Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs at U.S. National Parks: A Multi-Case Study of Volunteer Partnerships

By Joseph M. Follman

B.A. in English, May 1983, Emory University
M.A. in English Language & Literature, January 1986, The University of Virginia

A Dissertation Submitted to

The Faculty of
The Graduate School of Education and Human Development
of The George Washington University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

May 17, 2015

Dissertation directed by:

Maria Cseh
Associate Professor of Human and Organizational Learning

UMI Number: 3687557

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI 3687557

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

The Graduate School of Education and Human Development of The George Washington University certify that Joseph M. Follman has passed the Final Examination for the degree of Doctor of Education as of February 27, 2015. This is the final and approved form of the dissertation.

Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs at U.S. National Parks:
A Multi-Case Study of Volunteer Partnerships

Joseph M. Follman

Dissertation Research Committee:

Maria Cseh, Associate Professor of Human and Organizational Learning

Neal Chalofsky, Associate Professor of Human and Organizational Learning

Jeffrey Brudney, Betty and Dan Cameron Family Distinguished Professor of Innovation in the Nonprofit Sector, University of North Carolina-Wilmington

Acknowledgements

While only one person is the author of a dissertation, I could not have completed this long and fruitful academic, professional, and personal journey without ongoing support. Faculty, friends, and family provided encouragement and guidance at every stage of this process, and I am deeply grateful.

In particular, I wish to thank Dr. Maria Cseh, my advisor and dissertation committee chair, for her enthusiasm, insight, guidance, exacting standards, and willingness to give as much of her time as I needed at all points of this degree program. I could not have had a more supportive mentor and teacher.

Special thanks also go to the other members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Chalofsky and Brudney, whose probing questions, ideas, and expertise provided essential direction, occasional redirection, and resources that helped me formulate the dissertation topic and the theoretical underpinnings that serve as its foundation. To my external reviewers, Drs. Ken Bartlett and Lisa Benton-Short, thank you for giving of your time and expertise to serve as members of my committee and for offering cogent ideas, questions, and feedback.

My fellow students in the Human and Organizational Learning doctoral program at George Washington University were classmates, project partners, sources of inspiration, sounding boards, friends, and sojourners with me on this sometimes bumpy but always engaging path. Thanks for all your help, feedback, and solidarity; I can't wait to see you get your doctorates as well.

This study could not have been conducted without the support, time, and generosity of over 50 staff at national park sites and nonprofit partner organizations who participated in this study. The volunteer program coordinators at each location were particularly generous of their time. Thank you for giving interviews, being patient with my many questions, providing documents, connecting me with your colleagues, and for your willingness to share about your challenging and necessary work. Your passion for preserving American's wild and historic places is evident in all you do.

My parents' unflagging belief that I could get a doctorate—some 30 years after I initially attempted to do so—uplifted me throughout the past four years. Thank you for a lifetime of support that I can never fully appreciate or re-pay. Your attendance at my dissertation defense meant more to me than any graduation ceremony ever could.

Finally, the greatest thanks and praise go to my wonderful spouse, Rebecca. Put simply, I would and could not have made this journey without you. You are, in the words of the *Book of Common Prayer*, my great mediator and advocate. Thank you.

Abstract of Dissertation

Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs at U.S. National Parks:
A Multi-Case Study of Volunteer Partnerships

This multi-case study examined interorganizational relations of co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships between select U.S. National Park Service (NPS) sites and their nonprofit partners. National parks face ongoing funding challenges, resulting in staff reductions and the inability to address many park and visitor needs. Cutbacks and more park visitors translate to greater need for volunteers. Many national parks have nonprofit partners that traditionally focused on fundraising. In 14 cases, these nonprofits expanded their activity to include co-coordination of volunteer programming with NPS partners.

Six partnerships were selected for in-depth study based on a quantitative survey. The study's research questions focus on how the partners collaborate, structures of their co-managed volunteer programs, the programs' adherence to research-based tenets of volunteer program management and interorganizational collaboration, and similarities and differences among the cases. In each case, the partnerships resulted in substantial growth of volunteer programming.

As predicted by Interorganizational Relations and New Institutionalism theories as well as research on volunteer programs managed by a single organization, the volunteer program partnerships have many similar structures, face comparable challenges, and employ many of the same strategies to address challenges. However, the partnerships developed additional practices related to their volunteer programs being co-managed, including staff co-location, daily partner communication, creating a shared

volunteer program mission, use of technology for communication, longevity of key staff, and innovative ways to multiply the number of their volunteer coordination positions. The largest volunteer partnerships also use more agreements, structures, and strategies.

Despite partially adhering to New Institutional theories that suggest structures within organizational fields become more similar over time, these volunteer programs also remain distinctive based on the partners' responses to unique features, challenges, and opportunities at their parks as well as due to different management practices. The most impactful programs take greater advantage of features of their locations, surrounding populations, and available staff. Finally, 'love' for certain parks emerged as a factor that both helps ameliorate conflict among partners and serves as the primary motivator for many volunteers. Overall, these partnerships resulted in expanded volunteer programs, enhanced partner relationships, and greater ability to adapt to changing conditions and opportunities.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Since the 1980s, interorganizational collaboration has become an increasingly prevalent strategy for operating in a world of constant change and of expanding diversity, technological advancement, and globalization. Such collaboration, says Gray (1989), represents "emergent interorganizational arrangements through which organizations collectively cope with the growing complexity of their environments" (p. 236). Within the realm of interorganizational collaboration, cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs) have also burgeoned (Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Young, 2000). CSSPs bring together government, nonprofits, businesses, and/or civil society to jointly address issues such as environmental sustainability, health care, education, poverty, and economic disparity (Austin, 2000; Cropper, Ebers, Huxham, & Ring, 2010; Koschmann, Kuhn, & Pfarrer, 2012; Waddock 1989, 1991).

Collaborations between the U.S. National Park Service (NPS) and nonprofit support organizations are an example of CSSPs. The first such collaboration formed in 1923 at Yosemite National Park, and nonprofit partners have traditionally focused on raising funds for their NPS sites. There has been an evolution in some NPS-nonprofit organization partnerships, however, framed around co-coordination of volunteer programs that serve NPS sites. The functioning of these co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships, which are a component of the larger existing partnerships between the organizations, represents an unexamined phenomenon that is the subject of this study.

The Context

U.S. National Park Service. The mission of the NPS is to preserve, unimpaired, "the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the

enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations" (NPS, 2013, first para.). The national park system comprises 407 units across all 50 states and in 4 territories and includes national parks, monuments, memorials, preserves, historic sites, historical parks, battlefields, military parks, seashores, lakeshores, reserves, trails, recreation areas, rivers, and other designations (NPS, 2015). 'National Park Service' refers to the U.S. federal agency that administers all NPS units. The terms 'NPS unit' and 'NPS site' both refer to an individual national park, forest, historic site, memorial, etc.—such as Glacier National Park. An exception is the National Mall & Memorial Parks in Washington, D.C., which encompasses multiple NPS units—memorials and monuments, historic sites, etc.—but which is administered as a single unit.

Yellowstone was designated the world's first national park in 1872, and the NPS was formally established in 1916 (U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1940). The NPS system encompasses 131,000 square miles of preserved lands (about the size of Germany) and has 22,000 full or part-time employees and an annual federal budget of $2.98 billion (NPS, 2015). In 2014, 292.8 million visitors to U.S. national parks (NPS, 2015). Park visitors spent over $30 billion, supporting 251,600 jobs and generating $9.34 billion in labor income (Committee on Natural Resources, 2013).

For the purposes of this study, the type of partnership being examined is one in which an NPS unit and a nonprofit organization (e.g., a trust, foundation, conservancy, or friends group that supports a specific NPS unit or site) co-coordinate a program to engage individuals to volunteer at or for an NPS site. Shared or co-coordinated program elements include volunteer recruitment, orientation, training, placement, supervision, public relations, evaluation, funding, fund-raising, and recognition.

Nonprofit partners. Since the founding of the Yosemite Museum Association in 1923, nonprofit foundations, trusts, 'friends' groups, conservancies, and related organizations have partnered with NPS sites to raise funds and advocate for national parks. Approximately 70 individual NPS sites have dedicated nonprofit fundraising partners (Yosemite Conservancy, 2011). At the national level, the National Park Foundation (founded in 1947) raises money for the NPS system as a whole and gave $16.9 million in grants and other support to the NPS in 2013 (National Park Foundation, 2014). Money raised by these nonprofit organizations supports a wide variety of programs, materials, and activities at NPS sites, including areas of spending for which the NPS has restrictions or prohibitions.

Volunteers. For generations, volunteers have also helped NPS sites meet their needs and mission. NPS volunteers play many roles, including interpretation, answering questions, clerical support, trail maintenance, data gathering and entry, leading hikes, and more. At the national level, the Volunteers in Parks (VIP) program, authorized in 1970 by Public Law 91-357, provides "a vehicle through which the National Park Service can accept and utilize voluntary help and services from the public" (NPS, 2013a). Individuals interested in volunteering register by mail or online, identify NPS sites and volunteer roles of interest, and are linked with their chosen NPS sites. In 2011, the NPS had 229,000 volunteers (NPS, n.d.). The NPS Director's Order #7 (NPS, 2005) provides "direction to NPS personnel who are responsible for and/or involved in, implementing the VIP program" (p. 2).

Volunteer Program Partnerships

Traditionally, volunteer programs at all the NPS units were solely coordinated by NPS staff. The shift at some NPS sites to co-coordination of NPS volunteer programs with nonprofit partners has been driven by multiple factors, and money is clearly one reason. NPS park entrance fees generate only about $160 million annually (Wilderness Society, 2013). Most of the billions spent by visitors on trips to national parks pays for travel expenses or goes to nearby businesses (about $13 billion) or to concessionaires that provide food, lodging, shops, transportation, and other services within NPS units (NPS, 2013). For example, concessionaires took in $1.1 billion from visitors in 2012, of which about $100 million went to the NPS (National Park Hospitality Association, 2013).

Across much of its history and almost continually since the 1980s, the NPS has struggled to meet its mission with the funds and the often politically driven mandates given to it (Connally, 1982; Rettie, 1995; Runte, 2010), which helps explain the longstanding use of both nonprofit fundraising partners and volunteers to address gaps. By 2013, the system had a maintenance backlog of $12 billion (NPS, 2013), resulting in deferred maintenance, less interpretation and other assistance for visitors, reduced resource protection, trail and road closures, etc. From 2009-2013, the NPS had a 13% reduction in funding in today's dollars. NPS employment was stagnant during most of the 1970s, for example, a period when 88 new NPS units were added (Rettie, 1995). The total number of park rangers actually fell 10% from 2003-2013 (Wilderness Society, 2013), despite the addition of 17 new NPS units during that time (NPS, 2013). Appropriations have not kept up with additions of new parks (Leinesch, 1982), and as noted by Rettie (1995), when new NPS units are added, NPS personnel and funds for

new sites are often "scavenged from existing park budgets to staff up and operate the new parks" (p. 163).

Insufficient funding has impacted nearly every area of NPS site functioning, including personnel, resource management and protection, visitor safety and health, construction and rehabilitation, planning, and land acquisition (Leinesch, 1982). The director of the NPS from 1989-1993 noted that virtually every park he visited "suffered from a lack of maintenance" (Ridenour, 1994, p. 113) and that the NPS was "never given enough money to take care of" (p. 113) its holdings. He also asserted that members of Congress engaged in "park-barrel" (p. 17) politics, supporting activities that were not park priorities and "thinning the blood" (p. 17) of the NPS by authorizing creation of new NPS sites in their districts or states that lacked national stature or significance.

Today, NPS budgets are further attenuated due to the U.S. federal deficit, increased visitation, and associated strains on park resources and infrastructure. The 2013 NPS budget was reduced by $180 million from 2012 (National Parks Conservation Association, 2013). Nonprofit fundraising is insufficient to cover fiscal shortfalls. Smaller budgets mean NPS sites are more dependent on volunteers than ever, while insufficient NPS staffing translates to NPS sites having less capacity—i.e., staff, time, and resources—to manage volunteer programs.

A second factor in the shift toward co-coordination of NPS volunteer programs relates to deficits which have weakened governments and led to increased privatization to help meet public needs (Austin, 2000; 2000a; Googins & Rochlin, 2000). "Intersectoral blurring" occurs in partnerships when an organization in one sector takes

on a role traditionally associated with another (Selsky & Parker, 2005). As noted by Klitgaard and Treverton (2003), we are now in an era of 'hybrid' governance, in which the distinctions between the private, public, and nonprofit sectors are eroding. Goldsmith and Eggers (2004) concur, and assert that 'governing by network,' while challenging, offers great rewards and is becoming "deeply entrenched" (p. viii) in the U.S. The combination of funding shortfalls and increasingly complex problems require that public officials collaborate across sectors:

> Problems have become both more global and more local as power disperses and boundaries (when they exist at all) become more fluid. One-size-fits-all solutions have given way to customized approaches as the complicated problems of diverse and mobile populations increasingly defy simplistic solutions (p. 7).

A third impetus for the evolving NPS volunteer program partnerships is U.S. federal policy that promotes multi-sector partnerships. Walter (1993) characterizes this trend as an "application of entrepreneurial strategy to the management of public sector volunteer programs" (p. 273). Government funders often require partnerships and partner match from grantees to encourage devolution of functions to local organizations and from the public to the private sector (Austin, 2000a). These partnerships often take the form of volunteers or volunteer programs, in what has been termed 'coproduction,' or the "voluntary collaboration of citizens with paid employees of government agencies" (Walter, 1987, p. 22) to address public needs. In 1997, the NPS Assistant Director of External Affairs, Destry Jarvis, said such partnerships were essential for the "survival" of the NPS in an era of funding cutbacks (Propst & Rosan, 1997). At a more recent policy summit on national parks, a "Statement of Joint Principles" explicitly identified partnerships (including volunteer partnerships) as one of its six core principles:

> Our national parks and Park Service programs depend on powerful, diverse partnerships. Partnerships help achieve conservation goals, propel visitation, engage youth, preserve cultural heritage, and foster recreation, volunteerism and public service, healthy lifestyles, sustainable jobs and economic vitality (America's Summit on National Parks, 2012, p. 3).

A fourth factor relates to institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), or the tendency of organizations to become more similar or homogeneous over time. Coercive (financial, regulatory), normative (shared training, associations, conferences), or mimetic (copying, modeling on others) mechanisms may help explain the growth of volunteer partnerships at NPS sites and similarities among them. These factors have contributed to expansion of existing partnerships between multiple NPS sites and their nonprofit partners, whereby some nonprofits have become directly involved in volunteer recruitment, interviewing, orientation, training, supervision, recognition, or evaluation. These volunteer program partnerships impact the NPS sites, nonprofit partners, activities in parks, and the nature of NPS-nonprofit relationships.

Problem Statement

Although there is a significant body of research focusing on business-related interorganizational relations—i.e., collaboration between organizations to improve production and profitability—as well as on relations within and between sectors (e.g., for-profit, nonprofit, government), co-coordinated NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships represent an unexamined phenomenon. Theories on Interorganizational Relations (Cropper et al., 2010; Evan, 1965; Gray, 1985, 1989; Levine & White, 1961; Negandhi, 1975; Van de Ven, 1976), Cross-Sector Social Partnerships (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Seitanidi, Koufopoulos, & Palmer, 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Vorro, Dacin, & Perrini, 2011), and New Institutionalism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983;

Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1977)—as well as research related to Strategic Human Resource Management—can help illuminate how collaborations between NPS and nonprofit organizations are manifested in co-coordinated volunteer programs. However, there have been no studies of interorganizational collaborations in the NPS or that focus on cross-sector organization partners who have a high degree of goal congruity. The partners in this study share a common mission to help the NPS meet its overall goals.

Lacking research on NPS-nonprofit volunteer partnerships, there is little guidance for practitioners on how they function. No one has examined them to see how they compare to each other or to traditional volunteer programs managed solely by NPS staff. Although recommended practices have been identified for cross-sector collaboration (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Gray, 1985, 1989; Klitgaard & Treverton, 2003) and for volunteer program management (Brudney, 1999; Hager & Brudney, 2004; Safrit, Schmiesing, Gliem, & Gliem, 2005), no examination has been made to determine the degree to which the NPS-nonprofit volunteer partnerships employ these recommended practices or if there is a relation between use of the practices and successful volunteer collaboration at NPS sites. And while there are other models of CSSPs, volunteer program partnerships between NPS sites and their nonprofits may differ in character and composition. Anecdotal evidence suggests the NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships vary due to their locations, the population densities around them, needs at different sites, and other factors. There is also no context-specific information for NPS stakeholders on recommended practices. An NPS-funded a study of its nationwide volunteer efforts (NPS & Walker Davidson, 2007) did not examine co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this multi-case study is to understand how interorganizational relationships between NPS units and their nonprofit organization partners function as manifested through their co-coordinated volunteer programs. The following research questions will be addressed:

1. How and why do NPS units and their nonprofit partners collaborate to co-coordinate volunteer programs?
2. What are the structures and components of the co-coordinated volunteer programs?
3. How do the co-coordinated volunteer programs adhere to research-based elements of effective volunteer program management and interorganizational relations?
4. What are similarities and differences in how the co-coordinated volunteer programs function at the selected sites?
5. How well are the partnerships able to adapt to changing conditions?

Theoretical Framework

Two theories inform this study: Interorganizational Relations (IOR) and New (or neo-) Institutionalism. The study is also informed by research on Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM). Since this research is designed to understand the nature and elements of relations or collaborations between organizations, IOR theory is applicable, especially the IOR sub-field of cross-sector social partnerships between government and nonprofit organizations. New Institutionalism illuminates the study via its examination of how organizational forms persist and become more similar over time as a result of various pressures and actions. Volunteer program management, which derives from SHRM, is also a key component of the study. The unit of analysis is the co-coordinated volunteer program collaboration between the NPS and nonprofit organizations.

Interorganizational Relations Theory. The most applicable body of theory may be Interorganizational Relations (IOR) Theory, which draws from sociology and organization science. IOR's sociological roots relate to the shift from conceiving of organizations as closed systems to viewing them as constantly interacting with their environments (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Parsons, Shils, & Smelser, 1951; von Bertalanffy, 1950, 1951). The other major root of IOR theory stems from organization science and draws from Exchange (Litwak & Hylton, 1962), Resource-Dependence (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), Network (Hall, 1999), and Stakeholder theories (Freeman, 1994; Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). IOR theories describe how and why organizations interact with each other in open systems, the challenges they face, how they address and adapt to collaboration challenges, and the types of impacts they engender.

Interorganizational relations occur when "autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain" (Wood & Gray, 1991, p. 146). In NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships, the stakeholders are the NPS sites and their nonprofit partners. The organizations retain their autonomy, even as they abide by agreed-upon rules and norms to co-coordinate volunteer programs. Within IOR theory, this study homes in on cooperative government and nonprofit collaborations that address a social need—i.e., cross-sector social partnerships or CSSPs (Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010).

New Institutionalism. Given the focus of this study on understanding similarities and differences in co-coordinated volunteer partnerships at the different study sites, New (or neo-) Institutionalism theory is also applicable because it seeks to

explain processes by which organizations develop similar (or isomorphic) forms over time. New Institutionalism, first articulated by Meyer & Rowan (1977), Zucker (1977), and DiMaggio & Powell (1983), elaborates on Institutional Theory. The process by which organizations within an "organizational field" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) become more homogenous over time is not necessarily due solely to rational adaptation or conscious action. Instead, organizations often unconsciously follow social norms and "rational myths" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) within their fields to fit into their institutional settings and obtain legitimacy.

In addition, isomorphic change is driven by coercive, mimetic, and normative mechanisms within institutional fields (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Greenwood & Meyer, 2008). Organizations may become similar over time because they respond to similar rules and inputs, copy their more established peers, and/or adopt established norms in order to fit in and compete. This theory helps explain how and why coercive, mimetic, normative, and other mechanisms may influence the cases of NPS-nonprofit co-coordination of volunteer programs to adopt similar structures and components. New Institutionalism also examines the relative roles of fields (or sectors) and social conditions that enable the development of new institutional forms and the roles of entrepreneurial leaders in establishing new programs or enacting change.

Strategic Human Resource Management. Although it is seen as a practice illuminated by theory rather than as a theory in itself, SHRM research also helps explain the 'how' of the co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships and in developing descriptive models for them. Volunteer program management is a form of human resource management, and SHRM focuses on aligning HRM policy and practice with

strategic organizational goals and investment in human capital toward those ends. Over the past 15 years, research studies have identified and tested a set of elements of effective volunteer program management, to include establishing the rationale for volunteer involvement, financial commitment, integrating volunteers into the organization, creating position descriptions, recruiting and retaining volunteers, training and managing volunteers, and program evaluation (Brudney, 1999, 2010; Hager & Brudney, 2004; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; Safrit et al., 2005). These research studies have included a wide variety of volunteer programs, and their findings inform this study of NPS-nonprofit volunteer partnerships.

