

ERNOP Conference 2015 Paris

**Session 5-C: Management of volunteers
Room Le Galion F-134**

Exploring parameters of volunteer management: A typology of volunteer management in nursing homes

Katharina Kaltenbrunner

**Affiliation: Paris Lodron Universität Salzburg
Department of Social and Business Sciences
Kapitelgasse 5-7, 5020 Salzburg
Katharina.kaltenbrunner@sbg.ac.at**

2 Introduction

In recent decades there has been a vast interest in studying volunteering; manifold aspects from different research perspectives have been explored (Hustinx et al., 2010). A central debate in the strategy- and organization-based literature stream is how volunteer management can be further developed in order to enhance today's volunteers' satisfaction. Changes in the socio-economic system and correspondingly altered motivations of volunteers require that voluntary organizations reconsider their relations, interactions and behaviors in managing volunteers in order to improve their satisfaction (c.f. Hustinx & Lammertyn, 2003; Dolnicar & Randle, 2007; Safrit & Schmiesing, 2012).

Volunteering is a complex phenomenon, though. It encompasses various activities, organizational settings, types of volunteers etc. Volunteering is at least partly elusive; there is not one particular nature of volunteering (Hustinx et al., 2010, p. 73). Hence, volunteer management as well as research in volunteer management has to address this multifaceted nature. One approach to capture this diversity is to examine managerial parameters which constitute volunteer management. Managerial parameters are constitutive, provided they primarily determine the design of managerial activities, practices, processes etc.

Hence, this paper argues that a promising way for developing volunteer management is to identify and analyze the underlying managerial parameters. In a next step, one can classify these parameters to various types of volunteer management. By illustrating different types of volunteer management, the nature of volunteer management becomes better comprehensible as well as the understanding referring its operations is deepened and better structured.

Yet, despite an enormous progress in volunteer management research a significant gap is missing with regard to managerial parameters of volunteer management. Only a few scholars dedicate their interest to the analysis of parameters respectively principles in volunteer management, particularly discussing the appropriate degree of managerialism, formalization or professionalization etc. (cf. Hill & Stevens, 2011; Kreutzer & Jäger, 2011; Smith, 1996; Priller & Zimmer, 1999). These principles differ from the parameters addressed in this paper. The former mostly refer to the appropriate normative alignment or rather discuss the normative foundation of volunteer management but they explicitly lack the design of management practices, processes etc. Nevertheless a small amount of literature deals with managerial parameters. However, these parameters only refer to selected issues of volunteer management, such as HR management and do not address comprehensively volunteer management. Worth mentioning are f.e. parameters constituting HR strategies according to Eckhardstein & Mayerhofer (2003) or the parameters according to Reifenhäuser & Reifenhäuser (2013, p. 16) which describe different organizational types of volunteer management. Due to their limited scope, these parameters cannot be used for the purposes of this paper. In short, there is only limited research dealing with parameters which primarily determine the design of volunteer management's activities, processes and practices.

Furthermore, the paper suggests that the identification of the underlying parameters of volunteer management essentially draws on the volunteer managers' expertise and experience because they are the ones who can best capture the nature of "their" volunteer management approaches.

Thus, this paper aims at empirically identifying *parameters* constituting current volunteer management approaches by interviewing volunteer managers. This should finally result in a *typology*, a scheme for classifying volunteer management approaches. As previously mentioned, such a typology provides valuable insight in the work modes of volunteer management; it systematizes volunteer management. Furthermore it can serve practitioners as a useful basis for analyzing their current volunteer management practices respectively for optimizing them.

Subjects of research are Austrian nursing homes. They are important representatives of the NPO's social sector (Badelt, 2002). Data originates from 11 semi-structured interviews with volunteer managers of these organizations.

For this purpose the paper is organized as follows: Next section introduces a conceptual foundation of volunteer management; followed by explanations regarding the applied method and sample. Chapter 3 provides the empirical findings illustrated in form of a tabular synopsis as well as in form of a description of each volunteer management type. The final section concludes with a brief discussion including the study's contribution, its limitations and implications for further research.

3 How to capture volunteer management?

For identifying parameters which constitute volunteer management, knowledge regarding the "content" – the elements volunteer managements may consist of – is necessary because these elements represent the basis for deducing parameters. For this purpose publications dealing with different conceptualizations of volunteer management have been analyzed.

