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ABSTRACT

Volunteers are utilised extensively in the preparation and execution of sport events, and contribute substantially to their success. Although a significant amount of research focusing on perceived organisational support (POS), perceived supervisor support (PSS), affective commitment and satisfaction exists within paid employment settings, comparatively little reported research addresses these issues in relation to volunteers in the context of sport events. Consequently, the situation where there is little (if any) paid employment relationship between volunteers and their organisation represents an ideal context in which to explore the relationship between volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, affective commitment and satisfaction.

This thesis explores the nature of POS of sport event volunteers, as well as the relationships between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers. A three-stage study design was employed, in which participants responded to a self-administered questionnaire (Stage One, n = 173), as well as participating in a series of focus group interviews (Stage Two, n = 25) and individual interviews (Stage Three, n = 12). Results showed that PSS and the satisfaction respondents held with the level of decision making regarding their role were found to contribute to their overall perceptions of organisational support; PSS was identified as a major component of sport event volunteers’ POS.

Additionally, it was found that volunteer satisfaction and positive perceptions of organisational support resulted in higher levels of commitment. PSS was found to have very little contribution to commitment, which indicates that respondents’ perceptions of supervisor support are not related to their affective commitment. POS
was found to be insignificant in predicting satisfaction; however, PSS significantly contributed to the respondents’ satisfaction, suggesting that the perceived support gained from the respondents’ immediate supervisor affects their satisfaction, whilst the perceived organisational support does not.

The conclusions drawn from these findings are that volunteers value the informal support provided by their immediate supervisor and developed through social relationships, and that this ultimately leads to increased satisfaction with their experience. Indirectly, through their satisfaction, volunteers reported increased commitment with the organisation. Additionally, sport event volunteers value the formal procedures and practices put in place by the organisation, which reflects their perceptions of the formal organisational support provided to them, and positively impacts their affective commitment to the organisation.

The study has made a unique contribution to the field of sport management, in that these relationships had previously not been explored, and the findings are distinct from those reported in the extant literature. This research may assist organisations that employ volunteers for sport events, as it has identified some of the practices that should be present in volunteer management systems. As such, organisations should encourage the development of social relationships between volunteers and supervisors, but must also ensure that formal procedures (including effective communication, written information and clear instruction) are provided by the organisation. Through identifying the important elements that comprise organisational support for sport event volunteers, this may assist event management organisations design and deliver effective management practices, and may enhance individual volunteer satisfaction and commitment.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Volunteers are utilised extensively in the preparation and execution of sport events, and are considered integral to their success. However, despite a great deal of research being completed on volunteer motives and behaviours in non-sport settings in recent years (Edwards & Graham, 2006; Dolnicar & Randle, 2007; Grabowski & Wearing, 2008), very little is known about sport event volunteers within Australia, particularly in regard to satisfaction with their volunteer experiences, their affective commitment or their perceptions of organisational and supervisor support. It is important to investigate these issues due to the significant amount of resources devoted to volunteer recruitment and training, problems arising with turnover of volunteers and the relatively short time period to influence the performance of volunteers.

Although a significant amount of research focusing on affective commitment, satisfaction, perceived organisational support (POS) and perceived supervisor support (PSS) has been conducted within paid employment settings, comparatively few studies have addressed the relationships between these variables within a voluntary context. Given the dependence of volunteers at events, it is important to understand more about the experiences of sport event volunteers and how volunteer support systems affect volunteer outcomes (including satisfaction, affective commitment, performance and retention). While event organisers depend on large numbers of volunteers, where there is little (if any) paid employment relationship established between the volunteer and the organisation (Catano, Pond & Kelloway, 2001), this may present challenges for both the organisation and the volunteer. Therefore, through supporting volunteer personnel, in order to increase positive volunteer outcomes, this may benefit event organisers; arguably such support will produce a well-managed and
successful event while at the same time deliver substantial benefits to volunteers and the wider community.
SPORT EVENTS

Sport events are a particular form of a special event, defined as “a one-time or infrequently occurring event outside normal programs or activities of the sponsoring or organising body” (Allen, O’Toole, McDonnell & Harris, 2005, p. 11). Sport events may be classified as either mega-events (The Olympic Games), hallmark events (The Melbourne Cup), major events (The Commonwealth Games), or local or community events (Allen et al., 2005). These events may also be classified by how often they occur; they may be classed as ‘single-pulse’ events, which occur only once, with the organising team dismantling at the conclusion of the event, or they may be classed as ‘regular-rhythm’ events, which are held on a regular basis, either every six months, every year or even every two years, and are held in the same location, with the same organising committee each time (Allen et al, 2005). Regardless of their size or form, these types of events require the assistance provided by volunteer personnel to aid in the operation of the event, and to significantly reduce costs associated with the event (Pauline & Pauline, 2009). The focus of this study is regular rhythm sport events that utilise large numbers of volunteers, rather than sport events which do not employ significant numbers of unpaid personnel.

The rapid growth of the event industry in Australia is evident particularly within Melbourne, which has dubbed itself ‘the events’ capital’ (City of Melbourne, 2009). Melbourne has hosted the Australian Masters Golf Tournament in 2009, FINA World Swimming Champions in 2007, Commonwealth Games in 2006 and the Rugby World Cup in 2003 (Department of Planning and Community Development, 2009), as well as regular high profile sport events held each year in Melbourne, such as the AFL Grand Final, Australian Open Tennis, Australian Grand Prix, Melbourne Cup Carnival and the Melbourne Cycling Festival (City of Melbourne, 2009). Sport events are an
important driver of economic activity. Given their dependence on volunteers, it is important to understand more about the experiences of sport event volunteers and how volunteer support systems affect volunteer satisfaction and commitment and ultimately their willingness to continue to make such important contributions to the delivery of events. Supporting volunteer personnel in order to increase their satisfaction and commitment whilst volunteering may benefit event organisers; arguably such support will produce a well-managed and successful event while at the same time deliver substantial benefits to volunteers and the wider community.

Sport events are increasingly becoming an important part of the event industry within Australia (Frawley & Cush, 2011). Hosting successful sport events requires the effective management of volunteer personnel that contribute significantly to the success of the event (Williams, Dossa & Tompkins, 1995; Farrell, Johnston & Twynam, 1998). Numerous sport events depend on volunteer personnel, and would not operate efficiently without volunteer contribution (Getz, 1991). Previous research has also emphasised the importance of volunteers who comprise a majority of overall event staffing to sport events (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Green & Chalip, 1998; Strigas & Jackson, 2003; Pauline & Pauline, 2009). As sport events become more popular, event organisers continually face the challenge of recruiting and retaining a sufficient number of volunteer personnel (Pauline & Pauline, 2009). Thus understanding volunteer satisfaction and commitment at sport events, and how it may lead to the retention of volunteers is an important aspect of effective event management.
VOLUNTEERS

In order to understand the importance of volunteers at sport events, and to examine their satisfaction and affective commitment to such events, one must first determine who can be considered a volunteer and what volunteering includes. The study of volunteering can be quite complex, with different definitions, theories and disciplines identified within the literature (Hustinx, Cnaan & Handy, 2010). Therefore, it is important to clearly delineate who a volunteer is within a specific context applicable to the study at hand.

Within a social science setting, Stebbins (2001) defined a volunteer as an individual who:

- Partakes in volunteering as a freely chosen activity, as all leisure activities are;
- Gains a satisfying and rewarding experience from the activity; and,
- Fulfils the requirement of being at a particular place, at a specified time, to perform specific duties, and may be relied upon to do as such.

Similarly, Cnaan, Handy and Wadsworth (1996), identified four key characteristics of volunteering (refer to Appendix Two), including:

- free choice
- minimal levels of remuneration
- structure (in which the activity takes place)
- intended beneficiaries.

Therefore, volunteering is defined as “the un-coerced help offered either formally or informally with no, or at most, token pay done for the benefit of both other people and the volunteer” (Stebbins, 2004, p. 5). For the purpose of this study, recognising both
the social and psychological aspects of volunteering, a sport event volunteer is defined as a person “who contributes to the organisation and running of [a sport] event without receiving any payment, financial or otherwise, for their services” (Ferrand & Chanavat, 2006, p. 21). It is important to understand that a clear distinction exists between event volunteers, and club volunteers. Club volunteers are those who volunteer for a particular club (whether that is the local football club, an art society or Lions club). These volunteers feel they belong to the club; their identity is associated with the club or the activity, and they volunteer often on a regular, long term basis (Nichols & Shepherd, 2006). This is opposed to an event volunteer, who volunteers in an episodic manner; their involvement is not sustained and regular, but is instead periodic (Baum & Lockstone, 2007).

While volunteering may be understood by different definitions, it may also be examined from a variety of perspectives within the social sciences, including sociological, psychological and economical perspectives (Lockstone-Binney, Holmes, Smith & Baum, 2010), as well as the political science perspective (Hustinx et al, 2010). According to Hustinx et al (2010), the sociological view of volunteering puts forth the notion that volunteering is a social occurrence, which involves social relationships amongst individuals, groups and organisations. In contrast, the psychological view focuses on volunteer behaviour and personality, in which volunteering is driven by psychological characteristics (Hustinx et al, 2010), while the economical perspective measures the value of volunteer involvement (Lockstone-Binney et al, 2010). Finally, the political science perspective sees volunteering as a necessity within communities, which is required by local governments to sustain community welfare (Hustinx, 2010). While distinct perspectives are presented, clear boundaries between the literatures may be difficult to identify, and may in fact,
overlap. Therefore, as the focus of this study is on the relationship between management actions and volunteer behaviour, it utilises both the sociological and psychological perspectives to examine the social relationships sport event volunteers develop during their volunteer experience, as well as the psychological drivers of their behaviour.
Sport Volunteering in Australia

As stated earlier, volunteers contribute significantly to the success of sport events, with event organisers relying heavily on volunteers to provide their time, services and expertise. Without the contribution of volunteers, many sport event organisations would cease to exist (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2009). It is critical to recognise the contribution of such volunteers; the data presented below in Figure 1.1 identifies the scope and size of sport volunteering, in relation to volunteering for other industries. From a total of 6.1 million people, or 36 per cent of the adult population aged 18 years and over who participated in voluntary work in 2010, sport and physical recreation organisations attracted the largest number of volunteers with 2.3 million people (14% of the adult population), followed by religious organisations (1.4 million or 8%) and community and welfare organisations (1.3 million or 8%) (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012).

Figure 1.1: Percentage of Australian Volunteers by Category (2010)

More specifically, Figure 1.2 contains survey results from individuals who volunteer for sport only, which includes sport and physical recreation organisations, in order to gain a snapshot of sport volunteering over time, and how the phenomenon has grown.

Figure 1.2: Percentage of Sport Volunteers by Gender over Time


Figure 1.2 presents the percentage of people who volunteer in sport by gender over a 15 year time period. The percentage of volunteers involved within sport and recreation comes from the total pool of volunteers across all industries within Australia (see Figure 1.1 on page 8). A significantly higher percentage of males volunteer within sport and recreation than their female counterparts over the course of time. It is interesting to note that the total percentage of volunteers during the year 2000 is proportionally higher than the years 1995 and 2006. This may be as a direct result of the Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games, which have created public awareness of volunteering in Australia, thus influencing volunteer contribution at sport events (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002). However, despite this trend,
voluntary work for the Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games (some 47,500 individuals) was excluded from the results of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002) data, in order to maintain an accurate record of sport volunteers across time.

During the year 2006, more than a third of sport volunteers spent most of the volunteering time involved in coaching, refereeing and judging, followed by administration, clerical, recruitment and information management tasks (15.7%), and fundraising and sales activities (14.5%). Additional tasks required of volunteers at sport organisations included media production, mentoring, preparing or serving food, transport, maintenance, management, personal care, providing information and research (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006), highlighting the importance of volunteers to the successful deployment of sport events.

In 2006 more than 50 per cent of sport volunteers (489,000 individuals during the year) had volunteered with sports and physical recreation organisations for more than ten years (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006). This suggests that the commitment of sport volunteers to organisations and, in particular to the sporting industry, is relatively high. Additionally, 88 per cent of sports and recreation volunteers (1.5 million individuals during the year), indicated that they participated in sports or physical recreation activities during the past 12 months, which suggests they are passionate about the activity in which they are volunteering (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006).

Finally, with regard to event volunteers specifically, Figure 1.3 (see page 11) highlights the number of sport volunteers who attended sport events in a voluntary capacity during the year 2010, when compared with cultural and other leisure events.
Evidently, there are a substantially higher number of volunteers who have volunteered for sport events, as opposed to those who have not (4,313 persons, compared with 1,771 persons). However, when compared with those individuals who volunteered for cultural and other leisure events (5,618 persons), volunteering at sport events was considerably lower. Although volunteers who attend sport events are somewhat underrepresented compared to cultural and other leisure events, the significant contribution of volunteers to events, and in particular sport events, is overwhelming; this highlights the increasing importance of volunteers at not only events in general, but specifically sport events.

Figure 1.3: Number of Event Volunteers by Event Type (2010)

Issues Concerning Event Volunteers and Organisations

Due to the nature of events, in which they have a pulsating organisational structure (Hanlon & Cuskelley, 2002), event organisers are faced with a number of issues in managing volunteers. A pulsating organisational structure, in which the structure of an organisation expands rapidly in terms of personnel in the lead up to and during an event, but contracts rapidly at the cessation of the event (Hanlon & Jago, 2000; Hanlon & Cuskelley, 2002), presents challenges for event organisers in fulfilling human resource needs for the duration of the event life cycle (Allen et al, 2005). Event organisers are faced with issues concerning the recruitment of volunteers for short periods of time, and perhaps on different occasions if it is a recurring event. Sourcing personnel for events presents problems, as a majority of volunteers assist because their family and friends are also volunteering (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006). Consequently, such volunteers may become preoccupied in the social aspect of volunteering and may fail to work towards organisational and event goals, which may jeopardise the success of the event.

It may also become difficult for event organisers to attract a sufficient number of volunteers, and to retain them for the duration of the event. Although not the focus of the current study, significant time should be spent recruiting volunteer personnel; however, this is not always feasible due to the strict time limit event organisers’ face. Therefore, events may operate with an insufficient number of personnel, which may cause volunteers to experience dissatisfaction and potentially withdraw from the event. If an individual is dissatisfied they are unlikely to remain, which causes the remaining volunteers to experience pressure to perform extra duties, as well as their own, resulting in volunteer stress, lower service quality and potentially continued volunteer turnover, thus negatively impacting the success of the event (Farrell et al,
Event organisers experience high volunteer turnover rates during the event life cycle. Therefore, effective recruitment, induction and training programs are important to ensure that volunteer expectations are met, which may minimise the risks of volunteer turnover (Ralston, Downward & Lumsdon, 2004). Although an important aspect of volunteer management, the measurement of intentions to continue volunteering will be excluded from the current study, due to the pulsating nature of events, and thus the difficulty in accurately measuring retention. As an event concludes, so will the volunteer involvement, suggesting that examining the satisfaction, affective commitment and perceived support of volunteers at an event while volunteering, is more important to determine as this will affect future volunteer management practices employed by sport event organisers (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2009).

Developing and implementing effective volunteer training programs also presents challenges for event organisers, given the short term nature of events. Often, there is limited time and resources to provide quality training for volunteers, resulting in volunteers being unqualified and unprepared for the task allocated (Harris & Jago, 2000). If a volunteer has not received sufficient training, this may result in poor quality service, which may negatively impact upon the success of the event, through spectator dissatisfaction, volunteer dissatisfaction and misuse of resources (O’Neill, Getz & Carlson, 1998; Ralston et al, 2004). Therefore, effective volunteer induction and training programs must be implemented to avoid disruptions to the event, due to lack of training and communication (Tourism Training Victoria & Arts and Recreation Victoria, 2002; Allen et al, 2005).

Maintaining the motivation of volunteers at events is a fundamental component of event management, and ultimately contributes to the success of an event (Allen et al,
2005); accordingly the motives of sport event volunteers have been well documented (see for example Farrell et al, 1998; Kemp, 2002; Ralston et al, 2004; Monga, 2006; Baum & Lockstone, 2007; Giannoulakis, Wang & Gray, 2008). However, event volunteers’ motives have been found to have virtually no impact on volunteer satisfaction, perceptions of organisational support and intent to remain (Omoto & Snyder, 1995; MacLean & Hamm, 2007; Finkelstien, 2009). As such, no further examination of volunteer motives will be performed in the current study.

Volunteers may face issues with their expectations in regards to planning, recruitment, training and communication activities of the event, which must be effectively managed to reduce turnover intentions. If expectations are not met, withdrawal from the process and the event is expected, disrupting the success of the event, and causing strain on event managers (Ralston et al, 2004). Therefore, event managers must understand the expectations held by volunteers and actively move to fulfil these expectations in order to avoid turnover of volunteer personnel. According to Gaston and Alexander (2001) additional factors which influence volunteers’ affective commitment, satisfaction and intent to remain include poor supervision, lack of communication, inability to showcase skills or expertise and feelings of not being valued or appreciated. Therefore, it is critical that volunteer managers provide flexible working conditions, with open communication and immediate feedback, and a participative leadership style (Catano et al, 2001), to encourage volunteer participation and retention (Allen et al, 2005).
Volunteer Organisations and the Significance of Volunteers

Non-profit organisations requiring the assistance of volunteers may be referred to as volunteer organisations. Volunteer organisations depend significantly on unpaid personnel to reach their goals, and exist to facilitate work for a cause (Stebbins, 2002). The majority of volunteer organisations employ only a minimal number of paid staff, whilst the majority of activities are carried out by volunteers. This is true in an Australian non-profit event context, where there are few paid staff employed full time, whilst volunteer assistance is recruited during busy or peak periods (Stebbins, 2002). Volunteers are indeed a significant factor contributing to the success of an organisation’s operations, as seen within Bicycle Victoria (BV), discussed later in the chapter.

The next section of this chapter presents and reviews the four key concepts relevant to the study; POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction.
PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT

The concept of perceived organisational support (POS) was first espoused by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson and Sowa (1986). POS refers to the set of beliefs that individuals hold in relation to how organisations value an individual’s contribution to the organisation, as well as how organisations care about the well-being of an individual. If individuals perceive that they are in receipt of positive organisational support they will demonstrate higher levels of satisfaction and commitment with the organisation (Walters & Raybould, 2007). Eisenberger et al (1986) identified three general forms of treatment that contribute to an individual’s level of POS, including fairness (organisational justice), supervisor support and rewards and task conditions. Additionally, previous research has identified further antecedents of POS, including opportunities for growth (Graen, Scandura & Graen, 1986; Aryee & Chen, 2004 and Pack, 2005) and participation in decision making (Locke, Schweiger & Latham, 1986; Allen et al, 2003 and Pack, 2005).

The development of POS is based on an individual’s tendency to view favourable or unfavourable treatment towards them, as an indication that the organisation favours or disfavours them (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). POS is influenced by organisational rewards and conditions, including recognition, pay (in terms of paid employment), reimbursement of costs (in terms of voluntary employment), promotion, job security and training (Djurkovic, McCormack & Casimir, 2008), and is increased by voluntary, internal actions taken by the organisation which benefit individuals (including training), rather than external actions that are compulsory (including legislation) (Eisenberger et al, 1986). POS may be measured from the individual’s perspective in respect to three dimensions, including their peers, the organisation and their
supervisor, which contribute to the overall perceptions of support delivered by the organisation as a whole (Eisenberger et al, 1986).

High levels of POS may benefit both the individual and the organisation. The individual (whether a paid employee or a volunteer) may experience positive outcomes including a decrease in stress relating to their job or task, an increase in positive job-related affect and job involvement, reduced intentions to withdraw from the organisation, and increased commitment and intentions to remain with the organisation (Eisenberger et al, 1986). Once the individual experiences such positive outcomes, this will result in positive organisational outcomes, including reduced turnover, higher productivity and performance levels and increased affective commitment, enabling the organisation to minimise costs associated with turnover (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch & Rhoades, 2001).

It is important to note that POS is closely related to, yet quite distinct from social exchange theory, and in particular, leader-member exchange, as well as supervisor support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Walters & Raybould, 2007). However, while leader-member exchange and supervisor support describe the relationship between an individual and their immediate supervisor who act on behalf of an organisation, POS reflects the relationship an individual has with their organisation as a whole, and not individual aspects (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003; Walters & Raybould, 2007). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, whilst acknowledging leader-member exchange as a contributing factor toward POS, the examination of POS will include investigating supervisor support as an antecedent of POS, as well as exploring the relationship between PSS, POS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers.
The importance in examining the antecedents of POS, including fairness (organisational justice), favourable rewards and task conditions, supervisor support, participation in decision making and opportunities for growth, can enable an inference to be made with regard to what aspects of their role volunteers consider most important in determining their level of POS and thus those elements that impact the satisfaction and affective commitment of the volunteer. As little is known about sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, it is critical to understand what volunteers perceive to be the main drivers in generating positive perceptions of organisational support, in order for volunteer managers to effectively provide such positive working conditions. This may contribute to enhancing favourable outcomes for the organisation and volunteer such as satisfaction, affective commitment and intent to remain, whilst reducing unfavourable outcomes such as absenteeism and turnover.

Previous research has shown that POS is positively associated with favourable outcomes for the organisation, including organisational commitment (Shore & Wayne, 1993; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Van Kippenberg & Sleebos, 2006), loyalty (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) job satisfaction and intent to remain (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli & Lynch, 1997; Stamper & Johlke, 2003; Foley, Hang-Yue & Loi, 2006; Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007; Walters & Raybould, 2007), and negatively related to unfavourable organisational outcomes, including absenteeism (Eisenberger et al, 1986) and withdrawal (Allen et al, 2003). Evidently, within a paid employment setting, high levels of POS are associated with greater commitment to the organisation, and in particular, are positively related to affective commitment. In contrast, low levels of POS reflect lower commitment to the organisation, thus influencing individuals’ satisfaction and turnover (Eisenberger et al, 1986; Rhoades &
Eisenberger, 2002; Van Kippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). While these relationships are evident amongst paid employees, they are yet to be tested amongst volunteers. As such, it is important to examine the relationships between POS, PSS, satisfaction and affective commitment within a voluntary context, in particular to determine whether a relationship exists between these constructs in the absence of monetary rewards. Such an analysis has not yet been performed within a voluntary context amongst sport event volunteers.
PERCEIVED SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

In addition to the perceived support delivered by an organisation, the degree of support provided by a supervisor, in which they value an employee’s well-being and contributions, is also an important aspect in determining an employee’s level of POS. This concept, known as supervisor support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988), is closely related to, yet distinct from POS.

The concept of supervisor support has had considerable attention within the literature. Numerous authors have examined PSS in relation to POS, establishing that although the constructs are similar, they are indeed independent of one another, and that individuals build relationships with both the organisation, and their supervisor (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Yoon, Han, & Seo, 1996; Hutchison, 1997a, 1997b; Wayne, Shore & Linen, 1997; Yoon & Lim, 1999; Yoon & Thye, 2000; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Eisenberger et al, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006). The support provided by a supervisor is an important factor that contributes to an individual’s overall perception of organisational support, especially for individuals whose direct contact in carrying out their role may be solely with their immediate supervisor (Elias & Mittal, 2011).

There is consensus amongst authors in that when individuals feel positive support from their supervisors their POS is enhanced, which results in increased satisfaction, commitment and intent to remain (Eisenberger et al, 2002). However, this relationship may also occur in the reverse, in which increased POS will enhance perceptions of supervisor support, indicating that PSS may in fact be an outcome of POS, as well as an antecedent to POS (Yoon & Thye, 2000; Dawley, Andrews & Bucklew, 2008). This highlights the importance of examining PSS as an independent construct to POS,
to determine the influence of each on the situational outcomes of affective commitment and satisfaction.

Supervisor support has also been widely applied to the concept of affective commitment, and it has been established that these are positively correlated (Eisenberger et al, 2001; Eisenberger et al, 2002). When an individual experiences positive supervisor support this results in enhanced affective commitment to the organisation. Similarly, if an individual perceives the support to be negative, this results in a less committed employee (Rhoades et al, 2001; Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003; Gagnon & Michael, 2004; Vandenberghe et al, 2004; Stinglhamber, De Cremer & Mercken, 2006; Chen, Wang, Chang & Hu, 2008).

Positive relationships have also been found between supervisor support and employee satisfaction, in which positive perceptions of supervisor support impact positively on both perceptions of organisational support, and employee satisfaction. Likewise, when an individual feels they are not being supported by their supervisor, this is reflected in their perception that they are also not being supported by their organisation and thus become dissatisfied (Brough & Frame, 2004; Brough & Pears, 2004; Gagnon & Michael, 2004; Mc Calister, Dolbier, Webster, Mallon & Steinhardt, 2006; Hall, 2007; Elias & Mittal, 2011). Importantly, positive support provided by supervisors is critical for job satisfaction amongst individuals (Brough & Pears, 2004). This support is expected to create a pleasurable work environment, thus creating positive perceptions of the job and enhances satisfaction (Elias & Mittal, 2011).
While the presence of a supportive supervisor has been found to increase satisfaction amongst paid workers, so too does it result in heightened efficiency amongst volunteers at events (Allen, et al, 2005). As explained by Goldblatt (1997), effective supervisors of event personnel have the ability to motivate and inspire, and are admired by their subordinates. This relationship created between a supervisor and their subordinate, if perceived as positive, is more likely to lead to a successful event. The volunteer will more likely be satisfied with their experience, based on positive support provided by the supervisor, which will lead to them being more committed (and less likely to leave), thus decreasing costs associated with volunteer turnover (Allen et al, 2005).

As previous research has indicated that PSS is positively correlated with POS, affective commitment and employee satisfaction within a paid employee scenario, it is important to examine whether such relationships occur amongst sport event volunteers. Supervisor support has been included in the current study as an antecedent of POS, in order to determine its importance in influencing volunteer levels of POS, in comparison to other antecedents of POS. Additionally, the relationship between PSS, POS, affective commitment and satisfaction will also be explored, in order to examine the influence of supervisor support on volunteers’ commitment and satisfaction, compared with the support delivered by the organisation.
COMMITMENT

Organisational Commitment

Whilst organisational commitment involves organisational, individual and supervisory components (Morrow, 1993), for the purpose of this study, supervisory commitment will be excluded, as the focus of this study is on volunteer commitment to the organisation, and not to that of the volunteer supervisor.

Organisational commitment is multidimensional in nature; a distinction may be made between attitudinal commitment (organisational commitment), which relates to the commitment of an individual to an organisation, and behavioural commitment (individual commitment), which is the individual’s attachment to a particular organisation (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). According to Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974, p. 604), organisational commitment is defined as “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organisation”.

Organisational commitment is often determined by three factors. It may be measured by the extent of an individual’s “belief in and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values”, their “willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation” and their “desire to maintain organisational membership” (Porter et al, 1974, p. 604).

Meyer and Allen (1997) conceptualised three dimensions of organisational commitment. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), organisational commitment may be measured as either affective (attitudinal) commitment, normative commitment, or continuance (calculative) commitment. Affective or attitudinal commitment reflects the emotional attachment to and identification with an organisation by an individual, where the individual wants to remain in the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997;
Engelberg, Zakus & Skinner, 2007). In contrast, normative commitment is when an individual believes they should remain in the organisation, due to an obligation they feel they have towards the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Engelberg et al, 2007). Finally, continuance or calculative commitment “occurs when individuals make personal sacrifices to join or continue with an organisation” (Engelberg et al, 2007, p. 27). The individual remains with the organisation due to the costs associated with leaving, therefore, the individual needs to remain committed to the organisation (Engelberg et al, 2007).

Due to the nature of the current study, only the affective component of organisational commitment will be measured. This is due to the conditions of volunteer employment, in which volunteers are not dependent on certain aspects provided by the organisation that paid employees are (for example financial remuneration and individual obligation to the organisation as a result of the relationship between the employer and the employee) (Engelberg et al, 2007). Previous studies have found normative and continuance commitment to be less applicable to voluntary settings than affective commitment (Elstad, 2003; Bright-Preston & Brown, 2004; Stephens, Dawley & Stephens, 2004; Dawley, Stephens & Stephens, 2005; Engleberg, Skinner & Zakus, 2006; Engleberg et al, 2007). Evidently, a volunteer’s commitment to the organisation is stronger when the commitment is driven by an emotional attachment, rather than commitment that is driven by material rewards or personal sacrifice (Elstad, 2003). Therefore affective commitment, which is more applicable to a voluntary study, will be the sole component of commitment to be measured within the current study.

Within the literature, important relationships have been established between organisational commitment and satisfaction, which encourage the continued study of
organisational commitment (see for example, Porter et al, 1974; Begley & Czajka, 1993; Bennett & Barkensjo, 2005; Costa, Chalip, Green & Simes, 2006; Foley et al, 2006; Güleryuz, Güney, Aydin & Asan, 2008). Attitudes towards organisational commitment have been found to develop slowly and consistently over time, as individuals develop a relationship between themselves and the organisation (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). In contrast, satisfaction is deemed less stable as a measure over time, in which individuals demonstrate immediate reactions to specific aspects of the work environment, often which are controlled by the organisation (Mowday et al, 1979). Therefore, it is important that organisations effectively control those aspects internal to the organisation (for example, recognition programs, tasks, work environment and supervision), to develop satisfaction amongst individuals within the organisation, and potentially increase affective commitment. As discussed by Mathieu and Zajac (1990), organisational commitment is positively related to desirable behaviours, including satisfaction, motivation and performance, and negatively related to non-attendance of the individual, and turnover. Thus, the current study aims to test this relationship between volunteer satisfaction and affective commitment, as mediated by POS and PSS.
SATISFACTION

Job or role satisfaction is the perception that results from an evaluation of performance and expectations from the individual’s experience (Oliver, 1980), in which the individual experiences a “pleasurable or positive emotional state, resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Satisfaction has been examined extensively within a paid employment context (Hulin, 1966; Hulin, 1968; Atchison & Lefferts, 1972; Porter et al, 1974; Mobley, 1977; Wild, 1979; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Eby, Rush, Freeman & Lance, 1999; Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007); and also within an unpaid, voluntary context (Stevens, 1991; Farrell et al, 1998; Kemp, 2002; Marta, Guglielmetti & Pozzi, 2006; Hoey, Abell & Reading, 2007; Osborn, 2008).

Creating and maintaining conditions which influence the satisfaction of volunteers at sport events is critical in ensuring the success of an event, and to influence continued volunteer service at future events (Farrell et al, 1998). According to Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen (1991, p. 281) “people will continue to volunteer as long as the experience as a whole is rewarding and satisfying to their unique needs”. Volunteers (as well as paid personnel) evaluate their work experiences relative to their expectations of those experiences. Thus, if satisfied, the individual will continue to participate, and if dissatisfied, the individual will be unwilling to continue, and will withdraw from the task and potentially the organisation (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). Therefore, it is critical for volunteer managers to create a supportive environment for volunteer personnel, which enhances satisfaction with the experience, to ultimately lead to continued service.
Satisfaction is closely related to, yet distinguishable from, the concept of job involvement (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). When an individual is ‘involved’ in their job, they are preoccupied or absorbed fully within their job. This individual takes their job seriously, is mentally preoccupied with their job, and their feelings are significantly affected by job experiences (Locke, 1976). The importance of job involvement to satisfaction is that a positive relationship exists between the two concepts. If an individual has high levels of job involvement, they are more likely to feel highly satisfied (if successful in their performance), or highly dissatisfied (if unsuccessful in their performance). In contrast, an individual who is uninvolved with their job is unlikely to feel satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their job, as they are not emotionally attached to the job itself (Locke, 1976).

It is important to acknowledge the relationship between satisfaction and job involvement, as the latter has a moderating effect on satisfaction (Lodhal & Kejner, 1965; Locke, 1976; Randall & Cote, 1991; Leong, Huang & Hsu, 2003). However, due to the nature of the current study, an in-depth discussion of volunteer job involvement will not be provided. It is however worth noting the impact of the construct on satisfaction, which may influence volunteers’ affective commitment (Lodhal & Kejner, 1965; Locke, 1976; Randall & Cote, 1991; Leong et al, 2003).

Satisfaction may be influenced by a number of work conditions which the volunteer manager must manage effectively in order to enhance satisfaction. According to Locke (1976), the work itself, as well as positive working conditions, can have a significant influence on whether the volunteer will experience satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Additionally, recognition of their efforts and contribution into the design of the work, has a significant impact on the satisfaction of volunteers, which
impacts positively on commitment, and may enhance volunteer retention (Du-Boulay, 1996; Bennett & Barkensjo, 2005). By matching organisational and employee/volunteer needs, expectations and aspirations in work, the individual will experience higher levels of satisfaction, thus producing beneficial outcomes for the organisation, as well as themselves (Mumford, 1991).

Volunteer satisfaction is essential to the successful delivery of sport events. If a volunteer is satisfied with their experience, they will continue to volunteer at the event, and potentially with the organisation. In contrast however, if dissatisfied, the individual will be more likely to cease volunteering at the event, the organisation, and potentially, all together (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). Therefore, event organisers must effectively manage the entire volunteer process at sport events, from initial contact with the volunteer to their exit from the organisation. In recruiting volunteers for events, organisers must ensure volunteers’ interests and abilities match the tasks to be performed whilst volunteering (Henderson, 1990; Williams et al, 1995; Auld, Cuskelley & Harrington, 2009). If there are discrepancies between task and volunteer fit, the volunteer may not be satisfied with the experience, which may result in the individual withdrawing, which will, in turn, negatively impact upon the organisation and the event.

According to Hill (1991), other aspects of the event involving volunteers including training, orientation and task allocation all have an impact in determining volunteer satisfaction. Therefore, volunteer managers who effectively coordinate all aspects of volunteer participation at sport events, by incorporating timely feedback, specific information regarding the event, recognition and communication (Farrell et al, 1998), may increase volunteer satisfaction with the experience, and commitment to the
organisation, and ultimately, retention. Due to the episodic nature of events however, retention and intent to remain will not be measured in the current study, as the event life cycle is relatively short, and is not ongoing; it is assumed that when the event ends, the volunteers’ employment will terminate, regardless of volunteer intentions.

By determining the satisfaction of sport event volunteers, and understanding the factors that may be associated with a satisfied volunteer, this may assist organisations employing volunteer personnel to effectively manage volunteers (Zappala & Burrell, 2002). Therefore, it is important to investigate the factors which influence satisfaction at sport events, which may enable volunteer managers to employ effective strategies to increase volunteer satisfaction and affective commitment.
STUDY OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study aims to investigate the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, affective commitment and satisfaction, as well as the nature of POS. Figure 1.4 (refer to page 32) provides an outline of the study relating to research question one. When looking at the nature of POS, it is expected that supervisor support, fairness (organisational justice), favourable rewards and task conditions, growth opportunities and participation in decision making will act as the independent variables, with POS as the dependent variable of POS.

Figure 1.5 (refer to page 33) provides an outline of the study pertaining to research questions two and three. In reference to the relationship between the four concepts highlighted, and based on secondary research, it is expected that previous volunteer experience may act as a moderator between the independent variables of POS and PSS, and the dependent variables of commitment and satisfaction. In this case, it is expected that the longer a volunteer has been with the organisation (past volunteer experience), they are more likely to express positive perceptions of supervisor and organisational support, which leads to increased satisfaction and affective commitment. Similarly, mediating relationships are also expected between the variables, which may explain the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). As such, it is expected that PSS would act as a mediator between the independent variable of POS and the dependent variables of satisfaction and affective commitment.
To that end, several research questions have been developed:

**Research Question 1:**

What is the nature of the POS for sport event volunteers?

**Research Question 2:**

What is the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, affective commitment to the organisation and satisfaction with their experience?