Methodology

The case study methodology was selected for this study, which examined six NPS volunteer program partnerships. Each partnership represents an instance—or case—of the phenomenon that was studied in depth (Merriam, 2009). Each volunteer program partnership also represents a 'bounded system' that is limited by factors such as participants, time, place, and processes (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2006). As noted by Yin (2009), case studies are an effective method for gaining "insight into causal processes" (p. 175). A quantitative approach, by contrast, records the prevalence of a phenomenon" (p. 175). This study examined several partnerships, or cases, and was thus a multi-case comparison. Multi-case studies offer different perspectives on a topic, identify common and disparate characteristics of sites, allow for comparisons among cases, and can reinforce overall findings (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2006).

Population and sample. The units of analysis in this study were cases of NPS-nonprofit cross-sector social partnerships to co-coordinate volunteer programs at NPS

sites. The cases were drawn from the total population of 407 NPS units in the U.S., of which 14 were identified as having co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships. Six cases of co-coordinated NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships were then selected, based on the following criteria: (1) the level of application of research-based elements of effective volunteer management practice in the partnership (Brudney, 1999; Hager & Brudney, 2004; Safrit et al., 2005) and tenets of IOR theory (Gray, 1985, 1989)—the highest-scoring sites were elected; (2) partnerships representing different types of NPS units; (3) partnerships in different regions of the U.S.; and (4) a combination of partnerships located in urban, suburban, rural, or mixed areas. An online questionnaire sent to the 14 identified volunteer program co-collaboration NPS sites and their nonprofit partners (a total of 28 organizations—see Appendices 1 and 2) was used in case selection. Study participants at each site included staff involved in coordinating and implementing the co-coordinated volunteer programs.

Data collection methods. The following data collection methods were used:

1. Semi-Structured Interviews: Interviews are imperative to understand how individuals design and implement a program. A semi-structured format allows for following up on responses from interviewees. The interview guide was developed based on the theoretical frameworks of the study (Appendix 3). Interviews were conducted in person or via video link.
2. Document Analysis: The partners have written records of their activities to integrate the co-coordinated volunteer programs into agreements, policies, procedures, programming, training, budgets, staffing, evaluation, roles, etc. Such efforts are codified in various forms of documentation that were examined.

Data analysis. Data analysis occurred simultaneously with data collection and was a "recursive and dynamic" (Merriam, 2009, p. 169) process that used constant comparison to develop and refine findings. Interview transcripts and collected data were

reviewed and annotated with codes, memos, and notes via multiple readings of each transcript. Patterns and correspondence within and across cases were identified (Creswell, 2007). Constant reconsideration of data guided development of memos and codes related to study questions. Codes were combined into categories influenced by the theoretical frameworks guiding the study (Bergerson, 2007; Honan, Knobel, Baker, & Davies, 2000; Yin, 2009).

Concepts applying across the cases were then distilled into potential categories that helped explain the data. Consideration of potential categories ultimately lead to identification of several overarching categories that address the research questions (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Narrative text, tables, and other descriptive methods provided an embedded analysis (Yin, 2009) of the functioning and the components of the NPS-nonprofit partnerships that address co-coordination of volunteer programs. The study employed 'thick' descriptions (Stake, 1995), substantively addressed the topic (Yin, 2009), and provides evidence to support its conclusions related to the "meaning of the cases" (Creswell, 2007, p. 75).

Trustworthiness. To help ensure the trustworthiness of the study, several approaches were used:

1. Two data collection methods helped to corroborate findings (i.e., interviews with 3-10 individuals from each case, plus review of documents).
2. Member check or 'response validation' (Merriam, 2009) of interview transcripts allowed interviewees to review and clarify their remarks.
3. Inter-coder reliability. After analyzing the data, transcript sections and categories were shared with peers to allow outsiders to review and comment on the category-development process and findings.
4. Maintaining an audit trail. All the materials used and developed in the study, to include transcripts, memos, and journal notes, were retained to allow other scholars to follow up on or replicate this study.

Findings are directly applicable to the partnerships included in the study, and other organizations in similar contexts and situations may also learn from them.

Ethical considerations. IRB approval was obtained before data gathering began, as was approval from interviewees at each case site. To ensure confidentiality, interviewee names were not included in the study. Sections of the study that addressed challenges in the partnerships additionally anonymized the names of the NPS units and their partners. A list of participants by code was stored in a locked cabinet and was destroyed, along with all audiotapes, once data transcription was completed. Records of the study were kept private on a computer with password access.

Limitations and delimitations. Any study using interviews with human subjects is limited based on the openness, accuracy, memory, and veracity of the respondents. To address these limitations, multiple (3-10) interviews were held at each case site. Efforts were made to build rapport with interviewees in order to promote openness. In addition, the researcher submitted (via e-mail) follow-up questions that arose after the interviews helped to increase accuracy and compared interview comments with documents from each site. The study is delimited to the selected partnerships, and the findings are applicable only to those partnerships and to similar contexts.

Significance of the Study

This study is the first to specifically examine volunteer program partnerships between NPS sites and nonprofit organizations. It has the potential to apply and extend IOR and New Institutionalism theories as well as knowledge related to SHRM. Given historic and current trends, it is probable that there will be greater need for volunteers at NPS sites in the future. Therefore, these partnerships will likely multiply, and this study

can help researchers understand—from multiple theoretical lenses—how such partnerships function.

Descriptions of NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships will be helpful for practitioners at NPS sites who may be considering such collaborations. Examination of diverse cases allows for broader potential applicability to multiple NPS sites and different types of NPS units and partnerships nationwide. In addition, evidence about what program components may relate to volunteer program partnership effectiveness may aid other NPS and nonprofit partner staff in designing their own partnerships.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

The purpose of this multi-case study is to understand co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships that expand existing interorganizational and cross-sector relations between National Park Service units and dedicated nonprofit organization partners. This study addresses the following research questions:

1. How and why do NPS units and their nonprofit partners collaborate to co-coordinate volunteer programs?
2. What are the structures and components of the co-coordinated volunteer programs?
3. How do the co-coordinated volunteer programs adhere to research-based elements of effective volunteer program management and interorganizational relations?
4. What are similarities and differences in how the co-coordinated volunteer programs function at the selected sites?
5. How well are the partnerships able to adapt to changing conditions?

This literature review describes and critiques research related to the above questions, and its overall structure is guided by recommendations from multiple researchers (Boote & Beile, 2005; GSEHD, 2013; Hart, 1998; Krathwohl, 1998; McDade, 2003; Merriam & Simpson, 2000). The chapter defines and delimits the topic, to include listing the criteria used for inclusion. The bulk of the chapter is devoted to describing and critiquing relevant scholarly literature, focusing on three disciplinary areas that offer significant understanding of the topic: Interorganizational Relations (IOR), Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM), and New (or neo-) Institutionalism. Analysis and summary are provided regarding why each area was selected, its history and development, how it impacts the topic, examples of studies and their methods, strengths and gaps of the studies, and how this dissertation draws from, departs from, or extends those studies and theories. Thus, this chapter 're+views'

(Leedy, 1993) the literature related to this study, places this dissertation in the context of existing research, and describes how it will advance knowledge on the topic (Boote & Beile, 2005; GSEHD, 2013; Hart, 1998; Krathwohl, 1998; McDade, 2003; Merriam & Simpson, 2000).

Literature Review Methods

While this literature review covers six decades of research related to interorganizational relations, SHRM, and new institutionalism, most of the cited studies are from the past ten years. Sources cited in this study were obtained through ALADIN and Google Scholar search engines. Articles were accessed from multiple academic databases and online resources, including EBSCO Host, ABI/Inform Complete Plus, ProQuest Information & Learning, Dissertation Abstracts International, SAGE Journals, UMI, Springer Link, Wiley Online Library, JSTOR, Project Muse, and PsycInfo. Numerous books were also examined. Only sources in English were reviewed, and no time limits on publishing dates were used in searches.

While many electronic search terms were used to narrow and define the topic, the most fruitful search terms used in the study were as follows: national park (national park system, National Park Service), volunteer (volunteer program, volunteer management, volunteer program management), partnership (organizational partnership, cross-sector social partnership, interorganizational partnership), interorganizational (interorganizational relations, interorganizational collaboration), neoinstitutionalism, new institutionalism, strategic human resource management, and strategic human resource development.

IOR, SHRM, and New Institutionalism perspectives each contribute to this study. Because the study seeks to understand the nature and elements of relations or collaborations between organizations, IOR theory is directly applicable. The management of volunteer programs is also central to the study, and relevant research on this topic is based primarily in SHRM models. In addition, the study seeks to identify similarities and differences in the volunteer program partnerships and their sources, which is addressed by New Institutionalism.

There is voluminous literature on each of the three disciplinary areas that undergird the study. Therefore, the study is delimited in its approach to IOR and New Institutionalism theories and to SHRM research. It provides explanations of each area, then homes in on aspects of each that shed light on the specific research problem and research questions. The relative novelty of the NPS-nonprofit partnerships and their interdisciplinary expression are such that no studies correspond precisely with them. Therefore, this review identifies, describes, and critiques selected studies across the three disciplinary areas that shed cumulative light on aspects of this phenomenon. In addition, the study identifies limitations of each disciplinary area in understanding the overall phenomenon and argues the necessity of employing a multi-theory or multidisciplinary approach to appreciate co-coordinated volunteer partnerships of this type.

Interorganizational Relations Theory

IOR Theory illuminates this study of collaborations between NPS sites and nonprofit support organizations to co-coordinate volunteer programs. The term 'interorganizational relations' (Cropper et al., 2010; Evan, 1965; Gray, 1985, 1989;

Levine & White, 1961; Litwak & Hylton, 1962) is often used interchangeably with interorganizational collectivity (Van de Ven, 1976; Van de Ven, Emmet, & Koenig, 1975) and interorganizational collaboration (Gray, 1985, 1989; Negandhi, 1975; Powell, Koput, & Smith-Doerr, 1996). Cropper et al. (2010) actually identify 38 terms that are used to describe interorganizational entities or actions (including alliance, collaboration, network, coalition, cooperative, partnership, association, and multi-party), and no term is universally accepted. 'Interorganizational relations' (IOR) is used in this study because it is the most prevalent and is used in the current handbook on the topic (Cropper et al., 2010).

IOR theory draws from sociology and organization science and focuses on studying and understanding "relationships between and among organizations" (Cropper et al., 2010, p. 4). Such relationships are substantive and based on mutual interests. IOR's sociological roots relate to the paradigm shift from conceiving of organizations as closed systems—as described in modernist perspectives of Weber (1905/2002), Taylor (1911), and Gulick and Unwick (1954)—to viewing them as open systems that constantly interact with their environments in a dynamic equilibrium, whereby exchange is an "essential factor underlying the system's viability" (Buckley, 1967, p. 50). Such organizations are not just open systems (von Bertalanffy, 1950, 1951), but are open social systems (Katz & Kahn, 1978) whose interactions include relations between and among organizations—i.e., interorganizational relations.

The second theoretical root of IOR theory stems from organization science. Early case studies described interorganizational relationships, exchange, or coordination between different social service agencies (Levine & White, 1961; Litwak & Hylton,

1962). These collaborations were characterized by mutual interest, interdependence, autonomy, standardized action, resource dependence, and exchange. Building on these studies, Evan (1965) proposed a theory of interorganizational relations that integrated the sociological and organizational elements. Such study, he asserted, involves "analysis of inter-social system relations" (p. B-229) which were widely practiced but which had received little scholarly attention. Although Evan focused mostly on collaboration for the purpose of gaining competitive advantage, he postulated that cooperative relations between organizations (the focus of this study) are likely to occur when their work is complementary and when resources are scarce.

Evan's seminal work helped spawn other theories related to how and why organizations partner to control scarce resources and enhance their competitiveness, including Exchange (Litwak & Hylton, 1962), Resource-Dependence (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), Network (Hall, 1999), Stakeholder (Freeman, 1994; Mitchell et al., 1997), as well as Contingency theories (Hickson, Hinings, Lee, Schenck, & Pennings, 1971; Thompson, 1967), Transaction Costs Theory (Williamson, 1975), and Negotiated Order Theory (Gray, 1989). Over time, these theories have been customized—even 'fragmented' (Galaskiewicz, 1985)—into different disciplines, including organizational behavior, psychology, public administration, nonprofit management, and law.

Drivers of interorganizational relations. Much of the impetus behind the growth of IOR theories relates to scholarly interest in understanding the reasons for—or forces behind—increasing collaboration among organizations. Exchange theories, for example, suggest organizations cooperate when benefits of doing so exceed the costs (Smith & Ashford, 1994). Bandura (1971) and DiMaggio & Powell (1983) say

collaboration can arise from imitation or modeling among organizations. Many studies also find that resource dependence—lack of critical competencies, expertise, connections, resources, etc.—also drives cross-sector interorganizational collaboration (Andriof & Waddock, 2002; Barringer & Harrison, 2000; Emery & Trist, 1965; Gomes-Casseres, 1996; Gray, 1985; Pasquero, 1991; Pfeffer & Nowak, 1976; Selsky, 1991; Trist, 1983). For the cases described in this study, a volunteer program partnership is "necessary for the provision of a level of service which is mutually satisfactory" (Walter, 1987, p. 30).

Ashby's (1956, 1960) 'requisite variety' and Emery and Trist's (1965) environmental 'turbulence'—also help explain the rise in IORs. These authors depicted the modern world as one of increasing complexity, change, diversity, and technological advancement. Ashby's (1956, 1960) Law of Requisite Variety states that the greater the variation of actions or options available to an entity, the greater its ability to compensate for environmental changes or 'perturbations.' In environments of increasing fluctuation, organizations must employ new strategies to keep pace. IORs are a key approach to maintain requisite variety and 'resilience' (Heuer, 2011) in the face of change and complexity.

Similarly, Emery and Trist (1965) aver that the environment (or 'fields') in which organizations operate is 'turbulent'—uncertain, unstable, decentralized, interdependent, etc. Such turbulence is now a fixed feature of organizational fields, and organizations must respond with new strategies to maintain stability, endure, and succeed. IOR researchers (Cropper et al., 2010; Gray, 1986, 1989; Gray & Wood, 1991; Koschmann et al., 2012; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Trist, 1983; Van de Ven, 1976)

also identify turbulence as driving organizations to collaborate—sometimes even with their competitors (Powell et al., 1996)—in order to succeed.

Defining interorganizational relations. Because this study examines cooperative—as opposed to competitive— interorganizational relations, further narrowing is needed within IOR theory for the literature review. Even so, basic elements of IOR theory clearly apply. It is useful to compare and synthesize ways in which IOR is defined by scholars (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1
Definitions of Interorganizational Relations (IOR)

Author(s)	Date	Definition
Litwak & Hylton	1962	IORs are formed to promote areas of common interest, access more or better resources than either agency can alone, and address areas of disagreement or competition.
Gray	1985	IORs occur in instances (1) where there are problems too large for a single organization to solve, and (2) of environmental turbulence. They involve (a) the pooling of tangible resources, (b) by two or more stakeholders, (c) to solve a set of problems which neither can solve individually (p. 912).
Gray	1989	"[N]egotiated orders created among stakeholders to control environmental turbulence by regulating the exchange relationships among them" (p. 228). IORs are emergent, developmental, and exploratory; involve strategies to cope with external pressures; create quasi-institutional mechanisms for accommodating different interests; and serve as vehicles for action learning.
James	1996	"A purposeful, cooperative relationship among distinct but related organizations" (p. 14).
Powell et al.	1996	"Cooperative efforts that seek to reduce the inherent uncertainties associated with novel products or markets" (p. 117). Organizations collaborate to "acquire resources and skills they cannot produce internally, when the hazards of cooperation can be held to a tolerable level" (p. 118).
Brinker-hoff	2002	Characterized by (1) mutuality (symbiosis, interdependence, mutual commitment, equality), and (2) organizational identity (independence, autonomy, and adherence to mission, vision, and values) (pp. 22-23).
Goldsmith & Eggers	2004	IORs that include government entities are "initiatives deliberately undertaken . . . to accomplish public goals, with measurable performance goals, assigned responsibilities to each

		partner, and structured information flow" (p. 8). IORs allow for increased speed, innovation, specialization, flexibility, reach, and impact.
Thompson, Perry, & Miller	2009	A process "in which autonomous or semi-autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiation, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together" (p. 23). IORs include dimensions of governance, administration, autonomy, mutuality, and norms.
Cropper et al.	2010	Focuses on "the properties and overall pattern of relations between and among organizations that are pursuing a mutual interest while also remaining independent. . . . The aim is to understand and explain . . . the antecedents, content, patterns, forms, processes, management, or outcomes of relations between or among organizations" (p. 9).
Lotia & Hardy	2010	"Encompasses a wide range of collaborative arrangements . . . designed to achieve a variety of social and commercial purposes" (p. 366). The collaboration is (1) social, as it involves relationships, (2) political, as participants serve both their organization and the collaboration, and (3) dynamic, as collaborative roles evolve over time.
Bedwell, Wildman, Diaz-Granados, Salazar, Kramer, & Salas	2012	An evolving process whereby "two or more social entities actively and reciprocally engage in joint activities aimed at achieving at least one shared goal" (p. 135).

Common elements of these definitions, which apply to both competitive and cooperative IORs, include the following. Interorganizational relations . . .

- Are purposeful and voluntary;
- Are emergent and evolve, based on conditions and the success of the partnership;
- Focus on areas of mutual interest or concern;
- Allow each organization to maintain its overall identity and autonomy.
- Include negotiated roles, responsibilities, commitments, and understandings among the partners, to include reciprocity; and
- Allow each partner to (a) obtain resources it would not otherwise have, (b) more fully and capably address its goals or needs than it could acting alone, (c) accomplish more than it could acting alone, and (d) respond more successfully to changing, complex, and turbulent conditions.

Interorganizational relations processes. Cropper et al. (2010) suggest IOR research typically focuses on describing either the organizations involved or the nature of the collaboration—i.e., the "process through which IORs are established, maintained, changed and dissolved, and produce outcomes" (p. 10). For this study, the functions of the partnerships between NPS units and their nonprofit partners are the focus. Therefore, it is useful to examine IOR literature related to processes, structures, and forms. Doing so, suggest Cropper et al. (2010), helps explain "the properties of the organizations participating in an IOE [interorganizational entity], their relations, and related outcomes" (p. 10). As with IOR definitions, there is no consensus on IOR processes or structures. Therefore, a compilation is useful for representing varying conceptions in the field:

Table 2.2
Processes and Structures of Interorganizational Relations

Author(s)	Date	IOR Processes and Structures
Astley & Fombrun	1983	They take four sequential forms: 1. Exploratory—partners acknowledge their inability to address an issue, discuss the idea of collaborating, and establish trust; 2. Advisory—partners analyze the problem and propose recommendations for joint action to address it; 3. Confederative—consensual recommendations, agreements, resource exchanges, and guidelines are adopted; and 4. Contractual—enforceable contractual agreements are promulgated, and formal structures are institutionalized.
Gray	1985, 1989	They occur in three stages or phases: 1. Problem setting—developing a common definition of the problem, identifying and convening stakeholders, committing to collaborate, and identifying resources; 2. Direction setting—establishing norms, setting agendas, organizing groups, exploring options, and agreeing on how to proceed; and 3. Implementation—conducting joint action, building external support, dealing with constituencies, structuring, monitoring the agreement, and ensuring compliance (1989, p. 57).

Ring & Van de Ven	1994	They involve the cyclical processes of negotiation of joint expectations, commitment to future action, execution of commitments, and assessment of effectiveness based on efficiency and equity (p. 97).
Spekman, Isabella, MacAvoy, & Forbes	1996	They occur in four mutually influencing stages: 1. Formation—development of shared vision, values, and voice; 2. Metamorphosis—the alliance takes form and develops structures and processes for coordination and translating ideas into action; 3. Stabilization—ongoing management and sustaining of the IOR over time, which requires willingness and ability to address issues as they arise and regular examination of the alliance; and 4. Decision—when the partners decide to continue, revise, or end the IOR based on how it has worked and on changing circumstances.
Austin	2000	Partnerships typically evolve from a limited philanthropic stage, to a transactional stage, and ultimately to an integrated or strategic partnership through success and development of mutual trust.
Googins & Rochlin	2000	Defining clear goals, obtaining senior-level commitment, engaging in frequent communication, assigning professionals to lead the work, reciprocal exchange, symbiotic value creation, sharing resources, and evaluating progress and results (p. 133).
Cropper et al.	2010	Macro processes include phases, evolution, and dissolution of an IOE. Micro processes include how trust, leadership, sense-making, innovation, evaluation, and intervention processes develop over time.

Gray's (1985, 1989) three stages of the collaborative process (problem setting, direction setting, and implementation) offer a solid core for IOR processes. Her sequence, plus three other elements from the literature—(1) development of mutual trust and the key roles of (2) organizational leaders and (3) staff dedicated to the IOR—serve as the literature-based foundation for IOR processes in this study. The cases in this study align at various places along this continuum of formality and institutionalization in their partnerships.

Cooperative, cross-sector, and social interorganizational relations. IOR theory provides a useful lens for examining NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships. Before reviewing IOR studies, it is necessary to delimit within this body of theory. Much of IOR theory focuses on for-profits and the use of interorganizational collaboration to gain competitive advantage. This study, by contrast, focuses on cooperative interorganizational collaborations. In addition, it examines cooperative collaborations across two sectors—public and nonprofit. Even further, this study focuses not just on cooperative cross-sector collaboration, but collaboration to address social needs.