Volunteer management has been conceptualized and defined in manifold ways (c.f. Safrit & Schmiesing, 2012; Wilson, 2012). Predominantly, volunteer management is discussed from a managerial point of view highlighting processes and tools for volunteer management (Naylor, 1967; Boyce, 1971; Brudney, 1990; Fisher & Cole, 1993; McCurley & Lynch, 1997; Connors, 1995, 2012). Safrit & Schmiesing (2012, p. 16) claim that most of these concepts are similar, only differing from the wording respectively the composition of specific elements.

A detailed analysis shows that conceptional work with reference to volunteer management is mainly varying regarding the relation between program management and HR management. F.e. Naylor's (1967) concept which is based on the components: inventory of jobs, inventory of volunteers, recruitment plan, selection and placement process, induction and supervision, comprehensive and unified training program, provision for volunteer mobility largely emphasizes program management. Similarly, Brudney's (1990) concept including designing/organizing programs, attracting/retaining, planning/managing volunteer programs, evaluating cost effectiveness, improving service quality and impact, encouraging volunteers' involvement mainly

focuses program management. There are also numerous empirical papers concentrating on program management. However, these papers only deal with selected aspects of volunteer management and not with volunteer management comprehensively. They mostly indicate best practices or ways for optimizing these aspects, activities or processes (for recruitment see i.a. Hager & Brudney, 2011; Wymer & Shields, 2009; Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Starnes, 2001; Bennetta, & Kottasza, 2001; for retention/motivation see i.a. Garner & Garner, 2011; Welty Peachey et. al., 2014; Nichols et al., 2014; Newton et al., 2014; Hidalgo & Moreno, 2009; for evaluating/performance management see i.a. Doherty & Hoyer, 2011; Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Cnaan & Cascio, 1998; Utterback & Heyman, 1984).

However, other scholars stress HR management (Boyce, 1971; Safrit et al., 1994; Culp III et al., 1998; Cuskelly et al., 2006). I.a. Boyce (1971) introduces volunteer management as leadership process consisting of the phases: Identification, selection, orientation, training, utilization, recognition, and evaluation. Similar to this is the GEMS-Model. GEMS is an acronym for generating, educating, mobilizing, and sustaining (Culp III et al., 1998).

Other scholars closely link the two perspectives and provide a volunteer management approach consisting of program and HR respectively leadership elements (Fisher & Cole, 1993; McCurley & Lynch, 1997; Connors, 1995, 2012).

Based on this analysis one can identify two crucial "logics". Volunteer management is either considered as organizational support system – accordingly system-related practices are predominant – or it is more intensively dedicated to individuals respectively their needs. Thus, one parameter for classifying volunteer management could be defined as the *main reference figure* of managerial practices which determines, if the activities are either more system-related, individuals-related or both.

The review of volunteer management literature also shows that volunteer management is often illustrated as cyclical process with sequential phases. Scholars primarily rely on the phases of organizational membership or the volunteers' socialization process (Haski-Leventhal & Bargal, 2008; Omoto & Snyder, 1995, 2002; Kaltenbrunner, 2010; Esslinger et al., 2013). Exemplary, Haski-Leventhal & Bargal (2008) propose the VSTM model (volunteer socialization and transitions model) which is based on five stages. These five stages are: Nominee, new volunteer, emotional involvement, established volunteering, and retiring. In general, this view proposes that the needs of volunteers are changing depending on the stage of socialization. To enhance volunteers' satisfaction, management has to consider these varying needs. Also, *socialization process* or at least any other form of considering the *varying volunteers' needs* could represent a further interesting parameter.

Another literature vein focuses on single issues such as antecedents, moderators or other contingency factors, e.g. work place characteristics, leadership, team aspects, resources, personality or/and psychological constructs (motivation, role identity, involvement or commitment etc.) examining their interdependencies, relations or effects on volunteer management (for organizational context see i.a. Penner, 2002; Omoto & Snyder, 2002; Neufeind et al., 2013;

for motivation see i.a. Clary et al., 1996; Dolnicar & Randle, 2007; Garner & Garner, 2011; for commitment see i.a. Dawley et al., 2005; McCudden, 2000; Cnaan & Cascio, 1999). However, due to their lack of a holistic view of volunteer management no further parameters can be deduced.

Finally, volunteer management literature was analyzed with respect to typologies and/or classification schemes; the review showed no results, though. To the author's knowledge literature does not provide typologies dealing with managerial parameters. This stresses the importance for the intended study.

Overall, it can be concluded that volunteer management literature provides valuable indications for identifying managerial parameters. Following literature-based parameters have been deduced: First, managerial practices can be differentiated, whether they are more system-related or individual-related. Secondly, the socialization process or any other form of considering the varying volunteers' needs can serve as point of reference for designing managerial practices. Although these parameters seem to provide an appropriate foundation for the empirical study, they are still vague. Empirical findings will complement and refine these parameters.