**Research Question 3:**

What is the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of supervisor support, affective commitment to the organisation and satisfaction with their experience?
Figure 1.4: Study Outline One:

The nature of POS for sport event volunteers
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Figure 1.5: Study Outline Two:

The relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, affective commitment and volunteer satisfaction
STUDY CONTEXT

Bicycle Victoria

Bicycle Victoria (BV) is an independent, not-for-profit organisation, heavily reliant on volunteer personnel. Developed in 1975, BV exists to encourage cycling amongst people of all ages, in order to improve the health of individuals, and to create a ‘healthy society’. Throughout the deployment of BV’s many activities, the benefits that may be gained by individuals and society as a result of participation in cycling are evident. The organisation exists solely for the wellbeing of the community, in influencing significant change in the perceptions and behaviour of individuals, as well as improving the infrastructure available to the cycling population. Programs that encourage this change, such as ‘Ride to Work’ and ‘Ride 2 School’, are designed to encourage the wider population to cycle, thus enhancing individual and societal benefits, and improving cycling infrastructure through increased membership funding.

As well as coordinating community programs, BV also acts as an integral information hub to the cycling community, providing expert knowledge and services to individuals, other not-for-profit organisations and cycling groups, and government agencies. Whilst providing worry-free cycling insurance for all members, BV also provides experienced advice on cycling policy and community projects. BV provides such support to its members in collaboration with other member based cycling organisations around Australia, including Bicycle NSW, Bicycle Queensland and Bicycle South Australia, thus forming the Bicycle Coalition. Through a shared common vision, each member group have strengthened their presence in the community, and have advanced the number of shared initiatives to encourage cycling. The Coalition has a combined membership base of over 60,000, and has contact with
over a quarter of a million cyclists across Australia, which better enables BV to reach their vision of More People Cycling More Often.

BV is a leader in hosting large scale sport events, including ‘Around the Bay in a Day’ (ATB), the ‘Great Victorian Bike Ride’ and the ‘3 Peaks Challenge’, as well as smaller scale events, including the ‘West Australian Great WA Bike Ride’, ‘Great New Zealand Bike Ride’, the ‘Great Tasmanian Bike Ride’ and ‘Ride to Work Day’. BV’s deployment of successful cycling programs and events would not be possible without the support and dedication of their solid base of volunteer personnel. In addition to approximately 60 paid employees, BV relies heavily on a volunteer base of over 800 individuals, sourced from schools, universities, sporting clubs, community clubs and the general public, as well as those individuals with previous participation at BV and cycling events. Numerous volunteers provide their time, expertise and knowledge at the BV office, assisting with tasks from engineering or legal advice, through to banking and computing, as well as at the BV workshop, assisting with the maintenance of the bicycles. Additionally, a significant number of volunteers provide assistance to the numerous cycling events hosted by BV, with over 300 volunteers required for the ‘Great Victorian Bike Ride’ and close to 600 volunteers at the ATB event, with this number increasing each year.

Around the Bay in a Day

BV’s largest one day cycling event, ‘Around the Bay in a Day’ (ATB), has been operating since 1993, and has been increasing in rider and volunteer size ever since. Escalating from 3000 riders and less than 300 volunteers in 1993, to 16,500 riders and 540 volunteers in 2010, ATB has become a significant event in Melbourne’s sporting calendar. Through collaboration with the City of Melbourne, BV has recently
combined the ATB event with the GO Bike Expo, developing the Melbourne Cycling Festival. This festival involves a weekend full of cycling activities at the Alexandra Gardens, including workshops, stalls, information sessions and sponsors, while concluding the festival with the ATB cycling event on Sunday.

The event is based at Alexandra Gardens, with cyclists riding around Port Philip Bay. The event offers riders a choice to complete one of five ride distances, including 50 kilometres, 80 kilometre School Challenge (designed specifically for school students), 100 kilometres, 210 kilometres and 250 kilometres, with riders taking the Queenscliff to Sorrento ferry across the bay, and continuing their ride to the finish line at the Alexandra Gardens. All ride distances begin and finish at the Alexandra Gardens, excluding the 100 kilometre ride, which begins at Sorrento, thus providing volunteers the ideal opportunity to volunteer at a location within the proximity of their home.

The 2010 ATB event proved to be a success, with record breaking numbers of riders and volunteers. A total of 16,500 riders registered for the event, with 1981 interstate participants and 72 international riders. Of these, 42 per cent were repeat riders, with the majority of all riders being male (approximately 13,000). Although the total number of registered volunteers exceeded 620, the final volunteer attendance on the day was reduced to 540; 50 per cent of whom were past volunteers. These volunteers were situated at various stations along the route around the Port Philip Bay, assisting with numerous tasks. The event could not have been successful without the support and dedication of the volunteers who cared for all the riders involved, including providing direction, food, drinks and other services. The volunteers were also supported and guided by the 27 Team Leaders, 10 of whom were new Team Leader recruits. Through the tireless fundraising efforts of all involved, over $846,000 was
raised for the Smith Family charity, with the aim of exceeding $1 million, establishing that the ATB event was again, successful and enjoyable for those involved.

(All information and statistics were sourced from: BV Website, 2010; Single Days Team Leader Forum, 2010 and Post Event Volunteer Survey Report, 2010).
DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS STUDY

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:


*Interactional Justice:* The perceived fairness of the interactions between the employee and the organisation, while performing their role (Greenberg, 1990).

*Organisational Commitment:* The psychological and emotional attachment of an individual to an organisation (Fornes, Rocco & Wollard, 2008).

*Organisational Justice:* The perception of fairness in treatment, delivered by an organisation, to an individual, whether a paid employee or a volunteer, and the individual’s reaction to these perceptions (James, 1993).

*Perceived Organisational Support:* The set of beliefs that individuals hold in relation to how organisations value the individual’s contributions to the organisation, and how organisations care about the well-being of the individual (Eisenberger et al, 1986).

*Procedural Justice:* The perceived fairness of the way decisions are made within an organisation, concerning an employee (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

*Satisfaction:* The perceptions that result from an evaluation of performance and expectations from the individual’s experience (Oliver, 1980).

*Special Event:* “A one-time or infrequently occurring event outside normal programs or activities of the sponsoring or organising body” (Allen et al, 2005, p. 11).

*Sport Event Volunteer:* A person “who contributes to the organisation and running of …” a sport “… event without receiving any payment, financial or otherwise, for their services” (Ferrand & Chanavat, 2006, p. 21).
Volunteering: “… the un-coerced help offered either formally or informally with no, or at most, token pay done for the benefit of both other people and the volunteer” (Stebbins, 2004, p. 5).

Volunteer Satisfaction: The continued service provided by an individual based upon the provision of positive rewards, which are satisfying to their unique needs (Cnann & Goldberg-Glen, 1991).
DELIMITATIONS

The scope of the study was delimitated to include sport event volunteers, and not those volunteers who partake in general volunteering, or sport volunteering. This is due to the nature of sport event volunteering, in that it is episodic, as it is assumed that different results would be produced by sampling such a population in terms of regular involvement in generalised volunteering or sport volunteers.
SUMMARY

The importance of volunteers to the success of sport events cannot be overlooked. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, affective commitment and satisfaction. Additionally, examining the antecedents of POS, and investigating the importance of such drivers to sport event volunteers’ levels of POS is also of importance for this study. Whilst these four constructs have been examined within a paid employment setting, they have been somewhat neglected within a voluntary context, in particular, amongst sport event volunteers. The outcomes of the research aim to inform organisations of suitable volunteer management practices, which may enhance affective commitment and volunteer satisfaction. This may benefit organisations which engage volunteer personnel, in designing more appropriate support systems to improve affective commitment and volunteer satisfaction, and ultimately retention.

The following chapter, Chapter Two, reviews the literature on volunteers at sport events, as well as a review of the literature on each of the four major variables discussed in the study; POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction, in terms of paid employees and volunteers. Chapter Three provides an overview of the methodology used in the study, whilst Chapter Four presents the results of the data collected. Finally, Chapter Five provides a discussion of the results, and concludes with research findings and conclusions. Recommendations for further research and theoretical and practical implications are also discussed.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of Chapter Two is to present a review of the literature pertaining to the variables within this study. The chapter is presented in five sections; a review of research that has been conducted on volunteers and sport events, followed by reviews of each of the major variables in the study, namely POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction. Each of these sections includes a review of the literature relevant to the study and how previous empirical studies of these variables in the context of paid employment and volunteering inform the current study.
VOLUNTEERS AND SPORT EVENTS

It is evident that many people volunteer in order to experience the excitement of sport events, locally, nationally and internationally (see for example, Kemp, 2002; Lockstone & Baum, 2006; Keunsu, 2007; Giannoulakis et al, 2008), however, there are limited reported studies that have explored the experiences of volunteers in sport events. This section reviews the extent of volunteering associated with sport events and reviews the major themes evident in the limited number of studies that have focussed on volunteer behaviour and management issues associated with sport events.

The review is structured to present findings of studies on external and internal influences and impacts related to sport event volunteers. External influences that have been the subject of some research include the impact of tourism (Lockstone & Baum, 2008), media perception (Lockstone & Baum, 2009), and economic and social contributions to communities that result from individuals volunteering for sport events (MacLean & Hamm, 2007). There have been a number of studies that have explored internal, or organisational level influences on sport event volunteers, namely; the impact of effective volunteer management practices (Ralston et al, 2004; Lockstone, Smith & Baum, 2007); flexibility within organisations (Lockstone et al, 2007); recruitment and retention programs (Lockstone et al, 2007; Giannoulakis, et al 2008) and volunteer training (Costa et al, 2006; Shaw, 2009). Finally, this review addresses studies that have sought to assess individuals’ internal influences on volunteering, including volunteers’ attitudes and expectations (Ralston et al, 2004); motives (Monga, 2006); previous experience (Downward & Ralston, 2006); volunteer legacy (Edwards, Dickson & Darcy, 2010), satisfaction (Farrell et al, 1998; Monga, 2006; Downward & Ralston, 2006) and commitment (Farrell et al, 1998).
External Influences

Exploring the external influences and impacts on volunteering at events, Lockstone and Baum assessed the impact on tourism during an event (2008), as well as the media perception of volunteering at events (2009). They concluded that such media representations of volunteering may have the potential to influence others when considering volunteering. Their findings suggest that it is critical that volunteer managers effectively manage volunteers in order for the media to portray volunteering at events as a satisfying experience for the volunteers, thus helping to encourage others to consider contributing their time and expertise to such events. Whilst studying the effects of the Commonwealth Games on tourism to host city destinations, Lockstone and Baum (2008) highlighted the role that mega sports tourism can play in stimulating the local and national economies. Additionally, sport event volunteers contribute economic as well as social benefits to local communities, which may encourage individuals to volunteer (MacLean & Hamm, 2007). Such findings are relevant to this study, as they emphasise the importance of maintaining a satisfied volunteer base which increases commitment; this may be achieved through effective management practices that encompass an element of support.

Internal Organisational Level Influences

Investigating the effective management of volunteers during the lead up to a major international sport event, Ralston et al (2004) examined the expectations of volunteers and their attitude towards functional management at the XVII Commonwealth Games. The study identified a number of key factors in relation to volunteer expectations with regard to recruitment, training and other management practices at the Games that have implications for volunteer motivation, responses to the psychological contract and the long-term impact of a major event. Ralston et al (2004) concluded that if volunteers
indicated that their expectations were not met, then their withdrawal from volunteering was expected (Ralston et al, 2004).

Also investigating effective volunteer management practices at events, Lockstone et al (2007) assessed the importance of flexibility within tourism organisations that employ volunteers for events, in order to effectively recruit and retain volunteers. They determined that the level of reciprocal flexibility between organisations and volunteers is an important factor on the level of volunteer supply within tourism. Additionally, Giannoulakis et al (2008) examined the motives of volunteers at the Athens 2004 Olympic Games, in order to identify more effective volunteer recruitment and management strategies of volunteers at mega-sport events. They concluded that the measurement of volunteer motives by volunteer managers would enable managers to utilise more effective recruitment strategies, through matching volunteer motive with volunteer perception, thus ensuring satisfaction amongst the volunteers involved (Giannoulakis et al, 2008).

Volunteer training designed to increase the effectiveness of volunteer management at sport events is also an important factor influencing volunteering. Costa et al (2006) investigated the role of training in determining event volunteers’ satisfaction, and found that the sense of community held by volunteers had a positive impact on volunteer commitment to the event and the organisation, and volunteer commitment to the organisation had a direct impact on satisfaction. Costa et al (2006) concluded that volunteer training at events should be designed to incorporate and build a sense of community amongst volunteers in order to increase volunteer commitment and satisfaction. Furthermore, Shaw (2009) investigated volunteer training and learning experiences and concluded that volunteer training must include learning aspects, in
order to potentially enhance volunteer satisfaction, through effective management practices.

Focusing on the attributes of satisfaction of volunteers at an elite sport competition, Farrell et al (1998) investigated the implications of volunteer satisfaction for effective event management. The study identified that particular attributes of the event organisation and venue played an important role in influencing volunteer satisfaction at the event. Farrell et al (1998) also highlighted that communication with other volunteers and recognition of their efforts were significant predictors of volunteer satisfaction with the event and with the organisation. However, managerial and administrative variables were identified as concerns in volunteer satisfaction whilst volunteering. Farrell et al (1998) concluded that to ensure volunteer satisfaction remains high throughout the duration of the event, and to encourage their commitment to volunteer for future events, managers need to pay attention to the attributes that influence volunteer satisfaction with their experience at the event.

**Internal Individual Level Influences**

The majority of studies reported on sport event volunteering focus on the motives of volunteers at such events. While a considerable literature base exists on general volunteer motives (see for example Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998; Anderson, & Cairncross, 2005; Boz, & Palaz, 2007) and volunteer motivation at sport events (see for example Farrell et al, 1998; Kemp, 2002; Ralston et al, 2004; Monga, 2006; Baum & Lockstone, 2007; Giannoulakis et al, 2008), there is a dearth of studies focussing on other aspects of volunteer behaviour such as commitment, retention or performance, or on volunteer outcomes such as satisfaction or benefits, in the context of events.
Contributing to the knowledge base of volunteers at sport events, Kemp (2002) identified that volunteers’ motives to partake in mega-events such as Olympic Winter and Summer Games were based on a strong pride in their country and its culture, opportunities for new social contact and the chance to develop potential friendships. In addition, Green and Chalip (2004) found volunteers at sport events want to contribute to the event and desire some form of control over their working environment, suggesting that an effectively managed team of volunteers results in volunteer satisfaction (Auld, Cuskelly and Harrington, 2008). Analysing the travel motives for volunteers to assist at the Athens Olympic Games, Fairley, Kellett and Green (2007) found that volunteers travel to contribute their time and effort as a result of nostalgia or friendship; connection with the event; and sharing and recognition of expertise, and concluded that event volunteers can be distinguished from general volunteers on the basis of these motives.

Focusing on special event organisations, Monga (2006) examined the importance of understanding the satisfaction and commitment of special event volunteers, and concluded that the more satisfied the volunteer feels, and the more commitment the volunteer has towards the event, the stronger the likelihood of retention. Additionally, Downward and Ralston (2006) explored how the experience of volunteering at major sport events affects interest, participation and subsequent volunteering in sport and non-sport contexts. The study identified that volunteering at major events raised interest, participation and volunteering in sport in general, and that there was evidence of an increase in interest in sport as a result of volunteering; however, this may not result in increased volunteer participation in specific sports. Downward and Ralston (2006) also identified that it is more likely for those who have previously attended sport events to increase participation in and intentions to participate more in sports
volunteering, and good feelings from volunteering increased future intentions to volunteer. Finally, it was concluded that in order to effectively manage volunteers to potentially result in higher levels of satisfaction and commitment at a major event, organisations need to focus on promoting the personal development of volunteers (Downward & Ralston, 2006).

**Summary**

A substantial amount of research has been devoted to the study of volunteers in a range of settings. Similarly, there are many reported studies of sport events and their economic and social impacts on communities. However, research to date has somewhat neglected the study of volunteers at sport events, in particular, issues associated with POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction. The following sections review each of these issues, for the purposes of understanding the perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, as well as the commitment and satisfaction amongst paid employees and volunteers, and to highlight areas for further examination. Consideration and discussion of instruments used to measure POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction amongst volunteers is also included, in order to explain the selection of scales used in this study.
Chapter Two – Literature Review

POS
As discussed in Chapter One, POS refers to the set of beliefs that individuals hold in relation to how organisations value an individual’s contribution to the organisation, as well as how organisations care about the well-being of an individual (Eisenberger et al, 1986). Within a paid employment context, research has identified that when organisational support is viewed as positive the individual will experience higher levels of satisfaction and commitment with the organisation, thus contributing to the retention of employees. In contrast, when viewed as negative, lack of organisational support leads to dissatisfaction and lower levels of commitment, thus resulting in higher levels of turnover (Walters & Raybould, 2007). Consequently, POS reduces absenteeism and increases employee affective commitment to the organisation (Eisenberger et al, 1986). Therefore, it is essential to examine the relationship amongst POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction amongst volunteers, and in particular, sport event volunteers, in order to determine the impact POS has on commitment and satisfaction, and its role in influencing volunteer retention.

Antecedents of POS
Eisenberger et al (1986) and Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) identified three main antecedents of POS, including organisational procedures which are fair for the individual involved (including organisational justice programs), PSS and favourable rewards and task conditions. Furthermore, a review of the literature identified additional factors of favourable treatment which drives POS, including opportunities for growth (Graen, Scandura & Graen, 1986; Aryee & Chen, 2004; Pack, 2005) and participation in decision making (Locke, Schweiger & Latham, 1986; Allen et al, 2003; Pack, 2005). The importance of understanding the antecedents of organisational support may assist management in designing and delivering effective management
practices which enhance organisational support, and heighten individual commitment and satisfaction and potentially retention; this may be applicable to the current study, as well as for broader management theory. Although an antecedent of POS, PSS was identified to be an important factor contributing to the commitment and satisfaction of volunteers, and thus will be discussed separately to POS.

**Fairness (Organisational Justice)**

In conceptualising the theory of POS, Eisenberger et al (1986) discussed how fairness in an organisation’s procedures concerning employees, can contribute to improving employee perceptions of the support received from an organisation. Employee fairness, or organisational justice, which is the level of fairness an individual perceives to exist within an organisation (Greenberg, 1987), has had significant attention within the literature, with numerous authors examining the concepts of distributive justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Hums & Chelladurai, 1994; Brockner, 1996; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Kashyap, Ribeiro, Asare & Brashear, 2007; Janssen, Lam & Huang, 2009), procedural justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Brockner, 1996; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Kashyap et al, 2007) and interactional justice (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001; Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Dayan & Di Benedetto, 2008; Zapata-Phelan, Colquitt, Scott & Livingston, 2009). Although distributive, procedural and interactional justices are distinct terms, for the purpose of the current study, they will be discussed collectively under the term organisational justice, or fairness. Accordingly, organisational justice is the perception of fairness in treatment, delivered by an organisation, to an individual, whether a paid employee or a volunteer, and the individual’s reaction to these perceptions (James, 1993).
Organisational justice is deemed to be an important concept to examine in relation to sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, and the relationship between commitment and satisfaction. Evidently, organisational justice, in the form of distributive justice, which is the perceived fairness in the outcomes or rewards an employee receives (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Greenberg, 1990); procedural justice, which is the perceived fairness of the way decisions are made, rather than the nature of the decisions themselves (Lind & Tyler, 1988); and interactional justice, which is the perceived fairness of the interactions between the employee and the organisation, while performing their role (Greenberg, 1990); has found to correlate significantly with affective commitment and employee job satisfaction (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Lowe & Vodanovich, 1995; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996; Bies, 2001; Spence Laschinger & Finegan, 2005; Jordan, Turner, Fink & Pastore, 2007; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Therefore, it is important to test these relationships amongst sport event volunteers, in order to examine the importance of fairness as an antecedent of POS, and how such an antecedent may influence affective commitment and volunteer satisfaction.

**Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions**

According to Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe (2003), favourable rewards and task conditions also contribute to the level of perceived support delivered by the organisation, as well as the supervisor. Extrinsic job conditions are delivered on behalf of the organisation, while intrinsic job conditions and rewards are as a result of the supervisors’ actions (Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003). In their meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) identified favourable rewards and task conditions to include (but not limited to) recognition, pay, promotions, job security, autonomy, role
stressors and training, indicating that each favourable outcome contributes significantly to an employee’s perception of organisational support. Research has indicated that favourable rewards and task conditions contribute to POS, and in order for POS to be enhanced, employees must perceive organisational rewards and task conditions to be positive and beneficial to the individual (Eisenberger et al, 1997; Rhoades et al, 2001).

Accordingly, numerous authors have examined rewards and favourable task conditions in relation to affective commitment and satisfaction, with the consensus being that when perceived as favourable, such rewards and task conditions correlate positively with the affective commitment and satisfaction of employees (Rhoades et al, 2001; Wayne et al, 2002; Allen et al, 2003; Burke, 2003; Hochwarter, Kacmar, Perrewé & Johnson, 2003; Williams, Brower, Ford, Williams & Carraher, 2008). Whilst such relationships are prevalent amongst paid employees, the examination of the importance of rewards and favourable task conditions amongst sport event volunteers, in determining their level of POS, is significant for the purpose of the current study, to determine the nature of sport event volunteers’ POS.

**Growth Opportunities**

In order to motivate employees to achieve common organisational goals, management must provide growth opportunities through challenging tasks to enhance individual skills and attributes (Chay & Aryee, 1999). If such opportunities were non-existent, employees may not perform at their best, thus impacting negatively on the organisation through low employee performance, and even reduced commitment and satisfaction of employees, resulting in increased turnover with associated costs (Green & Butkus, 1999). The growth opportunities provided by an organisation to an
employee are considered an important aspect of the perceived support delivered by that organisation. When an organisation actively provides opportunities to employees for individual growth, employees may evaluate these opportunities in terms of the level of support they perceive to gain from the organisation, thus indicating that growth opportunities are indeed an antecedent of POS within a paid employment setting (Graen et al, 1986; Aryee & Chen, 2004).

According to Aryee and Chen (2004), growth opportunities are intended to enhance employees’ skills, which benefit both the employee and the organisation. Whilst there is a substantial body of literature focusing on growth opportunities for paid employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Graen et al, 1986; Feldman & Weitz, 1988; Chay & Aryee, 1999; Green & Butkus, 1999; Aryee & Chen, 2004; Grawitch, Ledford, Ballard & Barber, 2009), there is little research examining growth opportunities for volunteers, and in particular, sport event volunteers, indicating this is an area of importance. Evidently, growth opportunities are important for paid employees in terms of career development, however, this may not be the case for volunteers, as they can only progress so far within an organisation they are volunteering for. Therefore, growth opportunities amongst sport event volunteers, in terms of skill development and enhancement, rather than career progression, will be examined within the current study, to determine the importance of growth opportunities as an antecedent of POS.

*Participation in Decision Making*

Participation in decision making (PDM) reflects “the amount of an individual’s participation in a given decision made by a group or organization … represented by the amount of influence that person has on the plans or decision agreed upon” (Vroom & Jago, 1988, p. 15). PDM is an effective way to empower employees, aiding in the
development of positive perceptions of organisational support. A significant body of literature exists on employee PDM, with scholars highlighting the importance of PDM in enhancing employee satisfaction and commitment, in which the absence of PDM reflects an employee’s withdrawal from an organisation (Heilman, Hornstein, Cage & Herschlag, 1984; Locke et al, 1986; Boshoff & Mels, 1995; Glew, O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Van Fleet, 1995; Vanyperen, Berg & Willering, 1999; Ugboro & Obeng, 2000; Soonhee, 2002; Allen et al, 2003; McDonald, 2009).

Research had revealed the identification of six varied forms of PDM, including; participation in work decisions, in which participation of decision focuses on the work itself, and is formal and long-term in nature; short-term participation, which is similar to participation in work decisions, however differs in its duration; consultative participation, which focuses on job issues, rather than the work itself, and is also formal and long-term in nature; informal participation, which occurs through interpersonal relationships between employees and their superiors; employee ownership, which is both a formal and indirect form of PDM, and concerns the rights of the employees; and representative participation, in which a board of directors is elected and responsible for PDM on behalf of the employee (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall & Jennings, 1998). Although PDM may be viewed in differing forms, for the purpose of the current study, it will be examined collectively, in determining the importance of PDM in influencing sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support.

It is considered important to understand the antecedents of organisational support, including fairness, favourable rewards and task conditions, opportunities for growth, participation in decision making and PSS (discussed later in the chapter), in order to
comprehend what sport event volunteers believe influences the level of POS they receive when volunteering. Accordingly, this may assist management in designing and delivering effective management practices which enhance organisational support, and heighten affective commitment and satisfaction, and potentially, retention.

**Employed Personnel**

Within a paid employment context, the concept of POS has had reasonable attention, considering its relatively novel development. This section presents a review of the literature concerning POS and the relationship between retention and turnover, employees’ internal and external influences and commitment and satisfaction.

Research has shown that POS has a positive linear relationship with employee turnover and retention, in that positive perceptions of organisational support impact positively on employee retention, in contrast to negative perceptions of organisational support, which may result in employee turnover (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). These relationships were found to be mediated by supervisor support (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski & Rhoades, 2002); role conflict and ambiguity (Stamper & Johlke, 2003); supportive human resource practices (Allen et al, 2003); organisational justice programs (Loi, Hang-Yue & Foley, 2006); work pressures (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007); burnout (Walters & Raybould, 2007) and workplace bullying (Djurkovic et al, 2008). Employees who held low levels of POS showed higher levels of absenteeism, than those employees who held high levels of POS, resulting in withdrawal from the work, thus influencing turnover (Eisenberger et al, 1990; Allen et al, 2003; Fuller, Hester, Barnett, Frey & Relyea, 2006; Van Knippenberg, Van Dick & Taveres, 2007).
A review of the literature identified numerous studies examining the relationship between POS and elements of the individual, the job and the organisation. Internal to the employee, POS was found to be impacted by the strength of an employee’s socio-emotional needs, which in turn, influences employee performance. As such, when socio-emotional needs were strong, a positive relationship between POS and performance was evident (Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo & Lynch, 1998). Additionally, research identified that employees experienced an increase in distress at work when support was low, and a decrease in distress when support was high (George, Reed, Ballard, Colin & Feilding, 1993; Chen, Ayree & Lee, 2005), thus highlighting the importance of positive perceptions of organisational support to employees, as well as to organisations.

External to the employee, yet internal to the organisation, numerous studies examined the effects of, and influences on POS to differing facets of the job and organisation. Accordingly, POS was identified to correlate positively with job performance, in which employees who held higher perceptions of organisational support showed greater performance, and stronger feelings of loyalty to the organisation (Eisenberger et al, 1990; Orpen, 1994; Lynch, Eisenberger & Armeli, 1999; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann & Birjulin, 1999; Eisenberger et al, 2001; Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007). POS was also found to be positively related to goal setting and feedback (Hutchison & Garstka, 1996); leader-member exchange (Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996; Wayne et al, 1997; Wayne, Shore, Bommer & Tetrick, 2002); organisational justice and organisational practices which provide recognition to the employee (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998; Wayne et al, 2002; Johlke, Stamper & Shoemaker, 2002); social support (Yoon & Lim, 1999) and task-related training (Johlke et al, 2002), in which POS is influenced by such concepts. Similarly, POS was
found to have a mediating effect on employees’ communication – commitment relationship (Allen, 1992; Allen, 1995; Hofmann & Morgeson, 1999), as well as directly impacting on human resource practices (Meyer & Smith, 2000); autonomy needs (Yamaguchi, 2001); workplace violence and aggression (Schat & Kelloway, 2003); organisational attachment (Fuller et al, 2006) and organisational identification (Edwards, 2009).

Research has also focused on the relationship between POS, organisational commitment and employee satisfaction, including the effects on, and influences of POS to commitment and satisfaction. A positive relationship exists amongst POS and organisational commitment, in which positive perceptions of organisational support enhance commitment to the organisation, in particular, affective commitment (Eisenberger et al, 1990; McFarlane, Shore & Wayne, 1993; Settoon et al, 1996; Hofmann & Morgeson, 1999; O’Driscoll & Randall, 1999; Randall et al, 1999; Eisenberger et al, 2001; Casper, Martin, Buffardi & Erdwins, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Wayne et al, 2002; Fuller et al, 2006; Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006; Rocha & Chelladurai, 2011). POS was found to act as a mediator between variables, which influence organisational commitment, including variables as employee innovation (Eisenberger et al, 1990); communication (Hofmann & Morgeson, 1999); job involvement (O’Driscoll & Randall, 1999); organisational politics (Randall et al, 1999); human resource management practices (Meyer & Smith, 2000); perceived situational factors (Moideenkutty et al, 2001); organisational culture (Foley et al, 2006) and organisational justice programs (Loi et al, 2006).

Similarly, POS was also found to correlate positively with employee satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), in which the relationship was influenced by positive
job conditions (Eisenberger et al, 1997); job involvement (O’Driscoll & Randall, 1999) and organisational politics (Randall et al, 1999). Additionally, POS was found to mediate the relationship between job satisfaction and role stress (Stamper & Johlke, 2003) and organisational culture (Foley et al, 2006). Very little research has focused on the relationship between the three constructs of POS, affective commitment and job satisfaction within a paid employee situation, let alone a voluntary context; this presents an ideal situation to explore the relationship amongst volunteers at sport events.

Volunteers

As POS is a relatively new concept (Eisenberger et al, 1986), its application within a voluntary context has been limited; POS has been examined amongst volunteers in assessing the psychological contract of volunteers, and the impact of POS on the contribution and withdrawal of volunteers to non-profit organisations (Farmer & Fedor, 1999). POS was identified to lead to increased volunteer attendance, performance and innovation, and positively impacted intentions to remain with the organisation (Farmer & Fedor, 1999). Additionally, positive perceptions of organisational support were found to enhance volunteer perceptions of their field placements whilst volunteering, as well as improving training and satisfaction with their role (Balvin, Bornstein & Bretherton (2007). Finally, Boezeman and Ellemers (2008) identified the benefits of providing non-volunteers with information about organisational support during recruitment, in which it was found that such perceptions of organisational support encouraged feelings of respect for the organisation, and heightened attraction to the organisation during recruitment. An examination of POS amongst sport event volunteers has not yet been performed. This presents an ideal
situation in which to examine sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, and the relationship between satisfaction and commitment.

**Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (Eisenberger et al, 1986)**

Developed by Eisenberger et al (1986), the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (see Appendix Three) was developed to “test the globality of the employees’ beliefs concerning the support by the organisation” (Eisenberger et al, 1986, p. 501). The SPOS consists of 39 statements which represent an employee’s evaluative judgements of the organisation, and actions the organisation may take which may benefit or harm the employee, from the employee’s perspective. The SPOS requires respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree to the statements, based upon a 7-point Likert Scale. In order to avoid biased responses, half of the scale items are positively worded, while half are negatively worded, thus providing accuracy in response. A shortened version of the SPOS also exists (see Appendix Three), which includes eight scale items with the highest factor loadings, with half of the scale items positively worded and half negatively worded, in order to maintain internal validity. As Eisenberger et al’s (1986) development of the SPOS is the initial instrument within the exploration of POS, the application of the SPOS is widely evident within a paid employment scenario, and consequently, has high internal reliability and validity (Eisenberger et al, 1986; 1990; 1997; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; McFarlane Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Hutchison, 1997a; Hutchinson, 1997b), indicating the instrument is a valid and reliable measure of an individual’s POS.

Eisenberger et al’s SPOS has been widely applied within a paid employment setting. Accordingly, the shortened version of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al, 1990) has been
used to measure perceptions of organisational support amongst hourly employees (Eisenberger et al, 1990; McFarlane Shore et al, 1993; Eisenberger et al, 1997; Lynch et al, 1999; Wayne et al, 2002; Edwards, 2009); salaried employees (Wayne et al, 1997); hospital employees (Moorman et al, 1998); postal employees (Eisenberger et al, 2001); sales representatives (Moideenkutty et al, 2001); salespeople (Johlke et al, 2002; Allen et al, 2003; Stamper & Johlke, 2003); university students (Chen et al, 2005); professional lawyers (Foley et al, 2006; Loi et al, 2006); university employees (Fuller et al, 2006; Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006); front-line hospitality employees (Walters & Raybould, 2007) and teachers (Djurkovic et al, 2008).

Within a voluntary context however, the SPOS has had limited application, with the author identifying only one study amongst health volunteers (Farmer & Fedor, 1999), and failing to identify any studies amongst sport event volunteers, using the SPOS as a measurement instrument. However, from such a robust application within a paid employment setting, the SPOS is deemed a valid and reliable instrument to apply to a voluntary scenario, measuring volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, due to its high internal validity and reliability.

**Summary**

A review of the current literature indicates that the area of POS is one which requires further investigation. In particular, the perceptions of organisational support within a voluntary context amongst sport event volunteers, provides an ideal setting in which to explore. It is important to examine levels of POS amongst sport event volunteers, as it may assist event managers to determine the causes and effects of volunteer turnover, thus enabling them to take the necessary steps to potentially increase retention amongst volunteers and reducing costs associated with volunteer turnover, all of
which will contribute to the effective management of the event. The SPOS (Eisenberger et al, 1986) is suggested to be the most appropriate instrument to measure volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support for the current study, as it has been most widely applied within a paid employment setting, and due to its high internal reliability and validity, may be generalised to a voluntary context.
PSS

As highlighted in Chapter One, supervisor support is known as the degree of support provided by a supervisor, in which they value an employee’s well-being and contributions (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). For the purpose of this study, supervisor support will be discussed in terms of perceived supervisor support on behalf of the volunteer. As such, PSS is the perception of an individual of how well they feel they are supported by their immediate supervisor (Eisenberger et al, 2002). PSS is seen to have a moderating effect on commitment and satisfaction (Rhoades et al, 2001; Brough & Pears, 2004).

Employed Personnel

PSS has been the object of many studies, particularly within a paid employment setting. PSS has been investigated in relation to a range of variables, including those surrounding the employee, the organisation and the task. Studies pertaining to supervisor support of the employee have identified that emotional and instrumental supervisor support provided to an individual results in decreased levels of individual level task strain, mental strain, tension-anxiety and stress, thus increasing organisational and employee benefits such as improved job performance and satisfaction (Karasek, Triantis & Chaudry, 1982; Kirmeyer & Dougherty, 1988; Babin & Boles, 1996; O’Driscoll, Poelmans, Spector, Kalliath, Allen, Cooper & Sanchez, 2003). Likewise, positive perceptions of supervisor support have been found to reduce feelings of emotional exhaustion and burnout amongst employees and intentions to quit (Eastburg, Williamson, Gorsuch & Ridley, 1994; Munn, Barber & Fritz, 1996; Hatton & Emerson, 1998; Kalliath & Beck, 2001; 2007).
Additionally, supervisor support has been examined in relation to absenteeism (Goff, Mount & Jamison, 1990); teamwork (Griffin, Patterson & West, 2001); employee productivity (Baruch-Feldman, Brondolo, Ben-Dayan & Swartz, 2002); supervisory training (Cromwell & Kolb, 2004); work-family conflict (Frye & Breaugh, 2004; Karatepe & Kilic, 2007); employee intentions to remain (Smith, 2005; Maertz et al, 2007) and role clarity (Jokisaan & Nurmi, 2009), indicating that it is indeed a widely applied concept amongst paid employment settings.

Numerous studies have also examined PSS in relation to POS, highlighting the importance of both supervisor and organisational support to employees. PSS and POS have been examined amongst university staff (Hutchison, 1997a; 1997b); corporate employees (Wayne et al, 1997); hospital employees (Yoon & Lim, 1999; Yoon & Thye, 2000); retail sales employees (Rhoades et al, 2001; Eisenberger et al, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006); manufacturing employees (Dawley et al, 2008) and police officers (Elias & Mittal, 2011). Evidently, when individuals hold positive perceptions of supervisor support, their perceptions of organisational support are enhanced. However, the literature has also shown that this relationship may occur in the reverse, where increased perceptions of organisational support will enhance perceptions of supervisor support. This indicates that PSS may in fact be an outcome of POS, as well as an antecedent to POS.