Finally, the cases examined in this study are also distinctive in that they represent cross-sector partners that have a high level of goal congruity. In effect, the public and nonprofit organizations have the same goal: each individual NPS site seeks to meet the overall mission of the NPS, and the nonprofit partners seek to help their particular park unit meet that NPS mission. This high degree of mission overlap contrasts with most other cross-sector collaborations, in which dissimilar organizations identify an area of common interest in their otherwise disparate missions and collaborate within that defined area. The cases in this study had existing relations, often long before they expanded their collaboration to the volunteer program. The nonprofit organizations were, in fact, created for the explicit purpose of supporting their individual NPS sites, and traditionally focused on fundraising. The following section addresses how the goal congruity of the cases presents both benefits and challenges for the partner organizations. Given the particularities of the phenomenon of the study, the most pertinent literature within IOR theory relates to cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs),

an artery within the corpus of IOR literature. To begin, cross-sector partnerships must be clarified.

Cross-sector partnerships. Cross-sector partnerships are voluntary collaborations among organizations from at least two sectors (private, public, or nonprofit). Organizations collaborate across sectors for many of the same reasons that they do so within sectors—to tap expertise, funds, materials, legitimacy, or other resources they need to meet their goals in complex, diverse, and changing environments. As noted by many, however (Austin, 2000b; Brinkerhoff, 2002; Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Gray, 1985, 1989, 2000; Heuer, 2011; Klitgaard & Treverton, 2003; Koschmann et al., 2012; Mandel & Keast, 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Trist, 1983), there are additional reasons for cross-sector partnerships, to include tapping different skills across fields, inter-sectoral blurring of roles, government support (and funding) of cross-sector partnerships, and recognition of the limits of government programs and power.

Different sectors, suggest Selsky & Parker (2005), tend to focus on particular aspects of issues. However, given the complexity of today's world, no one sector has the capacity to solve the challenges we face. Combining talents and resources across sectors can yield innovative ideas and solutions. For example, globalization has led to companies having significant impacts on societies around the world. However, multinational corporations may not understand the cultures of the communities in which they operate. Therefore, they partner with other sectors, such as local governments and non-governmental organizations (Googins & Rochlin, 2000).

Klitgaard and Treverton (2003) say the world is trending toward 'hybrid governance,' in which once-clear lines between sectors are eroding. The transition, they say, is from a system of 'layer-cake' governance, in which different sectors have clearly distinct roles, to 'marble-cake' governance, characterized by "new forms of partnerships across sectors at all levels" (p. 6). Technology also drives cross-sectoral partnerships. Today, for example, the exchange of money, goods, and ideas has passed largely from government control to the private sector, blurring the roles of the sectors. As O'Riain (2000) declares, "each sphere is *multiply embedded* within the others. Their boundaries cannot be clearly drawn, as each is intertwined with the others" (p. 191) (emphasis original).

Looking particularly at cross-sector partnerships that include government organizations, Goldsmith and Eggers (2004) say the complexity of today's challenges requires a shift from traditional models to one of "governing by network" (p. 6). Traditional bureaucratic systems, they suggest, "are ill-suited to addressing problems that often transcend organizational boundaries" (p. 8). As a consequence, there has been an unprecedented rise in partnerships that are "deliberately undertaken by government to accomplish public goals, with measurable performance goals, assigned responsibilities to each partner, and structured information" (p. 8). The goal of these collaborations is to generate the "maximum public value, greater than the sum" (p. 8) of what each individual partner could accomplish alone.

Governments, particularly in the West, also explicitly promote cross-sector collaboration and commonly require the formation of cross-sector partnerships as a condition of contracts and grants they award. At the same time, governments have

fewer resources, and many formerly government-funded initiatives are now privatized. As a consequence, says Austin (2000), nonprofits have stepped into the gap created by the weakening of, and loss of confidence in, governments. The nonprofits in this study, for example, mostly do not receive federal funds. Rather, they give funds to a federal agency—the NPS—resulting in the nonprofits being more able to wield influence with their NPS partners. For these reasons, cross-sector partnerships have become commonplace, and private and nonprofit stakeholders are increasingly involved in "public purposes, often in new and different partnerships with governments at various levels" (Klitgaard & Treverton, 2003, p. 8). As described by Kapucu (2006) cross-sector partnerships have the potential to "enable diverse organizations and groups to collaborate around a shared vision and purpose to bring about positive impact" (p. 207).

Cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs). Two influential articles by Waddock (1989, 1991) directed attention to cross-sector collaborations that focus on issues of social need or importance. In a multi-case study (1989) and a follow-up conceptual piece (1991), she distinguished cross-sector social partnerships from economic-sector examples and offered guidance on how CSSPs are defined, structured, and developed as well as a typology of social partnership organizations. CSSPs, she said, represent voluntary collaborative efforts of actors from organizations in two or more economic sectors in which they cooperatively attempt to solve a problem of mutual concern that is in some way identified with a public policy agenda (Waddock, 1991, p. 481-482).

CSSPs address complex 'metaproblems' or 'messes' that single organizations or sectors cannot solve on their own—particularly issues with a social or public policy agenda such as poverty, the environment, health care, and education (Ackoff, 1974;

Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Waddock, 1989). CSSPs evolve through four stages: recognition of the need to partner, partnership initiation, establishment and collective action, and maturity—a sequence that echoes Astley and Fombrun's (1983) stages (exploratory, advisory, confederative, and contractual). Waddock (1989) describes six types of pressures that serve as an impetus to form CSSPs: (1) mandates or legal systems, (2) existing networks that introduce partners to each other, (3) third-party brokers who provide pressure to interact or forums for interaction, (4) a common vision about a need and how to address it, (5) a crisis that focuses potential partners toward a problem, and (6) leaders who inspire or convene the players and provide a vision for action.

In their structures, CSSPs are similar to other interorganizational relations. Their focus, however, is on a socially relevant goal, and CSSPs range from technical, to administrative, to integrative or institutional in their depth and breadth (Waddock, 1991). As noted by Klitgaard and Treverton (2003), few collaborations reach the integrative stage, where the alliance becomes strategic and boundaries between the partners begin to blur. Integrative partnerships "resemble an integrated joint venture that is critical to the strategies of both partners. Exchanges multiply in everything from money to people to ideas. At this point, the partnership is able to effectively respond to the changing environment" (p. 10).

Selsky and Parker (2005, 2010) further define and delineate CSSPs. Such partnerships, they argue, occur at three levels, or 'platforms':

1. Resource dependence platform: collaboration to secure resources, cope with turbulence, or gain competitive advantage. These CSSPs are narrow, extrinsic, and are typically short-term and focus on

"organizational needs with the added benefit of addressing a social need" (p. 852).
2. Social issues platform: organizations join to more efficiently shape and address a shared social 'metaproblem" that neither can address alone.
3. Societal sector platform: the relations, actions, and responsibilities of the partners begin to blur, as an "organization in one sector adopts or captures a role or function traditionally associated with another sector" (p. 853).

Thus, CSSPs range from transactional to integrative and societal. The authors suggest that their 'platforms' may serve as 'sensemaking devices' that researchers and managers, respectively, can use to implement or evaluate CSSPs. This study will seek to understand which platforms are reflected in the cases of NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships.

CSSPs hold potential for finding new and innovative ways to address complex social issues. Because they tap multiple sectors, CSSPs can have a wider societal impact than individual organizations or within-sector IORs. In addition, the broader benefits of IORs also accrue in CSSPs (i.e., access to resources, greater influence, better solutions, more expertise). Recent work by Kania and Kramer (2011) promotes similar efforts to achieve 'collective impact' on complex social problems. Indeed, the potential of cross-sector collaboration is already widely accepted by public and private funders, who commonly require such partnerships of their grantees. At the same time, however, researchers have identified challenges related to cross-sector partnerships.

Barriers to cross-sector collaboration. Collaboration can be challenging. Sharing—of power, authority, resources, information, control, successes, failures, etc.—is often difficult for individuals and organizations. The collaborations examined in this

study face a range of challenges. In addressing interorganizational collaboration broadly, Gray (1989) identifies a research-backed list of obstacles to CSSPs:

1. Historical and ideological differences between partners;
2. Power disparities between partners;
3. Cultural norms and dynamics, to include Western tendencies toward individualism or resistance to share resources in times of scarcity;
4. Varying perceptions of risk by partners, resulting in different approaches;
5. Technical complexity and different interpretations stakeholders have of how to respond to it; and
6. Institutional and political cultures that resist collaboration or change.

In public-private partnerships, the government organization must ensure that "the more generalized public purpose is protected and that the private participation is congruent with and enhances those uses" (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004, p. 22). In such partnerships, breakdowns in communication are "a leading cause" (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004, p. 94) of conflict and failed networks. The different structures, purposes, rules, and cultures of the partner organizations may inhibit their ability to support and implement collaborative goals.

Huxham and Vangen (1996) agree, and in an examination of four nonprofit-public partnerships conclude that working across sectors "is one of the most difficult activities that managers in any type of organization have to accomplish" (p. 6). Citing multiple studies of CSSPs between nonprofits and government agencies, Hibbert and Huxham (2010) find that the inability of partners to form and sustain relationships and to share power are the principle reasons IORs falter or fail. Brinkerhoff (2002) had similar findings in a case study of NGO-government partnerships in several countries. Governments, these authors and Keast and Brown (2006) say, have a tendency to revert

to traditional authoritative and bureaucratic postures and controls, which undermines the partnership.

Another area of challenge to IORs is the difference between the rhetoric and reality of partner roles, particularly as they relate to co-coordinated volunteer programs between government and nonprofit organizations. Walter's (1987) study of role relationships between a government entity (the Los Angeles Public Library system) and its volunteer 'Friends' partners is worth noting because of its parallels to this research. In her study, the author identifies major differences between role relationships (1) as they are described in formal plans, (2) as they are understood by the partners, (3) as they actually exist, and (4) as they ought to be. Such differences resulted in conflict among the partners.

Brudney (1990) and Walter (1987) also note that that while volunteer program partnerships may function effectively in delivering services, they can generate conflicts in the areas of control, power, policy, and use of funds, especially when funds are raised by the nonprofit partner who then wants a say in how the funds will be used. Government agencies such as the NPS depend on funds and volunteers provided by nonprofit partners and therefore must be responsive to the nonprofits' "preferences for agency missions, policies, and programs" (Brudney, 1990, p. 84). The nonprofits' ideas and goals may differ from those of their NPS partners, and if these differences are not recognized and negotiated, struggles for control of resources may damage the partnership. In this study, understanding the functioning of the partnerships helped illuminate how the nonprofit partners influence NPS policies and programs related to volunteer programming, as well as how the partners managed conflicts that arose.

The IOR and SHRM literature suggest that partnerships which adhere to tenets of volunteer program management and IOR theory will be more effective, but do these prescriptions apply in the cases at hand, and why or why not? This study examined several cases of volunteer program partnerships to describe the conditions under which the partnerships work, as well as how the quality of the partners' interactions affected how their volunteer programs are structured and operated.

Strategies for addressing barriers to collaboration. Huxham and Vangen (1996) recommend the following strategies to help CSSPs overcome challenges and succeed: managing aims, compromise, frequent communication at all levels, democracy and equality in the partnership, empowering an interorganizational group with authority for the partnership, determination, commitment, and stamina. Similarly, Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006) recommend that partners forge initial agreements; build leadership, trust, and legitimacy for the partnership; proactively address conflict; and build the partnership into the governance structure of the organizations. Gray (1989) suggests problems can be ameliorated if partners have sufficient incentives, include all stakeholders, agree on the scope of the collaboration, communicate frequently, and negotiate in good faith. Walter (1987) says that both the public and nonprofit organization partners must adapt to their new roles, view challenges as opportunities, and build confidence and trust.

Government managers in particular need to improvise, adapt, and focus less on doing things right (i.e., following rules and procedures) than on doing the right things. Goldsmith and Eggers (2004) examine a number of CSSP models that include government partners and suggest that a comprehensive framework and cycle of seven

strategies is needed to ensure that CSSPs involving government entities must include if they are to bridge their differences, work together successfully, and be accountable. The partners must communicate constantly in order to jointly (1) set goals, (2) align values, (3) build trust, (4) structure incentives, (5) share risks, (6), measure network performance, and (7) manage change. This study examined how the NPS-nonprofit partnerships face and address collaborative challenges.

Staber and Sydow (2002) suggest that IORs are more likely to successfully address partnership challenges if they have, develop, or employ 'organizational adaptive capacity.' Parsons (1964) used this term, which has ties to IOR, SHRM, New Institutionalism, and Organizational Change theories, to refer to an organization's ability to "survive in the face of its unalterable features" (p. 340) and cope with uncertainty and unpredictability. Partnerships with adaptive capacity work within their existing environments and structures as discursive agents to actively change those structures (Giddens, 1984). This concept also parallels the 'double-loop' thinking promulgated by Argyris and Schon (1978); adaptive CSSPs question and modify prevailing assumptions, as well as develop "new rules and methods of decision making" (Staber & Sydow, 2002, p. 410) to anticipate and keep pace with changing conditions.

Kapucu (2006, 2009) applies Complexity Theory to organizational adaptive capacity in multiple studies of how public-private collaborations respond to disasters. Partnerships with adaptive capacity, he suggests, are better able to respond to changing, complex, emergent, and stressful situations and challenges. He also draws from Giddens' (1984) Structuration Theory in asserting that successful adaptive CSSPs have "sufficient structure to hold and exchange information, but sufficient flexibility to adapt"

(Kapucu, 2009, p. 1) to changing conditions. This study explored the adaptive capacity of NPS-nonprofit partnerships.

Assessing cross-sector partnerships. Although there are many descriptive studies of CSSPs, as well as the above research related to difficulties in implementing and sustaining them, few studies evaluate their effectiveness. In a conceptual article, Gray (2000) synthesizes research on CSSP assessment and offers five approaches for evaluating CSSPs:

1. Creation of shared meaning—how well did the CSSP develop a "common interpretation about the problem domain and what actions should be taken" (p. 246) by the stakeholders?
2. Generation or formation of social capital—how well did the CSSP build social 'resources' around the issue, such as relationships, trust, norms, or networks?
3. Changes in network structure—to what degree did the CSSP create or expand a structure or network among the stakeholders?
4. Shifts in the power distribution—to what extent did the CSSP result in "a more equal distribution of power" (p. 246) among stakeholders?
5. Problem resolution or goal achievement—i.e., to what degree did the CSSP positively address the social issue or problem for which it was formed?

The research-articulated challenges of implementing and assessing CSSPs offer useful examples for a study of CSSPs involving the NPS and their nonprofit partners. Gray's (2000) categories were used in understanding the cases in this study. As the findings section (Chapter 4) will show, the cases in this study have data to indicate that their volunteer efforts have resulted in more volunteers, trainings, and programs. They also say, feel, and believe they are addressing Gray's (2000) categories, but rely on anecdotal and informal evidence to support these assertions.

Review of cross-sector social partnership studies. This section reviews CSSP studies from the perspectives of how they (1) relate to literature-based definitions,

descriptions, forms, challenges, and assessments about CSSPs and (2) inform this study of NPS-nonprofit CSSPs. And while there is no published research that examines the particular phenomenon at hand, several studies illuminate aspects of this dissertation and provide guideposts for its questions, structure, and methodology.

Studies by Leigh (2005) and Lamoureux (2009) offer the closest parallels to the current study. They examined cross-sector partnerships involving U.S. federal land agencies, and both focused on factors that lead to success or termination of such partnerships. Using a questionnaire, interviews, and document analysis, Leigh (2005) conducted a case study of ten long-standing NPS-nonprofit partnerships. She employed a social constructivist epistemology and used interviews and data analysis as her methods. Three of the cases included partnering related to volunteer management, but volunteer programs were incidental to the study.

Leigh (2005) describes elements that support or undermine the "long-term sustainability of cross-sector partnership" (p. iii). Conflict management, strategic alignment between partners, and evolution in the core schemata of the partnerships over time helped sustain them. Other factors also distinguished long-lasting (five years) partnerships from ones that failed:

1. Partner type: collaborations with official 'friends' organizations, trusts, or foundations were much more likely to endure.
2. Communication frequency: long-lasting partnerships were characterized by frequent (often daily) communication among the partners.
3. Proximity: durable partnerships were more often characterized by the NPS partner being located at or near the NPS partner site.
4. Strategic planning involvement: in 80% of the long-term partnerships, NPS staff participated in strategic planning with their nonprofit partners.

5. Conflict management: 80% of the durable partnerships had two or more distinct conflict management strategies; 80% of failed partnerships did not.
6. Amplifying change: for successful partners, changes led to growth and strengthening of the partnership; the reverse was true in failed partnerships.

The findings reflect other studies, as do the reasons the partners gave for forming the CSSPs: government encouragement, resource dependence, and achieving policy objectives.

In a study of success factors of cross-sector volunteer tourism partnerships with U.S. federal land agencies, Lamoureux (2009) examined partnerships involving civil society, government, and the private sector in co-managing volunteer tourism on federal lands. She asked what factors determined the success of 'voluntourism' partnerships. Success was defined by the number of volunteers at each site and satisfaction levels of the partners. The author developed a 68-item satisfaction survey around variables related to Mohr and Spekman's (1994) partnership behavior attributes, communication behavior, conflict resolution, and the "closeness of the relationship" (p. 49) of partners.

Results were mixed. None of the survey predictors was strongly related to the number of volunteers. It appears that factors such as commitment to the partnership, trust among partners, and management involvement promoted successful partnerships. Partnerships with formal contracts were more successful. In addition—and contrary to Leigh's (2005) findings—the level of conflict management techniques did not predict success. In her conclusions, Lamoureux (2009) cites the use of a survey as the sole data collection method as a limitation. Without interviews or document analysis, the study was unable to explain the responses or reasons for its mixed findings. Lamoureux's (2009) survey instrument and conceptual model were adopted from Mohr and Spekman

(1994). However, Mohr and Spekman's model is based on business-to-business partnerships, and two of the three sectors in Lamoureux's study are government and nonprofits.

Looking more broadly, Mandell and Keast (2010) examine studies of CSSPs between nonprofit and government agencies. Overall, these studies suggest an evolution in the nature of the relations between government and nonprofits, from vertical (in which governments award funds to nonprofits and dictate how the money is spent), to horizontal and equal (Brinkerhoff 2002). In these evolving partnerships, the nonprofits "are asked not only to implement government policies, but to help in developing them as well" (p. 186). This phenomenon has also been observed in the UK, Canada, Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand (Keast & Brown, 2006; Osborne & McLaughlin 2002, 2004; Rhodes, 1996). Mandell and Keast (2010) suggest that the trend toward greater equality in CSSPs means the focus of the relations will shift from emphasizing control to trust-building, power- and risk-sharing, and making the collaboration itself the focal point of the partnership instead of organizational boundaries. These findings resonate with some of the NPS-nonprofit partnerships, which have always been more horizontal than traditional hierarchical government-nonprofit collaborations.

Overall, the IOR studies that focus on CSSPs yield useful ideas, categories, avenues for exploration, and methods for data gathering and analysis in this study. Other research suggests reasons and ways in which CSSPs are formed and structured, as well as how relations between partners impact the partnership. Indeed, the studies also suggest the forms that successful or unsuccessful CSSPs might take, as well as how they may be evaluated. At the same time, the IOR and CSSP literatures only partly align

with the research questions that guide this study, and do not examine the phenomenon of co-coordinated volunteer programs. Thus, this study extends IOR and CSSP theories by applying them in a modified context.

Strategic Human Resource Management

Although it is more properly viewed as a practice illuminated by theory than as a theory, strategic human resource management (SHRM) research offers another useful lens for understanding co-coordinated volunteer programs between NPS units and their nonprofit partners. In particular, SHRM perspectives on volunteer program management directly inform this study. SHRM springs from human resource management (HRM), which is itself rooted in studying long-standing organizational personnel functions such as hiring, firing, and employee rights and benefits. As Ross (1981), Guest (1987), and others have noted, however, there is no consensus around how to define or describe precisely what is entailed in HRM.

Table 2.3
Definitions of Human Resource Management (HRM)

Author(s)	Date	Definition
Ross	1981	HRM is "concerned about the motivation and development of the individual employee and the performance and productivity of the organization" (p. 783). HRM has four interrelated components: 1. HR planning and forecasting, 2. Individual motivation and organizational analysis, 3. Personnel development plans, and 4. Personnel utilization with functions that include recruitment, selection, appraisal, compensation, and collective bargaining (p. 783). HRM-using organizations see employees as resources and investments.
Guest	1987	HRM "comprises a set of policies designed to maximize organizational integration, employee commitment, flexibility, and collective bargaining" (p. 783).

Boxall & Purcell	2003	HRM includes "the firm's work systems and its models of employment. It embraces both individual and collective aspects of people management" (p. 23).
Human Resources Guide	2013	HRM is "the process of managing people in a company as well as managing the existing interpersonal relationships" (para. 1).