4 Study

4.1 Setting

As previously mentioned, subject of research are nursing homes located in different federal states of Austria. Nursing homes are an interesting field for exploring volunteer management due to several reasons: First of all because, there have been some public initiatives for standardizing volunteer management recently, particularly in the publicly owned nursing homes. This may indicate a certain extent of "diversity" in the current approaches. Secondly, the interest in these organizations is based on the fact that volunteer management in nursing homes is generally considered to be in a period of transition. Due to an increasing number of clients as well as due to a growing but unmet need for human resources, nursing homes yearn for more volunteers. An increased number of volunteers with various expectations, however, demands adjusted ways of management.

4.2 Sample and method

To explore the underlying parameters of volunteer management currently applied in nursing homes, an exploratory research design was chosen. The chosen design can be particularly underpinned by the fact that – as previously mentioned – managerial parameters are hardly not discussed in literature as well as there are no volunteer management typologies based on such managerial parameters.

For data collection semi-structured, face-to-face interviews were conducted with 11 volunteer managers of different nursing homes. An interview guide that contains a list of questions related

to the managerial parameters was developed to facilitate the interviews. The interviews lasted between 35 and 60 min. Each interview was audio taped and transcribed. The organizations respectively the respective volunteer managers were selected on basis of theoretical sampling (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, 1978, 2009). In contrast to random sampling which aims at being representative of a population or testing hypotheses, theoretical sampling focuses on collecting data that will optimize concepts in terms of their properties and dimensions. It also focuses on uncovering common features, variations or relationships. In short, it does not strive for sampling (representative) individuals but sampling concepts. Hence, those individuals were interviewed who provide information about the concept (sub-concept) under analysis. Data analysis in general relies on a mixed approach combining deductive and inductive elements. The codes – thematic units were used for coding – were deduced theoretically, considering the findings of the literature review. Themes, though, were also identified from the transcript. This way, new codes were developed and existing codes were modified. Qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2008) serves as methodical basis.

4.3 Empirical Findings

Data analysis resulted in the identification of different parameters. As noted above, some parameters were *deduced* from the literature review:

One of them is the parameter “*main reference figure*” which indicates the basis, managerial practices are aligned to; whether they are more system-related, individual-related or both. In this context, recruiting, selection, onboarding and a basic training necessary for carrying out the voluntary work represent the system-related practices. The dimension “individual-(or team-related) practices” is represented by honoring, team building, training as “incentive”, and leadership activities.

Additionally, the parameter “*main reference figure*” provides the basis for deducing another parameter. This is the “*focus*” of the respective type of volunteer management. *Focus* refers to the superior policy, the various types of volunteer management pertain to. In this study, this is volunteer mobilization or a combination of volunteer mobilization and retention.

According to literature analysis, “*socialization process*” represents a further possible parameter. It was not possible to identify this parameter in the study, though. However, there was a small indication that varying needs are considered (at least partially). Thus, this criterion was rejected as “stand-alone” parameter. However, the issue of varying needs was considered implicitly in the typology. It was integrated in the parameter *focus*, and therefore analyzed whether particularly retention practices are designed undifferentiated (basic assumption: non-varying needs) or differentiated (basic assumption: varying needs).

Besides the parameters *main reference figure* and *focus*, “*coordination logic*” was developed inductively as further parameter. *Coordination logic* characterizes how the managerial practices are linked to each other and how they are adjusted vertically (across hierarchies). Activities can

appear as single initiatives, as coordinated initiatives, the later are mostly routines, or even as program. Vertical adjustment is made by applying feedback-, ad-hoc- or feed-forward-coordination.

For configuring the various types of volunteer management, in a first step, those managerial practices were identified which were existent in all volunteer management types in term of basic elements. Followed by identifying the differences (categorized by the parameters) between the various types.

Based on these parameters, the study finally revealed three types of volunteer management: *Volunteer administration*, *volunteer coordination* and *volunteer management* (see table 1). In short, *volunteer administration* represents a volunteer management approach which is primarily focused on mobilizing volunteers. This includes recruiting new volunteers as well as keeping volunteers ready for use. In this context, volunteers are mainly regarded as enablers of the operation system without any certain needs. *Volunteer coordination* aims at both, mobilizing and retaining volunteers. In contrast to volunteer administration, management practices of volunteer coordination are designed to meet the organizational objectives as well as the volunteers' needs. The consideration of volunteers' needs is rather general in terms of marginally customized. *Volunteer management* exactly addresses this deficiency by adjusting its management practices to the varying volunteers' needs.

