes § 12-12A-1

North Dakota
North Dakota Code § 65-17-01

Oklahoma
Oklahoma Statutes § 683.9

Oregon
Oregon Revised Statutes § 401.270

South Carolina
South Carolina Code of Laws § 42-7-65(3)

Tennessee
Tennessee Code § 58-2-107
APPENDIX Q:
TESTABLE HYPOTHESES
$H_{A1}=$ There is a positive correlation between strategic service motivation and volunteer service demand.

$H_{A2}=$ There is a positive correlation between economic motivation and volunteer service demand.

$H_{A3}=$ There is a positive correlation between aspirational motivation and volunteer service demand.

$H_{A4}=$ There is a positive correlation between need-based motivation and volunteer service demand.

$H_{A5}=$ There is a positive correlation between feasibility and volunteer service demand.
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