The above definitions have common elements, and overall represent an expansion of the traditional personnel function toward a more comprehensive approach to managing employees. HRM represents an advance "from seeing employees as a necessary expense of doing business to a critical investment in the organization's current performance and future work" (Ross, 1981, p. 781). HRM is based in social and behavioral science and differs from traditional personnel in its recognition of employees as contributors to the organization's mission and goals.

Just as Ross (1981) states that "little agreement exists on what human resources management is" (p. 781), Salaman, Storey, and Billsberry (2005) assert that "it is virtually impossible to define SHRM. . . SHRM is not a unitary phenomenon but a collection of phenomena" (p. 3) that include "prescriptions, models, theories, and critiques" (p. 3). In basic terms, SHRM enfolds HRM into broader strategic management philosophies and practices of an organization. 'Strategic management' represents organizational decision-making and action that focus on overall and long-term improvement of performance and competitiveness, as well as attainment of the organization's mission and vision. The strategic management process, Bratton (2001) says, typically consists of (1) mission and goals, (2) environmental analysis, (3) strategic formulation, (4) strategy implementation, and (5) strategy evaluation (p. 40).

As with HRM, it is useful to review conceptions of SHRM from the field before articulating the definition of SHRM to be used in this study (Table 2.4).

Table 2.4

Definitions of Strategic Human Resource Management

Author(s)	Date	Definition
Guest	1989	SHRM focuses on ensuring that HRM practices are "fully integrated into strategic planning; that HRM policies cohere both across policy areas and across hierarchies and that HRM practices are accepted and used by line managers as part of their everyday work" (p. 48).
Schuler	1992	• SHRM seeks to ensure that (1) "HR management is fully integrated with the strategy and the strategic needs of the firm; (2) HR policies cohere both across policy areas and across hierarchies; and (3) HR practices are adjusted, accepted, and used by line managers and employees as part of their everyday work" (p. 18). • "[I]ts purpose is to more effectively utilize human resources *vis-a-vis the strategic needs of the organization*" (p. 18) (italics original).
Wright & McMahon	1992	"The pattern of planned human resource deployments and activities intended to enable an organization to achieve its goals" (p. 298).
Bratton	2001	• "[L]inking the human resource function with the strategic objectives of the organization in order to improve performance" (p. 37). • A "managerial process requiring HR policies and practices to be linked with the strategic objectives of the organization" (p. 38).
Hill & Jones	2001	Actions an organization takes "to attain superior performance" (p. 4), to include those related to employees.
Storey	2001	SHRM "seeks to achieve competitive advantage through the strategic deployment of a highly committed and capable workforce using an array of cultural, structural and personnel techniques" (p. 6).
Trim	2004	SHRM places HRM in a specific strategic context, ensuring that HRM staff play a fully integrated role within the organization (p. 204).
Lengnick-Hall, Lengnick-Hall, Andrade, & Drake	2009	SHRM seeks "competitive advantage through unity of interest, cooperation, and investment in labor as a human resource" (p. 64).
McKeown & Lindorff	2011	SHRM models "emphasize the need to understand and effectively manage the workforce, and to align HRM practices with organizational strategy" (p. 185).

Akingbola	2013	• The SHRM premise is the "critical importance of HR to strategy, organizational capability to adapt to change and the goals of the organization" (p. 216). • SHRM "explicitly links the formulation and implementation of internally consistent HR practices and the human resource pool to strategy" (p. 216).

Although Wright and McMahan's (1992) straightforward conception of SHRM is often cited, this study uses a slightly more detailed definition, drawing from common elements of the above citations. For this study, SHRM is understood as the following:

1. Alignment of HRM policy and practice with the overall strategic needs, goals, and objectives of the organization, and
2. Recognition of, application of, and investment in human capital and HRM policy and practice as a strategic organizational resource across the organization.

Although the term "SHRM" first appears in the 1980s, Lengnick-Hall et al. (2009) identify companies in the 1920s that formally adopted HRM practices that "represented a strategic approach to the management of labor" (p. 64). SHRM, therefore, is not a new idea, but has become a much-studied and important lens for examining HR and HRM.

HRM and SHRM in nonprofit organizations. The HR challenge, say Salamon (2012) and Akingbola (2013), can be especially acute for nonprofits because they often have fewer resources than businesses. This challenge is one reason nonprofits often must "draw heavily on voluntary contributions of time and money" (Salamon, 2012, p. 3). In defining a strategic nonprofit HRM, the author draws on Ridder and McCandless (2010), who propose that nonprofits have specific characteristics that drive their HRM practices: they have different needs, values, community connections, activities, goals, and missions and motivations, as well as lower pay, than for-profits. Cunningham (1999) reaches similar conclusions, noting that the devolution of government services to nonprofits has resulted in the adoption by nonprofits of HRM and SHRM techniques and

practices. HRM and SHRM models, he notes, offer nonprofits blueprints for strengthening their volunteer programs and structures, raising funds, improving their services, and attracting more expertise.

Defining volunteers, volunteering, and volunteer programs. SHRM informs this study of elements and co-coordination of volunteer programs by NPS units and nonprofits. Much of the literature on volunteer programs—how they are structured, effective practices, their impacts, their application in various sectors, challenges in managing or evaluating them, etc.—is conducted under the SHRM framework. Therefore, it is important to clarify terms related to volunteers and volunteer programs, especially as related to nonprofit and government organizations.

What is volunteering? Conceptions of volunteering differ within and across multiple literatures, and there is no consensus. This paper uses the definition used based on Cnaan, Handy, and Wadsworth's (1996) study of 514 people's perceptions of volunteering. Volunteering (and volunteers) fall into the following dimensions:

- Free choice to volunteer.
- Remuneration—volunteering is done without expectation of monetary gain.
- Structure of volunteering—either formal (typically through an organization) or informal (such as helping friends).
- Intended beneficiaries of volunteering—strangers (usually the case in the NPS programs), friends and family, or the volunteer.

As Cnaan et al. (1996) and others (Barnes & Sharpe, 2009; Brudney, 1999; Connors, 2012; McCurley & Lynch, 2011) note, these dimensions are present in most definitions of volunteers and volunteering. This study focuses on volunteers in the public and nonprofit sectors. Brudney (1999a) identifies characteristics of volunteering in the public sector, providing a more focused description of NPS-nonprofit volunteers:

1. The volunteer activity is sponsored and housed under the auspices of a government agency.
2. Volunteering occurs in a formal setting—i.e., in an organizational context.
3. Volunteer are not paid for their time and labor, although they may be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses.
4. The volunteer's time is not mandated or coerced.
5. The volunteer activity is intended to benefit the clients of government agencies, although volunteers often reap nonmaterial benefits.
6. Such programs place volunteers in positions with ongoing responsibility for service delivery or organizational maintenance. (pp. 222-223)

Why people volunteer. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013), 64.5 million Americans (26.5% of the population) volunteered from September 2011 to September 2012. People volunteer for many reasons, which vary not only by person but also within individuals whose motivations can evolve over time. Studies have identified a range and combination of volunteer motivations, including for altruistic, material, social, civic, or religious purposes (Brudney, 2010; Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Hall, Lasby, Gummulka, & Tyron, 2006; Haski-Leventhal & Cnaan, 2009; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; Points of Light Foundation, 2004; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013; Waikayi, Fearon, Morris, & McLaughlin, 2012). Many youth volunteer through school-based 'service-learning' programs, as a punishment for rule-breaking, to get work experience, or to build their resume for college admissions or getting a job (Edwards, Safrit, & Allen, 2012; Hustinx, Handy, Cnaan, Brudney, Pessi, & Yamauchi, 2010; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; McIvor, 1992; Spring, Grimm, & Dietz, 2009). Volunteers, Brudney (2010) suggests, can be divided into (1) 'service' volunteers who provide direct service to individuals or agencies to meet needs, and (2) 'policy' volunteers who serve on nonprofit boards of directors. This study examined 'service' volunteers at NPS units.

Defining volunteer programs. As the need for volunteering has risen, organizations have responded by creating, expanding, and formalizing volunteer programs. Brudney (2010) defines a volunteer program as "a vehicle for facilitating and coordinating the work efforts of volunteers and paid staff toward the attainment of organizational goals" (p. 754). Along similar lines, Connors (2012) defines volunteer management as "the systematic and logical process of working with and through volunteers to achieve the organization's objectives" (p. 6).

Designing, implementing, and evaluating effective volunteer programs. There is interest in understanding what makes an effective volunteer program from both the scholarly and practitioner perspectives. As a consequence, there are many empirical studies of volunteer programs and numerous 'how-to' books on the topic. These literatures address aspects of organizations' volunteer programs, in the U.S. and other countries and suggest strategies, structures, and policies that inform this study. The following sections address identification and testing of effective volunteer management practices.

Identifying models of volunteer resource management. In her groundbreaking book, *Volunteers Today: Finding, Training and Working with Them* (1967), Harriet Naylor addressed the challenges of recruiting, training, supervising, and retaining volunteers in the public sector. She developed position descriptions for volunteers and stressed the importance of matching volunteers with appropriate assignments and taking a strategic approach to volunteer management. Building on Naylor's work, Boyce (1971) developed a volunteer program model that came to be known by its acronym as 'ISOTURE:'

1. Identification: finding people with the competencies and attitudes essential to fill specific volunteer positions
2. Selection: studying the backgrounds of potential volunteers and motivating them to fill selected positions
3. Orientation: orienting volunteers in the role expectations of the position
4. Training: supporting volunteers' efforts to acquire and develop the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) to improve the quality of their performance
5. Utilization: providing opportunities for volunteers to put acquired KSAs into action in the most appropriate ways
6. Recognition: recognizing and rewarding sound volunteer performance
7. Evaluation: determining results of volunteer performance (pp. 3-4)

Subsequently, a number of other lists were developed. Brudney (1990) stressed the importance of recruiting the right volunteers, managing volunteers like professionals, and evaluating volunteer programs. Penrod (1991) promulgated the L-O-O-P model, arguing that effective volunteer management should address locating, orienting, operating, and perpetuating volunteers. Safrit & Schmiesing (2012) compare the often-overlapping lists of effective management practices by Naylor (1967), Boyce (1971), Brudney (1990), Penrod (1991), and five others. Recurrent components include volunteer recruitment, orientation, training, screening/selection, supervision, evaluation, recognition, and retention.

Three studies testing volunteer management practices. In 2004, Hager and Brudney conducted a study to "document the extent to which charities use various practices in managing volunteers" (p. 2). Nearly 3,000 U.S. charities responded on the degree to which they used nine volunteer program management practices:

1. Regular supervision and communication with volunteers,
2. Liability coverage for volunteers,
3. Regular collection of information on volunteer numbers and hours,
4. Screening procedures to identify suitable volunteers,
5. Written policies and job descriptions for volunteer involvement,
6. Recognition activities, such as award ceremonies, for volunteers,

7. Annual measurement of the impacts of volunteers,
8. Training and professional development opportunities for volunteers, and
9. Training for paid staff in working with volunteers (p. 4)

Safrit et al. (2005) worked with volunteer program practitioners and researchers to develop a similar list of nine volunteer resource management practices. The authors sent this list to 2,057 members of the Association for Volunteer Administration, asking them to rate each construct. Seven components were found to be empirically valid:

1. Professional development (of staff who work with volunteers),
2. Volunteer recruitment and selection,
3. Volunteer orientation and training,
4. Volunteer recognition,
5. Program maintenance (conflict resolution, training, recognition),
6. Resource development (fundraising and marketing), and
7. Program advocacy (leadership team, evaluation, needs assessment, etc.). (p. 8)

In 2007, the NPS and Walker Davidson published a study of volunteer programs at 282 NPS sites, using the following criteria: (1) program management, (2) resource management, (3) planning and infrastructure, (4) volunteer engagement, (5) recruitment and training, (6) measurement and evaluation, and (7) recognition and celebration. These three empirical studies have lists with significant overlap, echoing earlier theoretical prescriptions for effective volunteer program management. Researchers continue to issue models for effective volunteer program management (Brudney, 2005, 2010; Connors, 2012; Ellis, 2002; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; Safrit, 2006; Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013).

Are there different effective practices for public-sector volunteer programs?

One of the research questions for this study focuses on determining how well the field- and research-identified elements and processes of volunteer programs managed by a

single organization apply to the co-coordinated NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships. The NPS and Walker Davidson (2007) study suggests that traditional volunteer programs in national parks—those coordinated by NPS staff—only partly adhere to recommended volunteer management practices. For example,

- Only 47% of the NPS sites agreed that "providing an outstanding volunteer experience is a management priority" (p. 5),
- NPS volunteer coordinators spent 75% of their time on other work,
- Only 45% of volunteer coordinators are part of the park's management team,
- 58% of parks have no plans to dedicate more staff to the volunteer program,
- Half the volunteer coordinators lacked resources to manage their programs,
- Fewer than half of the NPS sites met their volunteer hour goals,
- Only 40% of the NPS sites conducted background checks of volunteers,
- Only 30% of new volunteers received orientation training, and
- Only 40% of the sites recognized employees who worked on the volunteer programs. (pp. 5-10)

Many of these findings might be attributed to the insufficient resources at NPS sites, but they also reflect the absence of formal volunteer policies and practices. These challenges may partly explain why some NPS units now partner with nonprofits on the volunteer program. This study describes the adherence of the co-coordinated volunteer partnerships to volunteer management practices and whether there are effective practices in these new partnerships that do and perhaps do not reflect SHRM models.

Evaluating volunteer programs. Brudney and Nezhina (2012) define evaluation as "an assessment or judgment of the value or worth of an endeavor or initiative" (p. 364). And while volunteer programs can be assessed at many levels and in many ways, there is a clear consensus that they should be evaluated and subsequently improved based on assessments of their impacts. As noted by Safrit (2012), for volunteer

programs operating in contemporary society, evaluation is a critical, if not the most critical, component of managing an overall volunteer program and subsequently documenting the impacts and ultimate value of the program to the target clientele it is designed to serve as well as the larger society in which it operates. (pp. 389-390). Brudney (2010) agrees, saying evaluation is an essential program function for the organization, for those it serves, and for the volunteers themselves. In every sector, but especially in the public sector, assessment is an expected if not a required volunteer program element.

In a popular guide to volunteer management, McCurley and Lynch (2011) suggest five broad areas of volunteer programming that can be evaluated—mission, outputs, customers, standards, and outcomes (p. 265)—each of which can then be assessed in multiple ways. Safrit (2012) says evaluation involves measuring the volunteer program's inputs, activities, outputs, processes, and outcomes. Brudney and Nezhina (2012) suggest assessing the processes of the program and its value to the host organization, the clients or recipients of the volunteer service, and the value of volunteering to the volunteers themselves.

There is a gap, however, between the professed importance of volunteer program evaluation and the amount of effort and resources devoted to it by many organizations. The NPS and Walter Davidson (2007) study found, for example, that volunteer program evaluation at NPS sites was basic, recording little more than statistics on volunteer hours; few sites had systems to gather feedback from program participants; and there was little assessment of the degree to which volunteer activities met needs in the parks. Hager and Brudney's (2004) survey of charities found that only 32% conducted any

annual measurement of volunteer impacts. In a study of over 500 cities that used volunteers, Duncombe (1985) found that less than 12% of the cities evaluated their volunteer programs. Brudney and Kellough (2000) recorded a similarly low evaluation rate (13.6%) in a study of 189 state agencies' volunteer programs.

As is reported in some studies, including Choudhury (2010), the lack of resources (expertise, time, staff, money for assessment, etc.) is a key factor in the limited scale, depth, and rigor of evaluation at many volunteer programs. Less-than-stellar evaluation is hardly confined to volunteer programs, but it presents a difficulty for scholars and practitioners seeking to measure the effectiveness and impact of volunteer efforts. In the studies reviewed in the following section, the relatively narrow foci of the assessments reflect challenges in this area, as well as provide guidance for what may be measured in an NPS-nonprofit study, and how.

Studies of volunteer program management practices. Having reviewed the development of SHRM perspectives related to the co-coordinated volunteer programs of this study, the next step is to examine empirical studies. Doing so helps identify the extent to which the structures, forms, practices, characteristics, and impacts of empirically tested volunteer programs illuminate the cases under study, as well as methods that should be used. The studies show a clear trend; volunteer programs that adopt management practices are more likely to recruit, retain, and engender satisfaction in volunteers.

It may be useful to begin with two 'anti-examples.' Bremer and Graeff (2006) examined volunteering in national parks in Germany, or more precisely, its absence. Finding that there were virtually no volunteers within the German national park system,

the authors noted that there was an almost complete lack of volunteer management practices in the parks—little training or evaluation, few resources for volunteers, no volunteer recognition, and disinterest among park administrators in using volunteers. In a study of volunteer management practices in 37 cities in Ohio, Choudhury (2010) examined the degree to which the cities planned for, recruited, organized, staffed, directed, and evaluated their volunteers and volunteer programs. Cities that did not invest resources in these practices failed to retain volunteers.

Brudney and Kellough (2000) conducted a national survey of 189 state agency volunteer programs, testing the degree to which they adhered to effective volunteer management practices. Their findings buttress adherence to best volunteer management practices: "those programs that are more professionally developed and managed (as assessed by adoption of recommended practices) reap much greater (perceived) benefits" (p. 126). State agencies with a higher proportion of volunteer-to-paid personnel also had better results. In other words, "volunteer program management matters" (p. 126). In a survey of volunteer programs in Kazakhstan, Brudney and Nezhina (2005) reach similar conclusions. Use of best volunteer management practices was "the strongest predictor of program effectiveness" (p. 306).

The relation between use of best volunteer management practices and effective programming appears to hold in multiple types of organizations. In a study of volunteer retention and satisfaction at a theatre in England, Bussell and Forbes (2007) found that volunteer satisfaction derived from the "efficient and professional" (p. 25) approach used by the theatre manager, whose efforts resulted in a "committed volunteer force characterized by strong identification with the organization" (p. 25). Ferreira, Proença,

and Proença (2012) surveyed 76 volunteers at four hospitals on their attitudes toward the volunteer programs' recruitment, training, and recognition practices. Overall, the use of these practices was positively related to volunteer satisfaction. Their study summarized data from ten other studies, conducted between 1998 and 2010, that yielded similar results involving sport, hospice, social work, public recreation, and youth work volunteers. The studies also showed clear links between use of recommended volunteer management practices and volunteer satisfaction.

In their survey of U.S. charities, Hager and Brudney (2004) found that use of volunteer management practices was uneven. Charities were more or less likely to adopt such practices based on organizational characteristics. Larger charities, those that engaged volunteers in direct service or in a larger "scope of involvement" (p. 6), and health-related charities were more likely to adopt best practices. In addition, only some management practices—volunteer training, development, and recognition—led to greater volunteer retention. The authors conclude that effective volunteer management is a function of both adoption of best practices and staff support of the program.

Volunteer management practices, Hager and Brudney suggest in a later study (2011), represent ways that managers can 'nurture' volunteer programs. However, the authors note, some innate conditions that nonprofit organizations face—such as their location, their volunteer pool, and the nature of their volunteer needs—represent 'nature'—i.e., conditions beyond the organization's control. While the cases examined in this study employ many of the same volunteer program management practices, each also faces a unique set of inherent conditions that affect how well the volunteer management practices—and these partnerships—work.

Limitations of studies of volunteer program management. Many other studies (Hager & Brudney, 2011; Kaufman, Mirsky, & Avgar, 2003; Safrit et al., 2005; Schmiesing & Safrit, 2007; Tang, Morrow-Howell, & Hong, 2009; Vinton, 2012; Waikayi, Fearon, Morris, & McLaughlin, 2012; Wisner, Stringfellow, Youngdahl, & Parker, 2005) in the U.S. and elsewhere reach similar conclusions: use of research-based volunteer program management practices is positively related to outcomes such as volunteer satisfaction, more successful volunteer recruitment, and volunteer retention. It is notable, however, that the studies examine different volunteer management practices, so they are related but not parallel and are not study replications. None of the studies used all 12 of the practices that this study will examine with the NPS-nonprofit volunteer partnerships. They also found that not all of the practices led to volunteer satisfaction.

In addition, some studies found that <u>other</u> factors led to success. Barnes and Sharpe (2009) conducted a case study of volunteer engagement in a parks program in Canada that eschewed volunteer job descriptions and gave volunteers lots of autonomy. The volunteers took on staff functions, rejected traditional power differentials, established volunteer patterns that met their needs—and liked it. The authors suggest that traditional volunteer management practices may actually be "hindering engagement" (p. 169) and suggest a more collaborative approach in which power is shared by agencies and volunteers. Walter (1993) also cites evidence that effective volunteer program management may require management structures that are "less technically rational and bureaucratic" (p. 279) than traditional models that call for treating volunteers much like regular employees.

One of this study's research questions relates to the possibility that some practices in the NPS-nonprofit partnerships may differ from current conceptions of effective volunteer program management. Most of the current research examines volunteer programs that are led by a single organization. This question also echoes discussion in the field of volunteer management as to whether there is a universal list of best volunteer management practices, whether effective practices are contingent on settings and conditions, or perhaps whether a combination of approaches is appropriate (Brudney & Meijs, 2014; Hager & Brudney, 2011a, 2015; Macduff, Netting, & O'Connor, 2009; Rochester, 1999).