	Volunteer administration	Volunteer coordination	Volunteer management
Focus	Mobilization	Mobilization Undifferentiated retention	Mobilization Differentiated retention
Reference figure	System-related practices	System-related practices Individual & team-related practices (non-varying)	System-related practices Individual & team-related practices (varying)
Coordination logic	Single & selected coordinated initiatives Feedback & ad-hoc-coordination Self-adjustment	Single & coordinated initiatives Feedback- & partial feed forward-coordination Self-adjustment (program)	(not observable yet)

Figure 1: Typology of volunteer management approaches

Overall, it can be said that the analyzed nursing homes mainly apply volunteer administration and volunteer coordination. These are the most common types. Data analysis also revealed that there are single initiatives and practices which can be assigned to the third type, volunteer

management. An encompassing implementation of this volunteer management type is not existent so far.

4.3.1 Volunteer administration

Superior policy (*focus*) of volunteer administration is to mobilize volunteers. Mobilization encompasses both, recruiting new volunteers as well as keeping “existent” volunteers ready for use. Hence, main purpose of volunteer administration is to serve organizational purposes; that is to guarantee the quantitative and qualitative availability of volunteers. Voluntary work in general is considered to be a “support system” of the nursing homes.

“[Volunteers] fulfill tasks which are basically not aligned to nursing care. These [task areas] are indispensable for the [elderly people’s] quality of live and this way also indispensable for achieving the nursing home’s objectives.” (N1, p. 17)

Volunteer administration mainly focuses on system-related managerial practices. These are recruitment, selection, onboarding and training, as far it is necessary for carrying out the voluntary work. Managerial practices do not explicitly pertain to volunteer retention. This means they are carried out neither intentionally nor systematically with regard to retention. Nevertheless, there are some practices, e.g. rudimentary honoring activities. Leadership is mainly about the instruction and coordination of volunteers and does not cover leadership functions such as motivating, coaching or integrating etc.

“Volunteers work very independently and reliably. [...] The volunteer coordinator consider himself to be a coordinator and not to be a departmental manager.” (N1, p. 14)

In volunteer administration, there is no alignment to long-term concepts or objectives:

“Volunteer management does neither refer to [the nursing home’s] mission statement, nor to any specified objectives or strategies; it is quite loosely [organized].” (N1, p. 16)

Thus, volunteer administration is mainly characterized by ad-hoc-coordination. Decisions and corresponding initiatives are mostly based on (specific) occasions. Volunteer administration is also associated with feedback-coordination in terms of responding to problems or deviations; i.a. after having identified a miss-matching between volunteer and client, volunteer manager thinks of changing onboarding initiatives.

Most initiatives are single initiatives and are not coordinated with each other. There is only a minimum coordination regarding recruiting. Nursing homes use certain routines, especially regarding selecting and onboarding.

If coordination between different managerial practices (e.g. recruiting and onboarding) is required, this is done by self-adjustment but not via plans or programs.

“The primary interface [in volunteer management] is represented by the person who coordinates the volunteers.” (S2, p. 2)

In short, coordination in volunteer administration is predominantly ad hoc, not long-term based, slightly systematic and based on single initiatives.

In detail, managerial practices can be characterized, as follows: Recruitment occurs quite spontaneously and not systematically, mostly via viral communication (word-to-mouth advertising). This is followed by admission interviews. Onboarding is mostly done very individually by the nursing staff. Also, job inventory is neither designed pro-actively nor systematically. New tasks come up mostly coincidentally; they are “implied” from various stakeholders such as volunteers, elderly people etc. Trainings are done, provided they are necessary for carrying out the job. There is no training plan or program, though (Kaltenbrunner, 2013).

4.3.2 Volunteer coordination

Volunteer coordination aims at both, mobilizing and retaining volunteers. This goes in line with using system-related as well as individual-/team-related practices. The individual-/team-related practices are: leadership, teambuilding, and honoring practices. By applying these practices, volunteers’ needs are much better taken into account than in volunteer administration. Especially, leadership philosophy differs in contrast to volunteer administration. Leadership is more intensively about supporting respectively carrying for the volunteers. Leaders are asked to foster motivation and cooperation. Moreover, a set of training options, e.g. supervision, coaching etc., is provided but volunteers are mostly not asked to complete a defined training program. Leaders also provide the volunteers with professional support.

Nevertheless, managerial practices are not optimally customized to the volunteers’ needs because the same practices are applied to all volunteers and do not consider, how long they are members of the organization. Hence, volunteer coordination “only” provides an undifferentiated retention.