Furthermore, PSS has also been widely studies in relation to the concept of affective commitment, namely amongst retail sales employees (Rhoades et al, 2001); wood production employees (Gagnon & Michael, 2004); nursing employees (Vandenberghe et al, 2004; Chen et al, 2008); telecommunication employees (Stinglhamber et al, 2006); and MBA students who are employed full time in various roles (Pazy &
Ganzach, 2009). These studies concluded that when an individual experienced positive perceptions of supervisor support, this results in enhanced affective commitment. Similarly, if the individual perceived the support to be negative, this resulted in a less committed employee.

PSS and employee satisfaction has also had considerable attention within the literature, being examined amongst child life specialists (Munn et al, 1996); manufacturing employees (Griffin et al, 2001); police officers (Brough & Frame, 2004; Elias & Mittal, 2011); public sector human service employees (Brough & Pears, 2004); wood production employees (Gagnon & Michael, 2004); high-tech employees (Mc Calister, et al, 2006); government agency employees (Mc Calister, et al, 2006) and nursing employees (Hall, 2007). When an individual experiences positive perceptions of supervisor support, this results in increased employee satisfaction. Likewise, lack of supervisor support has been found to be a strong predictor of dissatisfaction towards the supervisor, organisation and task.

The relationships between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction have also been the subject of considerable research attention within a paid employment context. However, relatively little is known about how these constructs are related in unpaid employment settings.

**Volunteers**

As PSS is a relatively new concept (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Eisenberger et al, 2002), its application within a voluntary context, and in particular amongst sport event volunteers has not yet been explored. This presents an ideal situation in which to examine sport event volunteers perceptions of supervisor support, and the relationship
between affective commitment and satisfaction, allowing this thesis to present original work in an under researched field.

**Supervisor Support Models and Scales**

Numerous authors have adapted Eisenberger et al (1986) SPOS, to develop the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (SPSS). Evidently, Kottke and Sharafinski (1988), Hutchison (1997a; 1997b), Rhoades et al. (2001) and Eisenberger et al (2002) all modified the SPOS by replacing the term ‘organisation’ with ‘supervisor’. The need to develop the SPSS arose when it was identified that individuals differentiate between the support provided by an organisation as a whole, and the support provided by their supervisor, indicating that both are important in determining the level of support an individual perceives to receive (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Although Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) first espoused the SPSS, as based upon Eisenberger et al (1986) SPOS, their version of the SPSS consisted of 16 items to measure supervisor support, as did Hutchinson (1997a; 1997b). Eisenberger et al (2002) version of the SPSS, however, was adapted from the shortened version of the SPOS, and consisted of eight items to measure supervisor support (refer to Appendix Four). Due to Eisenberger et al (2002) version containing fewer items and the consistency in using the SPOS the SPSS is deemed the preferred instrument to use within the current study, to increase the response rate. Rhoades et al (2001) version was not considered, as it consisted of four items to measure supervisor support, and was not consistent with the SPOS measure.

As the SPSS is based on Eisenberger et al’s (1986) SPOS, the SPSS scale has had reasonable attention in the literature within a paid employment context. The SPSS has been used to measure perceptions of organisational support amongst university
employees (Hutchinson, 1997b); hourly employees (Rhoades et al, 2001; Cole, Bruch & Vogel, 2006); wood production employees (Gagnon & Michael, 2004); retail sales employees (Rhoades Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006); telecommunication employees (Stinglhamber et al, 2006); social workers (Maertz et al, 2007) and nursing employees (Hall, 2007). Within a voluntary context however, the SPSS has not yet been applied.

**Summary**

A review of the literature indicates that the area of PSS is one which requires further investigation within a voluntary context, specifically amongst sport event volunteers. It is important to examine levels of PSS amongst sport event volunteers, as it may assist event managers to create support structures within the volunteer management framework, to potentially increase retention amongst volunteers, thus reducing costs associated with volunteer turnover, all of which will contribute to the effective management of the event. The SPSS (Eisenberger et al, 2002) appears to be the most appropriate instrument to measure volunteers’ perceptions of supervisor support for the current study, as it has been most widely applied within a paid employment setting, and due to its high internal reliability and validity, may be generalised to a voluntary context.
COMMITMENT

As discussed in Chapter One, commitment is a complex concept, and has been defined in a variety of contexts. Meyer and Allen (1991) recognised that commitment may be defined within three categories, reflecting three broad themes emergent from the literature: affective orientation, cost-based and obligation or moral responsibility (Meyer & Allen, 1997) (see Appendix Five). The commonality of all conceptualisations of commitment is the view that commitment connects an individual to an organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Therefore, for the purpose of the current study, commitment is defined as the psychological and emotional attachment of an individual to an organisation (Fornes et al, 2008).

Individual Commitment

In contrast to organisational commitment, which is defined by an individual’s attachment to a particular organisation (Porter et al, 1974), individual commitment (behavioural commitment) is defined by aspects of an individual’s employment which directly affect the individual (Fornes et al, 2008). Individual commitment describes the psychological and emotional attachment of an individual to the individual’s jobs or career, as well as their peers whilst working, and the teams or work groups involved with (Cohen, 2003).

Within individual commitment, the extent to which an individual identifies with the values of their peers within an organisation is referred to as ‘team commitment’. Team commitment is when an individual identifies themselves as part of a team with other members of the organisation, and may enhance organisational commitment amongst individuals, who desire the cohesiveness of other members of a group, in a team environment (Randal & Cote, 1991). In terms of an individual’s attachment to their
job or work tasks, the importance the individual places on their work, and the extent to which they identify psychologically with their work, is referred to as ‘job commitment’ (Fornes et al, 2008). The specific tasks allocated to individuals within organisations are also important in determining the commitment of the individual to the organisation, thus must be allocated according to the personal characteristics of the individual (Lodhal & Kejner, 1965). Finally, an individual may become attached to their career or occupation, known as ‘career commitment’, which involves the extent of an individual’s motivation, attitude and behavioural intentions towards a specific occupation (Blau, 2001). Although various forms of commitment are identified within the literature, individual commitment, in the form of team commitment, job commitment and career commitment will be excluded from the study, as the focus of this study lies with an individual’s affective commitment to the organisation as a whole.

By analysing the affective commitment of volunteers at sport events to the organisation, and understanding the factors that may be associated with a committed volunteer, this may assist organisations employing volunteer personnel to effectively manage volunteers (Zappala & Burrell, 2002). Therefore, it is important to determine the factors which influence affective commitment at sport events, which may enable volunteer managers to employ effective strategies to increase volunteer satisfaction and commitment, thus improving long-term management of volunteers whilst reducing costs associated with turnover (Engelberg et al, 2007).

**Employed Personnel**

An extensive body of literature exists on commitment within a paid employment setting. Commitment has been investigated in relation to a range of variables,
including personal characteristics of employees, organisational characteristics and employee work experiences (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Numerous studies have investigated commitment as an antecedent of employee turnover within a paid employment setting. Studying measures of commitment and job satisfaction, as related to turnover, Porter et al (1974) found that employees who leave an organisation are characterised by lower levels of commitment and satisfaction, than those who stay, and concluded that commitment and satisfaction are theoretically related. Likewise, Farrell and Rusbult (1981), Blau and Boal (1989); Aryee et al (1991); Jaros, Jermier, Koehler and Sincich (1993) and Vandenberghe et al (2004) support Porter et al’s (1974) conclusions, and found that turnover intentions were influenced by commitment and job satisfaction of employees, however, commitment was more strongly related to turnover than was satisfaction. Mayer and Schoorman (1992) also investigated the relationship between commitment and turnover, and commitment and performance, and found that turnover is more strongly related to continuance commitment than to affective commitment and performance is more strongly related to affective commitment.

Also investigating commitment as an antecedent of employee turnover, Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky (2002) and Turner and Chelladurai (2005) assessed the relations between affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organisation, and their impacts upon turnover. Results indicated that all three forms of commitment correlated negatively with withdrawal and turnover. However, Pare and Tremblay (2007) found that continuance commitment mediates the effects of high involvement human resource management practices on turnover intentions of employees.
In regards to organisational and employee characteristics, and employee work experiences, Baruch and Winklemann-Gleed (2002) examined different work-related foci of commitment, such as the work group and the organisation, and the current occupation, and assessed how commitment is influenced by, and influences attitudes and emotions at work. The results of the study indicate a strong association between positive work-related emotions and commitment levels, thus leading to higher intentions to stay with the organisation.

Gaertner and Nollen (1989) explored the relationships between career experiences, perceptions of company employment practices and commitment to the organisation, and found that commitment is higher among employees who believe they are trained and developed within an organisation, in which a clear connection exists between employees’ perceptions of employment practices and their commitment. Similarly, Caldwell, Chatman and O’Reilly (1990) examined how organisations facilitate commitment among employees, and found that a significant positive relationship between strong organisational recruitment and socialisation practices, and individual commitment existed, thus supporting the notion that commitment is a multi-faceted construct (Meyer & Allen, 1990). Randall and Cote (1991) and Leong et al (2003) found that job involvement directly and strongly influences commitment, in investigating the relationships amongst commitment, career salience, work group attachment, job involvement and work ethic professional commitment. Investigating the key facets of commitment amongst hotel managers, Maxwell and Steele (2003) found that high commitment levels among managers may enhance individual staff commitment, which will have a positive impact on work tasks to be completed.
Examining the impact of commitment on employee training motivation, Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) found that commitment held positive associations with employee training motivation. Furthermore, Lee (2005) explored the relationship between leadership and commitment, and concluded that the support and guidance employees receive from their immediate supervisors, as well as the organisation, are important in determining the level of commitment amongst employees, and that positive experience at work is found to correlate positively with affective commitment. Additionally, investigating the relationship between work empowerment and commitment, Liu and Chiu (2007) found that when the perception of work empowerment increases, commitment increases accordingly, which may lead to increased performance and effectiveness amongst employees.

Within paid employment settings, the relationship between commitment, POS and satisfaction, has been the focus of a number of studies. Examining the relationship between POS and employees’ affective commitment to the organisation has established that commitment is aligned with POS, job satisfaction and turnover intentions; employees who expressed high levels of POS have stronger feelings of satisfaction, loyalty and affective commitment towards the organisation (Eisenberger et al, 1990; Meyer & Smith, 2000; Vandenberghhe et al, 2004; Foley et al, 2006; Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). Additionally, numerous studies have examined the relationship between organisational commitment and employee satisfaction, and found that the two constructs are significantly positively related (Porter et al, 1974; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Eisenberger et al, 1990; Aryee et al, 1991; Begley & Czajka, 1993; Eby et al, 1999; Goulet & Singh, 2002; Meyer et al, 2002; Foley et al, 2006; Guleryuz et al, 2008).
While the relationships between POS, PSS, satisfaction and commitment have been studied in a paid employment context, relatively little is known how these constructs are related in voluntary settings.

Volunteers

The study of commitment has had considerable attention within a voluntary context, however, not to the extent that paid employment settings have received (Engleberg et al., 2007). The majority of literature examining volunteers and commitment focuses largely on volunteer turnover as a result of commitment, and the impact of volunteer motivation on commitment. Volunteer commitment is associated with a range of volunteers’ socio-demographic characteristics, socioeconomic status, and motivations for volunteering (Cuskelley et al., 1998; Zappala & Burrell, 2002; Engleberg et al., 2006). The following section reviews the literature on volunteer commitment, and its relationship to turnover, motivation, satisfaction, perceptions of volunteers’ supervisors and volunteer management practices.

Focusing on volunteer turnover, motivation and commitment, Elstad (2003) examined volunteers’ continuance commitment and reasons to quit at a jazz festival, and found that volunteers who are influenced by material motivators are less likely to continue as a volunteer in the future. Also examining the commitment of marginal volunteer personnel (compared with career volunteers), Cuskelley, Harrington and Stebbins (2002) explored volunteers’ commitment categorised as either marginal or career volunteers. Findings indicate that although levels of commitment decreased over time for both career and marginal volunteers, career volunteers are more highly committed than marginal volunteers, which may have implications for sport event managers in retaining volunteers.
Likewise, Marta et al (2006) and Yanay and Yanay (2008) explored the motivational frame for volunteers and its relation to variables, including personality, satisfaction, integration, length and intention to remain, and commitment of the volunteer. It was found that commitment of the volunteer may be enhanced by considering the motivational set for volunteers, thus reducing turnover, and that when motivation wanes, volunteers become less committed, and terminate their assistance. Additionally, as a result of effective recruitment programs, when volunteers feel their efforts are recognised, satisfaction increases, leading to increased commitment, which improves volunteer retention (Martinez & McMullin, 2004; Souza & Mandeep, 2008).

In relation to sport volunteers, MacLean and Hamm (2007) examined volunteer motivation, commitment and retention at mega-events. Commitment was found to be related to sport specific factors of the particular event. Commitment to the organisation, other sport events and volunteering in general, was strongly positive amongst volunteers, with a majority indicating they were highly committed as a direct result of event organisers volunteer management strategies. Also focusing on volunteer commitment and retention, Engelberg et al (2006) and Engleberg et al (2007) examined the role commitment plays in voluntary outcomes, such as performance and retention of volunteers. They found that volunteer commitment to the organisation is critical for effective organisation and delivery of sport, and that volunteer managers need to focus on enhancing commitment in order to attract and retain volunteer personnel.

Voluntary committee members in sport organisations have been the focus of numerous studies involving commitment, in which it was found that volunteers become more committed to sport organisations when they are made to feel a part of
the group (Cuskelly, 1998). Additionally, commitment was found to be a strong predictor of board committee turnover intentions (Cuskelly & Boag, 2001), whereas normative and affective commitment enhanced self-reported performance (Stephens et al, 2004; Bright-Preston & Brown, 2004). Finally, commitment was found to have positive effects on volunteer board member’s roles (Dawley et al, 2005), in which performance increases, thus reducing turnover.

Focusing on volunteer commitment as a result of general volunteer management, Wandersman and Alderman (1993) examined the problems of volunteer turnover and the general management efficacy of voluntary and non-profit organisations. Findings suggest that the lack of structure evident in volunteer positions leaves the volunteer unsure of their role within the organisation, which may contribute to the volunteer’s lack of commitment to the organisation. Healy, Lyons-Crew, Michaux and Gal (2008) examined the impact of organisational change on volunteer commitment, and found that whilst volunteers did not seek change within their roles, well managed change may help maintain volunteers’ sustained commitment to the organisation.

Du-Boulay (1996) examined the qualities volunteers prefer in a supervisor which may enhance the volunteer experience and encourage commitment from volunteers. They found that volunteers prefer supervisors who involve volunteers, show great respect for volunteers and recognise volunteers for their contribution. It was concluded that if such attributes were absent, volunteers demonstrated lower levels of commitment. Likewise, Bennett and Barkensjo (2005) concluded that supervisor support for volunteers had a positive and significant impact on volunteer satisfaction, which impacted positively on volunteer commitment. Similarly, Catano et al (2001) examined commitment and leadership in volunteer organisations, and found that
transformational leadership predicted volunteers’ psychological involvement and commitment, in which volunteers held higher levels of commitment to the organisation when volunteer leaders acted as transformational leaders.

The review of the literature indicates that commitment within paid and non-paid employment settings has been explored in some detail, indicating that it may be viable to investigate the construct further in a voluntary setting, and in particular, amongst sport event volunteers. Volunteer turnover is a negative outcome of ineffective volunteer management, based upon low levels of volunteer satisfaction and commitment. Therefore, it is critical to examine the relationship between volunteers’ satisfaction of their experience and commitment to the organisation, based upon the levels of organisational and supervisor support volunteers perceive they receive. In determining such relationships, this may enable event managers, in particular, sport event managers, to reduce volunteer turnover by enhancing levels of volunteer satisfaction and commitment, thus contributing to the success of the event.

**Sport Event Volunteers**

Organisational commitment amongst sport event volunteers has been somewhat neglected within the literature, with the author identifying only one study exploring the construct. MacLean and Hamm (2007) examined volunteer motivation, commitment and retention at the 2005 Canadian Women’s Golf Championship. The findings suggest that by understanding the factors that impact upon volunteer commitment, and the relationships between intentions and commitment to volunteer, this can help event organisers target voluntary recruitment and retention strategies to assist management to provide the basis for continued commitment and retention.
Although limited, previous research has suggested that sport event volunteers may show affective commitment toward a particular sport or cause, event, or organisation, either collectively or in isolation (Engelberg, Zakus, Skinner & Campbell, 2012). A multiple commitment approach has enjoyed considerable attention within the paid employment literature, with Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) extending Allen and Meyer’s (1990) framework, suggesting that individuals may indeed show commitment to other organisational foci, and not merely the organisation as a whole. As such, commitment may be toward the supervisor (Vandenberghhe, Bentein & Stinglhamber, 2004), the team (Baruch & Winkelmann-Gleed, 2002; Engelberg, Skinner & Zakus, 2006), the volunteer role (Engelberg et al, 2006), the sporting club (Engelberg, Stipis, Kippin, Spillman & Burbidge, 2009) and the sport (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). While this approach provides scholars with a more precise way of measuring organisational commitment, no such instrument currently exists within the literature to measure this phenomenon. A subsequent review of organisational commitment scale/instruments suggests the most appropriate instrument to do so.

As so little is known about sport event volunteers’ organisational commitment, and the examination amongst sport event volunteers multiple commitments has been neglected, the current study presents an ideal context in which to explore sport event volunteers’ commitment to the organisation, based upon their perceptions of organisational and supervisor support. As previously mentioned, while there are no specific commitment models to measure multiple commitment towards specific organisational foci, organisational commitment will be measured towards the organisation as a whole through quantitative research, with further qualitative research exploring the commitment of sport event volunteers toward the organisation, their supervisor, their peers, the sport or cause and the event itself.
Commitment Models and Scales/Instruments

Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974)

Porter et al (1974) developed the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (see Appendix Six), which consists of 15 scale items, after identifying the lack of a reliable and valid instrument to measure employee commitment to work organisations. Upon recognising the need to develop and validate a measure of employee commitment to work organisations, Porter et al (1974) confirmed that the OCQ was reliable and internally consistent to the application of paid employment settings, thus becoming a widely used scale within numerous studies.

Within a paid employment setting, Porter et al’s (1974) OCQ has been utilised extensively, thus confirming the reliability and validity of the instrument, when applied within a paid employment setting. The instrument has been successfully applied to a significant number of studies within a paid employment setting, and to a minimal extent, within a voluntary context.

Within a paid employment setting, the scale has been used to measure organisational commitment amongst field office employees from an insurance company (Blau & Boal, 1989); skilled labour engineers (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989); hourly employees and managerial employees within a large work organisation (Eisenberger et al, 1990); university employees (Randall & Cote, 1991); professionals within an accounting firm (Aryee, Wyatt & Min, 1991; Shaub, 1991; Leong et al, 2003); hospital employees during a major divisional consolidation (Begley & Czajka, 1993); newly hired hourly employees (Vandenberg & Self, 1993); community health employees and managers (Baruch & Winklemann-Gleed, 2002); employees’ career commitment with a
particular organisation (Goulet & Singh, 2002); hotel managers (Maxwell & Steele, 2003) and paid nursing staff (Guleryuz et al, 2008). With such a robust application of the OCQ within a paid employment setting, the literature has demonstrated that the application of Porter et al (1974) OCQ is still reliable and valid over 35 years after its development.

Within a voluntary employment context, the OCQ has been utilised to acquire data about volunteer’s regarding a slight number of volunteer foci. The scale has been tested amongst voluntary sport administrators and voluntary committee members within sport (Cuskelly, 1998; Cuskelly, McIntyre & Boag, 1998; Cuskelly & Boag, 2001); as well as sport event volunteers at mega sport events (MacLean & Hamm, 2007). However, it is evident that there is limited application of the OCQ within a voluntary context.

Three-Component Model of Commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990)

Recognising that commitment is a multidimensional construct (Meyer & Allen, 1997), Allen and Meyer (1990) developed the Three-Component Model of Commitment, measuring affective, continuance and normative commitment within organisations (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Allen and Meyer (1990) developed the Three-Component Model of Commitment, to be utilised as an alternative to Porter et al (1974) OCQ. Allen and Meyer’s (1990) development of their model encouraged the use of a model which measures the differing dimensions of organisational commitment, rather than measuring organisational commitment as a uni-dimensional construct, as Porter et al’s (1974) achieves. Based upon the development of the Three-Component Model of Commitment, Allen and Meyer (1990) developed the Affective, Continuance and
Normative Commitment Scales, in order to measure, thus providing a conceptually sound alternative in the measurement of organisational commitment (Morrow, 1993).

Allen and Meyer’s (1990) commitment scales have been widely applied within a paid employment setting, as well as a voluntary setting, with affective commitment receiving significant attention within the literature. Within a paid employment setting, the Affective Commitment Scale (see Appendix Seven) has been used to measure commitment amongst part time employees in sport (Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004); university graduates (Vandenberghe et al, 2004); professional solicitors (Foley et al, 2006); university faculty members (Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006); and quantity surveyors (Liu & Chiu, 2007). Similarly, the Continuance Commitment Scale has measured the commitment of aerospace firm employees within organisations (Jaros et al, 1993).

Numerous studies have applied Allen and Meyer’s (1990) commitment scales collectively, measuring employees’ affective, normative and continuance commitment within a paid employment context, and comparing and contrasting the measures. The three scales have measured commitment amongst university students and registered nurses (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002); newly hired employees (Vandenberg & Self, 1993); commitment to human resource management practices within organisations (Meyer & Smith, 2000); organisational commitment in general, across a number of foci (Meyer et al, 2002); research and development professionals in Singapore (Lee, 2005); and university sport coaches (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). Finally, measuring the commitment of financial institution employees, Benkhoff (1997) applied Porter et al’s OCQ, however, concluded that it was not a suitable scale to utilise in the measurement of
commitment. Benkhoff (1997) supports Allen and Meyer’s (1990) organisational commitment scales, as they are based on differing commitment concepts and have been tested for homogeneity, which the OCQ has not.

In addition to a paid employment setting, Allen and Meyer’s (1990) commitment scales have been applied extensively within a voluntary context. Allen and Meyer’s (1990) commitment scales have successfully measured the affective, normative and continuance commitment of volunteers at non-profit organisations as well as for-profit organisations. Thus, the commitment scales have measured commitment amongst sports committee volunteer administrators (Cuskelley, 1998); board director volunteers (Bright-Preston & Brown, 2004; Stephens et al, 2004; Dawley et al, 2005) and sports volunteers (Engleberg et al, 2006; Engleberg et al, 2007). Additionally, the Continuance Commitment Scale has measured jazz festival volunteers’ commitment (Elstad, 2003), whereas the Affective Commitment Scale has measured the commitment amongst community based sport volunteers (Engelberg et al, 2006).

In testing the generalisability of Allen and Meyer’s (1990) Three Component Model of Organisational Commitment, the model can be generalised when studying commitment within other areas, including unions, careers, management, volunteers, organisational change, occupations and supervisors (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Therefore, based on the evidence that the model can be applied effectively within a range of settings, that it measures commitment as a multi-dimensional construct rather than collectively, and due to the extensive application of Allen and Meyer’s (1990) commitment scales, within both a paid employment setting, and more importantly, a voluntary context, the
Affective Commitment Scale may be deemed more suitable to apply to the current study, than Porter et al’s (1974) OCQ.

Summary
A review of the literature indicates that the area of commitment is one which is fruitful for further investigation (Beck & Wilson, 2001; Gallagher & McLean-Parks, 2001). It is important to examine affective commitment and satisfaction amongst sport event volunteers, as mediated by their perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, as it may assist event managers to determine the causes and effects of volunteer turnover, thus enabling them to take the necessary steps to potentially increase retention amongst volunteers, and reducing costs associated with volunteer turnover, all of which will contribute to the effective management of the event.

It is suggested that Allen and Meyer’s (1990) Three Component Model of Commitment is most appropriate to utilise for the current study, in particular the Affective Commitment Scale. This is due to this scale being the most widely applied within a voluntary context, as compared with Porter et al (1974) OCQ, indicating that the multidimensional model of commitment is applicable to volunteer personnel (Zappala & Burrell, 2002; Dawley et al, 2005).
Satisfaction
Satisfaction refers to the perceptions that result from an evaluation of performance and expectations from the individual’s experience (Oliver, 1980). For the purpose of the current study, satisfaction will be discussed in terms of volunteers. In this sense, volunteer satisfaction is determined by the continued service provided by an individual based upon the provision of positive rewards, which are satisfying to their unique needs (Cnann & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). It is believed that volunteers (as well as paid personnel) evaluate their working experiences relative to the expectations they hold for those experiences. Thus, if satisfied, the individual will continue to participate, and if dissatisfied, the individual will be unwilling to continue, and will withdraw from the task and potentially the organisation (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Reed, Kratchman & Strawser, 1994). The significance of examining satisfaction within the current study is highlighted by the relationship that exists between satisfaction and other important elements, namely POS, PSS, affective commitment and turnover intentions.

Employed Personnel
Within a paid employment setting, employee satisfaction with their role and organisation has been extensively researched, with a count of over 3350 articles and dissertations in 1976 (Locke, 1976), and double that in 1996 (Oshagbemi, 1996), focusing on job satisfaction. Consequently, this section of the review identifies a summary of the literature which exists in relation to employee satisfaction, including its causes and outcomes, as well as the relationships between job satisfaction, POS, PSS and commitment. This section of the review is not exhaustive, and only highlights key studies in order to outline general findings on the topic of employee satisfaction.
A review of the literature identified a large number of studies that have investigated satisfaction as an influence on turnover and retention of employees within organisations. There appears to be consensus among authors in that employees who voluntarily resign from an organisation show relatively lower levels of satisfaction than those employees who were retained (Hulin, 1966; Atchison & Lefferts, 1972; Porter et al, 1974; Mobley, 1977; Wild, 1979; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Wolfe-Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Eby et al, 1999). This relationship was found to be affected by poor managerial decision making causing negative events within the organisation (Atchison & Lefferts, 1972); intrinsic and extrinsic impacts of an individual, influencing job satisfaction (Maimon & Ronen, 1978); negative attitudes of employees to aspects of their jobs, causing job dissatisfaction (Wild, 1979); lack of rewards and monetary incentives from satisfactory performance (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid & Sirola, 1998); greater decline in rewards, increase in costs, increase in alternative quality and decrease in investment size (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983), as well as a decline over time in degree of job commitment (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Eby et al, 1999). The demographic characteristics of employees (Reed et al, 1994); intrinsic motivation during employment (Eby et al, 1999); burnout (Kalliath & Morris, 2002) and role conflict and ambiguity (Wu & Norman, 2006) were also found to impact upon employee satisfaction, resulting in turnover.

Employees with increased levels of job satisfaction reported reduced leaving intentions which increased retention (Hulin, 1968; Atchison & Lefferts, 1972; Maimon & Ronen, 1978; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Suszko & Breaugh, 1986; Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007). Such a relationship was found to be moderated by positive events during employment (Atchison & Lefferts, 1972);
high job rewards and low job costs (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Lum et al, 1998); realistic job previews during induction (Susko & Breaugh, 1986); increased tenure at the organisation (Farkas & Tetrick, 1989); and employees perceived work-life balance support from the organisation, and reduction of work pressures (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007).

A review of the literature identified an extensive examination between job satisfaction and elements of the individual, the job and the organisation. A range of factors internal to the employee were identified as influencing job satisfaction. An employee’s intrinsic motivation acts as a partial mediator of the relationship between the job characteristics and job satisfaction, in which an individual will be motivated to work towards organisational goals, if positive job characteristics are evident, resulting in job satisfaction (Halpern, 1966; Lawler & Hall, 1970; Eby et al, 1999; Burke & Fiksenbaum, 2009). Likewise, the effects of met expectations of the job also positively influence job satisfaction, which influences employee performance, benefiting the individual and the organisation (Wanous, Poland, Premack & Davis, 1992).

Negative relations concerning job satisfaction (dissatisfaction) and job stress were also identified within the literature, in which job stress led to feelings of dissatisfaction, and decreased commitment (Blegen, 1993), whereas job satisfaction and job involvement was found to have no direct relationship (Knoop, 1995). The emotional intelligence of employees was positively related to job satisfaction, as well as commitment, in which job satisfaction acted as a mediator between emotional intelligence and commitment (Sy, Tram & O’Hara, 2006; Guleryuz et al, 2008). Finally, positive social identity, which enhances employees’ self-esteem and
contributes to overall self-evaluation, was found to positively influence employee satisfaction and commitment (Todd & Kent, 2009), which encourages retention of employees, and benefits the organisation.

In addition to the factors influencing job satisfaction of employees that are internal to the individual, a number of factors were identified that influence job satisfaction which are external to the individual, yet internal to the organisation. The review of literature found positive relationships have been established to exist between job satisfaction of employees and the actual work undertaken, in which the more interesting, appropriate and opportunistic the work, the higher the level of job satisfaction (Ford & Borgatta, 1970; Stone, 1976; Rice, McFarlin & Bennett, 1989; Oshagbemi, 1997; Graham & Messner, 1998; Groot & Maassen van den Brink, 1999; Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; O’Leary, Wharton & Quinlan, 2009). Similarly, job satisfaction increases with job size (Shepard, 1970), and positively influences job quality, in which the employee is more likely to work more efficiently when satisfied (Munoz de Bustillo Llorente & Macias, 2005). High job satisfaction resulted in high individual performance, thus increasing job quality, and benefiting both the individual and the organisation (Petty, McGee & Cavender, 1984; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985).

An organisation’s culture and ethical climate also impacts the job satisfaction of employees. Evidently, a positive ethical climate (Schwepker, 2001; Koonmee, Singhapakdi, Virakul & Lee, 2010), as well as a positive organisational culture (Lund, 2003) which encourages organisational trust (Williams, 2005), as well as empowerment amongst employees (Spence Laschinger, Finegan & Shamian, 2001), have positive relationships with employees’ job satisfaction, which positively impacts
the commitment and retention among paid employees. Additionally, an organisation which incorporates effective employee training programs to enhance employee development also positively influences employee satisfaction, encouraging retention (Spears & Parker, 2002), in which length of service with a particular organisation is significantly correlated with job satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 2000).

The review of the literature also identified a number of studies reporting on the relationship between job satisfaction, POS, PSS and commitment. A recurring finding amongst authors appeared to highlight a positive relationship between job satisfaction and commitment (Porter et al, 1974; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Curry, Wakefield, Price & Mueller, 1986; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992; Begley & Czajka, 1993; Wu & Norman, 2006; Guleryuz et al, 2008). Such a relationship was found to be mediated by the provision of high job rewards and low job costs (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983); increased tenure in the organisation (Farkas & Tetrick, 1989); low levels of stress and job displeasure (Begley & Czajka, 1993, Blegen, 1993); demographic characteristics (Reed et al, 1994); job involvement (Knoop, 1995); organisational culture and POS (Foley et al, 2006); minimal levels of role conflict and ambiguity (Wu & Norman, 2006) and emotional intelligence (Guleryuz et al, 2008).

The relationship between satisfaction and POS, and satisfaction and PSS, has been investigated to a lesser extent than that between satisfaction and commitment. A positive relationship exists between satisfaction and POS, which was found to be mediated by positive job conditions (Eisenberger et al, 1997; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), and moderates the effects on role stress outcomes (Stamper & Johlke, 2003). POS also acted as a mediator between perceived situational factors (including
satisfaction) and affective commitment (Moideenkutty et al, 2001; Allen et al, 2003), indicating that positive perceptions of organisational support on employees’ work-life balance improved job satisfaction, as well as job performance and retention (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007). Positive relationships were also found between PSS and satisfaction, in that the literature concludes that when an individual experiences positive perceptions of supervisor support, this results in increased employee satisfaction. Likewise, lack of supervisor support was found to be a strong predictor of dissatisfaction towards the supervisor, organisation and task (Munn et al, 1996; Griffin et al, 2001; Brough & Frame, 2004; Elias & Mittal, 2011).

**Volunteers**

The study of volunteer satisfaction has had considerable attention within the literature. A number of studies examining volunteers and satisfaction focus on volunteer retention or turnover as a result of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, as well as the relationship between satisfaction and recruitment of volunteers (Stevens, 1991; Silverberg, Ellis, Whitworth & Kane, 2002; Doherty & Carron, 2003; Marta et al, 2006; Kulik, 2007; Karl, Peluchette & Hall, 2008; Osborn, 2008; Smith & Lockstone, 2009). Additionally, volunteer satisfaction is associated with task conditions, training and commitment. The following section reviews the literature on volunteer satisfaction, and its relationship to turnover and retention, commitment and POS, and the internal and external influences to the volunteer and the organisation, on satisfaction.

The relationship between volunteer satisfaction and turnover and retention has been well documented. Positive relationships exist between volunteer dissatisfaction and turnover, as caused by burnout (Kulik, 2007) and poor management (Osborn, 2008);
as well as volunteer satisfaction and retention (Stevens, 1991; Silverberg et al, 2002; Doherty & Carron, 2003; Marta et al, 2006; Kulik, 2007; Karl et al, 2008; Osborn, 2008; Smith & Lockstone, 2009). Research shows that volunteer satisfaction, which results in volunteer retention, is caused by a number of factors, including role characteristics such as recognition, interaction and role congruence (Stevens, 1991); quality of supervision (Silverberg et al, 2002); task and social cohesion (Doherty & Carron, 2003); consideration of initial and ongoing volunteer motivations (Marta et al, 2006); empowerment (Kulik, 2007); fun during volunteer tasks (Karl et al, 2008); social contact with other volunteers (Osborn, 2008) and providing a rewarding experience and acknowledging the contribution of volunteers (Smith & Lockstone, 2009). A satisfied volunteer is more likely to remain with the organisation, which reduces costs associated with turnover and recruitment for the organisation.

There has also been an extensive examination of the links between volunteer satisfaction and elements of the individual, the role and the organisation. A number of factors internal to the individual were identified to influence, and were influenced by, satisfaction. Satisfaction contributes to an individual’s motivation to volunteer (Pearce, 1983; Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Farrell et al, 1998; Johnston, Twynam & Farrell, 1999; Kemp, 2002; Green & Blackett, 2004; Reeser, Berg, Rhea & Willick, 2005; Hoey et al, 2007; Souza & Mandep, 2008; Stukas, Worth, Clary & Snyder, 2009); and has been found to correlate positively with self-esteem and goal achievement (Deery, Jago & Shaw, 1997; Tschirhart, Mesch, Perry, Miller & Lee, 2001; Kulik, 2007), as well as volunteer job skills and social skills (Kemp, 2002).
The review also identified a breadth of studies examining volunteer satisfaction and factors external to the volunteer, yet internal to the organisation. When volunteer work is perceived as challenging and interesting by volunteers, this has been found to have a positive effect on volunteer satisfaction (Gidron, 1983; Deery et al, 1997; Johnston et al, 1999; Kemp, 2002; Reeser et al, 2005). Significant predictors of volunteer satisfaction have also been identified as volunteer learning and training opportunities (Elstad, 1996; Deery et al, 1997; Baldwin Grossman & Furano, 2002; Green & Blackett, 2004; Auld et al, 2009); communication between volunteers and management and recognition of volunteer efforts (Farrell et al, 1998); job setting (Silverberg, Backman & Backman, 2000; Silverberg, Marshall & Ellis, 2001); ongoing management and support of volunteers by management (Baldwin Grossman & Furano, 2002; Davis, Hall & Meyer, 2003); quality supervision (Silverberg et al, 2002); task and social cohesion (Doherty & Carron, 2003); empowerment (Kulik, 2007); recognition of volunteer efforts (Hoey et al, 2007; Souza & Mandeep, 2008) and clarity of volunteer roles and responsibilities (Souza & Mandeep, 2008; Sakires, Doherty & Misener, 2009; Mills & Schulz, 2009).

Whilst a breadth of studies report on volunteer satisfaction in relation to variables such as retention, turnover and motivation, few studies examine the relationship between volunteer satisfaction, commitment, POS and PSS. Research has identified positive relationships amongst volunteer satisfaction and commitment, where a satisfied volunteer is likely to be more committed to the organisation they are volunteering (Silverberg et al, 2002; Costa et al, 2006; Mills & Schulz, 2009). Similarly, when a volunteer experiences unpleasant working conditions, they are more likely to suffer lower levels of satisfaction, which affects commitment. However, this relationship may be positively mediated by organisational support, which was
identified to be an important job characteristic to affect volunteer satisfaction (Bennett & Barkensjo, 2005). Examining the relationship between volunteer satisfaction, POS, PSS and commitment would appear to offer new insights into the experiences of volunteers and their management, highlighting the importance of the current study.