Another limitation of existing studies is inherent in the SHRM frame, which focuses on management of volunteers. In doing so, these studies generally do not concern themselves with the impact of the volunteer program on the need or issue which the volunteer program was created to address. Rather, volunteer program success is defined narrowly on volunteer happiness and retention. Only one study was located that measured the degree to which application of volunteer management practices addressed the social need itself. Cheung and Ma (2010) surveyed 193 residents at a community center for elders in China and found that effective volunteer management was the "key mediator" (p. 251) in the residents' successful adaptation to the community center living environment.

Without assessing the impact of volunteer programming on the problems which the organization hopes to ameliorate, existing studies provide only a partial measure of impact. Indeed, measuring just the degree to which a volunteer program succeeds in getting and keeping volunteers within it is a somewhat circular approach. Others have

described similar and other limits of the volunteer literature (Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013; Liao-Troth, 2008; Hustinx, Cnaan & Handy, 2010), noting that the field does not have an established conceptual framework or holistic perspective and only partly fits within SHRM.

Lessons from the SHRM literature. Overall, there are clear applications of SHRM models to this study. Based on the literature, for example, this study examines whether, how, and the degree to which the cases use the following consolidated—but not necessarily universal—list of recommended or best practices for volunteer program management:

1. Written policies to govern the volunteer program;
2. Sufficient resources for volunteer programs, to include having a paid volunteer coordinator position;
3. Training for paid employees who will work with volunteers;
4. Job descriptions for volunteers;
5. Liability coverage for volunteers;
6. Outreach to recruit volunteers;
7. Orientation for volunteers;
8. Basic and ongoing volunteer training;
9. Ongoing communication with, and management of, volunteers;
10. Higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers;
11. Evaluation of volunteers; and
12. Recognition for volunteer program staff and volunteers;

(Boyce, 1971; Brudney, 2005, 2010; Brudney & Nezhina; 2005; Connors, 2012; Ellis, 2002; Hager & Brudney, 2004; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; Penrod, 1991; Safrit, 2006; Safrit et al., 2005; Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013)

The SHRM literature also directly shapes three of the five research questions of this study:

2. What are the structures and components of the co-coordinated volunteer programs?
3. How do the co-coordinated volunteer programs adhere to research-based elements of effective volunteer program management and interorganizational relations?

4. What are similarities and differences in how the co-coordinated volunteer programs function at the selected sites?

Overall, and as with IOR theory, SHRM models offer a practical lens and structures for designing and conducting this study. At the same time, SHRM addresses only some aspects of the evolving volunteer program relations between the NPS and its nonprofit partners.

New Institutionalism Theory

In addition to perspectives related to IOR theory and SHRM, New Institutionalism theory also helps illuminate the form and activities of the co-coordinated volunteer programs examined in this study. In particular, New Institutionalism helps explain whether, why, and how organizations within a sector tend to develop similar forms and structures over time. This multi-case study includes examination of the degree to which the co-coordinated volunteer programs have developed similar structures, forms, norms, and practices. The terms 'new institutionalism,' 'neoinstitutionalism,' and 'neo-' or 'new-organizational institutionalism' all refer to this area of theory. For consistency, 'new institutionalism' is used in this study.

Institutionalism Theory. As suggested by its name, New Institutionalism springs from Institutionalism (AKA Organizational Institutionalism) Theory. The *SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008) defines institutions as "more or less taken-for-granted repetitive social behavior that is underpinned by normative systems and cognitive understandings that give meaning to social exchange and thus enable self-reproducing social order" (pp. 4-5). Scott (1995), says institutions "consist of cognitive, normative, and regulative structures

and activities that provide stability and meaning to social behavior. Institutions are transported by various carriers—culture, structures, and routines" (p. 33). As described by Powell and DiMaggio (1991), institutions are formed and endure when they "confer benefits greater than the transaction costs . . . incurred in creating and sustaining them" (pp. 3-4).

Fundamentally, Institutionalism seeks to understand and explain how organizations form, are influenced, operate, and endure (or become institutionalized); and the forms they take over time. Institutions—from businesses to families to processes to social events—represent ways of organizing and focusing human endeavor that are stable, accepted, and relatively persistent because they are "considered appropriate by relevant actors" (Palmer, Biggart, & Dick, 2008, p. 741). Application of this theory to the study is important because it seeks to understand how co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships become institutionalized, and what forms the institutionalization takes in and across the cases.

Institutionalism is rooted in the work of Weber, Durkheim, and Marx. Selznick's (1948) study of the Tennessee Valley Authority first articulated the idea that organizations operate on an institutional level. Institutionalism is based on positivist notions and focuses on the inner workings of organizations (Mizruchi & Fein, 1999). Individuals in institutions act logically to address conflicts, make changes, and respond to challenges. These institutions are embedded in and respond to their local communities using conscious action and interaction that are integrated within their formal structural components, rules, customs, and values (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Selznick, 1957; Shepsle, 1986).

Institutionalist sub-theories such as Behavioral Theory, Structural-Contingency Theory, and Resource-Dependence Theory apply rational principles to explain how managers adapt to situations and strategize to address issues of supply, demand, and competition (Greenwood et al., 2008). The environment in which organizations operate under 'old' institutionalism is perceived as market-driven and technical; leaders respond to it with rational interpretations and actions to succeed and to endure—i.e., to become institutionalized. The focus of traditional Institutionalism, say Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), is on explaining "organizational similarity based on institutional conditions" (p. 215).

New Institutionalism Theory. Starting in 1977, new lenses were applied to Institutionalism, resulting in development of what is now called 'New' Institutionalism. Seminal writings by Meyer & Rowan (1977), Zucker (1977), DiMaggio and Powell (1983), Meyer and Scott (1983), and Tolbert and Zucker (1983) promulgated new understandings about the meaning of institutions and how they operate. A key driver of the new theory and studies was the fresh perspective they applied to DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) basic question: "Why is there such startling homogeneity of organization forms and practices" (p. 147) among institutions within organizational fields? Why do universities, hospitals, and manufacturers tend over time to look and act very much like other universities, hospitals, and manufacturers, respectively?

Under the 'old' Institutionalism, such similarities were seen as the result of organizations in the same environments consciously making similar responses to technical requirements of their environments (Boxenbaum & Jonsson, 2008). New Institutionalism declares that organizations also become more alike because of how they

respond to social structures—regulations, laws, norms, practices, cultural pressures, and belief systems about what constitutes an effective organization within their fields (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Palmer et al., 2008; Zucker, 1983). These "powerful forces" lead organizations to "become more similar to one another" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148), or institutionally 'isomorphic.' DiMaggio and Powell define 'isomorphism' as "a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (p. 149).

Organizations are influenced, say Meyer and Rowan (1977), by their institutional contexts, which the authors describe as the "rationalized myths" that make up the "rules, norms, and ideologies of the wider society" (p. 84). Manufacturers, insurance companies, and other organizations act in defined ways not just because those ways are efficient and increase productivity, but also because certain actions are traditional, tacit, or expected within their organizational fields and cultures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Greenwood et al., 2008; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Zucker, 1977). Adopting such forms and structures is partly a ceremonial and symbolic action by organizations to obtain legitimacy; doing so leads to homogeneity, conformity, and isomorphism in both the actions and the "normative and cognitive belief systems" (Scott & Meyer, 1983, p. 163) of organizations.

Technical firms are judged on their outputs; institutional organizations are judged more on the level and depth of their forms and norms—they strive for social appropriateness rather than just economic productivity and efficiency (Meyer, Scott, & Deal, 1981; Powell, 1991). New Institutionalism seeks to understand how and why

organizations are socially driven toward similar forms over time. Such organizations, suggest Powell and Colyvas (2008), are deeply nested within their economic, political, and social environments, and their "practices and structures are often either reflections of or responses to rules, beliefs, and conventions built into the wider environment" (p. 976).

Meyer and Rowan (1977) note that conforming to institutionalized societal rules sometimes conflicts with the formal structures and technical efficiency of organizations. The 'old' Institutionalism structures "establish an organization as appropriate, rational, and modern" (p. 344). Socially derived norms may be arbitrary and even deleterious to the bottom line. In response, say Meyer and Rowan (1977) and Zucker (1977), organizations 'decouple' their symbolic and technical practices when the prescriptions of institutional pressures conflict with or contradict technical requirements (Greenwood et al., 2008).

Coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. Focusing specifically on nonprofit and public sector organizations, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) describe three drivers or mechanisms of isomorphic institutional change:

1. Coercive isomorphism that stems from political influence and the drive for legitimacy;
2. Mimetic isomorphism resulting from standard responses to uncertainty; and
3. Normative isomorphism, associated with professionalization (p. 150).

Coercive pressures can be formal or informal and include regulations, accountability standards, rules, laws, incorporation and reporting requirements, and other mechanisms that result in development of organizational homogeneity within institutional fields. Institutional fields or sectors represent communities of organizations

that hold common meaning systems or that articulate distinct beliefs about themselves and their actions (McDonald & Warburton, 2003). Mimetic pressures drive less-established organizations with uncertain goals to copy or imitate their more successful peers (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In effect, organizations adopt the recognized and legitimate practices of others in their fields. According to Mizruchi and Fein (1999), mimetic isomorphism is the most common driver of similarity in institutional forms.

Finally, normative pressures create institutional isomorphism via field-related training, education, and certification programs that promulgate similar ideas and strategies within sectors. Trade shows, conferences, degree programs, and associations result in proliferation of common norms, structures, and practices within fields (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Because public sector and nonprofit organizations often vie for the same resources and employees, adopting recognized and legitimized practices helps with recruitment and fundraising (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 153). New Institutionalism, declare Greenwood et al. (2008), is an antidote to the "overly rationalist and technocratic perspectives of the 1960s" (p. 29).

Studies of isomorphism. Many studies have examined the degree to which coercive, mimetic, or normative pressures lead to institutional isomorphism. As noted by Palmer et al. (2008), "new institutionalism has developed a multitude of measurable concepts and empirically verifiable relationships to describe and explain organizational phenomena" (p. 760). A review of this research instructs the choices of inquiry, assumptions, and methods used in this study.

The popularity of institutional isomorphism is such that an examination of the literature identifies dozens of studies providing evidence of organizations within

institutional fields becoming more similar because of either coercive pressures (Covaleski & Dirsmith, 1988; Edelman, 1992; Fligstein, 1990; Greening & Gray, 1994; Guillen, 2001; Konrad & Linnehan, 1995; Lehrman, 1994; Rao & Neilsen, 1992; Sutton, Dobbin, Meyer, & Scott, 1994), mimetic pressures (Bolton, 1993; Boxenbaum & Battilana, 2005; Davis, 1991; Deephouse, 1996; DiMaggio 1991; Fennell & Alexander, 1987; Fligstein, 1985, 1987; Goll & Rasheed, 2011; Greve, 1998; Han, 1994; Haunschild, 1993; Haveman, 1993; Lieberman & Asaba, 2006; Lomi, 1995; Mizruchi & Stearns, 1988; Schoonhoven, Eisenhardt, & Lyman, 1990; Townley, 2002; Villadsen, Hansen, & Mois, 2010; Zilber, 2002), or normative pressures (Abbott 1988; Galaskiewicz, 1985; Galaskiewicz & Burt, 1991; Gendron, Suddaby, & Lam 2006; Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Hirsch, 1986; Mezias & Scarselletta, 1994; Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Caronna, 2000; Suchman, 1995).

In addition, there are multiple studies in which researchers measure evidence of organizational isomorphism due to combinations of pressures—of coercive + normative (Fiss & Zajac, 2004; Ginsberg & Buchholtz, 1990; Sutton et al., 1994), mimetic + normative (Burns & Wholey, 1993; Drori, Jang, & Meyer, 2006; Galaskiewicz & Wasserman, 1989; Mezias, 1990), coercive + mimetic (Hodson, Connolly, & Younes, 2008;), and of coercive + normative + mimetic (Frumkin & Galaskiewicz, 2004; Levitt & Nass, 1989; Palmer, Devereaux, & Xueguang, 1993; Villadsen, 2013).

The organizations examined in these studies range widely and include for-profit, nonprofit, governmental, local, national, and international examples. Isomorphic behavior manifests in a similarly wide range of activity, from adoption of or response to rules/regulations (Edelman, 1992; Fligstein, 1990; Gendron et al., 2006; Lehrman, 1994;

Mezias & Scarselletta, 1994; Sutton et al., 1994) to development of similar practices within HR, HRM, accounting, hostile takeovers, budgeting, auditing, and crisis response (Covaleski & Dirsmith, 1998; Gendron et al., 2006; Greenwood et al., 2002; Han, 1994; Sutton et al., 1994; Zilber, 2002). Because this study only examines a few cases, and the cases represent nonprofit and public organizations, the most pertinent studies of isomorphism are those involving organizations in similar sectors.

Frumkin and Galaskiewicz's (2004) study has clear relevance to this one, as it examines governmental organizations and finds that they are more likely than other organization types to conform to isomorphic pressures. This finding somewhat upends traditional thinking, which is that government agencies are a primary driver of institutionalization in nonprofits and businesses—via laws, rules, standards, funding conditions, and regulations. Rather, the authors say, the public sector is more likely to be institutionalized and subject to institutional pressures (p. 284).

In a longitudinal case study of a new private university in Syria, Hodson et al. (2008) found that the fledgling university adopted the British Quality Assurance Agency's Code of Practice in order to establish legitimacy, even though elements of the code were a poor fit in the Syrian environment. The university, however, acted based on a belief that "the more practices are taken for granted within the organization, the more they may be used symbolically to demonstrate their fitness" (p. 144).

DiMaggio (1991) conducted an historical case study of the development of a national 'organizational field' of U.S. art museums from 1920-1940. This action was undertaken to obtain support, legitimacy, and wider acceptance of art museums as an organizational form. The process involved the creation, sharing, and adoption by U.S.

art museums of professional associations, definitions of expertise, a collective definition of the field, and standards for credentialing. It included elements of mimetic, normative, and coercive isomorphism and explains the incidence of similar practices, structures, and norms at U.S. art museums today.

Townley (2002) conducted a case study of the implementation of planning and performance protocols for cultural organizations by a provincial government in Canada. Dialectical imperatives between the cultural organizations' strategic performance measures and cultural norms caused ambivalence and conflict among staff. The author describes this conflict as a gap between formal and practical rationality (p. 178)—akin to the decoupling described by Meyer and Rowan (1977) and Zucker (1977) when social institutional pressures conflict with technical requirements. Staff at the organizations complied, begrudgingly, with the performance measures, an example of coercive isomorphism.

A review of articles on organizational isomorphism suggests they peaked around 1990, and are not as prevalent today. The argument appears to be validated: organizations of many types are subject to institutional pressures and tend to adopt similar structures, practices, and norms within their fields over time. It stands to reason that the NPS-nonprofit partners in this study will also demonstrate isomorphic tendencies. Important questions to examine relate to the nature of and reasons for those similarities—as well as differences—to understand how and why the volunteer program partnerships function as they do.

Institutional entrepreneurship. More recent New Institutionalism studies place greater emphasis on the endogenous roles that individuals play in institutional processes

than on institutional fields or domains. In 1980, Eisenstadt described the role that 'institutional entrepreneurs' play in establishing or changing institutional structures. DiMaggio (1988) then applied entrepreneurship in New Institutionalism. New institutions, he argued, are created partly by resourceful actors who "see in them an opportunity to realize interests that they value highly" (p. 14). Many actors, including managers, consultants, standard setters, and media can play significant roles in institutional change (Sahlin-Anderson & Engwall, 2002).

Institutional entrepreneurship refers to actions by actors who "have an interest in particular institutional arrangements and who leverage resources to create new institutions or to transform existing ones" (Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004, p. 657). Thus, institutional entrepreneurship adds actors, agency, interests, and power to new institutionalism analysis (Garud, Hardy, & Maguire, 2007). Such entrepreneurs can institutionalize projects through effort, skill, influence, strategy, and other actions. Institutional entrepreneurship is important to this study; anecdotal evidences suggests that leaders in the NPS and nonprofit organizations played significant roles in establishing co-coordinated volunteer programs. Many empirical studies describe how agents are instrumental in institutionalizing organizational practices and forms (Battilana, 2006; Child, Lu, & Tsai, 2007; Fligstein, 1997; Garud, Jain, & Kumaraswamy, 2002; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Leca & Naccache, 2006; Maguire et al., 2004; Mutch, 2007; Perkman & Spicer, 2007; Rao, Greve, & Davis, 2001; Walter, 1993; Zilber, 2002).

Studies of institutional entrepreneurship. Examination of the roles of actors in institutionalization raises, DiMaggio and Powell (1991), Holm (1995), and Seo and

Creed (2002), note the contradiction of how actors can simultaneously become institutional entrepreneurs while being subsumed within their institutional fields, a paradox termed 'embedded agency.' How can embedded actors define new ideas, envision new practices, and get others to adopt them (Garud et al., 2007)—i.e., how do you make change from within? Leca, Battilana, and Boxenbaum (2008) and Strang and Sine (2002) argue that two conditions enable institutional entrepreneurship: (1) enabling roles of field-level conditions and (2) actors' social positions and skills. Several studies support this argument.

Studies of field-level conditions.

Institutional fields that face turmoil, disruption, crisis, reduced or scarce resources, upheaval, regulatory change, or other precipitating 'jolts' (Leca et al., 2008) are more likely to allow for institutional entrepreneurs. Fligstein (1997) describes the case of the president of the European Commission being able to advance the Treaty on European Union (EU) in the 1980s. At this time, the EU was in crisis, with no consensus for moving forward. These conditions, the author argues, allowed an entrepreneurial actor to make institutional changes through brokering, framing action, aggregating interests, employing multiple courses of action, and allowing others to think they were in control.

Maguire et al. (2007) conducted a qualitative case study of how HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy emerged in Canada. A key enabling factor was the turmoil attendant with the rapid rise of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. In this situation, the players who would typically respond—doctors, hospitals, the government, or drug companies—did not act with sufficient alacrity to satisfy community members whose friends and family

members were falling ill and dying. In this vacuum, activist groups were able to form, gain legitimacy, join with existing institutions, obtain access to previously dispersed resources, and apply pressure that led to new treatments.

Studies of actors' social position and skills. The position, location, connections, and access of actors—as well as their interpersonal, communication, and political skills—also enable institutional entrepreneurship. Some of the above studies of field-enabling conditions of entrepreneurship (Fligstein, 1997; Garud et al., 2007; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Mutch, 2007) indicate that the social position and skills of the actors also factored in their success as institutional entrepreneurs. In terms of the skills employed by successful institutional entrepreneurs, Perkmann and Spicer (2007) examine how authorities living close to European borders coordinate policies along those borders. These authorities engage in a range of actions, to include assembling stakeholders, forming coalitions, mobilizing resources, planning cultural exchanges, and negotiating disputes and agreements. The actors employ different skills (analytical, cultural, or political) depending on the need, the audience, and the context. According to the authors, the skills of the actors—not the field conditions—are the main explanatory factors (Perkmann & Spicer, 2007). Walter (1993) also found in a study of government-sponsored volunteer programs that the 'entrepreneurial spirit' of government administrators may motivate them to create or expand volunteer programs.

Fligstein (2001) says separating field and social factors in institutional entrepreneurship is artificial. Enabling fields, he suggests, emerge when "members of different groups see new opportunities" (p. 115) and act on them. By doing so, they "produce new cultural frames for fields" (p. 115). Seo and Creed (2002) agree and

suggest that 'praxis' is an "essential driving force of institutional change" (p. 222). They define praxis as "agency embedded in a totality of multiple levels of interpenetrating, incompatible institutional arrangement" (p. 222).

New Institutionalism and divergence. A final aspect of new institutionalism warrants review; the incidence of organizational fields or sectors becoming institutionalized while not becoming more similar over time. Findings from such studies may help explain differences in the cases examined in this dissertation. To frame the idea, Ingram and Clay (2000), note that the constraints organizations place on actors—rules, regulations, hierarchies, etc.—not only make it difficult to modify institutionalized forms, but they also often make it difficult to adopt or copy them. It follows, then, that organizations may not fully succeed in becoming similar because of organizational constraints, even if they want to or respond to isomorphic pressures.

In a review of studies of mimetic, normative, coercive, and competitive isomorphism, Beckert (2010) argues that each force can also cause institutional change toward divergence. Every organization and person within it are unique and face ever-changing circumstances, so how they respond to isomorphic pressures will vary. Oliver (1991) agrees and describes five different responses organizations make to isomorphic pressures to conform. Organizations respond with "interest-seeking, active organizational behavior" (p. 146), in different ways depending on their assumptions, motives, needs, and contexts:

1. Acquiescence—equates to conformity, adopting norms, obeying rules, mimicking institutional models, and otherwise complying;
2. Compromise—akin to decoupling (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), where organizations 'decouple' their symbolic and technical practices to address contradictions;

3. Avoidance—represents veiled or indirect resistance—concealing, escaping, or disguising non-conformity;
4. Defiance—direct resistance to conformity—challenges, attacks, contesting new forms, or ignoring them; and/or
5. Manipulation—influencing internal and/or external actors to try and reshape imposed institutional norms and forms. (Oliver, 1991)

Boxenbaum and Jonsson (2008) liken manipulation (#5 above) to institutional entrepreneurship—a "deliberate attempt to change institutions in certain directions" (p. 85).