Even if, many managerial practices are based on ad hoc decisions, overall proceedings are considered to be more long-term oriented than in volunteer administration. Particularly, this is due to an enhanced alignment to normative tools, such as vision, mission or mission statement.

“The volunteers’ tasks are quite well aligned to the mission statement [...]. This effects the elderly people because it is harmonic. (O2, p. 16) Certain training concepts are adjusted to the [training] concepts of the full-time employees.” (O1, p. 16)

Occasionally volunteer managers define objectives, e.g. they assess, how many new volunteers are needed.

“[Volunteer management] is based on both [strategic and operative objectives] with an emphasis on operative objectives; there are superior strategic objectives, though.

(O1, p. 14). [Volunteer management] is mainly characterized by operative planning; there is an overall annual program.” (O2, p. 14)

Hence, feedforward coordination in terms of a step-by-step concretization of principles and norms is at least partially enhanced. Additionally, feedback coordination is also applied.

Coordination is characterized by single initiatives as well as by coordinated initiatives; the later ones are more frequently used than in volunteer administration. In particular, recruitment, selection, onboarding, and (partly) training are better synchronized. Moreover, coordination becomes more systematically by relying on standards and guidelines, e.g. regarding selection or onboarding. Thus, also coordination via programs takes place. Finally, indications for coordination via self-adjustment, in terms of occasional as well as thematic interaction, have been identified.

In sum, managerial practices of volunteer coordination are more comprehensive as well as more elaborate. E.g. nursing homes organize recruiting-days, use posters or commercial advertisements in their in-house magazines, local or municipal newspapers, etc. Viral communication (word-to-mouth advertising) still represents the primary recruitment tool. Selection is based on a guideline-based admission interview; followed by onboarding activities and finally finished by signing a volunteer agreement. Worth mentioning is, that onboarding is not regarded as “singular act” but as process with following elements: E.g. admission interview, time of probation, and final interview where either the cooperation is changed, terminated or continued.

„Folders are used for recruitment but that does not work well; it is better to contact them personally. This is followed by an admission interview, time of probation, [...] and a mutual agreement (O2, p. 8). Recruitment is defined as process [starting with] an interview to assess the volunteer’s qualification – we are seeking specific volunteers for specific elderly people; after the first contact between volunteer and home resident there is a feedback interview; the cooperation is either continued or terminated. Sometimes the task area is adapted.“ (O3, p. 8)

4.4 Volunteer Management

Comparable to volunteer coordination, volunteer management aims at volunteer mobilization as well as retention. This includes both, system-related practices and practices focusing on individuals or groups. In contrast to volunteer coordination, volunteer management is supposed to consider that volunteers’ needs are varying.

As previously mentioned (chapter 3.3), no indications could be found, that managerial practices are aligned to the volunteers’ socialization process (i.a. introduction, growth, maturity, and decline). An enhanced attention is paid to onboarding (introduction), though.

Particularly at the beginning [the volunteer coordinator] has many conversations (feedback); there are team meetings; she accompanies the volunteers.” (N2, p. 11)

Even if, the practices are not adapted to the different phases of socialization, volunteer management is better customized to the volunteers' needs. Primarily, this occurs by offering mentoring to the volunteers. Mentoring can address the varying needs very well.

Volunteer manager are also aware that volunteers of different ages need different jobs; e.g. they provide students with project work.

Leadership seems to be even more comprehensive.

"The volunteer coordinator can be contacted at all the times. She/he continuously accompanies the volunteers and supports the volunteers actively. (N2, p. 12)

Training is increasingly adapted to the volunteers' needs.

„There is a training program – volunteers have a training passport. The introduction period is quite short; training takes the strengths of the volunteers into account.” (N2, p. 11)

In contrast to volunteer coordination volunteer management relies on an enhanced coordination respectively adjustment, particularly via an overall concept.

“Key success factor of [volunteer management] is a proper concept (including recruitment, staffing, training, teambuilding etc.) because this creates stability.” (S1, p. 23)

Experts' opinions differ, though, what refers to the “ideal planning horizon”. Some Experts argue that there is, some say there is no respectively rarely any need for an intensified long-term planning. Comparable to volunteer coordination, managerial activities refer at least to a common superior principle, target, or to a project etc.

Activities of volunteer management are in accordance with the nursing home's vision; [Activities] are often coordinated by use of projects, particularly what concerns training and recruitment. (S1, p. 16) We are about to create a new vision and mission. This should consist of an overall vision and mission and particular ones for volunteers.” (N2, p. 16)

In summary, this study revealed, that there are single initiatives and practices which can be assigned to this approach. However, volunteer management is not yet implemented comprehensively. F.e. job inventory could also be aligned to socialization process by creating particular jobs for short, middle and long-term volunteers. Moreover honoring activities could refer to the different stages of socialization process.