**Sport Event Volunteers**

The examination of sport event volunteers’ satisfaction has been the subject of relatively few studies. The satisfaction of sport event volunteers has been investigated at the Summer and Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games (Elstad, 1996; Kemp, 2002; Reeser et al, 2005; Costa et al, 2006), in which volunteers indicated they were generally satisfied with their involvement, but they are more likely to be motivated to volunteer if the work is satisfying and rewarding (Reeser et al, 2005). Volunteer satisfaction was identified to be related to work variables, including personal network, participation in the celebratory Olympic atmosphere, involvement in a unique event, job related competence and skills, social skills, welfare issues, job characteristics and training (Elstad, 1996; Kemp, 2002; Costa et al, 2006). Sport event volunteer satisfaction has also been investigated at an elite sporting competition, in which it was found that communication with other volunteers and recognition were significant predictors of volunteer satisfaction (Farrell et al, 1998). As the literature has failed to examine sport event volunteer satisfaction in depth, this presents an ideal context in which to explore the relationship between satisfaction, commitment and sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support.

**Satisfaction Models and Scales/Instruments**

Job satisfaction measures may assess the global satisfaction with a job, or satisfaction with key aspects of the job, including pay, supervision, promotion, colleagues and the

Instruments to measure volunteer satisfaction have also been specifically developed (see for example Galindo-Kuhn & Guzley’s [2001] Volunteer Satisfaction Index; Silverberg et al’s [2002] Effects-Indicator Model of Volunteer Satisfaction; Marta et al’s [2006] Satisfaction with the Organization Scale and Boezeman & Ellemer’s [2009] Volunteer Satisfaction Index). However, such instruments have not been proven to be valid and reliable in measuring volunteer job satisfaction, and have had limited application in measuring the construct. For the purpose of this study, volunteer satisfaction will be measured using Weiss et al’s (1967) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a scale that has been successfully implemented in many paid
employment studies, has well established reliability and validity, and would appear to be most suitable in measuring job satisfaction among sport event volunteers.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al, 1967)**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (see Appendix Eight) was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967, as cited in Fields, 2002) to assess job satisfaction in general, and is the most common measure of job satisfaction in the literature (Sestak, 2008). The original form of the MSQ consists of 100 questions within 20 subscales, measuring employee satisfaction. A shortened version of the MSQ has also been developed, which includes 20 items measuring intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction on a five point Likert scale, ranging in response from ‘very dissatisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’ (Fields, 2002).

The MSQ has had significant application in measuring job satisfaction within a paid employment context. Evidently, the shortened version of the MSQ has measured the job satisfaction of production workers (Gillet & Schwab, 1975; Schriesheim, 1978; Keller, 1983); clerical employees (Pritchard, Dunnette & Gorgenson, 1972; Dittrich & Carrell, 1979); patrol officers (Fry & Greenfeld, 1980); professional, managerial and technical employees (Heneman & Schwab, 1985); hourly employees (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal & Abraham, 1989; Sims & Kroeck, 1994; Faragher, Cass & Cooper, 2002); business executives (Boxx, Odom & Dunn, 1991); bus drivers and engineers (Mathieu & Farr, 1991); hospital and health employees (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Golbasi, Kelleci & Dogan, 2008; Sharp, 2008; Nelson, Johnson & Bebbington, 2009); restaurant employees (Hancer & George, 2003); self-employed individuals (Scarpello & Carraher, 2008) and counsellors (Jones, Hohenshil & Burge, 2009). The MSQ has also been utilised to measure the job satisfaction of volunteers, including the job
satisfaction of social service volunteers (Norris & Cox, 1987; Griffin, 1988; Hsieh, 2000; Phillips, 2005); volunteer fire-fighters (Hershey, 1998) and museum volunteers (Wu, 2005).

Due to its application within both paid and unpaid employment contexts, the MSQ shows high internal reliability and validity (Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu, 1990; Smith & Brannick, 1990; Mathieu, 1991; Mathieu & Farr, 1991; Wong, Hui & Law, 1998; Hirschfeld, 2000; Buitendach & Rothmann, 2009), indicating the instrument is a valid and reliable measure of an individual’s satisfaction with their work. As the instrument has been successful in measuring the satisfaction of paid employees across a vast number of sectors, as well as measuring volunteer satisfaction, the MSQ may be effectively generalised to be used further within a voluntary setting, deeming the MSQ the most appropriate instrument to measure sport event volunteers’ satisfaction within the current study.

**Summary**

A review of the literature indicates that the area of volunteer satisfaction is one which requires further investigation, particularly amongst sport event volunteers, as very little is known about the satisfaction of sport event volunteers in relation to commitment and perceptions of organisational and supervisor support. It is important to examine sport event volunteers’ satisfaction with their experiences, as this may assist event managers in increasing satisfaction among volunteers, thus reducing turnover intentions and increasing retention (Stevens, 1991; Silverberg et al, 2002; Doherty & Carron, 2003; Marta et al, 2006; Kulik, 2007; Karl et al, 2008; Osborn, 2008; Smith & Lockstone, 2009), and contribute to the effective management of the event. The MSQ (Weiss et al, 1967) is suggested to be an appropriate instrument to
measure volunteers’ satisfaction for the current study, as it has had previous application within a paid and voluntary employment setting and, due to its high internal reliability and validity, may be generalised further to a voluntary context.
SUMMARY

The examination of POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction amongst sport event volunteers remains uncharted territory. It is important to examine sport event volunteers’ satisfaction with their experience, and affective commitment to the organisation, as this may assist event managers in increasing satisfaction and affective commitment among volunteers, by determining the causes and effects of volunteer turnover. This may enable volunteer management to take the necessary steps to reduce turnover intentions and increase retention, thus contributing to the effective management of an event.

The areas of POS and PSS are also ones which require further investigation, particularly amongst sport event volunteers. The literature highlights the importance of examining the relationship amongst sport event POS, PSS affective commitment and satisfaction, as it has yet to be investigated. By analysing the antecedents of POS, as well as investigating the relationship between the four constructs amongst sport event volunteers, this may assist event managers in the successful delivery of an event.

The instruments deemed most suitable in the measurement of the four constructs for the current study were selected due to their application amongst paid employees and volunteers, as well as their high internal reliability and validity. The SPOS (Eisenberger et al, 1986) is suggested to be the most appropriate instrument to measure volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support for the current study, while the SPSS (Eisenberger et al, 2002) was deemed most suitable in measuring perceptions of supervisor support. Allen and Meyer’s (1990) Three Component Model of Commitment, in particular the Affective Commitment Scale, is most appropriate to
measure volunteers’ affective commitment, while the MSQ (Weiss et al, 1967) is the suggested instrument to measure volunteers’ satisfaction for the current study.

The following chapter, Chapter Three outlines the methodology for the current study, with a further discussion of the instrumentation selected.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the procedures used to investigate the relationship amongst sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, affective commitment and satisfaction, as well as the procedures used to examine the antecedents of POS within a voluntary context. The chapter comprises the following sections; research design, sampling selection and sample size, instrumentation, pilot study, data collection procedures, treatment of the data and conclusion.
RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between sport event volunteers’ POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction, as well as the nature of the POS. The research design intended to examine the impact of sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support and supervisor support on their affective commitment to BV as an organisation and satisfaction with their volunteer experience at the ATB event. This was done firstly by surveying the population of event volunteers, and secondly through in-depth focus group interviews and telephone interviews involving the general volunteers and the team leader volunteers respectively.

Examining the nature of POS formed the remainder of the study, encompassing perceptions of supervisor support, fairness (organisational justice), rewards and task conditions, participation in decision making and opportunities for growth, and how these antecedents of POS impact volunteers’ affective commitment and satisfaction. If it could be demonstrated which antecedents of POS have a greater influence on the volunteers’ overall level of POS received, this would enable volunteer management teams to develop and implement effective organisational procedures that positively impact upon volunteers’ commitment, satisfaction and ultimately their intent to remain.

From a review of the literature, certain relationships between the key variables were assumed. The independent variable, POS was specified as the perceptions held by volunteers of the support provided by the organisation in caring for their wellbeing. Such support comprised perceptions of supervisor support, fairness (organisational justice), rewards and task conditions, participation in decision making and
opportunities for growth, which collectively make up the overall level of POS held by the volunteer. The dependent variables were affective commitment and satisfaction. Affective commitment denotes the level of emotional attachment a volunteer has to BV, as well as the identification with BV. If external organisational aspects remained steady for the volunteer (for example, personal, social or working facets of the individuals life), then the volunteer would willingly choose to remain as a volunteer for BV. Satisfaction denotes the degree the volunteer was satisfied with their volunteer experience; whether the volunteer held positive or negative feelings regarding their experience, which would influence their internal state of happiness.

As outlined in Figure 1.4 (refer to page 32), the proposed interrelationships between the key variables of the study relating to research question one, suggest that the independent variables of supervisor support, fairness (organisational justice), favourable rewards and task conditions, growth opportunities and participation in decision making, all contribute to the level of POS felt by the volunteer (dependent variable). A positive linear relationship is expected, so when the participant holds positive perceptions of each of the independent variables, this will lead to increased levels of positive POS. Likewise, if the perception of the independent variables were negative, then this would result in perceptions of organisational support to be negative also. With regard to research questions two and three, as highlighted in Figure 1.5 (refer to page 33), the proposed interrelationships between the key variables are also positive and linear in nature; if the participant holds positive perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, then this increases their satisfaction, which increases their commitment, and vice versa. These proposed relationships will be tested to determine the actual relationships that exist between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, satisfaction and commitment.
The research design involved a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods. A quantitative approach to research involves gathering and analysing numerical data in order to draw conclusions or test hypotheses, and derive meanings from the data analysed (Veal, 2005). Qualitative research, which is useful when the focus of the research is on the subjects attitudes and beliefs, thus providing a comprehensive account of the variables being examined (Veal, 2005), was used during Stages Two and Three of the data collection process. The qualitative methods selected included semi-structured, in-depth focus group interviews in order to gain an understanding of the variables from the general volunteers’ perspective, as well as semi-structured, in-depth telephone interviews, to obtain the perspectives of the volunteer team leaders.

The combined use of both qualitative and quantitative research methods is referred to as triangulation. Triangulation, or mixed methods research, involves using two or more research methods to answer a single research question, and is often used when one of the methods is not in itself, complete (Morse & Niehaus, 2009). A mixed method design was used to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the issues being investigated within the study. This method is more beneficial to researchers, as the weaknesses of one approach to research (for example quantitative) are complemented by the strengths of another approach (for example qualitative), thus enabling the researcher to enhance the benefits from the research method (Veal, 2005).

There are a number of ways to approach mixed method research, including sequential mixed methods, concurrent mixed methods and transformative mixed methods (Andrew, Pedersen & McEvoy, 2011). When adopting a sequential mixed methods
approach, either a qualitative or quantitative method is utilised first, and is then followed up with the alternative method to extend the findings produced within the first method (Andrew et al., 2011). Concurrent mixed methods research involves the researcher collecting both qualitative and quantitative data concurrently, before merging the data to give an inclusive account of the research problem (Creswell, 2009). Finally, transformative mixed method requires the researcher to adopt a specific theoretical perspective within a research design that incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2009).

Within the current study, sequential mixed methods approach was adopted. Quantitative data collection, via the online questionnaire, was performed first to examine the theory amongst a larger sample and to generalise findings. This was then followed by qualitative data collection processes in the form of focus groups and individual interviews amongst smaller sample sizes, to delve deeper into the findings from the quantitative procedure, and to begin to understand the concepts being examined amongst sport event volunteers at a more profound level. By using both quantitative and qualitative approaches, this strengthened the validity of the findings through triangulation (Gratton & Jones, 2010).

Combining both qualitative and quantitative methods is often considered difficult, as the researcher is mixing paradigms and may be using contradictory assumptions (Morse & Niehaus, 2009), and may present specific barriers to a researcher (Moran, Matthews & Kirby, 2011). However, limitations may be overcome if the researcher adheres to the fundamental rules in each paradigm, and recognises what rules may be compromised, so as to not implicate the research process, while maintaining maximum validity (Morse & Niehaus, 2009). If conducted properly with rigorous
planning and precise dissemination, there are in fact, numerous advantages with this method (Moran et al, 2011). A mixed method approach may provide very strong and valid research findings, and frequently produce results that are more comprehensive and significant than research designs that use one method alone (Morse & Niehaus, 2009).

Although a relatively new paradigm, a mixed method approach has also been widely accepted and applicable within sporting contexts. Such early studies adopting a mixed method approach examined burnout amongst junior competitive tennis players (Gould, Tuffet, Udry & Loehr, 1996; Gould, Udry, Tuffey & Loehr, 1996), and highlighted the suitability of using both quantitative and qualitative methods within a research design, to strengthen research findings. Weiss and Smith (2002) and Moran and Weiss (2006) also successfully adopted a mixed method research design within their studies amongst youth sport settings, emphasising the suitability of such a method within sporting contexts. More recently, in a review of the sport literature adopting mixed methods research, Horn (2011) highlighted the contributions of using both qualitative and quantitative research which strengthen the research paradigm and enhance the overall understanding and knowledge base pertaining to the research question. Similarly, McGannon and Schweinbenz (2011) advocate the use of mixed methods within a sporting context, in order to “enrich understandings of cultural, social and psychological influences on physical activity behaviour” (p. 380), and believe that this approach will further understanding of sporting contexts.

As such, three stages of data collection were undertaken:

- Stage One: self-completed online questionnaires administered to the population of event volunteers;
• Stage Two: semi-structured, in-depth focus group interviews with a selection of general volunteers who responded to stage one;

• Stage Three: semi-structured, in-depth telephone interviews with the volunteer team leaders who responded to stage one.

These will now be further discussed throughout the remainder of chapter three.
SAMPLING SELECTION AND SAMPLE SIZE

This section explains the sampling selection for the study, as well as a description of the samples.

**Sampling Frames and Samples**

The participants for the study were selected from the population of volunteers and volunteer team leaders at BV’s 2010 ATB event. The population of the volunteers of the ATB event were selected as the sample for several reasons. Firstly, as the purpose of the study was to investigate volunteer management practices at sport events, it is essential to gain an insight into how the volunteers perceive they are managed, thus providing an overall analysis of volunteer management efficiency rather than merely from an organisational perspective. Sport event volunteers were selected due to the episodic nature of events. It is evident that event volunteers require a different approach to their management whilst at an event, as opposed to social volunteers, in which the volunteering role is ongoing rather than episodic (Hanlon & Jago, 2000; Hanlon & Cuskelly, 2002). Finally, a population sample was selected in order to gain an insight into the perspectives of both the general volunteers as well as the team leader volunteers, rather than merely a representation of the general volunteers.

**Pilot Study**

The pilot study was undertaken to assess the quality of the research; to determine the validity and reliability of the questionnaire used in Stage One. Pilot testing, which involves distributing the questionnaire to a small sample population to ensure its appropriateness, is considered one of the most important stages in the development of a new survey instrument (Litwin, 1995). Pilot testing is useful as it identifies errors in a questionnaire’s presentation and structure, which may then be addressed before data...
collection with the final version. Pilot testing also enables the researcher to determine the most suitable way to distribute the survey amongst the sample (Litwin, 1995).

Pilot testing was performed in the current study to ensure face validity of the questionnaire and to determine the best way to distribute the questionnaire to the population. The sample for the pilot study was the population of team leader volunteers utilised by BV for the ATB event. The sample was selected using a convenience sample selection procedure, with every team leader volunteer who attended a team leader information session, three months prior to the event, receiving a questionnaire. A total of 16 team leader volunteers provided feedback on the questionnaire and the data collection procedure, as part of the pilot study, from a population size of 28. The pilot study was performed in July 2010 in order to allow sufficient time to finalise the research procedures. Upon completion of the pilot study the questionnaire was further developed and refined, before being administered for Stage One data collection via email.

**Stage One**

The sample for Stage One was selected from the population of event volunteers utilised by BV at the ATB sporting event (held October 17\(^{th}\) 2010), with a population of 540 volunteers. Only those within the population that had access to an email account were included within the sampling frame, and were considered for selection. The sample received their questionnaire via email, as approximately 95 per cent of the population had access to an email account. Those volunteers who did not have access to an email account were excluded from the study, due to restrictions in obtaining postal information for the population. Therefore the starting size of the sample for Stage One was 513 volunteers (95% of the population). From the 513 volunteers who
were invited to participate, 190 responded, with 173 complete and usable responses (response rate of approximately 37%). The decision to exclude volunteers without access to an email account was based upon the result of the pilot study, where it was agreed that an email based study would be preferred by both the volunteers that comprised the sample and the BV event organisers.

An email based distribution method was considered to be more appropriate in order to reach a larger population number on multiple occasions, thus increasing response rate and reducing costs associated with distribution. BV and the sample from the pilot study also requested that distribution was to be via email, due to environmental concerns of sending out a postal survey, as well as increasing the ease of response. This decision became a trade-off for securing access to the sample via BV, which ultimately restricted the capacity of the researchers to obtain postal addresses for volunteers who did not have an email address in order to include them in the sample.

**Stage Two**

The sample for Stage Two was selected from those general volunteers who responded to Stage One, and who had indicated at the completion of their questionnaire that they would be willing to partake in a short, informal focus group interview. Every third respondent who indicated they would be willing to participate were invited to participate in the focus group interviews until a total of 25 participants were recruited. Participants for Stage Two were selected and invited to participate at the end of October 2010, after the return of questionnaires, with focus group interviews being conducted during November 2010 and the beginning of December 2010, after the completion of the event. Seven of the eight focus group interviews were held at La
Trobe University’s city campus in central Melbourne, while one was held at the West Geelong Angling Club located in Geelong West.

**Stage Three**

Individual telephone interviews were also conducted at the completion of the event, with the sample drawn from the population of team leader volunteers (n = 28). A response rate of approximately 45 per cent was achieved, with interviews conducted with 12 team leaders. The interviews were approximately 20 minutes in length each, and were guided by a set of questions, similar to those posed within the focus group interviews. The interviews were tailored towards the team leader volunteers and focused on the perceived support they received from BV, as well as the support provided by them to the general volunteers.
Chapter Three – Methodology

INSTRUMENTATION

Three data collection instruments were developed for the study, including a self-administered online questionnaire for Stage One, a semi-structured focus group interview schedule for Stage Two and a semi-structured interview schedule for Stage Three.

Stage One Research Instrument – Online Questionnaire

The instrument developed for Stage One was a self-administered online questionnaire (see Appendix Nine), used to elicit responses regarding volunteer perceptions of organisational support and supervisor support, as well as their commitment to BV as an organisation, and their satisfaction with their volunteer experience. The questionnaire also gathered demographic information, including age, gender, education level and employment status, as well as data relating to the respondents past volunteer behaviour (within BV and external to BV).

POS

The Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (Eisenberger et al, 1986) was adapted to measure sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support. The instrument was modified by replacing the word ‘organisation’ in each item, with ‘Bicycle Victoria’. The shortened version of the scale was utilised, incorporating 8 scale items with the highest factor loadings, rather than the original 39 statements, with half of the scale items positively worded and half negatively worded, in order to maintain internal validity. The SPOS requires respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree to the statements, based upon a 7-point Likert Scale. Each statement represents an individual’s evaluative judgements of the organisation,
and actions the organisation may take which may benefit or harm the employee, from the employees’ perspective.

As Eisenberger et al’s (1986) development of the SPOS is the initial instrument within the exploration of POS, the application of the SPOS is widely accepted within paid employment scenarios, and has high internal reliability and validity (Eisenberger et al, 1986; 1990; 1997; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; McFarlane Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Hutchison, 1997), indicating the instrument is a reliable measure of an individual’s POS. Eisenberger et al (1986) reported a reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) of .97 for the full version, indicating high reliability of the scale. The face validity of the POS scale used in this study was established by assessing the appropriateness of each scale item with the volunteer team leaders used for the pilot study.

PSS
The Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (SPSS) (Eisenberger et al, 2002) was employed to measure sport event volunteers’ perceptions of supervisor support. The scale was developed by Eisenberger et al (2002) to use as an extension of the SPOS, in order to assess an individual’s perception that their supervisor valued their contribution and cared about their well-being. Eisenberger et al (2002) adapted the SPOS (Eisenberger et al, 1986) in the same manner as Kottke and Sharafinski (1988), Hutchison (1997a, 1997b) and Rhoades et al. (2001), simply by replacing the word *organisation* with the term *supervisor*. The SPSS asks respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree to eight statements, based upon a 7-point Likert Scale, with half of the scale items positively worded and half negatively worded. Each statement represents an individual’s evaluative judgements of the supervisor, and
actions the supervisor may take which may benefit or harm the employee, from the employee’s perspective.

As the SPSS is based on Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) SPOS, both scales have had considerable attention within the literature. Eisenberger et al (2002) reported a reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) of .90, indicating high reliability of the PSS scale, indicating the instrument is a reliable measure of individuals’ PSS. The face validity of the PSS scale used in this study was also established by assessing the appropriateness of each scale item with the volunteer team leaders used for the pilot study.

**Affective Commitment**

The Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) was used to measure affective commitment amongst sport event volunteers. Although Allen and Meyer’s development of the Three Component Model of Commitment (1990) measures normative and continuance commitment in addition to affective commitment, only the affective component of commitment was measured within the current study, thus only the Affective Commitment Scale was utilised. The Affective Commitment Scale posed a set of eight items to the respondent, in which they would indicate the level of which they agree or disagree to each of the statements on a 7-point Likert Scale. The instrument was modified by replacing the word ‘organisation’ in each item, with ‘Bicycle Victoria’, making it applicable to the current study.

Allen and Meyer’s (1990) Affective Commitment Scale has been widely applied within both paid employment and voluntary settings, and has high internal reliability and validity (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; McFarlane Shore &
Wayne, 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Ko, Price & Mueller, 1997 and Lee, Allen, Meyer & Rhee, 2001), indicating the instrument is a reliable measure of an individual’s affective commitment. The Affective Commitment Scale showed median internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) of .87, deeming it to be internally consistent and reliable (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Finally, the face validity of the Affective Commitment Scale used in this study was also established by assessing the appropriateness of each scale item with the volunteer team leaders used for the pilot study.

**Satisfaction**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al, 1967) was used to measure the overall job satisfaction of sport event volunteers. As the original form of the MSQ consists of 100 questions within 20 subscales, measuring all the facets of employee satisfaction, the shortened version of the MSQ was utilised to encourage participants to respond. The shortened version includes 20 items within four subscales (including satisfaction with working conditions [six items], leadership [two items], responsibility [six items] and extrinsic rewards [six items]). The scale measures both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction on a five point Likert scale, ranging in response from ‘very dissatisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’ (Fields, 2002). The intrinsic satisfaction scale includes 12 items that come from within the individual, including items that reflect their own ability and achievements, while the extrinsic satisfaction scale consists of eight items that are external to the individual, including the extent of satisfaction with company policies and working conditions (Weiss et al, 1967).

Due to its wide application within both paid employment and volunteer contexts, the MSQ shows high internal reliability and validity (Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu, 1990;
Stage Two Research Instrument – Semi-Structured Focus Group Interview Schedule

The second data collection instrument developed for the study was a semi-structured focus group interview schedule for the general volunteers (see Appendix 10). The purpose of the focus group interviews was to gather qualitative data on volunteer commitment, satisfaction and perceptions of organisational and supervisor support. The focus group interview schedule consisted of a series of questions, grouped into opening questions (asking the respondent to detail their role and their involvement at the event); introductory questions (relating to the participant’s connection to the event and BV); transition questions (relating to the participant’s commitment); key questions (exploring the concept of POS, PPS and the antecedents of POS); and ending questions (relating to the participant’s satisfaction and their understanding of the relationship between the concepts). The interview questions were developed on the basis of POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction theory, as reviewed within Chapter Two.
Stage Three Research Instrument – Semi-Structured Interview Schedule

The third and final data collection instrument developed for the study was a semi-structured telephone interview schedule for the volunteer supervisors (team leaders) (see Appendix 11). The focus of the team leader interviews was to gather qualitative data on volunteer commitment, satisfaction and perceptions of organisational support, as well as the PSS the team leaders believe they provide to the general volunteers. The interview schedule consisted of a series of questions, grouped into introductory questions (relating to the participant’s connection to the event and BV); transition questions (relating to the participant’s commitment); key questions (exploring the concept of POS, PPS and the antecedents of POS); and ending questions (relating to the participant’s satisfaction and their understanding of the relationship between the concepts). The interview questions were developed on the basis of POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction theory, as reviewed within Chapter Two.
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Prior to beginning data collection, ethics approval was granted to the researcher, with ethics approval code of 18/10PG.

Pilot Study

The data collection method involved distributing a questionnaire pack containing an A4 sized participant information letter, printed on La Trobe University letter head paper; an A5 sized booklet questionnaire, with a total of 3 pages; an A5 sized prize draw slip and a stamped, self-addressed envelope, to the sample whilst in attendance at the BV team leader information session. The pack was distributed to the sample to obtain feedback on the ordering of the questions, to gain insight into the necessity of providing an incentive, and for overall clarity and understanding of each document.

The participant information letter provided detailed information about the purpose of the study, as well as contact details of the researcher and the ethics committee. The prize draw slip invited the participant to provide their contact details to be entered into a prize draw to win a $500 Coles/Myer voucher. An incentive of a prize draw was used to encourage the response rate amongst the sample, and is often an influential technique to encourage the sample to respond (Mangione & Van Ness, 2009). Providing an incentive prize draw to those respondents who complete a questionnaire motivates people to participate if they expect to gain something rewarding from their efforts (Mangione & Van Ness, 2009), and was thus deemed appropriate for use within the study.
Stage One

Based upon the feedback provided as a result of the pilot study, the data collection method for Stage One involved distributing an online questionnaire via email to those volunteers within BV with email access.

The questionnaire was sent to the sample via the BV email data base. The email containing a link to the questionnaire was sent to the sample in collaboration with BV’s monthly newsletter. This email provided a detailed description of the purpose of the study and invited the volunteer to participate by completing the questionnaire via the attached link. This email was sent two days after the event (October 19th, 2010). A follow up email reminder, with a link to the questionnaire was sent to the sample 21 days after the initial questionnaire was sent (November 9th, 2010), inviting those volunteers who had not responded to the first email, to complete the questionnaire sent in the follow up email. Finally, a second reminder (a third email) was sent to the sample, with a link to the questionnaire, inviting those volunteers who had not responded to the first or second emails to complete the questionnaire. This final reminder was sent 49 days after the initial email was sent in order to increase the response rate as per Dillman (1978).

The reminder emails were sent to the entire sample, regardless of whether they had responded, due to the researcher having limited access to the database and thus being unable to determine which volunteers from the sample had previously responded. To avoid a double response from the sample, very clear instructions were included in the email, instructing those participants that have previously responded not to reply, and encouraging those who have not responded to complete the questionnaire. After 65 days of the initial email being sent (December 23rd, 2010), the online questionnaire
was closed, and data analysis began. The emails sent to the sample were done so in collaboration with BV.

The questionnaire sent to the sample was formatted to be suitable for online distribution, and took approximately 10 minutes to complete. The questionnaire was used to elicit responses regarding volunteer perceptions of organisational support and supervisor support, as well as their commitment to BV as an organisation and their satisfaction with their volunteer experience. The first page of the online questionnaire included information regarding the research, followed by individual sections involving a series of questions and statements investigating the participant’s previous volunteer experience; POS; commitment; satisfaction and PSS, before finishing with a series of personal questions. The final page of the questionnaire thanked the participant, and invited them to enter the prize draw, and offered them the opportunity for further research.

Stage Two
The data collection for Stage Two involved the implementation of eight focus group interviews, with between two and four participants in each, with a total of 25 participants. As previously explained, the participants were invited to take part in the focus group interviews via the online questionnaire. Those respondents who indicated they would be willing to participate in further research and who specified that they were a general volunteer, were included within the sampling frame for selection. The anonymity of the participant was no longer assured at this point as the participant was required to provide personal information in order to be contacted (this was only provided at the discretion of the participant). Once the sample had been selected from the sampling frame, individuals were contacted via phone or email requesting
participation within a focus group interview. Participants who agreed were allocated a focus group interview date which suited them, and were sent detailed information about the focus group interview via email.

Each focus group interview began with a welcome, an overview of the study and a discussion of the ground rules, before gaining the participants consent to be involved in the focus group interview. The focus group interviews were informal and semi-structured, led by a series of pre-determined questions with participants responding as they deemed suitable. Each respondent was encouraged to participate; however, there were individuals who dominated the discussion. This problem was overcome by the facilitator directing questions to those participants who had less input into the discussion, thus restricting the dominating participant and encouraging discussion from all focus group interview members. The problem of participants’ failure to attend the focus group also arose, in which there were either two, three or four participants in each focus group interview, rather than the desired five participants. This however presented a benefit, rather than a disadvantage, as mini focus group interviews with up to four participants are found to be easier to conduct, puts participants at ease and are preferable when the participants have a great deal to share about their experiences relating to the topic (Krueger & Casey, 2009). This enabled all participants to discuss their experiences at length, whilst keeping to the one and a half hour time limit. As a result, eight focus group interviews were conducted, rather than the six originally planned.

The focus group interview questions were designed to elicit responses of the nature of POS and PSS from a general volunteer’s view, as well as a discussion of their commitment to BV as an organisation, and their satisfaction with their volunteer
experience. The focus group interviews were conducted at La Trobe University’s city campus, located on Franklin Street in Melbourne, as well as at the West Geelong Anglers Club, located in Yuille Street, Geelong West, depending on volunteer locality.

Stage Three

In addition to focus group interviews, individual telephone interviews were administered, and tailored towards the volunteer team leaders. As outlined above, participants were invited to take part in an individual telephone interview via the online questionnaire, in which those respondents who indicated they would be willing to participate in further research, and who specified that they were a volunteer team leader, were selected for interviewing. The anonymity of the participant was no longer assured at this point, as the participant was required to provide personal information in order to be contacted to participate (this was only provided at the discretion of the participant).

Once the sampling frame was determined (the population of team leader volunteers who indicated they would like to participate), the potential participants were contacted via telephone to confirm participation in an interview and to arrange a call back interview date. Data collection for Stage Three involved 12 twenty minute telephone interviews with the volunteer team leaders from a population of 28, which commenced immediately after the completion of the event, and concluded during December, approximately two months after the event finish date. Each telephone interview began with a welcome, an overview of the study and a discussion of the ground rules, before gaining the participants consent to be involved in an interview.
The interviews were semi-structured, and were guided by a pre-determined set of questions.
TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Stage One

The quantitative data from each of the 190 completed questionnaires were entered into an Excel file, on a case by case basis. The data were then cleaned, with entire responses that had more than three missing values to be deleted from the final data set. Each case was assigned an identification number, with the final data set comprising 173 usable responses.

The data from each of the usable questionnaires were then edited, which consisted of reading each questionnaire to ensure clarity of the responses. Responses with open-ended answers or questions with ‘Other’ as a response selection were also edited to reduce confusion with spelling and grammar. For questions with an ‘Other’ option, the responses were grouped together to form a new item where there were multiple responses the same (for example, Question Three: How did you hear about the opportunity to volunteer with Bicycle Victoria? – Many people responded with ‘Rotary Club’ within the ‘Other’ option, which then became a new response).

The data were then systematically coded using a pre-designed code book. This required assigning a number to each response in order to analyse it through the use of a blank questionnaire as the ‘master coding questionnaire’. Once coded, the data were then categorised, which required grouping the items measuring a concept together. For example, all negatively worded questions that needed to be reverse coded, were reversed so that all answers within that question were in the same direction as the positively worded questions. Therefore, instead of the response being ‘Strongly Disagree’ (7) on the Likert Scale, it was actually ‘Strongly Agree’ (1). Once the items had been reversed, they were transferred into a Statistical Package for the Social
Sciences (SPSS) computer file, to allow for a frequency analysis to be performed, to compare with the non-reversed items to ensure consistency and accuracy. These scale items that were reversed then became new variables, using the recoded values.

Data were entered and saved into a SPSS computer file, in preparation for analysis. Each case was assigned a case number, with the variables listed along the top of the file. All text responses (open ended answers) were changed into numerical codes to allow for meaningful interpretation of the data. Data were then checked for errors and invalid codes through a frequency analysis. This required performing a frequency count on the range (minimum and maximum), mean, median and standard deviation on each variable in order to ensure there were no skewed responses, and that there were an accurate number of responses and items (for example, that there were 7 points within the Likert Scale items, not 6 or 8, which would indicate that the data would have been entered incorrectly). When errors were encountered, the original data set (as downloaded from the online questionnaire software) was consulted to either confirm or correct the error before further analysis could proceed.

Mean scores for the sample were calculated using descriptive statistical analysis, in order to describe the sample, as categorised as either a general volunteer, or a volunteer team leader. This analysis identified the number and percentage of respondents within the study, as based upon their demographic characteristics, including gender, age, highest level of education completed, employment status and occupation. A descriptive statistical analysis (based upon volunteer category) was also performed to gain a description of the respondents past volunteer participation and how the respondent was presented with the opportunity to volunteer.
Descriptive statistical analysis was also performed on each of the Likert Scale items (POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction). This analysis provided the mean, standard deviation and skewness for each scale item, in total, and based upon the volunteer category within which they identified themselves. In order to examine the scale items for reliability, a scale reliability analysis using Cronbach’s Alpha was performed on all scale items.

An independent t-test will tell the researcher if there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for two different groups. As there were two categories of volunteers within the study (team leaders and general volunteers), as well as two genders, a compare means analysis, in the form of independent sample t-tests, was performed to determine whether there was a significant difference in the response from the different groups of volunteers. The process was performed order to compare the means for each question between volunteer category and gender, and to identify significant mean differences between the responses of the volunteer team leaders and the general volunteers, as well as males and females within the sample.

Independent sample t-tests are useful when there are two groups (as in the case of the current study) to be compared; this procedure enables the researcher to compare the means between two groups, based on their responses to continuous variables. To perform an independent sample t-test, the groups that are being compared must not be related; they must be two different, or independent groups of people (for example, male and female) in order to compare their score for each item. The information is collected at one point, but amongst two different groups of people, with the categorical variable (male or female) acting as the independent variable, and the continuous variable as the dependent variable (Pallant, 2011).
When performing an independent t-test procedure, the researcher must first check assumptions to make sure their data is suitable to run the test. First, the researcher needs to determine whether the variation of scores for the two groups is the same. This can be done by assessing the significance level of Levene’s test; if it is .05 or less, then the variance are not equal. Likewise, if Levene’s test is .05 or greater, then the variances are assumed equal (Pallant, 2011). If the variance is not the same, then the test may be performed by not assuming equal variances between the groups (Pallant, 2011), which was the case in the current study. As the significant level of Levene’s test was less than .05 for the volunteer categories, equal variances were not assumed, allowing the t-test to still be performed and thus producing accurate information.

Once significant relationships were identified between variables, correlation analysis was then performed in order to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the variables (Pallant, 2011). The correlation coefficient gleaned from each procedure represents a quantitative value that describes the relationship between two or more variables. Correlations may be either positive or negative. A positive correlation occurs when the value of both variables entered into the equation either increase in a linear direction or the value of both variables decrease in a linear direction, whereas a negative correlation occurs when the value of one variable increases and the value of the second variable decreases (Andrew, Pedersen & McEvoy, 2011). Correlation analysis is useful in addressing research questions that propose an independent variable has either a positive or negative effect on a dependent variable (Andrew et al, 2011), as is the case in the current study. While a valuable technique to use in examining the relationships between variables, researchers must be mindful that their sample size is sufficient to accurately perform the analysis, to avoid generation of false results. With 173 cases within the current
study, the sample size was considered sufficient to perform correlation analysis. Additionally, researcher must be aware that correlation analysis does not necessarily indicate causality between two variables. While it is practical in determining the strength and direction of a relationship, it cannot be relied on to conclude that one variable causes a certain outcome in another variable (for example, we cannot assume that satisfaction causes commitment, based on correlation analysis alone). Therefore, it is important to perform additional statistical analyses, such as standard multiple regression analysis, to examine these relationships more comprehensively.