McDonald and Warburton (2003) provide an example of both isomorphism and divergence in an ethnographic case study of volunteers in two cafés in Australia. In one café, volunteers replicated established institutional orders. In the other café, however, volunteers had greater agency and used it to actively reconstruct the institutional order—to realign it "to one more congruent with the contemporary environment" (p. 396).

Multiple studies have found examples of divergence in the face of isomorphic pressures (Beck & Walgenbach, 2005; Dacin, 1997; Goodrick & Salancik, 1996; Ingram & Simons, 1995; McKeown & Lindorff, 2011; Ramanath, 2009). Dacin (1997) analyzed how different forces impacted 1,011 Finnish newspapers from 1771-1963, particularly the rate of newspaper launches and how launches were impacted by periods of Finnish nationalism, market forces, and environmental shocks. She found that levels of institutional isomorphic adoption varied based on ecological, temporal, economic, political, and other forces over time.

Beck and Walgenbach (2005) examined the rates of adoption of quality control standards by mechanical engineering firms to identify factors impacting the adoption rates. They found that some organizational factors resulted in a "reduced tendency to adapt to institutionalized environmental expectations, in this case the implementation of

. . . standards" (p. 860). Adoption was less likely in firms making customized products and those with weak customer influence. Such firms, the authors suggest, are more autonomous and thus more insulated from outside pressures to conform.

Ramanath (2009) conducted case studies of NGO-led housing interventions in India and found that variations in the NGO's resource environments mitigated against the NGOs' adoption of isomorphic forms. Working with the Indian government, the NGOs often disagreed with government regulations imposed on them. They responded, echoing Oliver (1991), with a combination of acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, negotiation, and political maneuvering to maintain contracts with the government and also meet their NGO mission.

Applications from and gaps in New Institutionalism related to this study. New Institutionalism Theory offers a framework for identifying similarities and differences in the cases to be examined, as well as explanations for similarities and differences in them. The theory suggests organizations, institutional pressures, individuals, groups, and social norms can all influence the structures of NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships. These influences vary depending on contexts and contingencies, but together suggest the NPS cases will show signs of similar practices because they developed within the same organizational field or sector. In addition, findings related to divergence in cases where standards and practices and standards are evolving or uncertain may illuminate differences in the cases examined in this study.

Review of the New Institutionalism literature also reveals gaps between existing research and the proposed study. The cases in this study—co-coordinated NPS volunteer programs—expand existing partnerships in ways not previously described.

The expanded partnerships are between government and nonprofit organizations with substantial goal congruity, which have received little attention. Further, in these cases the nonprofits provide money to the government, instead of the other way around, suggesting the nonprofits may have more influence on policies and programs at the NPS units. Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, research in Institutionalism has not focused on co-coordinated volunteer programs at national parks. Thus, and as with the reviews of IOR theory and SHRM research, this study and its design are partly illuminated by New Institutionalism. At the same time, it applies that theory in a different context and tests the degree to which its propositions obtain.

Chapter Summary

William Perry, Jr., said, "to have any idea of what is going on in a situation, you need at least three good theories" (in Daloz, 2012, p. 43). Perry's maxim applies in this study, in which three different disciplinary perspectives each offer significant (but incomplete) insight into understanding partnerships between NPS units and nonprofit organizations to co-coordinate volunteer programs in U.S. national parks. These three perspectives—IOR, SHRM, and New Institutionalism—illuminate different aspects of the research problem, research questions, and the proposed methods for the study. Conducting a study using this tripartite lens offers potential for a richer interpretation of the phenomenon. In addition, a meso perspective will stretch the existing theories and research by applying them in somewhat new directions and contexts. Social phenomena are often complex and evolving. A multi-theory approach is more likely to provide a comprehensive, integrative understanding of the phenomenon and yield information that is of value to both scholars and practitioners.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

This study seeks to understand co-coordinated volunteer program collaborations that expand existing interorganizational and cross-sector relations between National Park Service (NPS) units and their nonprofit organization partners. This chapter describes the methodology used for the study. It details and justifies elements and choices related to the study's methodology, type of study, sample selection process, and methods of data collection. In addition, the chapter describes how ethical issues, data analysis, trustworthiness, and potential bias were addressed.

Qualitative Study: Paradigm and Epistemology

This study employs an Interpretivist paradigm to focus on human social systems and structures and understand the "fundamental nature of the social world at the level of subjective experience" (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 28). A paradigm is a "basic set of beliefs that guide action" (Guba, 1990, p. 17). Paradigms are worldviews that inform research and shape its practice (Creswell, 2007). The focus of this study is on human social systems and structures—i.e., co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships in U.S. national parks. The interpretive paradigm "seeks explanation within the realm of individual consciousness and subjectivity, within the frame of reference" (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 28) of the participants.

Co-coordinated volunteer programs represent complex organizational and social systems. For this reason, qualitative analysis can help explain the complicated and shifting social, cultural, and micro (i.e., related to individuals) factors involved, provide

deeper explanations of the contexts and causes of change, fill gaps left by quantitative analysis, and help explain the 'thick' processes at play in the partnerships.

Within an Interpretivist paradigm, the study uses a Social Constructionist epistemology, in which knowledge and meaning are perceived as being developed through interaction with others in society. Epistemology is the study of the nature of knowledge, or of "how we now what we know" (Crotty, 2011, p. 8). It serves, says Maynard (1994), as the "philosophical grounding for deciding what kinds of knowledge are possible and how we can assure that they are both adequate and legitimate" (p. 10). The Constructionist epistemology is based on the belief that meaning "comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world" (Crotty, 2011, p. 8). Knowledge and meaning are constructed, not discovered. This approach does not deny objective reality; a rock is a rock whether anyone perceives it or not. However, rocks and phenomena have no meaning until a mind interprets and assigns meaning to them. Knowledge and reality are "contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed . . . within an essentially social context" (Crotty, 2011, p. 42).

We live, grow, communicate, and learn in a world of social interaction and structure (Giddens, 1984)—our reality is a social construction. The study examines human and social structures in an interorganizational collaboration to co-coordinate volunteer programs at select national park units. It seeks to understand and interpret how these social structures function. In other words, it seeks to uncover and understand "the meaning of a phenomenon" (Merriam, 2009, p. 5), how the participants construct and interpret it, and how well they think it is working. The study focuses on how

several NPS sites and nonprofits expanded existing partnerships to co-coordinate volunteer programs that previously had been managed solely by NPS staff. It seeks to identify unique information about individual examples of these partnerships, as opposed to reaching broadly generalizable conclusions from a random sample.

Case Study Methodology

Case study was used in this dissertation. Each partnership represents a "particular instance"—or case—of the phenomenon, process, and topic to be studied in depth (Merriam, 2009). The partnerships also each represent a 'bounded system' that is limited by factors such as participants, time, location, and processes (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2006), as opposed to a broad concept, topic, or activity such as education or health care (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006).

Rooted in anthropology, sociology, and psychology, case study is a widely used and accepted research method in many disciplines including political science, education, business, public health, and public administration (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009). Creswell (2007) defines case study as a qualitative approach in which the researcher explores a bounded system over time. Yin (2009) describes it as an "empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context" (2008, p. 18). By concentrating on examples or cases of a phenomenon, the researcher seeks to uncover and understand the significant factors that characterize that phenomenon. This study is interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation to produce a holistic description and understanding of the phenomenon of NPS-nonprofit volunteer partnerships (Creswell, 2007; 1975; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006). In addition, as Merriam (2009) notes, case

study "has proven particularly useful for . . . evaluating programs, and informing policy" (p. 51), which are goals of this study.

Multi-Case Study and Comparison

This study examines several sites, or cases, and thus is also a multi-case comparison. A multi-case approach provides varying perspectives on a topic, identifies common and disparate characteristics of sites, allows for evaluative comparisons among the cases, and enhances overall findings (Creswell, 2007, Stake, 2006). This case study is instrumental, in that it seeks to develop insight on the evolving NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships. It is heuristic, with the goal of broadening readers' understandings of these partnerships. The study is particularistic in its focus on a specific type of program in order to reveal what it might represent (Merriam (2009). It is also intrinsic, for the researcher is an NPS volunteer and has personal and professional interest in volunteer programs.

Finally, the study is descriptive. Six cases are examined to provide a holistic, 'thick' description of the cases. 'Thick description,' suggests Merriam (2009), involves providing sufficient description to contextualize the research and allow readers to "determine the extent to which their situations match the research context, and, hence, whether findings can be transferred" (p. 229). The samples include cases of volunteer program partnerships in rural, suburban, and urban areas and of different scale and focus of volunteer activity. Each case represents at least two partners (an NPS unit and one or more nonprofit organizations).

Evidence from multiple cases is often considered more robust and convincing than single-case designs (Herriott & Firestone, 1983). Yin (2009) offers guidance on

multi-case designs. Multiple cases, he suggests, are akin to multiple experiments and follow a 'replication' design instead of the sampling logic typically employed in surveys: "each case must be carefully selected so that it either (a) predicts similar results (a *literal replication*) or (b) predicts contrasting results but for anticipatable reasons (a *theoretical replication*)" (p. 54) (italics original). If the cases are similar, the research provides support for the assumptions proposed by the researcher. If the cases are dissimilar, then original assumptions must be revised.

Holistic and embedded multi-case study design. The unit of analysis for the study is each case of co-coordinated volunteer program collaboration. To the extent that each case represents a single coordination entity created by the partnering organizations (the NPS sites and their nonprofit partners), and that each case is studied as a whole, the study is holistic in character. However, because each partnership represents individuals and actions from two independent organizations, this multi-case study also examines subunits within each case (i.e., each partner). Thus, the study includes components of an embedded multi-case study as well, such as interviewing individuals and examining documents both from and within each case.

Population and Sample Selection

In a multi-case study, sample selection occurs at two levels: (1) how the cases are selected, and (2) how the participants within each case are selected. For the first level of sample selection, the selection of the cases (i.e., partnerships) from the total population of 407 NPS units in the U.S., 14 were identified as having the type of volunteer program partnership sought for the study. From these 14, four criteria were used to select the cases (partnerships) for the study. Selected sites are exemplary and

diverse cases of co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships, defined as meeting the following criteria. The cases represent

1. Partnerships with evidence of high-level application of research-based elements of effective volunteer management practice (Brudney, 1999; Hager & Brudney, 2004; Safrit et al., 2005) and tenets of IOR theory (Gray, 1985, 1989);
2. Different types of NPS units (national parks, historic sites, recreation areas, monuments, etc.);
3. Partnerships in different geographic regions of the U.S.; and
4. A mix of partnerships in urban, suburban, and rural areas.

Two questionnaires were developed to select the partnership cases in the study, one each for the NPS and nonprofit partners. The questions were based on research in IOR, New Institutionalism, and SHRM (see Appendices 1 and 2). The questionnaires differed slightly, to allow specific categories for the different administrative structures in NPS versus nonprofit organizations, but otherwise are identical. The questions sought basic information about the design, structure, scope, and impacts of volunteer program partnerships. The questionnaires were designed to be completed online, in one sitting, in 15-20 minutes.

A draft of each questionnaire was reviewed by volunteer coordinators at several NPS units and nonprofit partner organizations, and changes were then made based on feedback. The revised draft was then piloted with the volunteer coordinators at one of the 14 NPS-nonprofit program partnerships. Based on this feedback, the final text of the questionnaires was developed. The final versions of the two questionnaires were sent to the volunteer coordinators for each of the 14 identified co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships, for a total of 28 sites. Twenty-six (93%) of the volunteer coordinators completed the full questionnaire. The volunteer coordinator at one additional site was unable to complete the questionnaire, but described the level and

quality of his organization's volunteer partnership in an e-mail. Thus, the overall response rate was 27 of 28 sites, or 96.4%.

Based on responses, there were three instances in which both partners in the fourteen partnerships said their co-coordinated volunteer programs had both (1) high levels of adherence to tenets of volunteer program management and IOR and (2) strong positive impacts. These partnerships are for Cuyahoga Valley National Park, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and Yosemite National Park. For the three other partnerships, one of the partners rated adherence to volunteer program management and IOR and positive impacts as high/strong, while the other partner rated them as medium. These partnership are for Acadia National Park and Arches/Canyonlands National Parks. No other partnerships rated themselves as high in either adherence to volunteer program management practices, IOR, or as having significant positive impacts.

Therefore, the following six partnerships were selected for the study, based on the study's sample selection criteria:

Table 3.1
Cases Selected for Study

Partnership (NPS Unit / Nonprofit Partner)	Adherence to SHRM and IOR, plus Level of Positive Impact	Diversity—NPS Unit Type	Diversity —Region of U.S.	Diversity—Rural, Urban, or Suburban
Acadia / Friends of Acadia	Medium-high/High	National Park	Northeast	Rural
Arches, Canyonlands / Friends of Arches and Canyonlands	Medium-high/High	National Parks (2), National Monuments (2)	Mountain	Rural
Cuyahoga Valley / Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley	High/High	National Park	Central	Mix
Golden Gate / Golden Gate	High/High	National Recreation	West	Mix

National Parks Conservatory		Area, National Historic Sites		
National Mall / Trust for the National Mall	Medium high/High	National Monuments, National Memorials	East	Urban
Yosemite / Yosemite Conservancy	High/High	National Park	West	Rural

Responses from these partnerships demonstrated consistent alignment between adherence to SHRM and IOR tenets and positive impacts of the co-coordinated volunteer programs—partnerships with high adherence had high positive impacts, and vice versa. The diversity of the selected sites was coincidental, but allows for the six cases to represent partnerships in multiple parts of the U.S., multiple types of NPS units, and a range of locations that include urban, suburban, and rural sites. Therefore, all the desired criteria for cases in the study were met.

For the second level of sample selection—the selection of people from the six partnerships, the two volunteer coordinators from each partnership were interviewed. In addition, other individuals with direct coordination, knowledge, or experience with the partnerships were identified by the volunteer coordinators and were also invited to participate in the study. A total of 35 individuals were interviewed for the study, representing 3-10 individuals from each partnership.

The sample size—i.e., the selection of six cases/partnerships—was determined based on guidance from Yin (2009) and Merriam (2009). Two to three cases, Yin says, may be sufficient to establish certainty about multiple case findings when the research problem and questions are basic and straightforward. However, with more complex phenomena, multiple research questions, and/or more diverse cases, five to six cases

should be examined to establish both similarities (replications) and differences in the cases. Merriam (2009) notes that "the more cases included in a study, and the greater the variation across the cases, the more compelling an interpretation is likely to be" (p. 49). In a well-known example, Lightfoot (1983) studied six cases of effective high schools. For this study, understanding was sought about both similarities and differences in the cases. Thus, variation was sought in the cases to allow for "a greater range of application of the findings by consumers of the research" (Merriam, 2009, p. 229).

Data Collection Methods

This study employed two methods of data collection: semi-structured interviews and document analysis.

Interviews. As noted by Creswell (2007), Yin (2009), and Merriam (2009), interviews are an essential information source in case studies. It is not possible to observe behaviors that occur outside the interview or to observe peoples' understandings, interpretations, or feelings. Interviews, says Patton (2002), "allow us to enter into the other person's perspective" (p. 341). In-depth interviews were conducted. Typically, and as described by Merton, Fiske, and Kendall (1990), interviews lasted about 60 minutes.

A semi-structured interview format was employed, in which an interview guide was used with a combination of more and less structured questions focusing on obtaining facts and details related to the phenomenon and informed by the theoretical frameworks of the study. The interviews were guided by these questions (see Appendix 3), and a semi-structured format allows flexibility in following up with

interviewees. The inclusion of broad and somewhat open-ended questions allowed for responding to "the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic" (Merriam, 2009, p. 90).

Interview questions were designed to elicit key information related to how the partnerships function. The questions were derived from the theories and research that inform the study. Interviews were conducted at times and locations of convenience and comfort for the individuals being interviewed. There was also follow-up communication (via e-mail) with respondents for clarification or to ask additional questions.

The researcher was able to spend at least two days at each case site. There were 29 formal interviews of 35 people (a few interviews were with more than one person at a time), lasting an average of 57 minutes per interview. Two of the interviews were informal and were not recorded because of the non-optimal conditions under which they were held—i.e., participants were in transit or working/interacting with others at the time. Information from the informal interviews does not add substantively to the study and thus is not included in the results. Interviewees included volunteer program coordinators from each NPS unit and nonprofit partner, higher-level administrators, volunteer activity leaders, and one volunteer. Thirty-three participants were interviewed in person, and two interviews were conducted by phone.

Interviews were recorded with a digital recorder, using a cell phone recording application as a backup, always with the permission of the interviewee. During and after interviews, the researcher composed notes to capture immediate impressions, including explanations of unclear text, motives behind follow-up questions, interpretations of body

language and emotions not captured on tape. All interviews were then transcribed by the researcher.

Document/data collection. Documentation is vital to case study research and serves multiple purposes, including corroborating evidence obtained from other sources, providing details about a case, informing the interviews, and allowing the researcher to make inferences about the topic (Yin, 2009). Current and archival data related to the co-coordinated volunteer programs in each case were selected for study—policies, agreements, procedures, training descriptions, budgets, staff and volunteer job descriptions, evaluation protocols, etc., as recorded in memoranda, policy statements, public statements, e-mails, meeting minutes, and other documents. Information was obtained directly from the volunteer program partners, public records, archival records, books, the Internet, and other relevant sources.

Ethical Issues

Approval was obtained from GW's Institutional Review Board before data gathering began. Participants were given an information sheet that described the study and their involvement in it. They were also provided with the interview guide. Participation was voluntary. The nature of the study was such that it was not anticipated that participants would be exposed to any risks. However, standard procedures were implemented to ensure the confidentiality of participants. Individuals were assigned codes or pseudonyms. A list of participants by code was stored in a locked cabinet and destroyed, along with all audiotapes three months after the data transcription was completed. All other records of the study were kept private on a computer with

password access. Data were reported in aggregate form, and citations were selected and framed in ways that ensure the confidentiality of participants.

Study and interview questions incorporated IOR theories about the inevitability that challenges occur in interorganizational collaborations. Questions did not ask about specific challenges or conflicts in the partnerships. However, some interviewees described specific challenges, and then later asked that certain statements they made not be included in the study. These requests were honored. In addition, and in an abundance of caution to ensure no participants might be harmed, the section of the study results in Chapter 4 that addresses challenges also anonymizes the names of the NPS units and their nonprofit partners.

Finally, and following advice from Seidman (2013), the transcripts omit aspects of speech that an interviewee would not use in writing, to include terms like 'um' and 'you know' as well as some grammatical errors. This study is not about people's language, diction, or sentence structure, and so in transcription the researcher employed a balance between an accurate depiction of oral speech and maintaining the "dignity of the participant in presenting his or her oral speech in writing" (Seidman, 2013, p. 124).

Data Analysis

Code, memo, and category development. Multiple analytical techniques were used to create the cross-case synthesis for this study. Data analysis occurred simultaneously with data collection and represented a "recursive and dynamic" (Merriam, 2009, p. 169) process that used constant comparison to develop and refine findings and created a sequence of analysis: quotes, notes, codes, memos, categories, and interpretation of the findings. Interviews were transcribed and checked for

accuracy. The transcripts were placed into tables that allowed for codes, memos, and categories to be added in columns alongside the transcriptions. Alignment and triangulation between the interview and document materials and notes were examined.

The researcher created codes and memos in columns alongside the transcript and document text, capturing prominent *in vivo* concepts, words, phrases, and ideas until saturation of the data and emergence of regularities were achieved (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The initial open coding of transcripts and documents noted alignment of statements with the theoretical bases of the study (IOR, new institutionalism, and SHRM research on volunteer program management). A second round of coding was conducted based on alignment of text to the study research questions. A third round of coding identified other significant statements. Memos were drafted and organized in the same manner as codes: (1) memos related to the theoretical bases of the study, (2) memos related to the study's research questions, and (3) memos related to other emergent topics from the interviews or documents.

The researcher then used analytical or axial coding to group open codes within and across the interviews and create a codebook. Axial codes were subsequently consolidated into a master list of categories that "constitutes a primitive classification system reflecting the recurring regularities or patterns" (Merriam, 2009, p. 180) in the study and captured key concepts and ideas from the experience of the participants. The categories were "conceptual elements that 'cover' or span many individual examples" (Merriam 2009, p. 181) from the interviews and documents. The categories thus represented "the practical goal of data analysis" and served as "answers to research questions" (Merriam, 2009, p. 176).

Pattern matching. Findings from earlier data collection were compared with data from later collection in a formative process. Patterns and correspondence within and across cases were identified (Creswell, 2007). Trochim (1989) and Yin (2009) describe pattern matching as a useful analytic technique for descriptive case studies in which the researcher compares empirically based patterns with predicted ones. For example, the researcher compared recommended volunteer management practices from the SHRM literature with what was observed in the cases. When patterns align, the results "can help a case study to strengthen its internal validity" (Yin, 2009, p. 136). Along related lines, the analysis also looked for patterns of rival explanations and the presence of program structures, components, or variables that may be explanatory.