5 Conclusion

This paper aimed at developing a typology of volunteer management approaches of Austrian nursing homes. This seems to be important for various reasons: First of all, it represents a

technique to capture the variety of applied volunteer management approaches. By illustrating the underlying logics of volunteer management, the understanding of volunteer management is deepened and better structured. Secondly, such a typology provides valuable insights in the work modes of volunteer management. This way it can serve practitioners as useful basis for analyzing their current volunteer management practices respectively for optimizing them.

To define the typology, an exploratory research design, based on 11 interviews with volunteer managers, was chosen.

Data analysis and interpretation resulted in the identification of following constituent parameters:

- primary focus of the volunteer management approach
- main reference figure managerial practices are aligned to, and
- coordination logic.

On basis of these parameters three different types of volunteer management in Austrian nursing homes were identified: Volunteer administration, volunteer coordination and volunteer management. The study revealed that nursing homes primarily use volunteer administration and volunteer coordination. Yet, volunteer management has not been implemented comprehensively. However, single activities which refer to this type were identified.

Volunteer administration primarily emphasizes volunteer mobilization. This is associated with a focus on system-related practices such as recruitment, selection, and onboarding. Volunteer administration is predominantly ad hoc, not long-term based, slightly systematic and based on single initiatives.

The second type, volunteer coordination, aims at volunteer mobilization as well as on retention. Particularly, the latter is in line with a strong emphasis on leadership including coaching and support. Hence, this approach considers the volunteers' need much better. Even though, its coordination is still quite ad-hoc, this approach is generally more systematic as well as pro-active approach than volunteer administration.

Finally, there is volunteer management. In contrast to volunteer coordination, volunteer management considers that volunteers' needs are varying. This is mainly covered by a comprehensive support regarding onboarding as well as by offering mentoring to the volunteers. In sum coordination is supposed to be more elaborate.

Contribution to research

By developing a typology of volunteer management approaches, explanatory knowledge regarding the logics and interdependences of volunteer management is enlarged. Due to the combined illustration of strategic & operational issues, it also action knowledge to this field of research. Furthermore, the linkage between theoretically and empirically based findings is fostered. Overall the study provides a systematic illustration of currently applied volunteer management approaches which can be used for further research.

Contribution to practice

Such a typology can serve practitioners as useful basis for analyzing their current volunteer management approach. It provides various recommendations for optimizing managerial practices systematically. In general, it contributes to manage volunteers more effectively.

Research implications/limitations

As previously mentioned, the proposed typology of volunteer management approaches can be used as basis for further research, since the identified parameters represent suitable points of reference for a wide range of research activities. This research can refer to a more sophisticated exploration of the managerial practices or the corresponding coordination techniques. Moreover, leadership styles or rather behavioral aspects of leadership could be focused. Further research could also address the examination of antecedents or contingency factors influencing the organizational designs of the three volunteer management types. Furthermore, the identification of reasons for switching from one to another volunteer management type would be an interesting field of research.

Even if the study provides solid findings, there are some limitations that need to be mentioned. Since the study is based on a sample size of 11, the findings cannot be generalized. It remains vague, if and how, the typology can be transferred to institutions other than nursing homes. Secondly, the development of the typology is limited due to its inductive approach. The managerial parameters are not comprehensively theory-based.