Factor analysis, in the form of principal component analysis, was performed on the scale items for POS, PSS, commitment and satisfaction. Principal components analysis was performed in order to test the dimensionality of the scales used in the study, and to measure the underlying factors of each scale. It is a useful tool when testing a theory based on prior research (Andrews et al, 2011).

To perform principal components analysis, the data first needs to be assessed as to whether it is suitable for the procedure. Two main issues must be considered in determining whether the data set is suitable and that the procedure will accurately reflect the data: the size of the sample and the strength of the relationship amongst variables (Pallant, 2011). Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that a sample size of at least 150 cases is sufficient to perform factor analysis, as long as variables have high loadings (above .80). Evidently, all scales used within the study were tested, and yielded high loading, confirming that the data set is sufficient in size to perform the analysis. Additionally, Jackson (2003) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest researchers may also calculate whether their sample size is sufficient by calculating the ratio of cases to each scale item, in which a ratio of either 5 or 10 cases for each
item to be factor analysed may be sufficient. Within the current study, the ratio of cases was sufficient for each scale item, indicating that principal components analysis was suitable to be performed on the data set.

The second test to be performed to determine the data is suitable for principal component analysis is to assess the strength of the relationship amongst the variables. Performing correlation analysis on the variables to be tested will help in determining the suitability; if the correlation coefficient is greater than .3, then it is considered suitable for factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Statistical measures are also generated through SPSS to help to assess the suitability of the data; Bartlett’s test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Pallant, 2011). If the data is suitable, then Bartlett’s test should be significant (above .05) and the KMO index, which ranges from 0 to 1, should be a minimum of .6 to produce a good factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Once the data is deemed suitable to perform factor analysis, the number of underlying factors that best represent the set of variables must be identified. This may be done by performing a scree test, which is a plot in descending order of magnitude of the eigenvalues (which are calculated and used in deciding how many factors to extract in the overall factor analysis), and is useful to assist the researcher in visualising the relative importance of the factors. Producing a scree plot involves plotting each of the eigenvalues of the factors, and examining the plot to identify the point at which the shape of the curve changes direction and becomes horizontal. All factors above the break in the plot should be retained, as these are the factors that most contribute to the explanation of the variance in the data set (Pallant, 2011).
To examine the relationships set out in the research questions, standard multiple regression analysis was performed on the quantitative data. This technique was used to predict the dependent variable from a group of independent variables (Andrew et al, 2011), based on the expected outcomes discussed in Chapter One (see page 33). Each independent variable was analysed individually on the basis of their ability to considerably predict the dependent variable, allowing an analysis of the relationship between the variables, and to determine what variable is a stronger predictor of the dependent variable (Andrew et al, 2011).

Standard multiple regression analysis was performed in order to determine the strength of the independent variables in predicting the outcome of the dependent variable. As such, standard multiple regression analysis was performed using satisfaction as the dependent variable, and POS, PSS and commitment as the independent variables. Standard multiple regression analysis was also performed using commitment as the dependent variable, and satisfaction, POS and PSS as the independent variables.

Standard multiple regression analysis was deemed appropriate for use within this study, as it can be useful when making predictions based on the strength of relationship between variables; there were also a sufficient number of subjects for the number of independent variables that are involved in the model (Williams & Wragg, 2004). This technique was used rather than a simple linear regression analysis, as the independent variables were fixed and were measured without error, and the relationships between the independent and dependent variables were linear (see Pearson correlation analysis on pages 149 – 153). As such, standard multiple regression analysis was deemed more applicable to the data set, than simple linear
regression analysis, which does not require the independent variables to be fixed, or the relationship between the independent and dependent variables to be linear (Andrew et al, 2011). Additionally, structural equation modelling (SEM), which is also useful in testing complex relationships between variables (McDonald & Ringo, 2002), was deemed not suitable for use within the current study due to an insufficient number of cases in the model for the procedure to be performed accurately. As such, Pearson’s correlation analysis, and standard multiple regression analysis were the techniques deemed most appropriate for use within the current study.

**Stages Two and Three**

The data from the focus group interviews and individual telephone interviews with volunteers were audio recorded and transcribed into separate files for each session. In total, approximately 95,000 words of data were transcribed for the eight focus group interviews, and approximately 36,000 words of data were transcribed for the 12 interviews. Each transcript was printed and read thoroughly in order to identify the emergent themes and issues relating to the research questions, and to develop an overall understanding of the content.

Content analysis was performed on the data from both the focus group interviews and the individual telephone interviews, using a manual decision support system. The focus group interviews and individual telephone interviews were semi-structured, with pre-planned questions, which enabled the researcher to explore certain specific topics, set out within the research criteria. Content analysis was also performed in order to uncover the sub-themes within the already identified broad themes, for subsequent analysis of the data gathered. For example, respondents were asked the question ‘How does Bicycle Victoria support you as a volunteer?’ Although an open ended question,
which elicits a wide range of responses, the researcher automatically gathers a list and description of the different ways the volunteers were supported by Bicycle Victoria based on their perceptions (content analysis), focusing solely on the issue of organisational support (semi-structured qualitative analysis).

Using content analysis, the researcher identified, coded and categorised the primary patterns in the raw data, allowing specific themes to emerge. The theme coding process involved grouping similar responses from the respondents, by reorganising the data according to conceptual themes recognised. The theme coding system involved allocating a different colour for each emergent theme. Twenty-eight initial descriptive codes were established prior to data collection, as based on the research questions the conceptual framework of the study and the key variables. Additional codes were established as the focus group interviews and individual interviews were conducted, transcribed and initially coded. These additional codes were found to be more accurate in describing the data. As such, certain initial codes that were established prior to data collection were developed and refined as the analysis continued. This refinement consisted of segmenting codes which attracted excessive data into sub-codes, as well as removing codes from the analysis process which did not attract any data, in order to aid the interpretation of the data.

Separate identities to each emergent theme were established, and constant comparative analysis was performed in order to separate the themes (Cavana et al, 2001). During this process important themes were identified, and each new theme was compared with the previously identified themes to ensure they were different. This process ensures each new theme identified adds further understanding of the issue being investigated (Cavana et al, 2001).
A manual decision support system was utilised during the qualitative data analysis process, in which the researcher highlighted each new theme as it emerged in the raw data being examined. Each highlighted theme was then given a theme code, which was written in a data index, enabling the researcher to record the list of themes (Cavana et al, 2001). Each highlighted set of themes (for example, organisational support) were organised further into separate sub-themes (for example, organisational support was segmented into supervisor, peer, organisational and subordinate support), with each new sub-theme being divided even further (for example, the emergent themes within supervisor support were identified as communication/relaying information, appreciation and general assistance). These were then collated into separate Word document files so that each theme identified had a collection of quotes from the respondents.

Thematic analysis enabled the researcher to look for themes that were present in the whole set of focus groups and interviews, allowing a framework to be created that makes comparisons and contrasts between the different participants (Gomm, 2008). In addition to thematic content analysis, the process of grounded theory was employed, which provided a flexible method for analysing the qualitative data. Grounded theory, which involves the simultaneous collection and analysis of data, encourages the researcher to compare each data set collected with subsequent data sets, throughout the analytic process. This may be done through the use of data coding, identification of themes and data validation (Andrew et al, 2011), and when used in conjunction with thematic content analysis, provides a very solid analysis.

The analysis of qualitative data is often open to interpretation and debate, leading to issues surrounding bias interpretation on behalf of the researcher, thus questioning the
validity of the qualitative data collected (Gratton & Jones, 2010). However, there were a number of techniques employed within the study to validate the interpretation and to ensure the trustworthiness of the data collected. Firstly, negative cases and alternative explanations were considered to not only focus on identifying cases that support the researchers’ ideas or explanations, but to also identify and explain cases that contradict (Gratton & Jones, 2010). Additionally, an audit trail was maintained, where the process, in which the research was conducted, as well as the key decisions that had informed the research process, was documented. This included extensive descriptions of the setting and participants, the context within which the data were collected, and a clear description of the rationale for any decisions made regarding the data collection or analysis (Gratton & Jones, 2010). Finally, triangulation was used to cross reference the data from the qualitative stage with the quantitative data, to ensure that what was interpreted from the qualitative research, was in fact, what was being said by the participants; triangulation is a valuable means of ensuring the research process and analysis was valid and reliable.

The data analysis techniques employed can be seen to be appropriate for studies involving sport event volunteers. MacLean & Hamm (2007) adopted a mixed method approach (quantitative and qualitative), using correlation analysis and linear regression analysis to examine the relationship between the motivation, commitment and intentions to remain of golf event volunteers. Similarly, Love (2009) used both correlation analysis and linear regression analysis to test the relationship between event volunteers’ motivation to volunteer, factors representing event context and volunteer retention. Conclusively, both correlation analysis and regression analysis are deemed appropriate to examine the relationship between variables of a sport event volunteer study, as they have previously been satisfactorily employed.
SUMMARY

This chapter examined the procedures implemented in exploring the research questions. The research design was outlined, and justification of the sampling selection methods discussed. The instrumentation utilised during data collection procedures was explained, including an overview of the pilot study. Finally, the processes used in the treatment of the data were explained. The following chapters present and discuss the results from the questionnaire, focus group interviews and individual telephone interviews, and draw conclusions in relation to the research questions. Implications and recommendations for future research are also discussed in the final chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Chapter four presents the results of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures that were used in exploring the following research questions:

**Research Question 1:**

What is the nature of the POS for sport event volunteers?

**Research Question 2:**

What is the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, affective commitment to the organisation and satisfaction with their experience?

**Research Question 3:**

What is the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of supervisor support, affective commitment to the organisation and satisfaction with their experience?

This chapter is structured in three sections, to reflect the three stages of the research. For each stage, a description of the sample is provided, before presenting the results of the quantitative analyses, including the correlation analysis, regression analysis, factor analysis and reliability analysis; as well as presenting the results of the qualitative analysis.
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

STAGE ONE

Description of the Sample

The sample for Stage One (self-administered questionnaire) comprised volunteers of the 2010 ATB event who had provided BV with an email account. The following section presents the demographic characteristics and volunteer involvement characteristics of the sample.

Descriptive Statistics of Subjects Studied

Frequency analysis, in the form of cross tabulation analysis was performed on the raw demographic data, in order to provide a description of the sample. The demographic characteristics of the 173 respondents to the self-administered questionnaire are summarised in Table 4.1 (see page 134). The majority of respondents (n = 96, 55.5%) were male, and above the age of 50 years (n = 93, 53.7%) with 25 per cent of the sample between the ages of 51 and 60 years (n = 44), and 28 per cent above the age of 61 years (n = 49). The sample had an average education above that of primary level, with a significant portion (n = 84, 48.6%) having completed university studies. The majority of the sample (n = 74, 42.8%) were employed full time, with a large percentage of the respondents indicating they were senior or retired (n = 49, 28.3%).
Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Self-Administered Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 21 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 years and above</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some secondary school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed secondary school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some technical, commercial, trade certificate or apprenticeship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed technical, commercial, trade certificate or apprenticeship</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university or other tertiary degree/diploma</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed or other tertiary degree/diploma</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior or retired</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 173)
The volunteer involvement characteristics of the 173 respondents to the self-administered questionnaire are summarised in Table 4.2 (see page 136). A majority (n = 151, 87.3%) indicated they were general volunteers, with the majority of respondents (n = 159, 91.9%) also being either first time volunteers (n = 79, 45.7%) or having volunteered at three or fewer Bicycle Victoria activities (n = 80, 46.2%) in the past 12 months. A minority (n = 5, 2.9%) of the sample indicated they had volunteered at seven or more Bicycle Victoria activities in the past 12 months. In terms of volunteering with organisations other than Bicycle Victoria, the majority of the sample (n = 105, 60.7%) had either volunteered at one other organisation (n = 53, 30.6%) or had not volunteered with any organisation other than Bicycle Victoria (n = 52, 30.1%) in the past 12 months; only four per cent of the sample had volunteered at five or more organisations other than Bicycle Victoria in the past 12 months (n = 7). Volunteers were notified of the opportunity to volunteer at the ATB event either due to past participation with Bicycle Victoria (either in a voluntary or paying member capacity) (n = 70, 40.5%), or through the internet or Bicycle Victoria’s website (n = 55, 31.8%), with the media (television, newspaper, magazines, radio), only accounting for 2 per cent of the awareness among the sample (n = 4).
Table 4.2 Involvement of Self-Administered Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer team leader</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General volunteer</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous volunteer activity with BV</td>
<td>None, first time volunteer</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Past 12 months)</td>
<td>1 – 3 times</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – 6 times</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – 9 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or more times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Organisations</td>
<td>Other than BV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Past 12 months)</td>
<td>No other organisation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 organisation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 organisations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 organisations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 organisations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 or more organisations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the volunteers heard about the opportunity to volunteer</td>
<td>Internet or BV website</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media (TV, radio, newspaper, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past participation at BV</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invitation to participate by BV</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend or family member</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Participants could select as many as applied
(N = 173)
Scale Reliabilities

**POS**

POS was measured by asking respondents to indicate on a 7 point Likert Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) their perceptions of how Bicycle Victoria supported them as a volunteer, for each of the eight items of the POS Scale (Eisenberger et al, 1986). The mean scores for each item and a mean POS score is highlighted in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Mean Scores for all Respondents to the Perceived Organisational Support Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BV values my contribution to its wellbeing</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV shows very little concern for me (R)</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV would ignore any complaint from me (R)</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV cares about my general satisfaction as a volunteer</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV takes pride in my accomplishments as a volunteer</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV fails to appreciate any extra effort from me (R)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, BV would fail to notice (R)</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean POS</strong></td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 173)

*NB:* (R) indicates the statement has been reversed

*NB:* The response range is from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”.

*Key:* SD = Standard Deviation; BV = Bicycle Victoria.

Reliability analysis, in the form of Cronbach’s Alpha was performed on the Likert scale items in order to assess the reliability of measures used within the study. When a variable produces a Cronbach’s Alpha of less than .60, this is considered to be poor, and should not be used within a study, as it is not reliable. Reliabilities of .70 are considered acceptable, and those over .80 are considered good and reliable to use.
within a study. Ultimately the closer the Cronbach’s Alpha is to 1.0, the more reliable the measure (DeVellis, 1991).

When viewing the Cronbach’s Alpha for the POS scale items, it is evident that the reliability of the measure is considered good, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .81. This figure compared favourably with the internal consistency assessed by the original authors’, which produced Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .97 (Eisenberger et al, 1986).

Additionally, factor analysis, in the form of principal components analysis was performed on the scale items in order to measure the underlying factors of each scale. Factor analysis examines the way in which each respondent answered every item within a scale, and compares this with the way all other respondents answered the same items within a scale. Factor analysis then makes suggestions that certain items within a scale are clustered together, to determine the underlying factors (Cavana et al, 2001). Principal components analysis was used in the current study to establish construct validity of the POS scale and subsequently every other scale (see Appendix 12 for the data output for the factor analysis of all scale items).

The eight items of the POS scale were subjected to principal components analysis, using SPSS version 18. Prior to performing principal components analysis, the data were analysed for suitability for factor analysis. Inspection of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .91, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Pallant, 2011), and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance at .0, indicating the data were appropriate for factor analysis. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of one component exceeding the recommended value of 1 for this test, with
an Eigenvalue of 4.99, explaining 62 per cent of the variance. This was further supported by the results of the scree plot, which upon inspection, revealed a clear break after the first component. Finally, the component matrix extracted only one component, indicating that it only loads strongly on the first component, and not any of the other components, which reveals there is only one underlying factor within the POS scale.
**PSS**

PSS was measured by asking respondents to indicate on a 7 point Likert Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) their perceptions of how their direct supervisor supported them as volunteers, for each of the eight items of the PSS Scale (Eisenberger et al, 2002). The mean scores for each item and a mean PSS score are highlighted in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4 Mean Scores for all Respondents to the Perceived Supervisor Support Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor shows very little concern for me (R)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me (R)</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor values my contribution to their wellbeing</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, my supervisor would fail to notice (R)</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me (R)</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction as a volunteer</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments as a volunteer</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean PSS</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 173)

**NB:** (R) indicates the statement has been reversed

**NB:** The response range is from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”.

**Key:** SD = Standard Deviation; BV = Bicycle Victoria.

When testing the reliability of the PSS scale items, it is evident that the reliability of the measure is considered good, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .93. This figure compared favourably with the internal consistency assessed by the original authors, which produced Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .90 (Eisenberger et al, 2002).

The eight items of the PSS Scale were also subjected to principal components analysis, using SPSS version 18. Prior to performing principal components analysis,
the data were analysed for suitability for factor analysis. Inspection of the KMO value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Pallant, 2011), and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance at .0, indicating the data were appropriate for factor analysis. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of two components exceeding the recommended value of 1 for this test, with an Eigenvalue of 5.45 and 1.05, and explaining 68 per cent and 13 per cent respectively. Due to the presence of two underlying factors, an inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the first component. Upon observation, it was decided to retain one component for further investigation. This was further supported by the results of the component matrix, which although extracting two components, only the first component loads strongly when compared with the other component, revealing there is one dominant underlying factor within the PSS Scale.
**Affective Commitment**

Affective commitment was measured by asking respondents to indicate on a 7 point Likert Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) how committed they are towards Bicycle Victoria as an organisation, for each of the eight items of the Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The mean scores for each item and a mean affective commitment score is highlighted in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5 Mean Scores for all Respondents to the Affective Commitment Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy discussing BV with people outside it</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my volunteering career in BV</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do feel like “part of the family” at BV</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to BV (R)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel “emotionally attached” to BV (R)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel as if BV problems are my own</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I could easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to BV (R)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Affective Commitment                              4.47 1.44 1 7

*(N = 173)*

**NB:** (R) indicates the statement has been reversed

**NB:** The response range is from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”.

**Key:** SD = Standard Deviation; BV = Bicycle Victoria.

When testing the reliability of the Affective Commitment Scale items, it is evident that the reliability of the measure is considered good, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .87. This figure compared favourably with the internal consistency assessed by the original authors, which also produced Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .87 (Allen & Meyer, 1990).
The eight items of the Affective Commitment Scale were also subjected to principal components analysis, using SPSS version 18. Prior to performing principal components analysis, the data were analysed for suitability for factor analysis. Inspection of the KMO value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Pallant, 2011), and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance at .0, indicating the data was appropriate for factor analysis. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of one component exceeding the recommended value of 1 for this test, with an Eigenvalue of 4.42, explaining 55 per cent of the variance. This was further supported by the results of the scree plot, which upon inspection, revealed a clear break after the first component. Finally, the component matrix extracted only one component, indicating that it only loads strongly on the first component, and not any of the other components, which reveals there is only one underlying factor within the Affective Commitment Scale.
Satisfaction

Descriptive statistical analysis was performed on the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale. Satisfaction was measured by asking respondents to indicate on a 5 point Likert Scale: 1 (strongly dissatisfied) to 5 (strongly satisfied) how satisfied they were with their experience, for each of the 20 items of the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale (Weiss et al, 1967). The mean scores for each item and a mean satisfaction score are highlighted in Table 4.6 (see page 145). While scores from the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale may be tested and analysed as separate subscales that measure intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction, the scores may also be computed into one overall level of satisfaction score. For the purpose of this study, as the scale was used to explore underlying dimensions of satisfaction, the scores were calculated and analysed overall, and not within separate subscales. This was to provide greater clarity for the respondents, and allowed the researcher to collect data pertaining to intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction of the volunteer by using a single instrument, thus providing a measure of overall satisfaction.
Table 4.6 Mean Scores for all Respondents to the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgement</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to different things from time to time</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be “somebody” in the community</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my boss handles his or her subordinates</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pay and the amount of work that I do</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance for advancement on this job</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 173)

NB: The response range is from (1) “strongly dissatisfied” to (5) “strongly satisfied”.

When testing the reliability of the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale items, it is evident that the reliability of the measure is considered good, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .92. This figure compared favourably with the internal consistency assessed by the original authors, which produced Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .90 (Weiss et al, 1967).
The 20 items of the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale were also subjected to principal components analysis, using SPSS version 18. Prior to performing principal components analysis, the data were analysed for suitability for factor analysis. Inspection of the KMO value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Pallant, 2011), and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance at .0, indicating the data was appropriate for factor analysis. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of four components exceeding the recommended value of 1 for this test, with an Eigenvalue of 8.43, 1.54, 1.23 and 1.12 and explaining 42 per cent, 8 per cent, 6 per cent and 6 per cent of the variance respectively. Due to the presence of four underlying factors, an inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the first component. Upon observation, it was decided to retain one component for further investigation. This was further supported by the results of the component matrix, which although extracting four components, only the first component loads strongly, when compared with the other three components, revealing there is one dominant underlying factor within the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale.
Assessing Normality

Before performing statistical measures, such as Pearson’s correlation analysis and regression analysis, the data were checked for normality in order to determine the appropriateness of the tests (Pallant, 2011). The normality was assessed by producing and visually scanning a Histogram and a Normal Q-Q Plot for each key variable, as well as assessing the distribution of scores through more exact tests such as looking at the skewness of the data (Pallant, 2011).

When viewing the Histogram for commitment, a normal bell curve is presented, suggesting normality of the data; 86 per cent of the data falls between two standard deviations of the mean. This is supported by an inspection of the normal probability plot (Normal Q-Q Plot), where we can see that the observed value for each score is plotted against the expected value from the normal distribution. Evidently, a reasonably straight line is presented, which suggests a normal distribution. Skewness of the data was also assessed, with skewness for commitment of negative .252. While slightly negatively skewed, this figure was not significant, confirming the normality of the data.

When viewing the Histogram for satisfaction, although slightly negatively skewed, a normal bell curve is presented, suggesting normality of the data; 92 per cent of the data falls between two standard deviations of the mean. This is supported by an inspection of the normal probability plot (Normal Q-Q Plot), where we can see that a reasonably straight line is presented, which again suggests a normal distribution. The skewness of the data for satisfaction was negative .223, which although slightly negatively skewed, this figure was not significant, confirming the normality of the data. As commitment and satisfaction are the dependent variables identified in the
study (as a result of the correlation analysis), procedures such as Pearson’s correlation analysis and standard multiple regression analysis were deemed appropriate to perform on the data set, as normality was assumed.

The independent variables of POS and PSS were also assessed for normality to ensure the data were appropriate for correlation and regression analyses. When viewing the Histogram for both POS and PSS, we can see that the data are quite negatively skewed, with scores clustered around the high end of the graph. Although the data are negatively skewed, the data are deemed suitable for analysis, as the majority of the data falls between two standard deviations of the mean (82% for POS and 93% for PSS). This is supported by an inspection of the normal probability plot (Normal Q-Q Plot) for both POS and PSS, where we can see that a reasonably straight line is presented, which again suggests the data are suitable. As both POS and PSS are identified as the independent variables in the study, the skewness of the data will not affect the outcome of the correlation or regression analyses; however, this must be recognised as a limitation of the study, in that the data for POS and PSS were negatively skewed.
Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis was performed on the scale scores to determine the strength and direction of the linear relationships between the variables. The analysis was performed on the total sample, as well as on the sample as split by volunteer category and gender. To determine the strength of the relationship between variables, it is important to observe the \( \rho \) value. This value may range from \(-1.0\) to \(1.0\), whereas a correlation of \(0\) indicates there is no relationship between the variables, a value of \(1.0\) denotes a perfect positive correlation and a value of \(-1.0\) indicates a perfect negative correlation (Pallant, 2011). The strength of a correlation may be determined using the following guidelines, in which a small correlation is measured by a value range of \(0.10\) to \(0.29\); a medium correlation is measured by a value range of \(0.30\) to \(0.49\) and a large correlation is measured by a value range of \(0.50\) to \(1.0\) (Pallant, 2011). When determining whether a correlation is significant, the Sig. (2-tailed) figure must be observed. A correlation is deemed significant when the figure is between \(0.05\) and negative \(0.05\). In contrast, when the figure is above \(0.05\) or below negative \(0.05\), this indicates there is no significance associated with the correlation, thus no relationship (Veal, 2005).

The relationship between POS (measured by the SPOS), PSS (measured by the SPSS), affective commitment (measured by the Affective Commitment Scale) and satisfaction (measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale) was investigated using the Pearson correlation coefficient, as presented in Table 4.7 (see page 150). Analysis indicates there are significant positive relationships between the following variables, all of which were deemed to be of large strength:

- POS and PSS \((0.558)\)
- POS and commitment \((0.570)\)
• POS and satisfaction (.559)
• PSS and commitment (.525)
• PSS and satisfaction (.689)
• commitment and satisfaction (.599)

This implies that high levels of POS are associated with high levels of PSS, commitment and satisfaction; high levels of PSS are associated with high levels of commitment and satisfaction and high levels of commitment are associated with high levels of satisfaction.

Table 4.7 Pearson Correlation Analysis between POS, PSS, Commitment and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total POS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.689**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.599**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

The relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction as divided by volunteer category, was investigated using the Pearson correlation coefficient, as presented in Table 4.8 (see page 152). When divided by volunteer category, concerning the Volunteer Team leaders, analysis indicates there are significant positive relationships between the following variables, all of which were deemed to be of large strength:

• POS and PSS (.871)
• POS and satisfaction (.799)
• PSS and commitment (.696)
• PSS and satisfaction (.811)
• commitment and satisfaction (.645),
suggesting that high levels of POS are associated with high levels of PSS and satisfaction; and high levels of PSS are associated with high levels of commitment and satisfaction and high levels of commitment are associated with high levels of satisfaction. While there is a significant positive relationship between POS and commitment, due to the sample size, this is not a statistically significant finding.

In regards to the General Volunteer category, analysis indicates there are significant positive relationships between the following variables, all of which were deemed to be of large strength:
• POS and PSS (.538)
• POS and commitment (.564)
• POS and satisfaction (.548)
• PSS and commitment (.505)
• PSS and satisfaction (.674)
• commitment and satisfaction (.595)

This implies that high levels of POS are associated with high levels of PSS, commitment and satisfaction; high levels of PSS are associated with high levels of commitment and satisfaction and high levels of commitment are associated with high levels of satisfaction.
The relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction as divided by gender was investigated using the Pearson correlation coefficient, as presented in Table 4.9 (see page 153). When divided by gender, concerning the Male sample, analysis indicates there are significant positive relationships between:

- POS and PSS (medium strength, r = .463)
- POS and commitment (large strength, r = .540)
- POS and satisfaction (large strength, r = .567)
- PSS and commitment (medium strength, r = .438)
- PSS and satisfaction (large strength, r = .667)
- commitment and satisfaction (large strength, r = .668),

suggesting that high levels of POS are associated with high levels of commitment and satisfaction; medium levels of PSS are associated with medium levels of commitment and POS; high levels of PSS are associated with high levels of satisfaction and high levels of commitment are associated with high levels of satisfaction.

---

**Table 4.8 Pearson Correlation Analysis between POS, PSS, Commitment and Satisfaction by Volunteer Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>1. Total POS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td>.589*</td>
<td>.799**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Total PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.696**</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Total Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.645**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Total Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Volunteer</td>
<td>1. Total POS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Total PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.505**</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Total Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Total Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
In regards to the Female sample, analysis indicates there are significant positive relationships between the following variables, all of which were deemed to be of large strength:

- POS and PSS (.681)
- POS and commitment (.616)
- POS and satisfaction (.547)
- PSS and commitment (.631)
- PSS and satisfaction (.716)
- commitment and satisfaction (.536),

which implies that high levels of POS are associated with high levels of PSS, commitment and satisfaction; high levels of PSS are associated with high levels of commitment and satisfaction and high levels of commitment are associated with high levels of satisfaction.

Table 4.9 Pearson Correlation Analysis between POS, PSS, Commitment and Satisfaction by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1. Total POS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.567**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Total PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.667**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Total Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.668**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Total Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1. Total POS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.681**</td>
<td>.616**</td>
<td>.547**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Total PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.631**</td>
<td>.716**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Total Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Total Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**
Regression Analysis

Following a Pearson correlation analysis, which indicates the strength and direction of a relationship between variables, standard multiple regression analysis was performed to determine how much the variance of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables (Cavana et al, 2001). Each independent variable was entered into the equation concurrently, and evaluated in terms of its predictive power, amongst that of all the other independent variables. The investigation explored possible relations as developed in the literature through correlations. While the research questions set out to explore the relationships between the key variables, predictions as to what these relationships may entail were made based on assumptions made from the literature review. This resulted in an evaluation of the results of the Pearson correlation analysis, in order to identify possible dependent and independent variables to include in the equation, based on the existing literature.

Affective Commitment

Standard multiple regression analysis was used to assess the ability of the control measures, including satisfaction, POS and PSS to predict levels of commitment, as presented in Table 4.10 (see page 156). The key concepts within the study were included to address the research questions.

When observing the R Square figure (.446) this indicates that 45 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable (commitment) is explained by the predictors, including satisfaction, POS and PSS. The model in this case reaches statistical significance, as the regression value equals 0 (Sig. = .000), indicating the sample size is sufficient to produce statistically significant analysis. The Beta value under the Standardised Coefficients column indicates that the independent variable satisfaction
(.347) makes the strongest individual contribution in explaining the dependent variable commitment. POS (.315) also made a strong contribution with PSS (.110) seen to have very little contribution. When viewing the Sig. column, POS and satisfaction both make a significant contribution in explaining the dependent variable, while PSS is seen to be insignificant. The Part value in the Correlations column indicates how much of the total variance in the dependent variable commitment is uniquely explained by the independent variables (when the value is squared, and presented as a percentage). Evidently, satisfaction explains 6 per cent of the variance of commitment with POS also explaining 6 per cent of the variance.

Finally, both the Partial correlation and the Zero-Order correlation describe the linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables, while controlling for the effects of the additional independent variables (when the value is squared and presented as a percentage); the purpose is to find the unique variance between two variables while eliminating the variance from a third variable. When observing the Partial correlation value, satisfaction explains 9 per cent of the variance of commitment with POS explaining 10 per cent of the variance when all other variables are controlled for. When reporting the Zero-Order correlation, satisfaction explains 36 per cent of the variation, with POS explaining 32 per cent and PSS explaining 27 per cent of the variance.
### Table 4.10 Standard Multiple Regression Analysis using Commitment as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Part Correlation</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Zero-Order Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(N = 173)*
Satisfaction

Standard multiple regression analysis was performed using satisfaction as the dependent variable, and POS, PSS and commitment as the independent (predictor) variables, as detailed in Table 4.11 (see page 158). The key concepts within the study (commitment, POS and PSS) were included to address the research questions.

When looking at the R Square figure (.564) this indicates that 56 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (satisfaction) is explained by the predictors, including POS, PSS and commitment. It is evident that the model in this case reaches statistical significance, as the regression value equals 0 (Sig. = .000), indicating the sample size is sufficient to produce statistically significant analysis. The Beta value under the Standardised Coefficients column indicates that the independent variable PSS (.465) makes the strongest individual contribution in explaining the dependent variable satisfaction. Commitment (.273) is also seen to contribute significantly. POS (.143), while found to be significant in predicting satisfaction, it was less so than the other predictors. When observing the Sig. column, it is evident that all three predictors make a significant contribution in explaining the dependent variable.

The Part Correlations value indicates how much of the total variance in the dependent variable is uniquely explained by the independent variables (when the value is squared, and presented as a percentage). PSS explains 13 per cent of the variance in satisfaction, commitment explains 5 per cent of the variance and POS explains 1 per cent of the variance. Finally, both the Partial correlation and the Zero-Order correlation describe the linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables, while controlling for the effects of the additional independent variables (when the value is squared and presented as a percentage). When observing the Partial
correlation value, PSS explains 24 per cent of the variance of satisfaction, with commitment explaining 9 per cent of the variance and POS explaining 3 per cent of the variance, when all other variables are controlled for. When reporting the Zero-Order correlation, PSS explains 47 per cent of the variation, with commitment explaining 36 per cent and POS explaining 31 per cent of the variance.

Table 4.11 Standard Multiple Regression Analysis using Satisfaction as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Part Correlation</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Zero-Order Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 173)
QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Explanation of themes in the context of the study

Before presenting the qualitative data for Stages Two and Three of the study, the themes identified in the data will be explained within the context of the study.

**POS** – Within the context of the study, POS is the volunteers’ perception of how BV supported the volunteer in carrying out their role, how BV cared for the volunteer, and how BV appreciated and recognised the volunteers’ efforts. This may be before the event (for example, at information sessions or through prior contact), during the event (while performing their allocated role), or after the event (for example, at thank-you receptions or through follow up contact).

**Fairness (Organisational Justice)** – Within the context of the study, fairness (organisational justice), referred to the way the volunteer feels they are treated by BV; whether they feel they are treated in a fair and just manner, or otherwise. This fairness is in relation to the way the volunteer performs their role, as well as the general treatment of the volunteer by BV, in relation to other volunteers (for example, whether there was preference given to one subset of volunteer over another, or all volunteers were treated equally).

**Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions** – Within the context of the study, favourable rewards and task conditions referred to either tangible or intangible gains provided by BV, which the volunteer felt were positive and rewarding, and that benefited the volunteer personally. Task conditions were those practices put in place by BV, that would make the volunteers’ role easier to perform, and their overall
experience more satisfying (for example, training provided at information sessions and ensuring sufficient team members within each team to reduce role stress).

*Growth Opportunities* – Within the context of the study, growth opportunities referred to the practices put in place by BV that encouraged the volunteer to better themselves, either through development and enhancement of new or existing skills or personal attributes, or the chance to progress within BV to higher responsibility roles (for example, from a general volunteer to a volunteer team leader).

*Participation in Decision Making* – Within the context of the study, participation in decision making referred to the extent that the volunteer had the ability to make decisions about their role and how to perform it, as opposed to BV controlling the volunteer to perform the role in a specific manner.

*PSS* – Within the context of the study, PSS is the volunteers’ perception of how the immediate supervisor (for the general volunteers, this was the volunteer team leader) supported the volunteer in carrying out their role, how the supervisor cared for the volunteer, and how the supervisor appreciated and recognised the volunteers’ efforts. This may be before the event (for example, at information sessions or through prior contact), during the event (while performing their allocated role), or after the event (for example, at thank-you receptions or through follow up contact). In terms of the volunteer team leaders, PSS referred to the way they believed they supported their team of volunteers throughout all stages of the event (prior to, during and after).
Commitment – Within the context of the study, commitment referred to how attached and connected the volunteer felt to BV (emotionally and psychologically); whether they felt like they belonged to BV, and felt they were a part of BV.

Satisfaction – Within the context of the study, satisfaction was the level of happiness (satisfaction) the volunteer held with regard to their overall volunteer experience, in relation to their unique needs; whether the volunteering experience met, exceeded or failed to meet expectations.

Perceived Peer Support – Within the context of the study, perceived peer support is the volunteers’ perception of how their peers within their team supported the volunteer in carrying out their role (whether they worked together and helped each other and were friendly and provided a sociable working environment). This may be before the event (for example, at information sessions or through prior contact), during the event (while performing their allocated role), or after the event (for example, at thank-you receptions or through follow up contact).