Explanation building. A form of pattern matching, explanation building was used to explain how or why a phenomenon occurred. The explanation-building process, again described by Yin (2009), involved several steps or iterations:

- Making initial theoretical statements or assertions about a phenomenon,
- Comparing the findings of an initial case against these initial statements or assertions;
- Revising the statements or assertions;
- Comparing additional details of the case against the revision; and
- Comparing the revision to the facts of the second, third, fourth, or fifth cases.

Through this process, the researcher systematically refined a set of ideas and findings, while recursively considering rival explanations. Constant comparison of data guided development of memos and codes related to study topics and questions. Memos, codes, and categories were analyzed to determine the degree to which they were either in accordance with or contrary to the theoretical frameworks and research questions that underpin the study (Bergerson, 2007; Honan et al., 2000; Yin, 2009).

Data Representation

A report was composed for a doctoral dissertation committee. Most of the report is a traditional narrative and employs a linear-analytic (Yin, 2009) structure to describe the phenomenon of the study. Because this study examines multiple cases, data are presented in an integrated manner that focuses on the identified categories as opposed to describing each case independently. While a vignette is provided of each case in Chapter 4, the balance of the chapter offers a cross-comparison in which the different cases are described not in isolated 'silos,' but based on how they align with or contrast on each category.

The final product is "shaped by the data that are collected and the analysis that accompany the entire process" (Merriam, 2009, p. 171). An integrative 'big picture' is needed of these partnerships to help NPS sites determine processes for initiating or sustaining them. The overall goal was to compose descriptions that are particularistic (focusing on the particular cases), descriptive (a rich, 'thick' description of the cases) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and heuristic (illuminating understanding of the phenomenon) (Merriam, 2009). The goal is to substantively address the topic (Yin, 2009) and provide evidence to support conclusions related to the "meaning of the cases" (Creswell, 2007, p. 75).

Visual displays are included to allow for additional levels of presentation and analysis. Tables provide further integration of data with text, highlight key information, and illustrate how each case developed (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Tables show the alignment of cases with the research categories as well as compare the cases with each other. The overall goal is for data representation to demonstrate that the cases are

significant and that the study is comprehensive, considers rival perspectives, addresses the questions that it raises, presents sufficient evidence, and is both readable and engaging (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009).

Trustworthiness

To help ensure trustworthiness of the study, the design follows recommended practices for qualitative and case study methodology. The two data collection methods help corroborate findings. A member check or 'response validation' (Merriam, 2009) was conducted for every interview transcript. About half of the interviewees made grammatical changes. Several participants clarified statements they had made. Three-four participants removed statements they did not want included in the study.

The researcher engaged with colleagues to establish inter-coder reliability of the data analysis and category-development findings. The researcher first invited one colleague to review the initial draft of emerging categories, received feedback, and made adjustments to create a revised list of categories. He then invited two other colleagues to review the revised categories at a meeting in which the colleagues were given a total of 49 different quotes from interview transcripts and asked to place each quote under the category which they thought was the best fit. The colleagues and researcher then discussed the category-matching decisions. Feedback substantially supported the author's categories. The colleagues suggested that one category be integrated into a summative statement for the findings chapter. The researcher agreed, resulting in a final set of four categories under which the findings of the study (Chapter 4) are described.

The study maintained an audit trail, in which all the materials used and developed in the study—transcripts, memos, methods, procedures, reflections,

documents, e-mail files, and journal notes—were retained to allow other scholars to follow up on or replicate this study. Every effort was made to identify, analyze, and account for all the available evidence relevant to the study questions and assertions. This process helped ensure the analysis focused on the most important aspects and components of the study. Rival explanations were sought and considered.

Finally, the researcher tapped his vocational and avocational experience related to the NPS and volunteer programs. Findings will directly apply to the sites in the study; other organizations in similar contexts and situations may also learn and apply lessons from them. The goal is to describe a phenomenon, but not to generalize findings or predict future behavior. As noted by Shields (2007), qualitative approaches "do not attempt to eliminate what cannot be discounted . . . [or] to simplify what cannot be simplified" (p. 13).

Recognizing researcher bias. All researchers have biases and must guard against emphasizing data that merely reflect their preconceptions and beliefs. This researcher's interests motivated and informed the study, but are also potential sources of bias. Therefore, the researcher conducted a critical self-examination to identify his biases and employed epoché (Moustakas, 1994) to bracket or set aside his biases for the purposes of the study. Interview and follow-up questions were research-based and not leading, and categories were derived from responses, not the researcher's preconceptions.

Subjectivity statement. A subjectivity statement is a brief expression of critical self-reflection that allows the reader to consider how the researcher's "personal features, experiences, beliefs, feelings, cultural standpoints, and professional predispositions"

may affect "the study's credibility, authenticity, and overall quality or validity" (Preissle, 2008, p. 844). For 18 years, the researcher administered student service-learning programs for the Florida Department of Education, in which students engaged in volunteering as a means and application of learning, applying knowledge, skills, and habits of citizenship their teachers wanted them to learn via curriculum-based service projects. Based on this work, the researcher has an abiding interest in volunteer programs.

During this period and continuing during his studies in the George Washington University doctoral program, the researcher personally engaged in volunteer and service-learning projects, primarily environmental projects and including activities in state and federal parks. While studying in Washington, D.C., he participated in the NPS Volunteers in Parks program on the National Mall. This work exposed him to roles that volunteers play in the NPS. In addition, he became aware that the National Mall volunteer program was an example of the phenomenon examined in this study—an NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnership—in this case between the National Mall and the Trust for the National Mall. Interest in the functioning of the volunteer program partnership led to the idea for this study.

As detailed in Chapter 1, the NPS is financially straightened and unable to fully address many needs in its 407 units. Based on his research and observations, the researcher believes there will be an increasing need for volunteers to help the NPS and its nonprofit partners meet their missions in support of national parks in the U.S. Therefore, he is very interested in the new partnerships detailed this study and hopes the

findings can help other NPS sites and their partners devise more effective volunteer program partnerships in the future.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand co-coordinated volunteer programs that expand existing interorganizational and cross-sector collaborations between National Park Service (NPS) sites and their dedicated nonprofit organization partners. This chapter presents key findings that emerged from analysis of interviews and documents. The study's research questions are as follows:

1. How and why do NPS units and their nonprofit partners collaborate to co-coordinate volunteer programs?
2. What are the structures and components of the co-coordinated volunteer programs?
3. How do the co-coordinated volunteer programs adhere to research-based elements of effective volunteer program management and interorganizational relations?
4. What are similarities and differences in how the co-coordinated volunteer programs function at the selected sites?
5. How well are the partnerships able to adapt to changing conditions?

Because the study examined multiple cases, results are presented in forms recommended by Yin (2009) and Merriam (2009). First, vignettes (or profiles) are provided for each of the six examples (i.e., cases) of co-coordinated NPS volunteer program partnerships:

1. Acadia National Park/ Friends of Acadia
2. Arches & Canyonlands National Parks / Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks
3. Cuyahoga Valley National Park / Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley
4. Golden Gate National Recreation Area / Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
5. National Mall and Memorial Parks / Trust for the National Mall
6. Yosemite National Mall / Yosemite Conservancy

Then, the four categories of findings that emerged are presented with their respective themes. Data from site visits, interviews, and documents allowed for analysis that

yielded these categories of findings that address the research-based questions that undergird the study:

Category 1: Reasons and approaches for collaborating to co-coordinate volunteer programming
Category 2: Components of the co-coordinated volunteer programs
Category 3: Impacts of collaboration
Category 4: Pressures driving conformity and distinctiveness in co-coordinated volunteer programs

Each category is sub-divided into themes. Category 1 has seven themes, Category 2 has six, Category 3 has three, and Category 4 has two. The chapter then presents a cross-case comparison of the cases. The chapter closes with a summary of findings.

Case Vignettes

The following vignettes highlight key structures, elements, and activities of each case, as well as basic information about each NPS unit. The vignettes allow the reader to examine and understand each case as a whole. The vignettes are followed by a table identifying common program structures.

Acadia National Park and Friends of Acadia. In the early 20th century, wealthy summer residents of Mt. Desert Island in Maine formed a trustee group to raise funds to purchase undeveloped portions of the island to preserve them from logging and development. After several years of promotion and negotiation, they donated this land to the U.S. government to become first a national monument (1916), and then (1919) a national park—the first in the eastern U.S. In the 1920s, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., gave additional land to the park and financed construction of a loop road as well as a network of gravel carriage roads in the park's backcountry (Monkman & Monkman, 2007).

More recently, volunteer programs were initiated by visitors and nearby residents who wanted to help maintain hiking trails, carriage roads, and winter trails beyond the

capacity of the NPS staff to do so. The Bar Harbor Garden Club was permitted by the Acadia Superintendent in 1961 to create a wild flower garden in the park. Over time, the Wild Gardens of Acadia, the Acadia Winter Trails Association, trail volunteers, and other independent volunteer groups were folded into the Friends of Acadia (FOA), founded (by volunteers) in 1986. An NPS staff person was assigned as a liaison to the FOA at that time to help the nonprofit work with the park.

The FOA's mission is to provide philanthropic and volunteer support to Acadia. Co-coordination of the volunteer program is a balance of elements that are led by NPS staff, by FOA, and jointly. For example, NPS staff traditionally coordinated volunteers in campgrounds and visitor centers, and continue to oversee them. There was unmet need related to trails, carriage roads, gardens, and organizing large one-day volunteer events. Thus, programs in these areas are either led by FOA or are conducted jointly with the NPS.

Because Acadia has few winter visitors, the partners developed a formal volunteer program for summer vacationers and seasonal park-area residents. Visitors can 'drop in' on Tuesday, Thursday, or Saturday and work on trails, carriage roads, or other maintenance needs in the park. The majority of the park's volunteers participate through the drop-in program, which is jointly coordinated by NPS and FOA staff, including seasonal FOA employees who work alongside the NPS volunteer coordinator at the park headquarters. Drop-in volunteers receive a basic training and safety orientation. With fewer restrictions on its ability to make hires and purchases, FOA hires interns who work with NPS staff on special projects (raptor study program, Ridge Runners), and purchases items like tools and equipment for the volunteer work.

The FOA has tapped wealthy visitors and residents to establish dollar endowments to support work and programs—including volunteers—in the park. The $9 million Acadia Trails Forever endowment, for example, includes $4 million to pay for Youth Conservation Corps stipended volunteers who work on trails. For this and other endowments, there are formal memoranda of understanding (MoUs) outlining the partner roles and responsibilities. Overall, however, there is no formal contract or agreement governing the volunteer program collaboration between the NPS and FOA.

Management from the partner organizations meet approximately annually to discuss priorities and make funding decisions for the next year, to include those related to the volunteer program. The volunteer program is growing steadily, and little recruitment is needed to attract volunteers. The partners expressed that they are approaching their capacity in some volunteer programs and will likely need more staff and vehicles to accommodate larger numbers of volunteers. Representative from both organizations stated that the program is very successful and has strengthened the overall relationship between the partner organizations.

Table 4.1
Park and Co-coordinated Volunteer Program Features at Acadia National Park

Park Features

- Location: Coast of Maine in northeast U.S.
- When designated: As a national monument in 1916; as a national park in 1919.
- Size: Approximately 47,000 acres
- Features/activities: Trails, carriage roads, mountains, coastline, beaches, lakes, wetlands, hiking, biking, canoeing, campgrounds, free visitor shuttle bus system.
- Proximity to developed areas: Communities are located adjacent to and amidst NPS holdings; there is a permanent population of 10,000 on Mt. Desert Island
- Number of annual visitors (2013): 2.25 million (National Park Service, 2014)
- Nearest city with 100,000+ people: Boston, Mass. (260 miles)

Features of Co-coordinated Volunteer Program

- Primary volunteer program partners: NPS and Friends of Acadia
- Year the volunteer program partnership was formed: 1986

- Is the volunteer program partnership governed by a formal agreement, MoU, memorandum of agreement (MoA), or contract? Not for the overall volunteer program. There are MoUs for endowed programs.
- Number of volunteers for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014: 3,815
- Number of volunteer hours for FY 2014: 49,525
- When most volunteering occurs: Primarily in the summer
- Types of volunteering performed by the most volunteers: Drop-in Stewardship Program by summer visitors, days of service by local population
- Total paid and non-paid staff who manage or lead volunteers: 56
- Park divisions most involved in volunteer programming: Resource Management, Interpretation, Maintenance
- Co-location of staff: The partners have separate offices, but seasonal FOA staff for the Drop-in Stewardship Program are placed in the NPS headquarters
- Primary ways volunteers are used: At visitor centers and campgrounds, maintaining hiking trails and carriage roads, caring for and serving as docents at Wild Gardens of Acadia, Days of Service events, grooming carriage roads for cross-country skiing
- Volunteer programs primarily or solely coordinated by NPS: Campground hosts, visitor centers, Waldron's Warriors, Raptor Internship, exotic plant management
- Volunteer programs coordinated primarily by FOA: Days of Service events, FOA office volunteers, Schoodic volunteers, Night Sky Festival, grooming carriage roads for cross-country skiing, Wild Gardens of Acadia
- Volunteer programs coordinated jointly: Drop-in Stewardship Volunteer Program, Ridge Runners, youth hires (including interns)
- Volunteer program expenses paid for by FOA: Staff, interns, youth hires, supervisory gardener, endowments (for carriage roads, trails, Wild Gardens of Acadia, Ridge Runners, cross-country ski grooming), equipment, recognition, and days of service
- Other sources of volunteer program support: 21st Century Conservation Service Corps
- Basic training for volunteers: Provided separately or jointly by partners
- Advanced training for volunteers: Formal training for interns. Supervising volunteers learn through experience and specialty training as needed
- Formal training for volunteer program coordination staff: Provided for NPS staff; occasional FOA staff attendance at conferences

Arches and Canyonlands National Parks, Hovenweep and Natural Bridges National Monuments, and Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks. Four NPS units are administered under a single superintendent as the Southeast Utah Group, or SEUG. One NPS Ranger oversees volunteer programming at all four sites. In addition,

the primary volunteer program partner, Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks (Friends group), supports the SEUG in all four NPS units. Co-coordinated volunteer programming is currently concentrated at Arches and Canyonlands, as the other two parks are quite remote and have few volunteers. Arches and Canyonlands are located within 15 miles of each other, and the town of Moab, population 5,046 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), is situated between them. The SEUG is a desert environment, with hot summers and average low temperatures that are sub-freezing from November-March.

Volunteer program co-collaboration between the NPS and the Friends group began in 2011. Formed in 2006 as a legacy to Bates Wilson, a long-time superintendent at Arches who is considered the 'father' of Canyonlands National Park, the Friends group is not a fundraising organization. Its mission is to "connect people to place in ways that continue Bates Wilson's values of exploration, collaboration, and stewardship" (Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks, 2014) in the SEUG. A separate nonprofit, the Canyonlands Natural History Association, provides funds for the SEUG's volunteer program with money raised through sales of publications, memberships, and donations. Through a contract with the NPS, funds from the CNHA support stipends and lodging costs for approximately 30 Student Conservation Association (SCA) interns who volunteer in Arches and Canyonlands each year (CNHA, 2014).

The NPS and Friends group first partnered to create a program (2011) in which volunteers addressed the rising incidence of graffiti and other damage to cultural resources in Arches and Canyonlands (petroglyphs, Puebloan structures, and rock faces). Previously, most of the volunteering in the two parks was provided by SCA interns who serve at the parks from March-October of each year. SCAs volunteer primarily in

interpretation (visitor centers), resource management, or for an outdoor education program.

The primary reason volunteer efforts have been limited is because of the remote location of the SEUG parks and a lack of housing for all but a few intern volunteers. Few residents in nearby Moab have the leisure to volunteer. Most of Moab's retirees are only part-time winter residents. Thus, volunteer recruitment is a significant challenge. The Friends group also has limited capacity, with only a full-time executive director and two part-time staff, including a volunteer coordinator (herself a volunteer). The Friends group office is located in Arches National Park.

The success of the Cultural Resource Monitoring partnership led to expansion of the volunteer program partnership into other NPS-identified areas of need and the creation of the Volunteer Stewardship Program (VSP) in 2014. The VSP includes five formal volunteer programs: (1) cultural/historic resource monitoring, (2) trail/boundary fence monitoring, (3) graffiti removal, (4) Weed Warriors, and (5) special projects and events (Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks, 2013, p. 2). The Friends group oversees VSP recruitment, organization, and feeding; training is provided at an annual event with the NPS. NPS rangers support and help supervise the programs, as well as oversee SCA intern activities. An internal document outlines partner and volunteer roles and responsibilities for the VSP, but there are no formal agreements governing the volunteer program collaboration. The VSP program is still in its early stages; a dozen volunteers attended the annual VSP training in 2014. Both organizations express strong support of the expanded volunteer program partnership.

Table 4.2
Park and Co-coordinated Volunteer Program Features at the Southeastern Utah Group

Park Features

- Location: Southeastern Utah
- When designated: Arches—As a national monument in 1929, as a national park in 1971; Canyonlands—1964; Hovenweep—1923; Natural Bridges—1908
- Size: Arches: 76,359 acres, Canyonlands: 337,598 acres, Hovenweep: 1.22 square miles, Natural Bridges: 7,636 acres
- Features/activities: natural bridges, arches, canyons, mesas, buttes, hiking, camping, petroglyphs, Puebloan structures, the Colorado and Green Rivers, rafting, kayaking, star-gazing
- Proximity to developed areas: Moab (population 5,046) is adjacent to Arches, 30 minutes from Canyonlands. 2 hours from Natural Bridges, and 2.5 hours from Hovenweep
- Number of annual visitors (FY 2013): Arches: 1.1 million, Canyonlands: 462,000, Hovenweep: 25,000, Natural Bridges: 82,000 (NPS, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d)
- Nearest city with at least 100,000 people: Provo, Utah (190-300 miles)

Features of Co-coordinated Volunteer Program

- Primary volunteer program partners: NPS, Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks
- Other significant volunteer program partner: Canyonlands Natural History Association
- Year the volunteer program partnership was formed: Piloted in 2011
- Is the volunteer partnership governed by a formal MoU, MoA, or contract? No
- Areas of volunteer co-collaboration: Co-coordinated volunteers are currently focused almost exclusively in Arches and Canyonlands National Parks
- Number of volunteers (FY 2014): 175 (Arches), 152 (Canyonlands)
- When volunteering occurs: Primarily spring through fall of each year
- Types of volunteering performed by most volunteers: providing information; weeding; monitoring trails, the park boundary, and historic sites in the parks; special events
- Total full-time, part-time, and volunteers who coordinate volunteer efforts: 14.5
- NPS expenditures for volunteer program for FY 2014: $60,000
- Friends of Arches & Canyonlands expenditures on volunteer program, FY 2014: $5,000
- Park divisions most involved in volunteer program: Interpretation, Cultural Resources
- Volunteer programs primarily or solely coordinated by NPS: Campground Hosts, Visitor Center & Roving Volunteers, Search and Rescue VIPs, Sierra Club, university service groups, Resource/Science VIPs
- Volunteer programs coordinated jointly by the partners: cultural/historic resource monitoring, trail monitoring, graffiti removal team, weed warriors, special events
- Volunteer program expenses paid for by the Friends of Arches and Canyonlands: Recognition items, uniforms
- Other funding sources that support volunteer programming: Funds from sales by the Canyonlands Natural History Association (CNHA) pay for 30 SCA interns

(stipends and housing), fundraising through foundations, business donations and grants.
- Introductory training for volunteers: Yes, both jointly and separately
- Number of volunteers trained in FY 2014: 381 (mostly informal, on-the-job training)
- Advanced training for volunteers: Limited to interns only, with 40 hours of formal training, plus 40 hours of on-the-job training
- Formal training for volunteer program coordination staff: No

(National Park Service, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d)

Cuyahoga Valley National Park, and Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park. The volunteer program at CVNP is the only one in the NPS in which day-to-day coordination of volunteering in a NPS unit is managed by a nonprofit partner—the Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park (Conservancy). The NPS and the Conservancy have collaborated on volunteer programming since 1988. The lessons learned through an early collaboration to manage the park's youth environmental education center led the partners to expand their relationship in the volunteer program in 2008. Through a task agreement, the Conservancy provides programmatic coordination for the park volunteer program. A subsequent cooperative agreement further defines volunteer program co-management, allows for transfer of funds between the partners, and authorizes a management-level sounding board to "ensure ongoing communications with the volunteer management staff" (National Park Service, 2011, p. 9).

The NPS transfers funds to the Conservancy for two volunteer program staff at Conservancy offices in the park. An interpretive park ranger also works in this office, focusing on student volunteer and service-learning programs. NPS administrators actively oversee the program through the sounding board, meetings, informal communications, and supervision of volunteer projects. Several staff have been with the program for over 20 years. As part of its management, the Conservancy also oversees

volunteer program activities of two other significant nonprofit partners in the park, the Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad and the Countryside Conservancy. These organizations raise funds, put on events, and use volunteers at/for their respective sites, a historic rail line and 12 working farms located within the park boundaries.

Collectively, the partners have taken advantage of the range of opportunities for volunteering in the park to create 167 volunteer jobs that involve all the NPS divisions in the park and include both standard volunteer roles in interpretation and trail maintenance as well as historians, photographers, well monitors, farm hands, train operators, artists, drop-in volunteers, corporate volunteers, and clerical worker in the Conservancy offices. Volunteer internships are available through the Student Conservation Association and other sources.