References

- Andessner, R. (2004). *Integriertes Potenzialmanagement in Nonprofit-Organisationen*, Linz: Trauner.
- Badelt, Chr. (2002). Der Nonprofit Sektor in Österreich, in: Badelt, Chr. (ed.). *Handbuch der Nonprofit-Organisationen: Strukturen und Management*, 3rd edition, Stuttgart: Schaeffer-Pöschl, 63-86.
- Bennetta, R. & Kottasza, R. (2001). A systematic approach to leadership development. Advertisement Style and the Recruitment of Charity Volunteers, *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 8 (2), 45-63.
- Boezeman, E. J & Ellemers, N. (2008). Volunteer recruitment: the role of organizational support and anticipated respect in non-volunteers' attraction to charitable volunteer organizations, *The Journal of applied psychology*, 93 (5), 1013-1026.
- Boyce, M. (1971). *A systematic approach to leadership development*, Washington, DC: USDA.
- Brandl, J., Güttel, W., Kronlechner, St., Beisheim, M., Von Eckhardstein, D. & Elsik, W. (2006). Entwicklungsdynamik von Vergütungssystemen in Nonprofit-Organisationen, *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 20 (4), 356-374.
- Brudney, J. L. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brewster, C. & Larsen, H. H. (1992). Human Resource Management in Europe: Evidence from ten countries, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3 (3), 409-433.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M. & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25 (4), 485-505.
- Cnaan, R. & Cascio, T. (1999). Performance and commitment: Issues in management of volunteers in human service organizations, *Journal of Social Service Research*, 24 (3-4), 1-37.
- Connors, T. D. (2012). *The volunteer management handbook, Leadership Strategies for success*, 2nd edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Culp III, K., Deppe, C. A., Castillo, J. & Wells, B. (1998). The GEMS model of volunteer administration, *Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 16 (4), 36-41.
- Cuskelly, G., Taylor, T., Hoyer, R. & Darcy, S. (2006). Volunteer Management Practices and Volunteer Retention: A Human Resource Management Approach, *Sport Management Review*, 9, 141-163.
- Dawley, D. D., Stephens, R. D. & Stephens, D. B. (2005). Dimensionality of organizational commitment in volunteer workers: Chamber of commerce board members and role fulfillment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67 (3), 511-525.
- Doherty, A. & Hoyer, R. (2011). Role ambiguity and volunteer board member performance in nonprofit sport organizations, *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 22 (1), 107-128.

- Eckhardstein, D. & Mayerhofer, H. (2003). Personalstrategien für Ehrenamtliche in sozialen NPOs, in: Von Eckhardstein, D. & Ridder, H.-G. (eds.). *Personalmanagement als Gestaltungsaufgabe im Nonprofit und Public Management*, München/Mering: Rainer Hampp, 77-95.
- Esslinger, A. S., Lohmüller, S. & Rager, E., (2013). Konzeption eines qualifizierten Freiwilligen-Managements am Beispiel einer stationären Altenhilfeeinrichtung, in: Von Schnurbein, G., Wiederkehr, D. & Amann, H. (eds.). *Freiwilligenarbeit zwischen Freiheit und Professionalisierung*, Zürich: Seismo, 290-303.
- Dolnicar, S. & Randle, M. (2007). What motivates which volunteers? Psychographic heterogeneity among volunteers in Australia, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 18 (2), 135–155.
- Fisher, F. C. & Cole, K. M. (1993). *Leadership and Management of Volunteer Programs, A Guide for Volunteer Administrators*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garner, J. T. & Garner, L. T. (2011). Volunteering an Opinion: Organizational Voice and Volunteer Retention in Nonprofit Organizations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40 (5), 813-828.
- Grube, J. A. & Piliavin, J. A. (2000). Role Identity, Organizational Experiences, and Volunteer Performance, *Personality Social Psychology*, 26 (9), 1108-1119.
- Hager, M. A. & Brudney, J. L. (2011). Problems recruiting volunteers: Nature versus nurture, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 22 (2), 137-157.
- Hager, M. A. & Brudney, J. L. (2004). *Volunteer Management: Practices and Retention of Volunteers*, The Urban Institute, Washington D.C.
- Haski-Leventhal, D. & Bargal, D. (2008). The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers, *Human Relations*, 61 (1), 67-102.
- Hidalgo, M. C. & Moreno, P. (2009). Organizational Socialization of Volunteers: The Effect on their Intention to Remain, *Journal of Community Psychology*, 37 (5), 594-601.
- Hill, M. & Stevens, D. (2011). Volunteers who manage other volunteers and the professionalisation of volunteer management: implications for practice, *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2 (1), 107-114.
- Horch, H.-D. (1983). *Strukturbesonderheiten freiwilliger Vereinigungen, Analyse und Untersuchung einer alternativen Form menschlichen Zusammenarbeitens*. Frankfurt a.M./New York: Campus.
- Howlett, St. (2010). Developing volunteer management as a profession, *Voluntary Sector Review*, 1 (3), 355-360.