Perceived Subordinate support – Within the context of the study, perceived subordinate support is the team leader volunteers’ perception of how their team of volunteers supported the volunteer team leader in carrying out their role (whether they took direction well without complaining, showed initiative, and showed good work ethic).
STAGE TWO

The sample for Stage Two (focus group interviews) comprised the general volunteers who responded to Stage One (self-administered questionnaire). The sample size included 25 participants: 7 female and 18 male. The age of the participants varied, ranging from early 30’s to late 60’s, with an even distribution across age brackets. The volunteer experience of participants was long term career experience, with all participants having volunteered at organisations other than BV in the past. A majority of participants had volunteered with BV in the past, with a small number having been first time volunteers with BV. Of those participants who had previously volunteered with BV, the majority of them were long term volunteers, with at least 5 years previous experience. Table 4.12 (see pages 163 and 164) highlights the key thematic findings from the qualitative analysis. These key findings are then presented and discussed accordingly throughout the remainder of the chapter, before being interpreted in relation to the research questions of examining the nature of the POS, as well as exploring the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers.
Table 4.12 Summary of the Key Thematic Findings from Stage 2 (Focus Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Research Concepts</th>
<th>Key Themes Identified</th>
<th>Sub-Themes Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td>Information provided/Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General support/concern for volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment/Tangible provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciation/Acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative support</td>
<td>No direct support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness (Organisational Justice)</td>
<td>Fair, positive treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions</td>
<td>Personal rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tangible rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities</td>
<td>Reinforcement of existing skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No new skills gained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>Minimal decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘On the spot’ decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions made as a team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied with level of decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would prefer more autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would prefer less autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Research Concepts</td>
<td>Key Themes Identified</td>
<td>Sub-Themes Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Negative support</td>
<td>Lack of information/communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Commitment to BV as an organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to the cause (cycling)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to event volunteering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to multiple organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low commitment/no commitment to BV/ATB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfied with the experience</td>
<td>Satisfaction of helping others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyclist attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of contribution/accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied with the experience</td>
<td>Lack of information/communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of direction from team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Displeasure with volunteer management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither satisfied or dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Peer Support</td>
<td>Negative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content Analysis

In order to validate and further explore the findings from this analysis, qualitative data was collected via the focus group interviews. Content analysis was used to identify code and categorise themes within the data. A number of key themes were evident in the data, which generally reflected the key concepts in the study (POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction). Additional themes emerged from the data, which were distinct from the key concepts in the study, and were worth noting in the discussion. Names have been changed to maintain anonymity of the study.

POS

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of organisational support; how well they believe BV as an organisation supported them during their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, three major themes emerged regarding the respondents’ perceptions of organisational support; no direct support (support provided by immediate supervisor, not the organisation); negative support and positive support. Within the theme positive support, four sub-themes were identified. Respondents indicated they received positive support in the form of information provided/communication, general support/concern for volunteers, equipment/tangible provisions and appreciation/acknowledgement, as demonstrated by the following quotations from respondents:

“What’s provided for you in the fact of meals and briefing support and all the rest ... I’d say that’s pretty good. So if Bicycle Victoria can take credit for the quality of their staff and for their coordinators, well yeah they get very good marks I think” (Greg*, elderly male).
“The volunteer coordinator ... he was sort of out and about and popped the good word in every now and said how are you going? So he was certainly out there recognising the volunteers on the day which I think is positive” (Rosie*, middle aged female).

These respondents generally were heavily involved in volunteering in the community, and supported cycling as a sport. They were also return volunteers with BV. In contrast however, certain respondents indicated they received negative organisational support during their volunteer experience. These respondents were generally first time volunteers with Bicycle Victoria, and expressed dissatisfaction with their experience and low commitment levels towards BV as an organisation. James* (middle aged male) outlines his perceptions of organisational support:

“Well I didn’t have a support I don’t think ... so as far as I’m concerned, there was no support”.

This finding was verified by Hannah* (elderly female), who also believed there was lack of organisational support for the volunteers:

“I didn’t get any information, I arrived there on the day ... and the bloke said if you need me heres my number and off he went ... so what sort of support? I don’t think there was any support at all ... no information on what we were to do”.

Similarly, respondents indicated that they did not receive any direct support from BV as an organisation; this was provided by their immediate supervisor instead, as outlined by Rosie* (middle aged female):
“I didn’t have a great deal to do with Bicycle Victoria ... the team leader was Bicycle Victoria for me”.

In summary, the dominating themes were identified to be an even division of perceived positive organisational support and perceived negative organisational support, as a result of the general concern provided to volunteers (perceived positive support) and a lack of information/communication (perceived negative support).

**Fairness (Organisational Justice)**

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on how they believed they were treated by BV, in order to gauge an understanding of the perceptions of organisational justice amongst the participants. In analysing the data, one dominant theme emerged; participants believed they were treated fairly, in a positive manner, as outlined by the following quotations:

“My bearing of how the organisation treats us ... yeah they treat you well, with respect ... well I think they cater for you pretty well, treat you well” (Dale*, middle aged male).

“Yeah I thought that they did a good job ... I thought we were well treated ... I thought they tried as hard as possible to make you feel comfortable” (Steven*, middle aged male).

Certain respondents believed they were treated in such a positive manner by the organisation that they expressed desire to return and volunteer again with BV, as described by Jenny* (elderly female):
“I think I felt valued as a volunteer ... for giving your time ... they thank you very much for coming along, and I said that I’d be interested in doing it again”.

In summary, the dominating theme was identified to be fair treatment, in a positive manner amongst participants of the focus group interviews.

Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on the rewards they believed they received during their volunteering experience, and the conditions of their role. In analysing the data, four clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ perceptions of rewards received; personal and social rewards, and to a lesser extent, tangible and educational rewards. Emma* (young female) outlines the personal rewards she received as a result of volunteering:

“I felt pretty nice after it. Tired, but very good ... just a positive feeling you know you went and helped someone do something”.

Additionally, Samuel* (middle aged male) indicated that volunteering “does become a social thing, it does become a bonding thing and people enjoy like-minded people getting stuck in and doing something”, which outlined the rewards he received during his experience. Tangible rewards, including the “big grab bag of goodies and the lunch” (Craig* middle aged male) emerged as a common theme, as well as educational rewards, as outlined by Steven* (young male):

“You got to see sort of behind the scenes and how they actually set it up and ran it. It’s a bit of an eye opener I suppose, just seeing some of the stuff that goes into it”.

---
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Interestingly, those participants who indicated they received personal and social rewards were generally previous volunteers within their local communities, in comparison to those participants who outlined tangible and educational rewards, who were first time volunteers. In summary, the dominating themes were identified to be personal and social rewards, and to a lesser extent, tangible and educational rewards.

**Growth Opportunities**

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on the growth opportunities presented to them as a result of their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, three clear themes emerged regarding the personal skills and attributes gained; reinforcement of existing skills, no new skills gained and to a lesser extent, inter-personal skills, including the ability to “gain more confidence; talk to people” (Gavin*, elderly male). Frank* (middle aged male) highlighted the growth opportunities presented to him whilst volunteering:

“A lot of the elements are done previously through work or previous volunteering so I felt comfortable within that role the tasks required so that was for me it was just reiterating knowledge I already had”.

However, Jenny* (elderly female) contrasted this finding, stating that “it wouldn’t have enhanced any skills [she] already had ‘cause it was fairly basic what [she] was doing”, indicating that the growth opportunities presented to the participants were dependent on the task they performed. In summary, the dominating themes were identified to be minimal growth opportunities, provided in the form of a division of reiterating previous skills, as well as the provision of no knew skills or attributes gained.
Participation in Decision Making

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on the extent of their decision making with regard to their role as a volunteer, in order to gauge an understanding of the amount of participation and influence each individual had in the decisions made. In analysing the data, four clear themes emerged; minimal decision making by the participant (decisions made by team leader/organisation), the individual made ‘on the spot’ decisions regarding their role, the participant had a high level of decision making regarding their role, and decisions were made as a team. ‘On the spot’ decisions regarding the participant’s role was identified to be the dominant theme, with many respondents indicating they “just applied common sense” (Samuel*, middle aged male), and were “always making lots of little decisions” (Damien* young male). Additionally, certain participants suggested that the decisions made were as a result of a team process, in that they were “working as a team, making team decisions ... it wasn’t an individual decision making process” (Dean* young male). In contrast, participants also indicated that they had a high level of decision making regarding their role, as expressed by Samuel* (middle aged male):

“Everything for us was pretty autonomous ... if we saw an incident, we dealt with the incident”.

This was opposed to those respondents who believed they had minimal decision making, in that the decisions regarding their role were made by their team leader or the organisation, as Darren* (middle aged male) indicates:

“It’s more [the team leaders decisions] than my decisions. No that’s about it, it’s just a support role ... the nature of the beast is go with the flow and fill the roles as they need to be done”.

Chapter Four – Results
The majority of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the level of decision making given regarding their role; they were “comfortable ... confident ... looking for leadership and some guidance and some direction” (Darren*, middle aged male), but overall, were “happy with what [they were] given, what decisions [they] made and [their] role as allocated” (Jenny*, elderly female). However, there were certain participants who indicated they would have liked “more responsibility lumped on” (Samuel* middle aged male), and those who indicated that they would prefer less decision making regarding their role, as expressed by Steven* (young male):

“Don’t want to seem lazy, but probably a little less decision making. I just didn’t feel there was much direction ... and that’s why we had to make so many sort of decisions on what we were actually going to do at the event, leading up to it and everything”.

However, Craig* (middle aged male) believes that “the improvisation on the day and your own judgement on what to do is part of the joy. If everything was prescribed and down pat and regulated, we wouldn’t like it ... I know that they trust my judgement at the end of the day”, which suggests that it is dependent on the type of person and what they prefer. In summary, the dominating theme identified was that participants indicated that they made ‘on the spot’ decisions regarding their role, and that they were satisfied with the level of decision making they were given.
Chapter Four – Results

PSS

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of supervisor support; how well they believe their immediate supervisor (volunteer team leader), supported them during their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, two clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ perceptions of supervisor support; negative support and to a lesser extent, positive support. Respondents indicated that the supervisor support was so poor that it “was probably the worst [the respondent] have really struck” (Carolyn*, elderly female). Additionally, Natalie* (middle aged female) remarked that she will “be a team leader next year at Alexandra Gardens ‘cause [the respondent] could do a better job than [the] team leader”.

Within the theme of negative support, the sub-theme of lack of information/communication was identified as the major contributor to influencing these perceptions, as outlined by James* (middle aged male):

“Our team leader ... I haven’t heard anything from this guy. I’d no idea when I’m going to be or where I’m going to be or what time and what’s our shift ... he said he’ll get back to you ... but nothing ever happened ... and apparently he’s been doing it for 25 years or so”.

Shannon* (young male) supported these claims of negative support, expressing his concern with his immediate supervisor:

“I found there wasn’t much support at the event. Sort of got there ... didn’t really know where to go. I met my team leader once ... I never saw him again ... so that sort of support I don’t think was really there”.
The respondents who expressed perceptions of negative support were generally first time volunteers with BV, and were located either at Alexandra Gardens or along the Mornington Peninsula. This is opposed to those respondents who indicated they perceived the support from their immediate supervisor to be positive, who were located within the Geelong region. Jenny* (elderly female) expresses her perceptions of positive supervisor support:

“My team leader ... he was brilliant. He’s only a young guy but he was really on the ball and very much so. Introduced himself and any problems, any queries ... I found him very, very good ... He was brilliant”.

This was supported by Emma* (young female), who was also located within the Geelong region:

“My team leader was really good. She sent maybe three or four emails just saying hi, who I am, this is what’s going on, this is where we’re meeting ... give me a call anytime ... and so that was really good because ... I knew what was going on ... so that was really good, I felt really supported”.

In summary, the dominating themes were identified to be a division of perceived positive supervisor support, and perceived negative supervisor support, depending on the locality of the participant. Lack of communication and information was found to be the major contributor to perceptions of negative support.
Affective Commitment

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on their level of volunteer activity, and their connection to BV, in order to gauge an understanding of the affective commitment levels amongst the participants. In analysing the data, five clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ affective commitment. Certain respondents indicated that they were committed to BV as an organisation. These respondents generally were long-term volunteers with BV, and although often had many criticisms of the way the organisation was run, they maintained a level of commitment to BV, as outlined by Gary* (middle aged male):

“Am I committed to Bicycle Victoria? Yeah, right ask my missus ... Regardless of role and event ... continue to volunteer for Bicycle Victoria, yes”.

Certain respondents also illustrated a commitment to the cause (cycling), and not particularly a commitment to BV as an organisation, or specifically to the ATB event. These respondents were dedicated cyclists, who were paying members of BV. Natalie’s* (middle aged female) commitment to the cause is evident with the following statement:

“I think it’s the biggest cycling event in Victoria if not Australia, yeah I think it is fun to be part of ... it benefits the cycling community ... it certainly gets bikes on the road and cars off the road is good”.

Respondents were also found to have a commitment to event volunteering, regardless of which organisation hosted the event. These respondents generally seemed displeased with their volunteering experience with BV at the ATB event, preferring the hype surrounding being involved in a well-publicised event, as explained by Maria* (elderly female):
“I haven’t volunteered since I volunteered at the Venus Swim Champs ... I did the Commonwealth Games and then the Swim Champs and then I haven’t done anything up until now with Bicycle Victoria”.

A vast majority of the sample indicated that they have a commitment to multiple organisations, in addition to BV. These respondents generally were long term volunteers with more than one not-for-profit organisation, and were heavily involved within their local communities. The following statements outline the respondents’ commitment to volunteering in general (for multiple organisations):

“My volunteering experience is quite vast ... a serial volunteer because I volunteer in Geelong one and a half days a week, St John of God Hospital two afternoons a week, Adacara once a fortnight and the footy club, netball club. So I’m very involved in volunteering” (Carolyn*, elderly female).

“Probably considered a career volunteer I guess. Volunteered on school councils ... been involved in running footy and cricket clubs ... president of the junior football club ... so that is a fairly big time commitment. I guess I don’t even look at it as volunteering as such, but it’s just something I do I suppose” (Matthew*, middle aged male).

Finally, in contrast to the committed respondents, there were also a number of respondents who had no commitment, or a low level of commitment to volunteering in general, and to BV and the ATB event. These volunteers were all first time volunteers with BV and concluded that they are unlikely to return to volunteer with BV in the future. Anna* (elderly female) outlines her commitment to volunteering:
“I haven’t I guess found anything that’s taken my interest enough to be committed to ... well I'll volunteer ... and it's about I guess the time I have available and how I feel at the time really”.

In summary, the dominating theme was identified to be a strong commitment to volunteering in general (with a number of not-for-profit organisations), and not to BV or the ATB event.
Satisfaction

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on how happy they were with their volunteering experience at the ATB event, and to indicate what they were particularly happy with, in order to gauge an understanding of the satisfaction levels amongst the participants. In analysing the data, three clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ satisfaction; the respondents were either satisfied with the experience, dissatisfied with the experience, or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the experience. Those participants who expressed their dissatisfaction with their experience, were generally first time volunteers with BV, and lacked the support of their supervisor, which contributed largely to their dissatisfaction, as expressed by Anna* (elderly female):

“Well, I’m very unhappy about it, we were given no instructions; the other (volunteers in the team) just stood there all morning talking to each other. I found I wasn’t doing the right things and I was very annoyed about the conditions on the day ... there were problems and no one could do anything about them and I was told you’re not allowed to do anything about them ... and so it’s really badly organised by the BV”.

This was supported by Carolyn* (elderly female), who held similar views:

“I actually wasn’t happy with the experience at all and I was seriously ... I probably won’t volunteer again unless there’s some dramatic changes ... it wasn’t a happy experience for me at all”.

The major factors contributing to the participants’ dissatisfaction with their experience included lack of information and communication, lack of direction from their
immediate supervisor (volunteer team leader) and BV, and displeasure with how the volunteers were managed, as detailed below:

“Not satisfied with that event ... lack of direction in to what the role actually is and having to make it up ... wandering around all the day just looking for something to do” (Natalie*, middle aged female).

“I was disappointed in the organisation this year, lack of information and I’m seriously considering not doing it again next year because of that; it was also a long day” (Josh*, middle aged male).

In contrast, respondents also indicated they were satisfied with their experience. These respondents were generally previous volunteers with BV, and had a strong community volunteer involvement, as indicated by Sam* (middle aged male):

“It was a positive experience, both at the level of information on the day, and my feelings about having too many goodies”.

This was supported by Jenny* (elderly female), who also was satisfied with her experience:

“Yeah, I thought the whole day was absolutely brilliant. Very well organised, no hiccups ... I thought the whole day was very enjoyable ... and in fact they said to us at the end, would you be back next year? I said yeah, for sure”.

The factors identified within the data as influencing the level of satisfaction for these participants included the satisfaction of helping others, the attitude from the cyclists and the sense of contribution and accomplishment gained, as described below:
“Yeah, I found it fun, I feel a sense of accomplishment and a sense of contributing in some way, and some sense of awe in some of the cyclists ... I think it’s great, in the roles that I’ve done” (Gary*, middle aged male).

“I just get the satisfaction; you’re there to help people. You just do it and I enjoy it, just something, I don’t know you can’t put it in words but you just enjoy doing it” (Eric*, elderly male).

Finally, respondents also indicated that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their experience, as detailed by Heath* (middle aged male):

“I was reasonably okay with it, I think that what I experienced was, there was enough there for me to feel comfortable about what I needed to do when, and how I needed to do it. But at the same time I think it could be a lot better. I think there’s certainly needs for certain sections I was looking at”.

In summary, the dominating themes were identified to be an even division of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the experience, as a result of their contribution to helping others (satisfaction) and negative support, in the form of lack of information/communication and poor volunteer management (dissatisfaction).
Perceived Peer Support

During the eight focus group interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of peer support; how well they believe their fellow peers (general volunteers) supported them during their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, two clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ perceptions of peer support; an even division between negative support and positive support. Those participants who indicated they received negative peer support also expressed perceptions of negative supervisor support and organisational support, as well as dissatisfaction with their experience. These participants were generally first time volunteers with BV. Hannah* (elderly female) outlines her perceptions of peer support:

“I was really the only person on duty at a very large rest area. ‘Cause the other two women just stood there and talked to each other ... they went off for a while and got some coffee, that was their support ... they didn’t speak to me the rest of the time”.

In contrast, respondents also indicated the support they received from their peers was positive, as outlined by the following statements:

“The [other volunteers] on the lunch team ... most of them had done it before in previous years, and so they were really good and supportive ... that’s the bonding bit, its good ... it was really supportive, it was just really nice” (Emma, young female).

“I got on well with the people I was working with. And that's what makes it a fun day ... we had a similar outlook ... and I think most people who volunteer have got that ... that was a great part ... excellent” (Matthew, middle aged male).
In summary, the dominating themes identified were an even division of positive peer support and negative peer support.
STAGE THREE

The sample for Stage Three (individual interviews) comprised the volunteer team leaders who responded to Stage One (self-administered questionnaire). The sample size included 12 participants: five female and seven male. The age of the participants varied, ranging from late 20’s to late 70’s, with the majority of participants within the later age brackets. The volunteer experience across participants was long term career experience, with all participants having volunteered at organisations other than BV in the past. All participants also had previous, long term volunteer experience with BV, with at least five years previous experience. Table 4.13 (see pages 183 and 184) highlights the key thematic findings from the qualitative analysis. These key findings are then presented and discussed accordingly throughout the remainder of the chapter, before being interpreted in relation to the research questions of examining the nature of the POS, as well as exploring the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Research Concepts</th>
<th>Key Themes Identified</th>
<th>Sub-Themes Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication/relaying information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General assistance/personal concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness (Organisational Justice)</td>
<td>Fair, positive treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions</td>
<td>Personal rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tangible rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities</td>
<td>No new skills gained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of intrapersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>Satisfied with level of decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tangible rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td>Communication/relaying information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Research Concepts</th>
<th>Key Themes Identified</th>
<th>Sub-Themes Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Commitment to volunteering in general</td>
<td>Satisfaction with their team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment only to BV as an organisation</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to other organisations as well as BV</td>
<td>Satisfaction with their accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to the cause (cycling)</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to event volunteering</td>
<td>Satisfaction with helping others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfied with the experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Peer Support</td>
<td>Negative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td>Willingness to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support from those physically near</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Subordinate Support</td>
<td>Positive support</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content Analysis

Content analysis was undertaken to identify, code and categorise themes within the data, which is now presented. A number of key themes were evident in the data, which generally reflected the key concepts in the study (POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction). Additional themes emerged from the data, which were distinct from the key concepts in the study, and were worth noting in the discussion. As in Stage Two, names have been changed to maintain anonymity of the study participants*.

POS

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of organisational support; how well they believe BV as an organisation supported them during their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, perceived positive support was the one dominating theme that emerged. Within this major theme, three sub-themes were identified; positive organisational support in the form of feedback, positive organisational support in the form of communication/relaying information and positive organisational support in the form of general assistance/personal concern. Respondents who indicated they received positive organisational support, also displayed high levels of satisfaction with their experience, and are committed to BV. Simone* (young female) explains her perceptions of organisational support:

“I think with BV, they’ve done a phenomenal effort in terms of their commitment to volunteers, in terms of there being more support, more communication. And also the full-time volunteer co-ordinator has also helped as well ... They’re there when you need them”.

This finding was supported by Robert* (elderly male), who also perceived the support gained from BV during the ATB event as positive:
“Bicycle Victoria has encouraged me ... they keep me up to date ... they keep me informed online, computer wise, emails. They’re free to talk to ... when you phone up someone”.

In summary, the primary theme identified for the interview participants was perceptions of positive organisational support, and in particular, positive support as a result of communication/information provided and general assistance/personal concern for the participants. This finding contrasted with that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they expressed a combination of perceived positive organisational support, and perceived negative organisational support, as a result of the general concern provided to volunteers (perceived positive support) and a lack of information/communication (perceived negative support). This distribution may be attributed by the location in which the volunteer worked at during the event, as it was found that the participants in the focus group interview from the Geelong locality held positive perceptions of organisational support, and were very satisfied with their volunteering experience.

*Fairness (Organisational Justice)*

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on how they believed they were treated by BV, in order to gauge an understanding of the perceptions of organisational justice amongst the participants. In analysing the data, one dominant theme emerged; participants believed they were treated fairly, in a positive manner. Ron* (elderly male) outlines his perceptions of organisational justice:

“I am treated like a much valued part of the organisation; greatly valued part of the organisation”.


This finding was supported by John* (elderly male), who also believed he was treated fairly by Bicycle Victoria:

“How was I treated? Top of the shelf; could not think better ... more highly of them”.

In summary, the dominating theme identified was positive fair treatment amongst all interview participants. This finding was comparable to that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they also expressed perceptions of fair, positive treatment from BV. With respect to the focus group interview participants, regardless of the satisfaction and commitment levels, as well as the perceptions of organisational and supervisor support amongst participants, all participants indicated that they believed they were treated fairly by the organisation. This finding suggests that for the purpose of this study, fairness (organisational justice) was not identified as an antecedent of organisational support, as those participants who outlined negative perceptions of organisational or supervisor support, still believed they were treated fairly.

Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on the rewards they believed they received during their volunteer experience, and the conditions of their role. In analysing the data, three clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ perceptions of rewards received: personal and social rewards, and to a lesser extent, tangible rewards. Kelvin* (middle aged male) explains the rewards he received whilst volunteering:

“We all did a funny thing, because it seems most people think of money, and that doesn't do it at all, and there's the T-shirt and you know sometimes we have a riding bag or something like that comes along, the water bottles and that, that
they're only a fraction of it. The real reward I would say comes in helping other people”.

Maggie* (elderly female) supported these findings, stating that she “loves doing it [volunteering] and it’s great to see them [BV] again ... you’re helping the community and the event ... and giving back what we’ve reaped out of it over the many years.

In summary, the dominating themes identified were personal and social rewards. This finding was comparable to that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they also identified personal and social rewards as the dominant themes.

**Growth Opportunities**

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on the growth opportunities presented to them as a result of their volunteering experience. In analysing the data, three themes emerged; intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills and no skills gained. Certain respondents indicated that they received no growth opportunities, as specified by John* (elderly male) who indicated that he gained no new skills, as “most of the skills [he] had [he] had from [his] career”. However, this was contradicted by Mark* (middle aged male) who outlined the interpersonal skills he gained from volunteering with BV:

“I think we learn from all our experience. I think it always enhances your relationship with people ... and I think working with Bicycle Victoria you have every kind of individual that you’re likely to find and so you can develop your ability to relate to different people from different walks of life. I think that’s probably important”.
Finally, Simone* (young female) indicated that she benefited from the growth opportunity of gaining the intrapersonal skill of "self-belief, that’s the biggest thing ... yeah, to actually be a team leader”.

In summary, the dominating themes regarding growth opportunities were identified to be intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills and no skills gained, which was comparable to that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they also expressed lack of growth opportunities in no new skills gained, however, also indicated that the experience reinforced existing skills and personal attributes.

*Participation in Decision Making*

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on the extent of their decision making with regard to their role as a volunteer, in order to gauge an understanding of the amount of participation and influence each individual had in the decisions made. In analysing the data, one clear theme emerged; participants indicated they were satisfied with the level of autonomy and decision making regarding their role, as expressed by Simone* (young female):

“On the whole enough decision making for things to flow quite well ... I mean Bicycle Victoria was a great help as well. So a lot of the major decision making ... was made as a joint decision”.

As such, participants believed they were capable of the decision making responsibilities granted, as they are long term volunteers with BV, as Jack* (middle aged male) indicates:

“I feel as though I’m fairly independent and that I can, after three years I’ve shown myself to be a responsible person and that Bicycle Victoria are happy then
to hand over that independent decision making to me and I’m happy with that and we haven’t had any issues”.

In summary, the dominating theme identified was that participants were satisfied with the level of decision making they received, as they believed they were capable. This finding was comparable to that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they also suggested they were satisfied with the level of decision making with their role. However, the focus group interview participants provided a deeper analysis, and indicated that they made ‘on the spot’ decisions regarding their role.
PSS

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of supervisor support; how well they believe they supported the team of general volunteers they were responsible for. In analysing the data, three clear themes emerged. Respondents believed they supported their team as a supervisor through communication/relaying information, appreciation and general assistance, as outlined by Mark* (middle aged male):

“I support them by making sure that they are aware of everything they need to know, that they have all the equipment or supplies, that they need to have, and that they understand what their roles and responsibilities are”.

This was further supported by Anna* (elderly female) who also perceived the support provided by her to be positive:

“I’d make sure they were all acknowledged and I’d go around to their sites ... and get feedback. Are they happy there? Do they want change ... all that sort of stuff. I think it's important to make sure that they are happy. If they are happy, you're happy. Everyone's happy”.

In summary, the primary theme identified for the interview participants was perceptions of positive supervisor support provided by them to their team. In particular, this positive support was provided in the form of communication/relaying information, appreciation and general assistance. This finding was contradictory to the perceptions of supervisor support provided to the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that the participants located in the Geelong region expressed perceived positive supervisor support, with all other participants expressing perceived negative supervisor support, due to lack of communication and information. This
result was consistent with the findings of satisfaction and organisational support, in that participants from the Geelong locality were satisfied with their experience, and perceived their organisational and supervisor support to be positive.
Affective Commitment

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on their level of volunteer activity, and their connection to BV, in order to gauge an understanding of the commitment levels amongst the participants. In analysing the data, four clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ commitment. The major themes highlighted included respondents’ commitment to only BV (at numerous events), as outlined in the following statements:

“Only Bicycle Victoria, that’s enough for me. I think it’s a good thing to do. I’m quite happy to ... I’ve got plenty of time to get involved ... about 80 days a year” (Charles* elderly male).

“I’ve been with BV since ’94 I don’t think I’ve really got time to volunteer anywhere else considering ... come up to an event I’m probably putting in 50 or 60 hours a week to it” (Robert* middle aged male),

as well as commitment to other non-profit organisations in addition to Bicycle Victoria, as discussed by Anita* (elderly female):

“Well, I volunteer about eight hours a week for Melbourne Tourism. I’m on a committee for YHA bushwalking club. I help out at the tennis club ... helped out with the Olympic Games ... and in my younger years I did Meals on Wheels and ... door knocking for Red Cross and Salvation Army”.

These respondents were generally long term volunteers with BV and had an ongoing personal and professional relationship with the BV employees (which suggest the reason why they are volunteer team leaders). To a lesser extent, the data also presented two additional themes concerning the participants’ commitment, including a
commitment to the cause, and a commitment to event volunteering. Helena* (elderly female) describes her commitment to the cause of cycling:

“I’m secretary of a couple of organisations at another cycling club and work extensively to support those organisations ... also volunteer to support other cycling events, for example ... the big UCI World Championships ... the tour of Geelong, which was a cycling ride. I’m a bike ed instructor so every now and then I help with schools that need bike ed”.

Additionally, Harriet* (elderly female) describes her commitment to event volunteering:

“ ... I like being part of the big event ... probably a bit of a cut back from Commonwealth Games, ‘cause I was a volunteer there and I enjoyed that, so big event volunteering is good fun”.

In summary, the dominating themes identified were a strong commitment to volunteering in general (with a number of non-profit organisations), and also to BV as an organisation. This finding was similar to that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they expressed a strong commitment to volunteering in general, at numerous non-profit organisations. However, the findings were also contradictory in that the volunteer team leaders (Stage Three) possessed a strong commitment to BV as an organisation, where the general volunteers (Stage Two) had a low commitment to BV as an organisation.
Satisfaction

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on how happy they were with their volunteering experience at the ATB event, and to indicate what they were particularly happy with, in order to gauge an understanding of the satisfaction levels amongst the participants. In analysing the data, one major theme was identified; all respondents indicated they were satisfied with their experience. Within this major theme, five sub themes emerged regarding the respondents’ satisfaction; satisfaction with their team, satisfaction with the organisation, satisfaction with their accomplishments, satisfaction with the rewards (social and tangible) and satisfaction with helping others. Mark* (middle aged male) explains his satisfaction

“Well I’m obviously happy because I keep coming back, which is number one … I’m a long-term volunteer and the things that I think make me happy are … that you’re a part of a very large group of people that do good things … the charter for Bicycle Victoria is a very noble charter to help people stay physically fit and that gives me satisfaction and specifically satisfaction about helping people that are in difficulties on the ride is also important to me”.

Respondents also indicated that the level of organisational support they received from BV enhanced their satisfaction with the experience, as Kelvin* (middle aged male) explains:

“Particularly happy with the organisation as a whole; lots of support from both within the team, team management and fellow team leaders. I can’t speak highly enough of them”.

This finding may be as a result of the participants having a close working relationship with the Bicycle Victoria staff, strengthening the level of support they receive directly
from the organisation. In summary, the dominating theme identified for the interview participants was satisfaction with their experience as a whole and, in particular, satisfaction with the organisation and their own accomplishments. This finding contrasted with that of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews, in that they expressed a combination of satisfaction (attributed by their accomplishments) and dissatisfaction with their experience, largely associated with lack of support from their immediate supervisor and the organisation.
Perceived Peer Support

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of peer support; how well they believe their fellow peers (team leaders), supported them during their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, three clear themes emerged regarding the respondents’ perceptions of peer support; negative support, support from those physically near and positive support. The dominant theme amongst respondents was that they received negative support from their peers, as expressed by Garth* (elderly male):

“Look I’d say almost none [support]. We weren’t in contact with them at all ... really as far as other team leaders are concerned, no, I’ll say no, we didn’t [receive support].”

This was supported by Simone* (young female), who also indicated they received negative support from their peers:

“There wasn’t really that much communication other than the first meeting that we had. So yeah, in terms of support from other team leaders, there wasn’t any”.

In contrast, certain participants indicated they received positive support from their peers, that it was “very good ... nothing but praise for them ... the information, the feedback vis-à-vis the other [team leaders] and the other teams is very very good”(Charles*, middle aged male). Other participants agreed to a point that they received positive support, but only from those team leaders who were physically near, as expressed by Anna* (elderly female):

“Well, I was working with [Sharee*] and I kept on asking her whether she needed ... we sort of worked together to make things easier ... so yeah, we supported each other”.
The participants who indicated they received positive peer support, and positive support from those physically near were located at Alexandra Gardens, providing them with a closer proximity to other team leaders, which may have increased their perceptions of positive peer support. This is opposed to those team leaders who were located in isolated areas (along the Mornington Peninsula), and did not have contact with other team leaders or teams.

In summary, the dominating themes identified were a combination of positive peer support, negative peer support, and positive support only from those physically near. This finding was similar to that of the general volunteers within the focus groups, in that they also expressed a combination of positive and negative perceptions of peer support.
Perceived Subordinate Support

During the 12 interviews, participants were asked to comment on their perceptions of sub-ordinate support; how well they believe the team of volunteers they were responsible for (general volunteers), supported them during their volunteer experience. In analysing the data, two clear themes emerged; negative support and positive support. Within the theme positive support, participants further identified three sub-themes, which they believed contributed to these perceptions of positive support; willingness to help, communication and friendliness (provided in the form of horseplay and friendly banter), as outlined by the following quotations:

“They support me by being on time and by doing their job adequately and I’ve had a fantastic group of volunteers” (Margaret*, elderly female).

“... We have a great time. We do things like pick on each other ... are you’re sure you’re fit enough ... all this sort of thing” (Ron*, elderly male).

In contrast however, certain respondents believed that their team of volunteers provided negative support to them as a supervisor, and that “it was a case of [the team leaders] supporting them and saying that they could do it” (Anna*, elderly female).

Mark* (middle aged male) explains:

“This year was a hotchpotch. A lot of them did not read their emails or because of work commitments or whatever and got an awful lot of texts on the ride. They didn't know what to do ... there is a problem out there, perhaps it's too much ... it's information overload and the right paths don't get through even if you mail them it, the people always seem to be drowning in a sea of misinformation, so to speak, and a lot of it is just reading the emails”.
This misinformation that Mark* referred to may be as a result of poor leadership and negative supervisor support provided to the team of general volunteers, as there is clear conflict between the results of the data analysis of the general volunteers within the focus group interviews and that of the volunteer team leaders. In summary, the dominating theme identified was positive subordinate support, provided in the form of communication, willingness to help and friendliness.
SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the data analysis procedures used to address the three research questions:

1. What is the nature of the POS for sport event volunteers?
2. What is the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, affective commitment to the organisation and satisfaction with their experience?
3. What is the relationship between sport event volunteers’ perceptions of supervisor support, affective commitment to the organisation and satisfaction with their experience?

As outlined in Chapter Three, the research design involved surveying the population of event volunteers, as well as through in-depth focus group interviews and individual interviews involving the general volunteers and the team leader volunteers respectively. Through a mixed-method approach where the study was quantitatively driven (Morse & Niehaus, 2009), the questionnaires were distributed first in order to measure the variables and to begin to address the research questions, followed by supplementary qualitative components. The qualitative component of the research project was used to compensate for the “inadequacies in meaning or detail that occurs with the quantitative core” (Morse & Niehaus, 2009, p. 122). As such, the qualitative research provided explanation, linked variables from the quantitative results, and interpreted quantitative findings. The qualitative research enabled conceptual links to be established between the key concepts, based on the general understanding of the relationships gained from the quantitative research. This encouraged justification of their inclusion in the study, with each key concept being linked to the concept of sport event volunteers.
Research question one involved analysing the qualitative results of the dependent variable POS, and the independent variables of PSS, fairness (organisational justice), favourable rewards and task conditions, growth opportunities, participation in decision making, peer support and subordinate support (in the case of the individual interviews). The purpose was to examine the antecedents of perceived organisational support amongst sport event volunteers, and to further explore the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction. Data collected from Stages Two and Three addressed research question one, highlighting the similarities and differences in the factors contributing to POS of both the general volunteers and the volunteer team leaders.

PSS and the satisfaction respondents (within Stages Two and Three) held with the level of decision making regarding their role were found to contribute to their overall perceptions of organisational support. Additionally, to a certain extent, the growth opportunities presented (where there were growth opportunities identified), also contributed to their overall perceptions of organisational support. Where there were no growth opportunities presented, this was found not to be an antecedent of POS. A clear relationship was identified amongst POS, PSS and peer support, in that those participants within the focus group interviews who indicated they had negative perceptions of supervisor and peer support, also had negative perceptions of organisational support. Finally, subordinate support had no impact on predicting POS, and was therefore concluded not to be an antecedent of POS. Fairness, in which all participants (within Stages Two and Three) believed they were treated in a positive manner, as well as the extent that they believed they received favourable rewards as a result of volunteering, were also concluded not to be antecedents of POS.
Research questions two and three involved analysing the results of the two dependent variables identified: affective commitment and satisfaction, and the independent variables POS and PSS, in order to explore the relationship between the concepts.