- Hustinx, L. & Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and Reflexive Styles of Volunteering: A Sociological Modernization Perspective, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 14 (2), 167-187.
- Hustinx, L., Cnaan, R. A. & Handy, F. (2010): Navigating theories of volunteering: A hybrid map for a complex phenomenon, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 40 (4), 410-434.
- Kaltenbrunner, K. A. (2013). Personalmanagement für freiwillige Mitarbeiter in Alten- und Pflegeheimen, in: Nöbauer, B. (ed.). *Personalmanagement in der Altenbetreuung: Mitarbeiter gewinnen und entwickeln – Leben im Alter (LIA)*, Linz: Wagner, 151-168.
- Kaltenbrunner, K. A. (2010). *Integriertes Freiwilligenmanagement in großen, fremdleistungsorientierten Nonprofit-Organisation*, Bern u.a.: Peter Lang.
- Kreutzer, K. & Jäger, U. (2011). Volunteering versus Managerialism: Conflict Over Organizational Identity in Voluntary Associations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 634-661.
- Mayring, Ph. (2008). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse – Grundlagen und Techniken*, 10th edition, Weinheim: Beltz.
- McCudden, J. (2000). What makes a commitment volunteer? Research into the factors affecting the retention of volunteers, *Voluntary Action*, 2 (2), 59-75.
- McCurley, St. & Lynch, R. (1997). *Essential Volunteer Management*, London: Directory of Social Change.
- Naylor, H. H. (1967). *Volunteers today: Finding, training and working with them*. New York: Dryden Association Press.
- Neufeind, M., Güntert, St. T. & Theo Wehner, T. (2013). The impact of job design on event volunteers' future engagement: insights from the European Football Championship, *European Sports Management Quarterly*, 13 (5), 537-556.
- Newton, C., Becker, K. & Bell, S. (2014). Learning and development opportunities as a tool for the retention of volunteers: a motivational perspective, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24 (4), 514-530.
- Nichols, G., Goel, R., Nichols, T. & Jones, W. (2014). Volunteers in British mountain rescue: responding to increasing demand for rescues and a changed relationship with the state, *Voluntary Sector Review*, 5 (2), 213-229.
- Omoto, A. M. & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 671– 686.
- Penner, L. A. (2002). Dispositional and Organizational Influences on Sustained Volunteerism: An Interactionist Perspective, *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (3), 447-467.

- Priller, E. & Zimmer, A. (1999). Ende der Mitgliederorganisation? Laufen den NPOs die Mitglieder davon? in: Witt, D., Blümle, E.-B., Schauer, R. & Anheier, H. K. (eds.). *Ehrenamt und Modernisierungsdruck*, Wiesbaden: Gabler, 127-147.
- Reifenhäuser, C. & Reifenhäuser, O. (2013). *Praxishandbuch Freiwilligenmanagement*, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz.
- Reifenhäuser, C., Hoffmann, S. G. & Kegel, T. (2009). *Freiwilligen-Management*. Augsburg: ZIEL.
- Safrit, R. D. & Schmiesing, R. (2012). Volunteer Models and Management, in: Connors, T. D. (ed.): *The Volunteer Management Handbook. Leadership Strategies for Success*, 2nd edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 3-30.
- Safrit, R. D., King, J. E. & Burscu, K. (1994). *A study of volunteerism in Ohio cities and surrounding communities*, Columbus, OH: Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University.
- Shields, P. O. (2009). Young Adult Volunteers: Recruitment Appeals and Other Marketing Considerations, *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 21, 139–159.
- Smith, D. J. (1996). Should volunteers be managed?, in: Billis, D. & Harris, M. (eds.). *Voluntary agencies: Challenges of organization and management*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 187-199.
- Stirlinga, Ch., Kilpatrick, S. & Orpin, P. (2011). A psychological contract perspective to the link between non-profit organizations' management practices and volunteer sustainability, *Human Resource Development International*, 14 (3), 321-336.
- Studer, S. & Von Schnurbein, G. (2013). Koordination von Freiwilligen: Praktiken, Einstellungen. Und der „Fit“ mit den Organisationsmerkmalen, in: Von Schnurbein, G., Wiederkehr, D. & Amman, H. (eds.). *Freiwilligenarbeit zwischen Freiheit und Professionalisierung*, Zürich: Seismo, 137-148.
- Ulrich, D. (1997). *Human Resource Champions*, Boston: Champions.
- Utterback, J. & Heyman, St. R. (1984). An examination of methods in the evaluation of volunteer programs, *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 7 (3), 229-235.
- Welty Peachey, J., Lyras, A., Cohen, A., Bruening, J. E. & Cunningham, G. B. (2014). Exploring the Motives and Retention Factors of Sport-For-Development Volunteers, *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43 (6), 1052-1070.
- Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism Research: A Review Essay, *Nonprofit and Voluntary sector Quarterly*, 41 (2), 176-212.
- Wymer Jr., W. W. & Starnes, B. J. (2001). Conceptual Foundations and Practical Guidelines for Recruiting Volunteers to Serve in Local Nonprofit Organizations: Part I., *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 9 (1-2), 63-96.