Data collected from Stage One addressed research questions two and three, enabling an examination of the relationship between the key concepts. In terms of affective commitment, as a result of the regression analysis, the independent variables were found to predict 45 per cent of the variance, with satisfaction contributing significantly with 6 per cent of the variance (Part correlation), 9 per cent of the variance (Partial correlation) and 36 per cent of the variance (Zero-Order correlation) when all other variables are controlled for. Additionally, POS was also found to contribute significantly with 6 per cent of the variance (Part correlation), 10 per cent of the variance (Partial correlation) and 32 per cent of the variance (Zero-Order correlation) when all other variables are controlled for. Both these relationships were found to be significant, indicating that the respondents’ perceptions of organisational support and satisfaction lead to a committed volunteer base. PSS was found to have very little contribution, and was identified as insignificant, which indicates that the respondents’ perceptions of supervisor support do not contribute to their affective commitment.

When using satisfaction as the dependent variable, as a result of the regression analysis, the independent variables were found to predict 56 per cent of the variance, with PSS making the strongest individual contribution (13.5 % for Part correlation), 24 per cent of the variance (Partial correlation) and 47 per cent of the variance (Zero-Order correlation) when all other variables are controlled for. Additionally, affective commitment was also found to contribute significantly with 5 per cent of the variance (Part correlation), 9 per cent of the variance (Partial correlation) and 36 per cent of the variance (Zero-Order correlation) when all other variables are controlled for.
variance (Zero-Order correlation) when all other variables are controlled for. While POS was found to be significant in predicting satisfaction, it only contributed to 1 per cent of the variance (Part Correlation) and 3 per cent of the variance (Partial correlation) when all other variables are controlled for, suggesting that the perceived support gained from the respondents’ immediate supervisor affects their satisfaction, but the perceived support gained from the organisation does not affect satisfaction.

Data collected from Stages Two and Three supported these relationships, in which it was found that respondents from both stages of the research held positive perceptions of organisational support, which contributed to their affective commitment to the organisation. Perceptions of supervisor support, which were identified as negative amongst the focus group interview participants, were found to have an impact on the satisfaction of participants, but not on their affective commitment. This indicates that if the participant is unhappy with the support provided by their immediate supervisor, this will affect their satisfaction with their experience, but not their affective commitment. Interestingly, perceptions of organisational support, which were identified as relatively positive amongst focus group interview participants, and positive amongst individual interview participants, were found to have a direct relationship with respondents’ affective commitment, but not satisfaction. Thus, if the participant feels the organisation is positively supporting them, this builds a more committed volunteer base, but does not make them more satisfied with their experience. This was further confirmed by the results of the Pearson correlation analysis derived from data collected in Stage One, which indicated that high levels of POS are associated with high levels of commitment, high levels of PSS are associated with high levels of satisfaction and high levels of satisfaction are associated with high levels of commitment.
The relationship between the four constructs drawn from the findings of the qualitative data can be visually depicted in Figures 4.1 (below) and 4.2 (see page 206), concerning the volunteer team leaders and general volunteers respectively. Figure 4.1 summarises the findings relating to the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction for the volunteer team leaders. Satisfaction mediates the relationship between POS and affective commitment, and PSS and affective commitment, while POS and PSS also have a direct influence on the commitment of the volunteer. There are also direct relationships between POS and PSS, POS and satisfaction, PSS and satisfaction and affective commitment and satisfaction.

**Figure 4.1: The Relationship between POS, PSS, Affective Commitment and Satisfaction for the Volunteer Team Leaders:**
Figure 4.2 summarises the qualitative findings of the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction for the general volunteers. Satisfaction mediates the relationship between PSS and affective commitment, while PSS mediates the relationship between POS and satisfaction. There are direct relationships between POS and PSS, POS and affective commitment, affective commitment and satisfaction and PSS and satisfaction; indirect relationships exist between PSS and affective commitment and POS and satisfaction.

**Figure 4.2: The Relationship between POS, PSS, Affective Commitment and Satisfaction for the General Volunteers:**

The following chapter summarises and discusses the conclusions drawn from the results presented in Chapter Four, discusses the implications of the research and makes recommendations for further research.
This chapter discusses the results of the study and draws conclusions from the research. The major limitations of the study are identified and discussed, and the implications for theory and practice are presented. A number of recommendations for further research are offered, followed by a discussion of the contribution of the study to the field, together with a concluding statement.

The premise to this study is that volunteers are utilised extensively in the preparation and execution of sport events, and contribute substantially to their success and so it is important to understand more about how event managers can maximise their commitment and satisfaction. Although a significant amount of research focusing on POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction exists within paid employment settings, little reported research addresses these issues in relation to volunteers in the context of sport events. As POS and PSS are relatively new concepts (Eisenberger et al, 1986; 2002), their application within a voluntary context has been limited; an examination of POS and PSS amongst sport event volunteers had not previously been performed.

The study identified a need to examine the role of organisational and supervisor support in predicting the affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers. Volunteers are considered critical to the success of sport events; therefore it is essential for event managers to effectively manage their volunteer labour. This study investigated the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction for sport event volunteers of the 2010 ATB event. It investigated the antecedents of POS; what volunteers perceive encompasses organisational support,
and the relationships between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction. In order to maximise the veracity of the data analysis, triangulation in the form of quantitative self-administered questionnaires, qualitative focus group interviews and individual interviews was utilised in the study design. The following section discusses and draws conclusions from the results pertaining to each of the research questions.
ANTECEDENTS OF POS

The first research question investigated the nature of POS for sport event volunteers with the results indicating five antecedents, namely PSS, fairness (organisational justice), favourable rewards and task conditions, growth opportunities and participation in decision making.

PSS

The results indicated that PSS was a significant component of POS. Results from the quantitative analysis in Stage One revealed that there was a strong, significant relationship between the two concepts. When a volunteer holds positive perceptions of supervisor support, this positively influences their perceptions of organisational support. This finding is consistent with the general consensus within the literature, in that PSS has previously been identified to be a contributor of POS (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Yoon, Han, & Seo, 1996; Hutchison, 1997a, 1997b; Wayne, Shore & Linen, 1997; Yoon & Lim, 1999; Yoon & Thye, 2000; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Eisenberger et al, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006).

The qualitative data gathered from Stage Two indicated that the majority of respondents (i.e., general volunteers) felt they received little supervisor support from the team leaders, largely due to a lack of communication and information. This was also reflected in their perceptions of organisational support, which were, overall, negative. The results showed that if volunteers feel that they are not positively supported by their immediate supervisor, then this is going to influence their perceptions of support provided by the organisation. When volunteers have little contact with the organisation (as is the case with the current study), and their primary support comes from their immediate supervisor, the volunteer is likely to interpret
organisational support as that which is provided by their immediate supervisor acting as an agent of the organisation. This conclusion is supported in the literature, in that when an individual whose direct contact lies solely with their immediate supervisor, their supervisor becomes the organisation to them (Elias & Mittal, 2011), thus reflecting their perceptions of organisational support.

In contrast however, the qualitative data gathered from Stage Three revealed that the team leaders perceived the support they provided to their subordinates (general volunteers) was positive, and took the form of communication/relaying information, exhibiting appreciation and providing general assistance. It is interesting to note the difference in perceptions of the team leaders and the general volunteers, suggesting that either the team leaders are unable to self-criticise or that general volunteers’ expectations of support are greater than the support provided thus far in the event. It should be noted that formal feedback processes are not in place to facilitate feedback from general volunteers to their immediate supervisor. This results in the team leader being unaware that they are not sufficiently supporting the general volunteers, and thus do not change their behaviour as they believe they are adequately performing their role in supporting their team. These issues add to the difficulties in managing volunteers in event contexts. Due to the episodic nature of event volunteering, volunteers often are not presented with the opportunity, or are unwilling to provide feedback regarding their volunteer experience, as it is not ongoing, and they may see little benefit in doing so. Therefore, it would be in the organisations best interest, as well as the interest of the volunteers, to provide avenues for volunteers to provide feedback in a timely manner, regarding their experience. This will help to reconcile the differences felt between the supervisor and the volunteer.
Fairness (Organisational Justice)

The study found that the perceptions of fairness (organisational justice) held by general volunteers did not significantly contribute to their overall perceptions of organisational support. The dominating theme identified was that focus group interview participants believed they received positive fair treatment, regardless of their perceptions of organisational and supervisor support. However, as the qualitative data from Stage Two showed, these participants held somewhat negative perceptions of organisational support, suggesting that for the purpose of this study, fairness (organisational justice) was not an antecedent of organisational support.

Obviously, this finding is in conflict with the majority of the literature, which suggests that fairness contributes to an individual’s perceptions of organisational support (Eisenberger et al, 1986; Pack, 2005; Jordan, Turner & Pack, 2009). This contradiction may be as a result of the volunteer context for the study, in which the short term nature of the event prevents volunteers from forming a clear sense of what is fair in the context of their volunteer role. Longer term volunteers (as opposed to event volunteers), may well consider fairness a significant element of POS as they experience continual interactions with the organisation.

Due to event volunteering being episodic in nature, participants have limited contact with their supervisor and the organisation in the lead up to, during and after the event. As such, this may contribute to the substance of POS felt amongst the sample, as they indicated they felt there was not sufficient communication and information provided by their supervisor, as well as BV as an organisation. While participants believed they did not receive positive support from BV, they still believed they were treated fairly and with respect. This may be due to the fact that volunteers were given the freedom
to select their role whilst volunteering, and they associated ‘fairness’ with the selection procedure, rather than their actual treatment during their voluntary experience at the event.

In contrast however, the study found that the perceptions of fairness (organisational justice) held by the team leaders was identified as an antecedent of POS. Team leaders indicated that they were treated fairly and in a positive manner by BV as an organisation, which enhanced their perceptions of organisational support, confirming that fairness (organisational justice) is indeed an antecedent of POS for the volunteer team leaders. These findings are supported in the literature, which reveals that fairness (organisational justice) enhances perceptions of organisational support felt by individuals (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Hums & Chelladurai, 1994; Brockner, 1996; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001; Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Kashyap et al, 2007; Dayan & Di Benedetto, 2008; Janssen et al, 2009, Zapata-Phelan et al, 2009).

The differences in the perceptions of fairness (organisational justice) as an antecedent of POS between volunteer team leaders and general volunteers may be attributed to the fact that the volunteer team leaders have a closer relationship with the organisation. As the team leaders are long-term volunteers, who experience continual interactions with the organisation, and have a higher degree of responsibility than the general volunteers, they consider fairness (organisational justice) to be an element of the organisational support they receive. This contradiction between the volunteer team leaders and the general volunteers may be resolved by enabling the general volunteers a closer connection with the organisation, in order to build more meaningful relationships with the organisation, as well as their direct supervisor.
Chapter Five – Discussion and Conclusions

Favourable Rewards and Task Conditions

Results from Stages Two and Three of the study found that the favourable rewards gained by both general volunteers and team leaders were not antecedents of POS. Participants from both stages of the study indicated that personal and social rewards were the dominant rewards gained through volunteering. It is because of these rewards, which are not provided by the organisation, but instead are created by the individual’s interactions with fellow volunteers, as well as within oneself, that it is concluded that for the current study, the favourable rewards identified do not contribute to the overall perceptions of organisational support. This finding contradicts the literature, which implies that favourable rewards do contribute to the level of perceived support delivered by the organisation (Eisenberger et al, 1997; Rhoades et al, 2001; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003).

This finding may be in part due to the study being focussed on volunteers rather than paid staff. This is due to the conditions of volunteer labour, where there is little (if any) paid employment relationship established over the course of the involvement between the volunteer and the organisation (Catano et al, 2001). This confirms that the favourable rewards identified within the literature (pay, promotions, job security, autonomy, role stressors) are not important to a volunteer base, and therefore do not contribute to their perceptions of organisational support. Instead, volunteers, as highlighted in the study, perceive personal and social rewards to be the main benefit gained from volunteering, which are not provided directly by the organisation, and therefore are not considered antecedents of POS.
With regard to task conditions, results from Stages Two and Three of the study found that the task conditions provided by the organisation also were not considered antecedents of POS. Task conditions, including job security, role stressors (work overload, role ambiguity and role conflict) and training (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), were considered unimportant by the respondents. This may be due to the conditions of volunteer labour at events, in that as their volunteer employment terminates at the conclusion of the event, volunteers do not expect job security to be an aspect of their involvement, and therefore, does not contribute to POS.

Similarly, role stressors were also not considered to impact on volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support, as participants did not feel they were unable to cope with environmental demands, deeming role stressors to be unimportant. Training was also considered not to contribute to POS, as participants did not believe they required training; volunteer information sessions were sufficient. Once again, this finding is due to the nature of event volunteering in that volunteers were only required to provide their assistance for one day. This suggests that training for the role was not necessary, and may result in individuals becoming unwilling to volunteer at the event if they are expected to undergo training for a one day event. The final task condition identified, the level of autonomy participants held with regard to their role, was considered important for participants within both Stage Two and Three in contributing to their level of POS. However, respondents discussed their autonomy when asked about the decisions they made with regard to their role, and not as a separate task condition. As such, autonomy is discussed in a later section of this chapter, as part of participation in decision making as an antecedent of POS.
Growth Opportunities

Within Stage Two, results found that the growth opportunities presented to volunteers (or lack thereof) was not an antecedent of POS. Participants expressed a lack of growth opportunities in that they perceived they gained no new skills through their volunteer experience; however, they also indicated that the experience reinforced existing skills and personal attributes. This finding contradicts the consensus within the literature, that when an organisation actively provides opportunities for individual growth, individuals may evaluate these opportunities in terms of the level of support they perceive to gain from the organisation, thus indicating that growth opportunities are an antecedent of POS (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Graen et al, 1986; Feldman & Weitz, 1988; Chay & Aryee, 1999; Green & Butkus, 1999; Aryee & Chen, 2004; Grawitch et al, 2009). The contradiction may be attributed to the fact that growth opportunities as an antecedent of POS is not applicable to an event volunteer sample, due to the circumstances surrounding volunteer involvement. As an event possesses a pulsating nature (Hanlon & Jago, 2000), there is little possibility that a general volunteer, who is involved with the event on a limited, once off basis, would be presented with growth opportunities, and thus is unable to, or unwilling to progress within the organisation.

The results from Stage Three showed that a majority of the sample indicated that they did receive growth opportunities in the form of intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. However, these skills are gained through the socialisation with fellow volunteers, as well as created internally. Therefore, growth opportunities were concluded to not be antecedents of POS of sport event volunteers as they are not provided by the organisation; they are driven by the individual.
Participation in Decision Making

Results from Stages Two and Three of the study found that the level of participation in decision making that respondents had whilst volunteering did contribute to their overall level of POS. Data showed that respondents from both stages were satisfied with the level of decision making with their role, as they believed they were capable of such responsibilities. This finding supports the literature in which it is evident that participation in decision making assists in empowering individuals, aiding in the development of positive perceptions of organisational support (Heilman et al, 1984; Locke et al, 1986; Boshoff & Mels, 1995; Glew et al, 1995; Vanyperen et al, 1999; Ugboro & Obeng, 2000; Soonhee, 2002; Allen et al, 2003; McDonald, 2009). As the respondents indicated that they were given the responsibility to make ‘on the spot’ decisions regarding their role, this helped to enhance their perceptions of organisational support, as the responsibility was provided directly by the organisation.

It is concluded that the location of where a participant volunteered acted as a moderator between the independent variables of PSS and participation in decision making and the dependent variable of POS. As the results show, respondents from the Geelong region were more likely to express positive perceptions of supervisor support, and indicated higher satisfaction with their level of autonomy with their role, than those respondents from the City or Mornington localities. This suggests that the behaviour of the supervisor at different locations moderates the direction and strength of the relationship between the independent variables of PSS and participation in decision making and the dependent variable of POS.

In summary, PSS and the satisfaction respondents held with the level of decision making regarding their role were found to contribute to their overall perceptions of
organisational support. Fairness, in which all participants believed they were treated in a positive manner, the extent that respondents believed they received favourable rewards as a result of volunteering, and where there were no growth opportunities presented, were concluded to not be antecedents of POS.
POS, AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT AND SATISFACTION

The second research question investigated the relationship between sport event volunteers’ affective commitment to the organisation, satisfaction with their experience and perceptions of organisational support.

Results from Stage One of the study identified significant positive relationships between POS and affective commitment. As such, high levels of POS were associated with high levels of commitment, indicating that the level of organisational support perceived by volunteers contributed to their level of commitment to the organisation. POS was found to make a strong contribution in predicting volunteers’ commitment to the organisation. These findings support the literature in which there is consensus amongst researchers that positive perceptions of organisational support enhance commitment to the organisation, in particular, affective commitment (Eisenberger et al, 1990; McFarlane, Shore & Wayne, 1993; Eisenberger et al, 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Wayne et al, 2002).

Results from Stage Three of the study also add to this conclusion, in that the volunteer team leaders indicated a strong commitment to the organisation. These volunteer team leaders had a close working relationship with the organisation and expressed positive perceptions of organisational support. In contrast, the general volunteers within Stage Two indicated they were not committed to the organisation, and did not hold positive perceptions of organisational support. This finding can be explained by the fact that the general volunteers did not have a close relationship with the organisation; they only had a close working relationship with their immediate supervisor. This suggests that the general volunteers were unable to perceive the support provided by the organisation as positive, as they instead received the support from their immediate
supervisor, and not the organisation. The conclusion to be drawn from this discussion is that individual volunteers will perceive organisational support, and its source, based on their individual volunteering experience they have over the course of an event.

Results from Stage One of the study identified positive relationships between POS and satisfaction. As such, high levels of POS were associated with high levels of satisfaction. The literature suggests that POS correlates positively with employee satisfaction within a paid employee setting (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), in which the relationship was mediated by positive job conditions (Eisenberger et al, 1997). The findings of Stage One reflect the literature in that POS and satisfaction are positively correlated, however, findings also illustrate that the strength of this relationship was insignificant; POS did not contribute to respondents’ level of satisfaction, which contradicts the literature. This finding may be explained by the fact that the volunteers gained satisfaction with their experience as a result of helping others; satisfaction was partially driven by internal emotion, as well as the direct contact they had with their immediate supervisor. As the volunteers did not have a direct relationship with the organisation, the organisation was unable to contribute to their feelings of satisfaction, as the volunteers did not associate the creation of satisfaction to be as a result of the organisation.

Stage Two of the study also revealed that POS does not contribute to the satisfaction of the general volunteers. Whilst respondents of the focus group interviews expressed a mixture of satisfaction with their experience (as a result of their contribution to helping others, driven by internal forces), and dissatisfaction with their experience (caused by perceptions of negative support, in the form of lack of information/communication and poor volunteer management, driven by external
forces), it is evident that the level of (dis)satisfaction participants felt with their experience was not as a result of their perceptions of organisational support. Arguably this is because the general volunteers did not have a direct relationship with the organisation; rather their contact was primarily with their immediate supervisor.

Results from Stage One indicate that the level of satisfaction volunteers receive as a result of their experience positively influences the level of volunteers’ commitment to the organisation; a satisfied volunteer is a committed volunteer. Satisfaction was found to be the strongest element influencing participants’ affective commitment. These findings are consistent with the literature in that there is consensus amongst researchers that affective commitment and satisfaction are significantly positively related (Porter et al, 1974; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Eisenberger et al, 1990; Aryee et al, 1991; Begley & Czajka, 1993; Eby et al, 1999; Goulet & Singh, 2002; Meyer et al, 2002; Foley et al, 2006; Guleryuz et al, 2008).

Based on results from the qualitative analysis, it was concluded that the location of where the participant was volunteering, as well as previous volunteer experience influenced the relationship between POS and affective commitment. Results showed that those volunteers who were located in the Geelong region, as opposed to the City or Mornington localities, expressed more positive perceptions of organisational support and were more committed. This was attributed to the behaviour of their immediate supervisor, in which the support provided by the supervisor was more positive than that provided to volunteers at the other localities, which directly influenced their perceptions of organisational support. Finally, those volunteers who had a history of volunteering, as opposed to the first time volunteers, also expressed more positive perceptions of organisational support, which influenced their affective...
commitment. This may be due to those volunteers with previous experience having a prior knowledge of what to do in their role, therefore, require the support from their supervisor or the organisation to a lesser extent than those first time volunteers who needed direction and guidance from either their supervisor or the organisation, to feel fulfilled.

In summary, POS was found to be significantly and positively related to affective commitment and satisfaction. However, POS was found to make a unique and significant contribution to the overall satisfaction of the volunteers. POS was found to be a strong contributor to the level of affective commitment volunteers held with the organisation. Finally, satisfaction and affective commitment were significantly positively correlated, illustrating that the satisfaction respondents felt with their experience contributed to the affective commitment they held towards the organisation.
PSS, AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT AND SATISFACTION

The third research question investigated the relationship between sport event volunteers’ affective commitment to the organisation, satisfaction with their experience and perceptions of supervisor support.

Results from Stage One of the study identified positive relationships between PSS and affective commitment with higher levels of PSS associated with higher levels of commitment; however, this relationship was insignificant. The literature suggests that PSS correlates positively with affective commitment within a paid employment setting; when an individual experiences positive perceptions of supervisor support, this results in enhanced affective commitment (Rhoades et al, 2001; Vandenbergh et al, 2004; Stinglhamber et al, 2006). While the findings of Stage One reflect the literature in that PSS and affective commitment are positively correlated, the findings also illustrate that the strength of this relationship was insignificant; PSS did not contribute to respondents’ level of commitment to the organisation, as the strength of other predictors (POS and satisfaction) were found to be more dominant.

Stage Two of the study also reveals that PSS does not contribute to the affective commitment of the general volunteers. Respondents (general volunteers) indicated they were not committed to their supervisor, and the majority did not hold positive perceptions of supervisor support, due to a lack of communication and information. It can be suggested that participants do not build commitment towards the organisation they are volunteering with through the support provided to them by their immediate supervisor. Instead, the formal support provided by the organisation, in the form of communication and information, is what they value and what ultimately leads to a committed volunteer base. The social relationships developed between the volunteer
and their immediate supervisor were found to have no direct impact on predicting the affective commitment of sport event volunteers.

Results from Stage One of the study identified significant positive relationships between PSS and satisfaction. Higher levels of PSS were associated with higher levels of satisfaction, which indicates that the level of supervisor support perceived by volunteers contributed to their level of satisfaction with their experience; PSS was found to make the strongest individual contribution in predicting volunteers’ satisfaction. These findings support the literature in which there is consensus amongst researchers which demonstrate an increased level of employee satisfaction with the experience, when an individual experiences positive perceptions of supervisor support within a paid employment setting (Munn et al, 1996; Griffin et al, 2001; Brough & Frame, 2004; Hall, 2007; Elias & Mittal, 2011).

The results of Stage Two also support this conclusion, in that respondents expressed varying levels of satisfaction with their experience, largely dependent on the locality of where they were volunteering. Respondents also perceived different levels of support were provided to them via their immediate supervisor with those participants who were dissatisfied with their experience holding negative perceptions of supervisor support (in the form of lack of communication and information), and were located in the Melbourne and Mornington districts. In contrast, those participants who expressed satisfaction with their experience also perceived their supervisor support to be positive; these respondents were in the Geelong region. Those general volunteers who received positive support from their supervisor, (in form of clear role descriptions, open two-way communication, and a general concern for their well-being), also had a satisfying experience, and indicated they were more likely to return. Therefore, it is
suggested that sport event volunteers value the direct, informal, social relationship between themselves and their supervisor, which in turn predicts their satisfaction with their volunteer experience. The formal support provided by the organisation, in the form of formal information via email and the volunteer handbook, were found to have no impact on predicting the satisfaction of sport event volunteers.

Based on results from the qualitative analysis, it was concluded that the location of where the participant was volunteering, as well as previous volunteer experience, influenced the relationship between PSS and satisfaction. Results showed that those volunteers who were located in the Geelong region, as opposed to the City or Mornington localities expressed more positive perceptions of supervisor support and held greater satisfaction with their experience. This was attributed to the behaviour of their immediate supervisor, in which the support provided by the supervisor was more positive than that provided to volunteers at the other localities, which directly influenced their perceptions of organisational support. Similarly those volunteers who had a history of volunteering, as opposed to the first time volunteers, also expressed more positive perceptions of supervisor support, which influenced their satisfaction. This may be due to those volunteers with previous experience having a prior knowledge of what to do in their role, therefore required the support from their supervisor or the organisation to a lesser extent than those first time volunteers who needed direction and guidance from either their supervisor or the organisation, to feel satisfied.

When considering the mediating relationships between the key variables, results suggested that satisfaction mediated the relationship between PSS and affective commitment (an indirect relationship between PSS and affective commitment), and
PSS acted as a mediator between the independent variable of POS and the dependent variable of satisfaction (again, an indirect relationship between POS and satisfaction).

In summary, PSS was found to be significantly and positively related to the satisfaction of sport event volunteers. PSS was found not to be significantly related to affective commitment, and did not contribute to the overall affective commitment of sport event volunteers. The next section of the chapter presents the methodological limitations of the study, and how each limitation was addressed by the study design.
METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS

As with most research, there were methodological limitations identified, which may have had an adverse effect on the results of the study. The first limitation identified was the case study approach to the research, with a focus on Bicycle Victoria’s 2010 ATB cycling event. As the research was concentrated on a single sport event, the results may not be easily generalised to other events which utilise volunteer personnel. However, this limitation was addressed by the study design. Through utilising triangulation and incorporating a three stage study, as well as noting the strength in the statistical results, the conclusions of this study may be applicable to volunteers in different contexts.

Limitations concerning the data collection process were identified, including the use of a self-administered questionnaire, sent to the sample via email. Whilst this form of data collection is useful in reaching a wide population, it presents the problem of the respondents misinterpreting the questions, as the researcher is not available to clarify information for them during response. There is also lack of control for the researcher, in who actually responds to the questionnaire; there was no guarantee that the intended recipient actually completed and submitted the questionnaire. These limitations were addressed by including the researchers contact information on the participant information sheet, and encouraging respondents to contact the researcher if necessary, as well as sending the questionnaire to the intended recipients’ personal email address (sent by BV), and addressing it directly to them.

Restrictions in gaining access to BV’s database (having to rely on BV to send out the questionnaire and reminders on behalf of the researcher) also proved to present a limitation to the study. Regardless of constant contact with BV, and persistent requests
for reminders to be sent (at a specific date and time) to the population to complete and submit their questionnaire, this was often overlooked by BV, resulting in reminders being sent late thus jeopardising the number of the sample.

The use of a single questionnaire may also present limitations to the study, in that it may produce data that has limited utility. The data reflects a single event, rather than reflections of volunteer experience over time at various events. However, due to the design of the study incorporating a case study approach, the participants were encouraged to only consider their perceptions of the 2010 ATB event, and not of any others they may have been involved with. This limitation was further addressed by administering the questionnaire immediately after the event, so as to avoid any confusion by the participant.

The collection and analysis of the qualitative data also presented limitations. Such limitations included recruiting participants to be involved in the focus group interviews of Stage Two. Even though these respondents specified they would be willing to partake in further analysis via their completed questionnaire in Stage One, when it actually came to inviting the respondents to participate, many declined the offer. This was partly due to the location of the focus group interviews which required the respondents to physically travel a distance from their home, thus incurring additional expenses. As such, recruiting participants was done so through a matter of convenience; if an individual stated they would be happy to participate, then they were recruited. The limitation of gaining a sufficient number of respondents was addressed through offering an incentive of being entered into a draw to win two double cinema passes, as well as providing refreshments during the focus group interviews. The
limitation of convenience sampling however, was not addressed but was justified, as the sample was still a good representation of the population.

Lack of finance also resulted in seven of the eight focus group interviews being located at the one central location in Melbourne City, with the eighth focus group interview situated in central Geelong, physically close to a number of participants from the sample. Had the option of locating the focus group interviews closer to segments of the sample been presented, this may have resulted in a higher number of respondents agreeing to take part in the focus group, as they would not incur expenses associated with travelling. This limitation was addressed by scheduling focus group interviews on dates convenient to the participants to coincide with a date in which they would already be in the city.

The time of the focus group interviews also presented problems, as the meeting rooms accessed for the focus group interviews closed at 6:00pm, which resulted in the focus group interviews having to be held from 4:30pm until 6:00pm, which did not suit many people due to work or study commitments. This limitation was addressed through scheduling extra focus group interviews on days that participants were available, and able to attend for the entire session. These issues involving location or time were not present regarding the individual telephone interviews of Stage Three, as they were conducted over the phone at a time and location convenient to the participant.

It is important to understand that bias may occur when analysing qualitative data; it is essentially the researcher who interprets what was said. Unfortunately, this may lead to challenges regarding the reliability and validity of the data reported (Andrew et al,
2011). While recognised as a possible limitation to the study, this was addressed through the research design incorporating triangulation, which helped to validate the qualitative data.

Finally, it is important to recognise common method of variance in the high correlation value between PSS and POS as a limitation to the study. Due to the way the data were collected from a single group of volunteers, single source bias occurred. While not avoided completely, this limitation was controlled by gaining perspective from both the team leader volunteers as well as the general volunteers, in order to verify the findings.

Despite these limitations, the study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, using triangulation to enhance the veracity of the research findings. The theoretical implications of the findings of the study are now presented.
IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY

Organisational and supervisor support were found to be related to volunteers’ affective commitment and satisfaction respectively. It was also found that POS is enhanced by supervisor support and the level of decision making with the role. This section considers the implications of this study for theory.

The study applied organisational psychology theory to examine the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers. Although developed within a paid employment setting, the scales used for the study were applicable to a voluntary context, and were selected due to their high internal validity and reliability. Due to their wide application amongst voluntary studies in recent literature, each scale was able to be generalised to a sport event volunteer context. This is due to the fact that volunteers develop a relationship with their organisation, much like that of a paid employee does with their organisation; the items in each scale could be adjusted to suit a volunteer sample, and still measure the intended variable. One of the implications of this study is that the instruments used (the SPOS [Eisenberger et al, 1986], SPSS [Eisenberger et al, 2002], Affective Commitment Scale [Allen & Meyer, 1990] and the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale [Weiss et al, 1967]) have all been identified as useful for the investigation of sport event volunteers.

In terms of identifying the nature of POS of sport event volunteers, the relationships found differed in the event volunteer context to that of a paid employee setting. It is suggested that the episodic nature of event volunteering creates a different type of environment in which the relationships between volunteers and their organisation develops. Therefore, the use of standard human resource practices, applicable to a
paid employment setting, need to be modified to cater for these contextual differences. There may be other elements that form part of the antecedents of POS amongst event volunteers, highlighting the need for further research efforts in this respect. As such, the second implication for theory identified by this study is that the antecedents acknowledged within classic organisational theory are not relevant to a sport event context, due to the differences with volunteer labour as opposed to paid labour. It is advised that an instrument is designed to measure the antecedents of POS, specific to sport event volunteers. As the study highlighted, PSS and the satisfaction respondents held with the level of decision making regarding their role were found to contribute to their overall perceptions of organisational support. Therefore, these elements must be incorporated into an instrument measuring the construct. As the situation where there is little (if any) paid employment relationship between volunteers and their organisation is distinct from a paid employment setting, event volunteers require specific management systems, reflecting their own individual needs.

The study identified significant relationships between POS and PSS, POS and affective commitment, affective commitment and satisfaction, and satisfaction and PSS. These relationships are consistent with the literature, which also identify significant relationships amongst these variables within a paid employment setting. While these relationships have been thoroughly explored within a paid employment setting, there has been a limited application of these constructs amongst volunteers, and in particular, sport event volunteers. Although applied primarily within a paid employment context, the current study has brought to light the ability to apply these four constructs amongst volunteers; it is possible for POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction to be examined amongst sport event volunteers.
As previously mentioned, organisational and supervisor support and the situational outcomes of support, have had a limited application within a voluntary context; there has been no previous attention within a sport event volunteer context regarding these constructs. Much of the existing literature focuses on the issue of support and the outcomes of support within a paid organisational context, but does not address the issues surrounding volunteer engagement at sport events. The results of this study indicate that sport event volunteers enhance their satisfaction with their overall experience as a result of the relationships built with their immediate supervisor; they also saw that satisfaction failed to have a direct relationship with POS. Additionally, results show that volunteers’ affective commitment to the organisation is increased, as a result of the formal relationship with the organisation, but had no direct connection with PSS.

These findings present the implication for the sport volunteer theory by highlighting the importance of encouraging both formal and informal relationships between the volunteer, their immediate supervisor and the organisation with whom they are volunteering. While event volunteering occurs sporadically, this presents the organisation with the challenge of building close relationships with the volunteer base; lack of time in the lead up to the event, as well as the short time frame of the event itself add to these challenges. Therefore, the organisation needs to rely on the volunteer supervisor to act on behalf of the organisation in developing social interactions and building relationships with the volunteer. This form of social support delivered by the supervisor occurs within informal surroundings, as opposed to the formal relationships built between the organisation and volunteer. However, it is important for both formal and informal exchanges to transpire, in order for the volunteer to be satisfied with their experience, and committed to the organisation; a
conclusion the literature has failed to suggest. The current study has extended the knowledge in the field by highlighting the importance of measuring both the formal and informal support of volunteers, delivered by both the immediate supervisor, as well as the organisation.

Although very similar in nature, POS and PSS are indeed independent and separate concepts, and must be accepted as such. It is important for the theory to not only measure POS and PSS as the one construct, under the umbrella of support provided by the organisation, but the support provided by the supervisor, impartial to the organisation, must be recognised as an important avenue for examination. Rightly so, the support provided by a supervisor is an important factor that contributes to individuals’ overall perceptions of organisational support; however, the relationship an individual has with their supervisor, as opposed to the relationship with the organisation, may be vastly different, emphasising the importance of recognising each concept independently.

While the findings of this study are somewhat dissimilar to a paid organisational context, as reported in the literature, this research has highlighted a limitation to paid organisational theory, in that it is not fully applicable to a voluntary context. The implication of this is that future analyses of volunteer management at sport events need to not only consider theory centred on paid employment settings, but incorporate an element of volunteer management theory as well. The implications presented outline the contribution of this study to the body of knowledge that exists within the field. Relative to previous sport volunteer literature, this study has extended the knowledge about the management of volunteers at sport events. It has identified the need for volunteer managers to develop support systems that encourage both formal
and informal relationships between the volunteer and the organisation and supervisor respectively. This is because volunteers welcome the social relationships that evolve between themselves and their supervisor, who provides a level of informal support that is needed for the volunteer to feel satisfied. Additionally, volunteers also appreciate and desire the formal relationships built directly with the organisation, which provides the formal support in the form of standardised procedures and practices, which in turn, enhances the commitment amongst volunteers.

A final implication for theory presented, concerns the importance of identifying the mediators in the relationship between the four key concepts. While different contexts may identify differing results, the relationships identified between the key concepts, amongst volunteers at sport events sees that satisfaction mediates the relationship between PSS and affective commitment, while PSS mediates the relationship between POS and satisfaction. Direct relationships between POS and PSS, POS and affective commitment, affective commitment and satisfaction and PSS and satisfaction were identified, while indirect relationships exist between PSS and affective commitment and POS and satisfaction. It is important for scholars to understand these mediating effects between these constructs, so that they may be tested and further explored amongst additional sport volunteer settings; the practical implications of the findings of the study are now presented.
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

This study has sought to establish the nature of the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers, as well as ascertain the nature of POS. Based on the findings of the study there are a number of implications for the effective management of sport event volunteers.

As the findings and subsequent discussion highlight, sport event volunteers value the formal support provided by the organisation, and the informal, social support provided by their immediate supervisor. As such, volunteer support systems that are designed to incorporate both elements of formal and informal support should be utilised in the management of sport event volunteers. Based on the results of Stages Two and Three of the study, these systems should be designed with a focus on the formal processes and procedures, ensuring the provision of adequate information through clear written and verbal communications, either via post, email, telephone or in person. Providing coherent instruction manuals, with detailed information relating to the task, maps of the event site, contact details of all relevant persons within the organisation, emergency procedures and additional tools to effectively complete the task, including answers to common questions, will all contribute to the formal support provided by the organisation. These procedures are to be provided directly by the organisation, and the use of information sessions and volunteer meetings should be encouraged to allow for further clarification.

Additionally, these volunteer support systems should also incorporate an element of social support, delivered directly by the immediate supervisor. As well as the formal procedures delivered by the organisation, sport event volunteers value the informal relationships they build with their immediate supervisor. These relationships should
begin with written and verbal communication via email and telephone, where the supervisor and volunteer begin to build a personal relationship. Informal meetings in the lead up to the event would also be beneficial, in which the volunteer can meet with their supervisor face-to-face. By the time of the event, a social connection has already been developed and the volunteer feels more comfortable with their supervisor, and as such, more satisfied with their experience. Providing the volunteer with a non-threatening environment which encourages the volunteer to contact their supervisor at any time, will also assist in building the social relationships needed. During the actual event, the supervisor is encouraged to act as a mentor to the volunteer. They should be available at all times (either in person or via telephone) to respond to questions the volunteer may have, and should provide encouragement and personal support. The volunteer needs to feel they are working in a safe environment, where they do not feel intimidated. By providing this level of social support through informal interactions, the supervisor will assist in increasing the volunteers’ satisfaction with the experience; this may be applicable to all volunteers, and not just sport event volunteers.

With regard to the nature of organisational support, it is important for organisations who employ sport event volunteers to understand what exactly their volunteers desire. Further research should address this issue. However, it is suggested that organisations develop support systems to incorporate the elements that volunteers express are important. As the findings for the study have shown, these support systems should include an element of supervisor support, and allow the individual to make decisions regarding their volunteer activity. This could be as minor as selecting what role they are to perform on the day, to operational decisions on how to actually perform that role, and to take responsibility for their decisions.
The provision of support to the volunteer demonstrates that the volunteer is cared about and valued by the supervisor, and the organisation. The implications for these organisational behaviours provide an added inducement for the supervisor, and the organisation as a whole, to be more aware of appropriate volunteer management practices. As demonstrated though this study, within a sport event management setting, it is important for both the organisation and the supervisor to provide a level of support to the volunteer in order to enhance the volunteers’ commitment to the organisation and their satisfaction with the volunteer experience. This will subsequently benefit the organisation, through a more satisfied and committed volunteer base, thus reducing costs associated with turnover.

POS and PSS are a critical connection between the actions and behaviours of the organisation and supervisor, and the volunteer’s actions and behaviours; what behaviour the organisation and supervisor display will directly affect the individual. POS provides a greater understanding of the sport event volunteers’ affective commitment, and PSS provides a greater understanding of their satisfaction, which may provide a basis of understanding volunteers’ intentions to remain, and designing and implementing appropriate volunteer management systems to reduce negative outcomes. From a practical perspective, the provision of support is realised through volunteer outcomes including affective commitment, satisfaction and intent to remain. Therefore, for these outcomes to be realised, the appropriate levels of both supervisor and organisational support must be delivered.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings and limitations of this study provide a basis to make recommendations about further research into the management of volunteers at sport events. While this study addressed a number of research questions, related to POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers, more studies are needed to further examine this topic. The following recommendations for further research may help to further understand the sport event volunteer experience, and assist by identifying suitable management practices.

The SPOS (Eisenberger et al, 1986), SPSS (Eisenberger et al, 2002), Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale (Weiss et al, 1967) utilised within this study, have been shown to be valid and reliable measures of the constructs examined amongst sport event volunteers. Each scale offers researchers a useful tool to further explore the dynamics of support, and its influence on situational outcomes. Future research should apply these scales across a larger sample size at a larger sport event, in order to conduct a further analysis of their applicability in a voluntary sport event context. The application of these scales amongst a larger sample size and at different sport events, would also enable a further exploration of the role of organisational and supervisor support in predicting situational outcomes, and to determine whether there is a difference based upon the size or type of the event.

As the study examined one single event at one moment in time, this presents the opportunity to replicate the research design, and extend the research by adopting a longitudinal study, and monitoring volunteer perceptions over time at various events. This would benefit the literature as it would enable comparisons to be made at
different events held by the same organisation, as well as at different years (2010 ATB event, as opposed to the 2011 ATB event). It would be interesting to view whether perceptions changed over time, and whether the volunteers believed they were treated differently at different events. It would also be beneficial to monitor volunteer perceptions before and after the event by administering data collection at pre and post event intervals. This would enable a comparison to be made with regard to volunteer predicted perceptions before the event and actual perceptions at the completion of the event.

The study found that POS contributed to the affective commitment of sport event volunteers, but PSS did not; it also found that PSS contributed to the satisfaction of the volunteers, but POS did not. This relationship between the differing degrees of support, and their impact on individual outcomes, should be further examined within a voluntary sport context. Although examined amongst sport event volunteers, it is recommended that PSS is further investigated amongst volunteers in different settings, and measured independently of POS. This is recommended in order to determine the importance of the support provided by the immediate supervisor, in comparison to the support provided by the organisation, in predicting the situational outcomes of volunteers.

Volunteers’ intent to remain within a sport event context is also a worthy element to further explore, to determine the influence of supervisor support as opposed to organisational support, in predicting the retention of volunteers. While retention has had considerable attention within general volunteer literature, it has had a limited focus amongst event volunteers, and in particular, sport event volunteers. It is essential to further examine retention as an outcome of POS and PSS, and its
relationship with affective commitment and satisfaction. As the nature of events is episodic, volunteer labour is terminated at the completion of the event, highlighting the importance of examining the retention of event volunteers at future events, and how the support provided by the organisation or supervisor may induce this retention.

Based on the results of research questions two and three, regarding the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction, it is advised that further research delve into these phenomena. The question of why POS does not influence sport event volunteers’ satisfaction with their experience must be investigated further; likewise, it is critical to examine why PSS does not impact on the affective commitment of sport event volunteers. The relationship between POS and PSS should also be further investigated, in order to determine whether the perceived support of sport event volunteers lies primarily with their immediate supervisor or the organisation, and the importance of each.

The study also found that PSS and the level of decision making volunteers held with regard to their role both contributed to the POS of sport event volunteers, whereas rewards and task conditions, fairness (organisational justice) and growth opportunities did not. The analysis of these factors was based on the antecedents identified within the organisational literature. However, there is a need to determine the exact nature of POS specific to a voluntary context, and in particular, amongst sport event volunteers. Therefore, further investigation into the nature of POS of sport event volunteers is recommended, to determine what these individuals value as support. It was found that the nature of POS differed in a paid employment setting, as to a voluntary sport event setting; therefore, this is a fruitful area for further exploration, perhaps through a qualitative exploratory approach. Examining the difference between a paid and
Voluntary sample to determine the different drivers of POS, would enable researchers to make distinct recommendations on the management of volunteers with respect to the support provided by the organisation. Event volunteers require different management systems to those within a paid employment setting, which is why it is important to establish suitable management practices for volunteers, and in particular, sport event volunteers.

The development of an instrument to determine and measure the antecedents of POS for volunteers that are context specific would also be beneficial in future research. It is recommended that this be performed through extensive qualitative analysis to gain an understanding on what POS is made up of within a particular context, and then to develop an instrument to measure these factors. Assessing the nature of POS, and developing a specific instrument to measure the antecedents of POS amongst sport event volunteers would contribute significantly to the volunteer literature. This would provide relevant framework specific to a volunteer cohort, rather than relying on factors identified within a paid organisational literature base.

Finally, in terms of the research setting for this study, supplementary research should examine similar outcomes of support amongst sport volunteers of non-profit organisations (rather than focusing solely on sport events) to investigate whether similar relationships exist outside the confines of an episodic event setting. As such, the population should be altered in further research to incorporate all sport volunteers, including those in community, as well as professional sport organisations who volunteer on an ongoing basis.
CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

The study investigated the relationship between POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers, as well as the nature of POS. The study has contributed to the body of knowledge concerning the management of sport event volunteers, specifically the measurement of volunteers’ perceptions of organisational and supervisor support, and the investigation of their relationship with affective commitment and satisfaction.

The study identified that the management of sport event volunteers was able to be conceptualised and measured using measures developed in the paid employment context. Specifically, the SPOS (Eisenberger et al, 1986), SPSS (Eisenberger et al, 2002), Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale (Weiss et al, 1967), were shown to be valid and reliable measures of the constructs studied. While the elements of POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction had been explored within paid employment settings, they had not been previously applied to a voluntary context, nor had they been specifically applied to a sport event volunteer context. This progression in the field has provided future researchers with suitable instruments to further explore the management of volunteers at sport events, and to help determine suitable practices in managing volunteers at sport events.

It was concluded that higher levels of POS were associated with higher levels of affective commitment and PSS, and higher levels of PSS were associated with higher levels of satisfaction. Additionally, higher levels of satisfaction were associated with higher levels of commitment, which indicates that the satisfaction and affective commitment of sport event volunteers was mediated by the perceptions of supervisor
and organisational support, respectively. Ultimately, a committed volunteer is one who is satisfied, and who receives the support needed from the organisation. POS was found not to be directly related to satisfaction, as well as PSS was not directly related to affective commitment, and had no influence on the outcome.

These findings aid the discussion amongst authors of organisational support, commitment and satisfaction literature by providing a novel understanding of the relationship between the constructs. Existing literature suggests that both POS and PSS result in the satisfaction and commitment of employed individuals, whereas the conclusions of the current study indicate that POS influences sport event volunteers’ commitment but PSS does not, and PSS influences their satisfaction when POS fails to contribute. These conclusions are a significant contribution to the sport volunteer literature as they offer a new understanding of the relationships between volunteers, supervisors and organisations.

The study also concluded that the nature of POS is somewhat distinct within a voluntary context, as to a paid employment setting. PSS and the level of decision making volunteers held with their role contributed to the perception of organisational support. Fairness (organisational justice), favourable rewards and task conditions and growth opportunities were found to have no contribution to the level of organisational support perceived by sport event volunteers. This finding opposes the literature, which suggests that all five elements are in fact antecedents of POS within a paid employment setting; however, the same conclusions cannot be drawn within a voluntary context.
Due to the episodic nature of event volunteering, factors that are important amongst individuals within ongoing employment settings were concluded not to be of significance to sport event volunteers. Volunteers did not strive for growth opportunities, as the volunteer experience was short term, and individuals had little opportunity to progress in status and responsibility. Additionally, respondents identified favourable rewards to be those generated by an internal state of emotion, brought on by their ability to assist, rather than tangible and intangible rewards provided by the organisation. As the rewards felt were driven by the individual, and not the organisation, it was evident that they did not contribute to the level of POS of sport event volunteers. Therefore, as the nature of POS has not previously been explored within a voluntary context, the study offers a unique contribution to the literature, which suggests that sport event volunteers’ POS is largely made up by the support of their immediate supervisor, and the volunteers’ ability to make decisions regarding their role, and not drivers that are evident within a paid employment setting.

The findings of this study add to the debate that has appeared within organisational support literature, which poses the question as to whether PSS is in fact an outcome of POS, as well as an antecedent to POS, and may also be independent of POS. While the majority of the literature supports the understanding that PSS is an antecedent of POS (Eisenberger et al, 2002), recent literature has exposed the trend which sees PSS to be an outcome of POS (Yoon & Thye, 2000; Dawley et al, 2008). While the current study agrees with existing literature in that PSS is indeed an antecedent of POS, it also suggests that PSS is independent of POS, and would be beneficial to examine it independently of POS. As such, this study has furthered knowledge surrounding the management of sport event volunteers, an area identified as being subject to only limited research.
Finally, the study identified a number of implications for improving the management of sport event volunteers. These included recommendations to design and implement volunteer support systems that incorporate both elements of formal and informal support in the management of sport event volunteers. These systems should deliver formal procedures directly from the organisation, as well as provide an element of social support through the volunteers’ immediate supervisor. Previous research has failed to identify the importance of volunteers building relationships with both the organisation and their immediate supervisor in a voluntary sport context, which this study has highlighted.
CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The study identified a need to investigate the role of organisational and supervisor support in predicting the affective commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers. A theoretical framework for the examination of these concepts was drawn from the literature of non-profit organisations, volunteers, sport management and paid employment fields. Three research questions were developed, focussing on the nature of POS, the relationship between POS, affective commitment and satisfaction, and the relationship between PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction.

It was concluded that PSS and the satisfaction respondents held with the level of decision making regarding their role were found to contribute to their overall perceptions of organisational support; PSS was identified as a major component of sport event volunteers’ POS. These findings support the literature, in which it is evident that when a volunteer holds positive perceptions of supervisor support, this positively influences their perceptions of organisational support (Hutchison, 1997a, 1997b; Rhoades et al, 2001; Eisenberger et al, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006). Additionally, participation in decision making assists in empowering individuals, aiding in the development of positive perceptions of organisational support (Locke et al, 1986; Allen et al, 2003; McDonald, 2009).

Addressing research questions two and three, the data analysis produced interesting results regarding the relationships amongst POS, PSS, affective commitment and satisfaction. Significant relationships between the constructs were identified, where it was found that volunteer satisfaction and positive perceptions of organisational support resulted in a committed volunteer base. PSS was found to have very little
contribution, which indicates that the respondents’ perceptions of supervisor support are not related to their affective commitment.

POS was found not to contribute in predicting satisfaction, however, PSS significantly contributed to the respondents’ satisfaction, suggesting that the perceived support gained from the respondents’ immediate supervisor affects their satisfaction, but the perceived support gained from the organisation does not affect satisfaction. Although an antecedent of POS, PSS was also found to be independent of POS in predicting sport event volunteers’ satisfaction, which is consistent with the literature. Although the constructs are very similar, they are indeed independent of one another, and individuals build relationships with both the organisation, as well as their supervisor (Rhoades et al, 2001; Eisenberger et al, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006). The support provided by a supervisor is an important factor that contributes to individuals’ overall perceptions of organisational support. This relationship is greatly due to the fact that to an individual whose direct contact lies solely with their immediate supervisor, their supervisor becomes the organisation to them (Elias & Mittal, 2011), which is apparent within the current study.

The conclusions drawn from these findings are that volunteers value the informal support provided by their immediate supervisor, developed through social relationships, which ultimately lead to increased satisfaction with their experience. Indirectly, through their satisfaction, volunteers reported increased commitment with the organisation. Additionally, sport event volunteers value the formal procedures and practices put in place by the organisation, which reflects their perceptions on the formal organisational support provided directly by the organisation, and positively impacts upon their affective commitment to the organisation. It should be noted
however, that these conclusions are made only in relation to sport event volunteers within not-for-profit organisations.

The relationship between the four constructs and the conclusions drawn for the entire population can be visually depicted in Figure 5.1 (see page 249). As stated earlier, satisfaction mediates the relationship between PSS and affective commitment, while PSS mediates the relationship between POS and satisfaction. There are direct relationships between POS and PSS, POS and affective commitment, affective commitment and satisfaction and PSS and satisfaction; indirect relationships exist between PSS and affective commitment and POS and satisfaction.

If we refer back to Figure 1.5 on page 33, we can compare the expected relationships between the concepts (Figure 1.5), as based on the literature, with the actual relationships identified in the study (Figure 5.1). Interestingly, Figure 5.1 differs to Figure 1.5 quite significantly; while the expected and actual relationship between PSS and POS are the same, PSS did not have a direct relationship with commitment, nor did POS with satisfaction, as was first presumed based on the literature review.
The study has made a unique contribution to the field of sport management, in that these relationships had previously not been explored, and the findings are distinct from those reported in the literature. This research may assist organisations that employ volunteers for sport events, as it has identified some of the practices that should be present in volunteer management systems. As such, organisations should encourage the social relationship between volunteer and supervisor, but must also ensure that formal procedures (including effective communication, written information and clear instruction) are provided by the organisation. Through identifying the important elements that comprise organisational support for sport event volunteers, this may assist event management organisations design and deliver effective management practices, and may enhance individual volunteer satisfaction and commitment.
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Appendix One: Ethics Approval
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# Appendix Two: Dimensions of Volunteer Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>1. Free will (the ability to voluntarily choose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Relatively uncoerced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Obligation to volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>1. None at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. None expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Expenses reimbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Stipend/low pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1. Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended beneficiaries</td>
<td>1. Benefit/help others/strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Benefit/help friends or relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Benefit oneself (as well)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Three: Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al, 1986) –

1. The organisation values my contribution to its well-being*
2. If the organisation could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary it would do so (R)
3. The organisation fails to appreciate any extra effort from me (R)*
4. The organisation strongly considers my goals and values
5. The organisation would understand a long absence due to my illness
6. The organisation would ignore any complaint from me (R)*
7. The organisation disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me (R)
8. Help is available from the organisation when I have a problem
9. The organisation really cares about my well-being*
10. The organisation is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability
11. The organisation would fail to understand my absence due to a personal problem (R)
12. If the organisation found a more efficient way to get my job done, they would replace me (R)
13. The organisation would forgive an honest mistake on my part
14. It would take only a small decrease in my performance for the organisation to want to replace me (R)
15. The organisation feels there is little to be gained by employing me for the rest of my career (R)
16. The organisation provides me little opportunity to move up the ranks (R)
17. Even if I did the best job possible, the organisation would fail to notice (R)*
18. The organisation would grant a reasonable request for a change in my working conditions
19. If I were laid off, the organisation would prefer to hire someone new rather than take me back (R)
20. The organisation is willing to help me when I need a special favour
21. The organisation cares about my general satisfaction at work*
22. If given the opportunity, the organisation would take advantage of me (R)
23. The organisation shows very little concern for me (R)*
24. If I decided to quit, the organisation would try to persuade me to stay
25. The organisation cares about my opinions
26. The organisation feels that hiring me was a definite mistake (R)
27. The organisation takes pride in my accomplishments at work*
28. The organisation cares more about making a profit than about me (R)
29. The organisation would understand if I were unable to finish a task on time
30. If the organisation earned a greater profit, it would consider increasing my salary
31. The organisation feels that anyone could perform my job as well as I do (R)
32. The organisation is unconcerned about paying me what I deserve (R)
33. The organisation wishes to give me the best possible job for which I am qualified
34. If my job were eliminated, the organisation would prefer to lay me off rather than transfer me to a new job (R)
35. The organisation tries to make my job as interesting as possible
36. My supervisors are proud that I am part of this organisation

*Note – (R) indicates the item is reversed scored

*Note – The items marked with * were retained for the shortened nine item version of the survey

(Eisenberger et al, 1986).
Appendix Four: Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (Eisenberger et al, 2002) –

1. My supervisor values my contribution to the wellbeing of the event
2. My supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me (R)
3. My supervisor really cares about my well-being
4. Even if I did the best job possible, my supervisor would fail to notice (R)
5. My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction as a volunteer
6. My supervisor shows very little concern for me (R)
7. My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me (R)
8. My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments as a volunteer

Note – (R) indicates the item is reversed scored

Note – The items marked with * were retained for the shortened nine item version of the survey

(Eisenberger et al. 2002).
Appendix Five: Definitions of Commitment

### Affective Orientation
- “The attachment of an individual’s fund of affectivity and emotion to the group” (Kanter, 1968, p. 507).
- “An attitude or an orientation toward the organisation which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organisation” (Sheldon, 1971, p. 143).
- “The process by which the goals of the organisation and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent” (Hall, Schneider & Nygren, 1970, pp. 176 – 177).
- “A partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of the organisation, to one’s role in relation to goals and values, and to the organisation for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth” (Buchanan, 1974, p. 533).
- “The relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organisation” (Mowday et al, 1982, p. 27).

### Cost-Based
- “Profit associate with continued participation and a ‘cost’ associated with leaving” (Kanter, 1968, p. 504).
- “Commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity” (Becker, 1960, p. 32).
- “A structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organisational transactions and alterations in side bets or investments over time” (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972, p. 556).

### Obligation or Moral Responsibility
- “Commitment behaviours are socially accepted behaviours that exceed formal and/or normative expectations relevant to the object of commitment” (Wiener & Gechman, 1977, p. 48).
- “The totality of internalised normative pressures to act in a way which meets organisational goals and interests” (Wiener, 1982, p. 421).
- “The committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the company, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the firm gives him or her over the years” (Marsh & Mannari, 1977, p. 59).

Appendix Six: Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974)

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

*Note* – (R) indicates the statement has been reversed to avoid biased responses.

*Note* – The response range is from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”.
Appendix Seven: Affective Commitment Scale Items (Allen & Meyer, 1990)

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organisation.
2. I enjoy discussing my organisation with people outside it.
3. I really feel as if this organisation’s problems are my own.
4. I think I could easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to this one (R).
5. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organisation (R).
6. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organisation (R).
7. This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organisation (R).

Note – (R) indicates the statement has been reversed to avoid biased responses.

Note – The response range is from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”.
Appendix Eight: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1967)

Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following aspects of your job:

1. The chance to work alone on the job
2. The chance to different things from time to time
3. The chance to be “somebody” in the community
4. The way my boss handles his or her subordinates
5. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions
6. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience
7. The way my job provides for steady employment
8. The chance to do things for other people
9. The chance to tell people what to do
10. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities
11. The way the company policies are put into practice
12. The pay and the amount of work that I do
13. The chance for advancement on this job
14. The freedom to use my own judgement
15. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job
16. The working conditions
17. The way my co-workers get along with each other
18. The praise I get for doing a good job
19. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job
20. Being able to keep busy all the time

Note – The response range is from (1) “strongly dissatisfied” to (5) “strongly satisfied”.
Appendix Nine: Self-Administered Online Questionnaire

Bicycle Victoria Volunteer Survey

1. Survey Instructions

We are conducting a study that aims to investigate the perceived organisational support of sporting event volunteers, and the relationship to volunteer commitment and satisfaction to Bicycle Victoria, and to the event ‘HBA Around the Bay in a Day - Get Sponsored for the Smith Family’. This survey has been forwarded to your email address by Bicycle Victoria, so please be assured that the research team from La Trobe University does not have your name or address.

We would like you to complete the following survey regarding your involvement as a volunteer with Bicycle Victoria. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

We would appreciate if you could complete the survey by Monday, 8th November, 2010.

Completion of the questionnaire implies your consent to be involved in the study. There are no disadvantages, penalties or adverse consequences for you if you chose not to participate in this study. You are assured complete confidentiality and your name will never be associated with the answers you provide.

The results from this questionnaire will be used for the purposes of the researcher’s PhD thesis and will be available for viewing in December 2011, upon request. Results may also be presented at conferences and in academic journals.

The information you provide will help to better understand the relationship between volunteers’ perceptions of organisational support delivered by organisations, and the commitment and satisfaction of volunteers to organisations, as well as their volunteer role at an event.

Any questions regarding this project may be directed to the researcher, or to her supervisors:

Researcher: Laura Pulis – ph. 0422 083 730, e-mail – lapulis@students.latrobe.edu.au

Primary Supervisor: Dr. Russell Hoye – ph. (03) 9470 1345, e-mail – r.hoye@latrobe.edu.au

If you have any complaints or queries that the investigator has not been able to answer to your satisfaction, you may contact The Secretary, Faculty Human Ethics Committee, Faculty of Law and Management, La Trobe University, Victoria, AUSTRALIA, 3086, Telephone: +61 3 9479 1603, e-mail: FLM_ERGS@latrobe.edu.au

Thank you for your participation.
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2. Your Volunteer Involvement

The questions below relate to your past or current volunteer participation, and your participation with Bicycle Victoria.

1. How many events have you been involved in volunteer related activities with Bicycle Victoria in the past 12 months:
   - None, this is my first time
   - 1-3 times
   - 4-6 times
   - 7-9 times
   - 10 or more times

2. For the purpose of the event 'HBA Around the Bay in a Day - Get Sponsored for the Smith Family', please indicate whether you are:
   - A volunteer team leader
   - A general volunteer

3. How did you hear about the opportunity to volunteer with Bicycle Victoria? (please select as many as apply):
   - Internet or Bicycle Victoria website
   - Media (e.g. Television, radio, newspapers, magazines, etc)
   - Past participation at Bicycle Victoria
   - Invitation to participate by Bicycle Victoria
   - Friend or family member
   - Other (please specify)
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4. Other than Bicycle Victoria, how many volunteer related organisations have you volunteered for in the past 12 months:

- [ ] None
- [ ] 1 organisation
- [ ] 2 organisations
- [ ] 3 organisations
- [ ] 4 organisations
- [ ] 5 or more organisations
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#### 3. Perceived Organisational Support

These questions are about your perceptions of how Bicycle Victoria supports your efforts as a volunteer.

5. With respect to your role as a Bicycle Victoria event volunteer, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria values my contribution to its well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria fails to appreciate any extra effort from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria really cares about my well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, Bicycle Victoria would fail to notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria cares about my general satisfaction as a volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria shows very little concern for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria would ignore any complaint from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria takes pride in my accomplishments as a volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 4. Organisational Commitment

These questions are about how strongly you feel about volunteering with Bicycle Victoria

6. With respect to your role as a Bicycle Victoria event volunteer, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my volunteering career in Bicycle Victoria</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy discussing Bicycle Victoria with people outside it</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel as if Bicycle Victoria's problems are my own</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I could easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to Bicycle Victoria</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do feel like “part of the family” at Bicycle Victoria</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to Bicycle Victoria</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Victoria has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to Bicycle Victoria</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 5. Volunteer Satisfaction

7. With respect to your role as a Bicycle Victoria volunteer, please indicate how satisfied you are with your role at this event by answering each of the following statements (the term "supervisor" refers to the Bicycle Victoria coordinator if you are a team leader or to the team leader if you are a general volunteer):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Strongly Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone as a volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my supervisor handles his or her volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my job provides for steady volunteer opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the organisation policies are put into practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rewards and the amount of work that I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance for advancement to do more senior volunteer roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-volunteers get along with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the volunteer role</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Perceived Supervisor Support

These questions are about your perceptions of how your immediate supervisor supports your efforts as a volunteer (the term supervisor refers to the Bicycle Victoria volunteer coordinator if you are a volunteer team leader, or to the volunteer team leader if you are a general volunteer).

8. With respect to your role as a Bicycle Victoria event volunteer, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor values my contribution to the well-being of the organisation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, my supervisor would fail to notice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction as a volunteer</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor shows very little concern for me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments as a volunteer</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 7. About Yourself

Please answer the following questions about yourself by crossing the box with the most relevant response. This information will help to describe volunteer participants within this study (remember your response will be kept confidential).

9. Please specify your gender
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

10. Please indicate your age in years at your last birthday

11. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   - [ ] Primary
   - [ ] Some secondary school
   - [ ] Completed secondary school (Year 12 or its equivalent)
   - [ ] Some technical, commercial, trade certificate or apprenticeship
   - [ ] Completed technical, commercial, trade certificate or apprenticeship
   - [ ] Some university or other tertiary degree or diploma
   - [ ] Completed university or other tertiary degree or diploma

12. What is your employment status?
   - [ ] Employed full-time
   - [ ] Employed part-time
   - [ ] Unemployed
   - [ ] Home duties
   - [ ] Senior or retired
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8. Thank You

I sincerely appreciate your time and cooperation. Please make sure you have answered all the questions, and again, thank you for your time.

13. As a thank-you for completing the survey, we are running a prize draw to win a $500 Coles Myer Voucher!

If you would like to enter the draw, please fill out your details below. Your details will remain confidential; they will not be disclosed to any third party, and will not be linked to the responses of your completed questionnaire.

Name
E-Mail Address
Phone Number

14. Please indicate whether you would be willing to take part in a short, informal focus group or interview for further research at a later date

☐ Yes (please contact me using my personal details provided for the prize draw)
☐ No
Appendix 10: Focus Group Interview Schedule –

The Nature of Perceived Organisational Support Research: Focus Group Schedule for General Volunteers

Welcome
Good afternoon everyone and welcome. Thank you all for taking the time to join our discussion today on your volunteering experience at the Bicycle Victoria event, Around the Bay in a Day. My name is Laura, and I am a student from LaTrobe University.

Overview of the topic
We are here today to discuss your volunteering experience at ATB. What we will be talking about today is the support you got from BV, as well as your commitment and satisfaction of the event. Essentially, I want to examine support, commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers. Because you are all volunteers of the ATB event, I would love to hear about your own individual experiences (Hand out Participant Information Sheets and consent forms to read and sign).

Ground rules
There are no right or wrong answers, and we will expect that you will have different points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view, even if it differs from what others have said.

We are recording the session today, because we don’t want to miss any of your comments. No names will be included in any reports, and your comments are confidential. Nothing you say here today will be associated with your identity.

The questions are open for discussion, you do not have to take it in turns to speak, but please make sure everyone gets a say. You don’t have to respond to me, feel free to talk about the topic amongst each other. If you want to follow up on something that someone has said, you want to agree, disagree or add something else, feel free to do so. I’m just here to ask the questions, listen and make sure everyone gets a say, we are interested in each of you. So, if you are talking a lot, I may ask you
to give others a chance, and if you are not saying much, I may ask for your opinion, so please do not take offence.

If you have a mobile phone, please put it on silent so it does not disrupt the group. If you must take a call, please step outside quietly, and we will continue with the discussion. The toilets are just outside, and help yourself to refreshments. Tea and coffee facilities are just outside, you may help yourself at any time.

Opening Question
Let’s begin. Let’s find out more about each other by going around the table one at a time.

1. Can everyone please start by introducing themselves, indicate your role at the event, how you got involved in the event and why you decided to come to the focus group.

Introductory Question
We are not going around the table anymore, so just jump into the conversation whenever you want.

2. Can you please explain your connection to BV and the event. How long have you had this connection (for example, how long have you volunteered with BV, other events, are you a member of BV, have you been a participant in any of the events, etc).

Transition Questions (Commitment)
3. Why did you become involved with BV and the ATB?
4. How much do you volunteer? How many organisations, how long have they been with that organisation, how many hours per week, days per year, events per year, etc.

Key Questions (POS)
5. Can you please explain to me the different ways BV supported you as a volunteer?
6. What about your immediate supervisor, the Volunteer Team Leader, how did they support you as a volunteer?
7. What type of support did you get from your peers (other general volunteers)?
8. Can you please explain how you were treated by BV?
9. Can you please tell me about the rewards you got from volunteering at the event (eg. Personal, social, educational, tangible, etc).
10. Imagine you are in charge of the event volunteers next year (in a BV volunteer coordinator role), what would you do differently, and what would you keep the same?
11. Using an example, can you tell me whether you improved your own personal skills or attributes from volunteering?
12. Tell me about the decisions you made as a volunteer with regards to your role (before and during the event).

Ending Questions (Satisfaction and Relationship between concepts)

13. Looking back on your entire ATB volunteering experience, can you please explain how happy you are, and what you are particularly happy with?
14. Thinking about the support you said you got from BV earlier, do you think this made your volunteering experience more or less favourable, and would you return next year because of this support?
15. Finally, is there anything we have missed that you feel we should have talked about today?

Thank you
Thank you all for your time. A transcript of this focus group will be available later in the year if you would like a copy. Please encourage fellow volunteers who have not participated in a focus group and you think would like to, to contact me, and if they have not completed the online survey, please encourage them to do so! Remember, you have the chance to win one of two double movie passes, and I will contact the winner once the focus groups are finished.
Appendix 11: Telephone Interview Schedule -

The Nature of Perceived Organisational Support Research: Interview Schedule for Volunteer Supervisors (Team Leaders)

Welcome
Hello and thank you for taking the time to participate in an interview about your volunteering experience at the Bicycle Victoria event, Around the Bay in a Day. My name is Laura, and I am a student from LaTrobe University.

Overview of the topic
We are here today to discuss your volunteering experience at ATB. What we will be talking about today is the support you got from BV, as well as your commitment and satisfaction of the event. Essentially, I want to examine support, commitment and satisfaction of sport event volunteers. Because you are a volunteer of the ATB event, I would love to hear about your own individual experience. I will be recording the interview today, because I don’t want to miss any of your comments. No names will be included in any reports, and your comments are confidential. Nothing you say here today will be associated with your identity. Do you agree to be voice recorded? As this is a telephone interview, and you are unable to sign a consent form, I require spoken consent from you to proceed with the interview. Do you agree to be interviewed today? I have also emailed you a copy of the participant information sheet for your own purposes, detailing the purpose of the study.

Ground rules
There are no right or wrong answers. Please feel free to share your point of view honestly. We will require a quiet space for the interview to be recorded, so if you are at a noisy location, please move somewhere quietly so your voice may be heard clearly.

Opening Question
Let’s begin. Can you please indicate your role at the event, how you got involved in the event and why you decided to participate in an interview?
Introductory Question

1. Can you please explain your connection to BV and the event. How long have you had this connection (for example, how long have you volunteered with BV, other events, are you a member of BV, have you been a participant in any of the events, etc).

Transition Questions (Commitment)

2. Why did you become involved with BV and the ATB?
3. How much do you volunteer? How many organisations, how long have they been with that organisation, how many hours per week, days per year, events per year, etc.

Key Questions (POS)

4. Can you please explain to me the different ways BV supported you as a volunteer?
5. What about the team of volunteers you were directly responsible for, how did they support you?
6. What type of support did you get from your peers (other volunteer team leaders)?
7. Thinking about the support provided by you to your team of volunteers, what were the different ways you supported them (general volunteers)?
8. Can you please explain how you were treated by BV?
9. Can you please tell me about the rewards you got from volunteering at the event (eg. Personal, social, educational, tangible, etc).
10. Imagine you are in charge of the event volunteers next year (in a BV volunteer coordinator role), what would you do differently, and what would you keep the same?
11. Using an example, can you tell me whether you improved your own personal skills or attributes from volunteering?
12. Tell me about the decisions you made as a volunteer with regards to your role (before and during the event).
**Ending Questions (Satisfaction and Relationship between concepts)**

13. Looking back on your entire ATB volunteering experience, can you please explain how happy you are, and what you are particularly happy with?

14. Thinking about the support you said you got from BV earlier, do you think this made your volunteering experience more or less favourable, and would you return next year because of this support?

15. Finally, is there anything we have missed that you feel we should have talked about today?

**Thank you**

Thank you for your time. A transcript of this interview will be available later in the year if you would like a copy. Please encourage fellow team leader volunteers who have not participated in an interview and you think would like to, to contact me, and if they have not completed the online survey, please encourage them to do so! Remember, they have the chance to win a $500 Coles Myer voucher just by filling out the survey! Again, thank you and goodbye.
Appendix 12: Factor Analysis (Principal Component Analysis)

**POS**

### KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>.913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>801.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>11.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>6.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>5.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>4.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>3.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>3.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>2.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

### Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS5</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS8</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPOS2</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPOS4</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPOS6</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPOS7</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.
PSS

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .890 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 1206.907 |
| df | 28 |
| Sig. | .000 |

**Total Variance Explained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.452</td>
<td>68.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>13.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>6.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>3.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>3.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

---

**Component Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSS1</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>-.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS3</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>-.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS5</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>-.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS8</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>-.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSS2</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSS4</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSS6</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSS7</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 2 components extracted.
KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .891 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square |
| df | 28 |
| Sig. | .000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>55.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>11.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>8.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>6.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>6.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>4.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>3.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>2.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component Matrixa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Componen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM1</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM2</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM3</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM5</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM7</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCOM4</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCOM6</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCOM8</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Total Variance Explained

Scree Plot
### SATISFACTION

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</th>
<th>.893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square: 1680.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Variance Explained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.432</td>
<td>42.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>7.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>5.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>4.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>3.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>3.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>2.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>2.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>2.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>2.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>2.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>2.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>1.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT1</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT2</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT3</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT4</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>-.635</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT5</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>-.632</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT6</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT7</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT8</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>-.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT9</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT10</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT11</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT12</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.354</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT13</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-.548</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT14</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT15</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT16</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT17</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT18</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT19</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT20</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 4 components extracted.
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