Each volunteer position has an articulated set of required and recommended trainings. Continuing education is available for volunteers through regular offerings. Nearly all of these volunteer programs also have a supervisor—a staff person from the NPS or one of the three nonprofit partners. By assigning volunteer program responsibilities to employees from these four partners, the park leverages over 100 staff who are fully or partly dedicated to coordinating volunteer programs and volunteers. Volunteer supervisors plan, organize, and lead volunteers in their programs and serve as the point of contact for their program volunteers.

Another element of the co-coordinated volunteer partnership at Cuyahoga Valley is that the park is situated between and adjacent to the cities of Cleveland and Akron, Ohio, with a combined metropolitan area population of 2,881,93 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The park's proximity to these population centers affords a large number and

range of volunteers and volunteer skills, as well as many potential business partners and donors. There are also towns located within the park, meaning many volunteers can be onsite within minutes and thus do not need lodging. Recruitment is not an issue, but the partners seek to broaden the diversity of volunteers by age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic level.

By configuring their partnership and staffing to support 167 volunteer jobs, the stakeholders have created a large-scale program at a national park site that—at first glance—does not appear to have nearly as much 'natural' appeal and endowments as some better-known parks. Now well-established and with many supportive veteran staff across the partner organizations, the volunteer program is seen as very successful by the partners and is a key element of the overall partnership.

Table 4.3
Park and Co-coordinated Volunteer Program Features at Cuyahoga Valley National Park

Park Features

- Location: Northern Ohio, in central U.S.
- When designated: As a national recreation area in 1974; as a national park in 2000
- Size: 33,000 acres
- Features/activities: Hiking, bicycling, skiing, sledding, forests, a river, waterfalls, historic canal and towpath, farms, concerts, historic train line, golf courses
- Proximity to developed areas: Towns amid park holdings, highways transect the park
- Number of annual visitors (2013): 2.1 million (National Park Service, 2014e)
- Nearest cities with at least 100,000 people: Cleveland, Akron (10 miles)

Features of Co-coordinated Volunteer Program

- Primary volunteer program partners: NPS and the Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park
- Other significant volunteer program partners: Countryside Conservancy, Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad.
- Year the volunteer program partnership between NPS and the Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley NP was formed: 1988
- Is the volunteer program partnership governed by a formal MoU, MoA, or contract? Yes—both a cooperative agreement and a task agreement

- Number of volunteers for Fiscal Year (FY 2014): 5,682
- Number of volunteer hours for FY 2014: 208,895
- When volunteering occurs: Mostly in spring-fall
- Total staff (full or part-time) and volunteers who help lead volunteer efforts: 136
- NPS investment in volunteer programs for FY 2014: $126,000
- Nonprofit investment in volunteer programs for FY 2014: $50,000
- Volunteer program expenses paid for by the Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley NP: Staffing, food, recognition items, materials
- Other funding sources supporting volunteer programs: Countryside Conservancy, Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad, National Park Foundation, National Park Conservation Association, National Fish & Wildlife Foundation, corporate partners
- Park divisions most involved in volunteer programming: Interpretation, Education, and Visitor Services (145,455 volunteer hours)
- Volunteer programs coordinated jointly by the partners: 167 (of which 14 have equal levels of coordination by the NPS and the Conservancy)
- Volunteer programs that are coordinated primarily by NPS: 112
- Volunteer programs that are coordinated primarily by the Conservancy: 41
- Number of trainings conducted for FY 2014: 49
- Number of volunteers trained for FY 2014: 418
- Introductory training for volunteers: Yes, jointly
- Advanced training for volunteers: Yes, jointly
- Continuing education programs for volunteers: Yes, jointly
- Formal training for volunteer program coordination staff from all volunteer coordination partners: Yes, 3 trainings in FY 2014 for 15 staff

Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) has the largest volunteer program of the cases in this study and in the NPS. GGNRA is an aggregation of sites sprawling over 60 miles along the California coast around San Francisco that includes various features spread over urban, suburban, and rural settings. Overall coordination of volunteer efforts is provided through collaboration between the NPS and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (Parks Conservancy). An additional partner, the Presidio Trust, also supports volunteers but focuses on activities at the Presidio, a former military base located within the park. The impetus for the partnership

and its expansion was provided by leaders of the organizations, Brian O'Neal (NPS) and Greg Moore (Parks Conservancy), who shared a vision for collaboration and seeking community support for GGNRA, to include volunteer programming.

The partners are guided by formal vision, mission, and goal statements developed for the volunteer program. Partners at the GGNRA reconfigured the roles of existing staff to have them lead or supervise individual volunteer programs. The NPS concentrates on coordinating programs that use long-term volunteers, while the Parks Conservancy focuses on organizing short-term, one-day, drop-in, episodic, special event, and group volunteer efforts. Combined with use of 70 interns and 100 experienced volunteers, GGNRA leverages 286 staff to help oversee efforts. Such support allowed, for example, for the scheduling, oversight, and activity of 459 groups and organizations at various GGNRA locations in FY 2013.

Volunteer program staff from the Parks Conservancy and the NPS share space and do joint planning, both formally and informally. Key volunteer program staff and leaders have been with the park or Conservancy for over 20 years. Two Parks Conservancy staff focus on making volunteer arrangements, and a new position was created in 2014 to coordinate the approximately 70 interns (about half at each partner) who support the program. The position is paid through a task agreement in which NPS funds are passed to the Parks Conservancy. Dozens of NPS ranger positions, in all the park divisions, have evolved to recruit and supervise volunteer programs. In all, 186 staff among the partner organizations support the volunteer program, mostly as a portion of their job. In addition, 100 experienced volunteers are involved in program coordination.

The GGNRA partners also use the volunteer program as a tool to increase the diversity of visitors, staff, and volunteers at the park. They particularly seek to entice and prepare youth to become involved. Thus, an NPS ranger leads an Academic Internship program to attract local college students to serve as interns. The internship is governed by MoUs with local colleges. Local K-12 students do service-learning in the park, including some in which they communicate only in Spanish. Another NPS ranger leads college students in a range of electronic and social media volunteer projects, including many in which volunteers work remotely.

Forty percent of the NPS volunteer coordinator's job focuses on interpretive training, and she uses this combination of roles to build a set of training opportunities for volunteers. She helped revamp the traditional volunteer management training provided by the NPS at the national level to make it more practical for NPS volunteer program staff and partners. GGNRA provides training for volunteer coordinators and leaders across the three partner organizations. Many of the trainers and instructors are themselves volunteers from the community.

Table 4.4
Park and Co-coordinated Volunteer Program Features at Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Park Features

- Location: San Francisco area on California coast in western U.S.
- When Designated: 1972
- United Nations International Biosphere Reserve
- Size: 80,624 acres
- Features/Activities: Headlands, hiking, beaches, coastline, trails, historic structures, historic forts, historic prison (Alcatraz), redwoods (Muir Woods), museums, Golden Gate Bridge, archeological sites, lighthouses, national monuments, camping
- Golden Gate National Recreation Area budget 2013: $26.8 million
- Number of Annual Visitors (2013): 16.8 million (National Park Service, 2014f)
- Nearest city with at least 100,000 people: In San Francisco metropolitan area, population estimate of 4.5 million (U.S. Census, 2010)

Features of Co-coordinated Volunteer Program

- Primary volunteer program partners: NPS, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
- Other significant volunteer program partners: The Presidio Trust
- Year the volunteer program partnership between NPS and the Trust was formed: 1988
- Is the volunteer program partnership governed by a formal MoU, MoA, or contract? Not the overall volunteer program partnership; there are MoUs and task agreements for program components
- Number of volunteers for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013: 35,598
- Number of volunteer hours for FY 2014: 491,521
- When volunteering occurs: All year
- Types of volunteering performed by most volunteers: maintenance, interpretation
- Total staff (full and part-time, plus volunteers) who lead volunteer efforts: 286
- NPS expenditures for volunteer program (non-staff) for FY 2014: $90,000
- Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy expenditures for volunteer program (non-staff) for FY 2014: $3,396,158 for youth, volunteer, and community programs (FY 13)
- Other funding sources that support volunteer programming: The Presidio Trust raises and provides funds for volunteer efforts at the Presidio
- Introductory training for volunteers: Yes, jointly
- Advanced training for volunteers: Yes, jointly
- Continuing education opportunities for volunteers: Yes, jointly
- Formal training for volunteer program coordination staff for all partners: Yes, jointly

National Mall and Memorial Parks, and Trust for the National Mall. The National Mall is an entirely urban and developed park. Its primary features are a cluster of memorials and monuments in a defined space adjacent to the U.S. Capitol, Smithsonian museums, and federal offices. There is free, unrestricted access to features in the park from many points. Hundreds of events are permitted on the Mall each year—concerts, festivals, demonstrations, anniversary events, inaugurations, etc.—attracting up to a million people in a day. Millions of visitors each year are from other countries, and K-12 students visit from across the U.S. on school trips. The climate allows for nearly year-round activity, and the area is served by public and private transportation. The

National Mall has more visitors (30 million) each year than any other NPS site—more than the five other cases combined—but has no visitor center or lodging.

As with the other cases, the co-coordinated volunteer program for the National Mall and Memorial Parks (NAMA) has two primary partners—NPS and the Trust for the National Mall (Trust). In addition, other nonprofits are involved with volunteers but focus on their particular sites: the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial Fund, Friends of the World War II Memorial, and the Ford's Theatre Society. Unique among the cases, the Trust and the NPS only partially overlap in their jurisdictions. The Trust is the official nonprofit partner of the NPS, but its mission is to restore, improve, and preserve the traditional area of the National Mall, which stretches from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial (Trust for the National Mall, 2014). By contrast, the NPS has no sites between the Washington Monument and the U.S. Capitol, but its portfolio includes sites outside of the Mall and spread out over downtown Washington, D.C.—scores of historic structures, statues, squares, Ford's Theatre, fountains, and parks. These other sites are not part of the purview of the Trust.

The Trust became involved with the NAMA volunteer program in 2009, supported by a grant from Boeing to create roving volunteers for the eastern side of the Mall. The goal was for these volunteers to educate visitors about the Trust and needs on the Mall. In practice, most visitors were interested in more practical information—i.e., locations of museums, eateries, and restrooms—and having a group of volunteers who were separate from those on the other side of the Mall created confusion, so the Trust and NAMA volunteer programs were combined. Volunteers are a mix of retirees and

working professionals who commute to volunteer; many do not work a set schedule. Instead, they typically just go to a site and volunteer when they can.

From 2010-2014, the volunteer program collaboration evolved such that the Trust became involved in multiple aspects of the volunteer program:

- Continuing to promote and recruit for roving volunteers;
- Purchasing gear for NAMA volunteers (t-shirts, jackets, caps, and backpacks);
- Developing formal orientation and training for new volunteers, including training modules and guides, a training location, and food;
- Helping to revise a volunteer manual, and paying for its printing;
- Creating opportunities for continuing education for volunteers;
- Sharing expenses related to volunteer recognition; and
- Working with NPS staff to organize some corporate days of service on the Mall.

The activities were conducted in collaboration with the NPS. Other volunteer program components, including interpreters at memorials and monuments, bike tours, visitor services, student volunteer programs, other days of service, the Trails and Rails program, and volunteer roles at events on the Mall remain under coordination of the NPS. The co-coordinated activities and roles of the partners were developed informally and are not governed by formal agreements.

The NPS is assessing its capacity for program growth, as it does not want to have more volunteers than it can manage effectively. In fall 2014, the Trust announced it would retrench its participation in the volunteer program to allow it to maximize efforts to achieve its goals developed with NAMA in the *National Mall Plan* (National Park Service, 2007). Beginning in 2015, the Trust's foci emphasized a learning initiative and restoring and rehabilitating Constitution Gardens and a nearby historic Lockkeeper's House. The Trust's Volunteer program participation was circumscribed to providing information to volunteers about its restoration projects and participating in some

corporate days of service. This shift effectively ended most of the co-coordination of volunteer programming between NAMA and the Trust.

Table 4.5
Park and Co-coordinated volunteer Program Features at the National Mall and Memorial Parks

Park Features

- Location: Washington, D.C., in eastern U.S.
- When designated: 1965, but encompasses more longstanding NPS sites
- Size: 1,000 acres
- Features/activities: Monuments, memorials, museums, gardens, concerts, walking, biking, 80 historic structures, festivals, inaugurations, rallies, golf course, sports fields, Ford's Theatre, plus 150 statues, fountains, and parks.
- Other site use: Non-NPS portions of the National Mall include Smithsonian Museums, the U.S. Capitol, and federal office buildings.
- Number of annual visitors (2013): Approximately 30 million (NPS, 2014g)
- Nearest city with 100,000+ people: Washington, a metropolitan area of 5.9 million

Features of Co-coordinated Volunteer Program

- Primary volunteer program partners: NPS and the Trust for the National Mall (Trust)
- Other significant volunteer program partners: Vietnam Veterans' Memorial Fund, Friends of the World War II Memorial, Ford's Theatre Society
- Year the volunteer program partnership between NPS and the Trust was formed: 2009
- Is the volunteer program partnership governed by a formal agreement? No.
- Number of volunteers for Fiscal Year (FY): 6,100
- Number of volunteer hours for FY 2014: 61,465
- When volunteering occurs: All year
- Types of volunteering performed by most volunteers: Interpretation at memorials and monuments, help with organizing events and festivals, maintenance activities
- Total full- and part-time staff and volunteers who oversee volunteer efforts: 17
- NPS expenditures for volunteer program (non-staff) for FY 2014: $24,780
- Park division most involved in the volunteer program: Interpretation and Education
- Primary ways volunteers are used: Providing information and interpretation at sites on the Mall, and assisting with public events on the Mall
- Volunteer programs primarily or solely coordinated by NPS: Interpretation at monuments and memorials, Bike Tours, Cherry Blossom Interpretive Programs, Site Programs, Visitor Services, Trails and Rails, some days of service, special events/festivals/anniversary celebrations, summer student volunteer programs
- Volunteer programs coordinated jointly/collaboratively by the partners (through 2014): Roving volunteers, some days of service, corporate volunteer program

- Some volunteer program expenses paid for by the Trust for the National Mall: training expenses (materials, space, food), volunteer guidebooks, volunteer clothing/gear, recognition events/items/food/space rental
- Basic training for volunteers: Provided jointly by partners
- Advanced training for volunteers: Limited—specialty training provided for branded programs and special events, and some web-based trainings
- Formal training for volunteer program coordination staff: No

Yosemite National Park, and Yosemite Conservancy. The large-scale and popular volunteer programs at Yosemite National Park are coordinated primarily by the NPS and the Yosemite Conservancy. Other nonprofits that provide volunteers and support for them—but which focus primarily on their own constituencies and not on park needs as a whole—include the Sierra Club, Pacific Crest Trail Association, American Hiking Society, Wilderness Volunteers, Boy and Girl Scouts, Student Conservation Association, Geological Society of America, and the National Council for Preservation Education.

Yosemite is one of the oldest national parks (1890) and it pioneered (in 1923) the use of a cooperative agreement between the government and a nonprofit organization (the Yosemite Museum Association) that allowed for fundraising for and a volunteer co-management at a national park. In 1985, the Yosemite Museum Association became the Yosemite Association. In 1988, the Yosemite Fund spun off from the Association to focus on fundraising. In 2010, the Yosemite Association and the Yosemite Fund reunited to form the Yosemite Conservancy (Yosemite Conservancy, 2014). Negotiated and articulated via cooperative and friends group agreements and practiced over decades, the co-coordination of volunteer programming in Yosemite is well-established. The partners have created vision, mission, and goal statements for the volunteer program. In general, the NPS coordinates intern and long-term volunteer programs, while the Yosemite

Conservancy organizes more short-term volunteer opportunities. The Yosemite Conservancy does this by focusing on four branded programs:

1. Visitor Information—Volunteers staying in Yosemite for a month or more offer information to visitors (including about work of the Conservancy) at multiple locations in Yosemite Valley.
2. Work Week—Volunteers conduct maintenance or restoration projects in the park while camping there for a week or more.
3. Corporate Weekend—Organizations that donate $25,000 send staff to conduct a weekend volunteer project in the park. Camping arrangements, meals, and other needs are provided by the Conservancy.
4. Fee Free—Several days each year, entrance fees are waived for all NPS visitors. For some of these days, Conservancy volunteers are allowed to man the park entrance stations and ask visitors to consider donating to the Conservancy. These volunteers are not considered as VIPs by the NPS.

For these four programs, volunteers make arrangements with and through the Conservancy, which communicates with and assembles the volunteers, provides some or all of the volunteer training, and typically supervises the volunteers on-site. The NPS determines what work will be done, where, and when in communication with the Conservancy, participates in some volunteer training, and provides oversight for maintenance projects.

Other nonprofits provide short-term volunteers for the park, primarily for maintenance projects. Like the Conservancy, these groups do their own volunteer recruitment and organizing, and work with the NPS volunteer coordinator for scheduling, arranging camping sites, and work assignments. Such partner legwork is essential because the park lacks staff to plan for and schedule individual volunteers. Volunteers address needs across all the NPS divisions at Yosemite, and dozens of park rangers lead volunteer programs as a collateral duty. During the peak visitor season, a Conservancy staff member works full-time out of an office in Yosemite Valley.

Because of its remote location, 95% of all volunteers are lodged in the park. Finding and scheduling campsites is a significant component of volunteer program planning. Recruiting volunteers is not a challenge. Each year many would-be volunteers are turned away because there is no camping space for them. Most of the volunteers, in fact, pay a fee ($200 a person, for example, to participate in the Work Week program) to help cover Conservancy expenses. At the same time, many volunteers return year after year, and park staff note that some people volunteer in order to obtain a place to camp, as camping sites in general are in very high demand. Growth of volunteer efforts is constrained by available camping space.

Executive-level staff from the partner organizations meet each year to discuss and determine plans and priorities. NPS staff draw up prioritized lists of needs, 50-75 in a given year, and provide them to the Conservancy. The NPS then submits proposals to the Conservancy, which considers the requests, their alignment with the Conservancy mission, their level of priority to the NPS, and awards funds for projects. In 2013, the Conservancy gave $9,770,310 in aid to the park (Financial Statements, 2014), including projects that involved volunteers. There is discussion at the Conservancy around the cost, mission-fit, and value of the Conservancy-sponsored Visitor Information and Work Week volunteer programs, which cost more revenue than they generate. The NPS expresses a strong desire to maintain these two partner programs, however, and so far the Conservancy continues to underwrite them.

Table 4.6
Park and Co-coordinated Volunteer Program Features at Yosemite National Park

Park Features
• Location: Central California in western U.S. • When Designated: As a state preserve in 1864, as a national park in 1890 • World Heritage site

- Size: 747,956 acres (1,200 square miles)
- Features/Activities: Mountains, rivers, waterfalls, hiking, mountain climbing, skiing, golf, sequoia groves, valley and alpine areas, lakes, charismatic mega-fauna, forests, wetlands, meadows, free shuttle system in park, camping, lodging
- Number of Annual Visitors (2013): 3.7 million (National Park Service, 2014h)
- Nearest city with at least 100,000 people: Modesto (110 miles)

Features of Co-coordinated Volunteer Program

- Primary volunteer program partners: NPS, the Yosemite Conservancy
- Is the volunteer program partnership governed wholly or partly by a formal MoU, MoA, or contract? Yes—both a cooperative agreement and a task agreement
- Year the volunteer program partnership was formed: Earliest nonprofit volunteers worked with the Yosemite Museum in 1923
- Is the volunteer program partnership wholly or partly governed by a formal MoU, MoA, or contract? Yes, cooperating association and friends group agreements
- Number of volunteers for Fiscal Year (FY 2014): 10,418
- Number of volunteer hours for FY 2014: 163,539
- When volunteering occurs: Primarily in the summer
- Total staff part- or full time staff and volunteers who oversee volunteer efforts: 101
- NPS expenditures for volunteer program for FY 2014: $192,000
- Park divisions involved in volunteer programming: All, of which 3 (Interpretation, Facilities, Resources Management) work with the Conservancy
- Park divisions most involved in volunteer programming: Interpretation, Facilities, Resources Management
- Primary ways that most volunteers are used: Interpretation, maintenance
- Volunteer programs coordinated primarily by the Yosemite Conservancy: Visitor Information, Work Week, Corporate Weekend, Fee Free
- Volunteer programs coordinated jointly by the partners: Artists in Parks
- Volunteer programs solely coordinated by NPS: All other volunteer programs
- Volunteer program expenses paid by the Yosemite Conservancy: Staff, recognition items for volunteers, food, cooks for work weeks and corporate weekends, marketing materials, some materials used in volunteer projects
- Introductory training for all volunteers: Yes, both jointly and separately
- Advanced training for volunteers: Yes, for volunteers in specific volunteer programs
- Continuing education training: Yes, both jointly and separately
- Safety/CPR training: Yes, both jointly and separately
- Formal training for volunteer program coordination staff: Annual volunteer management training, small-group workshops for supervisors and special programs
- How many staff trained: Approximately 30 for FY 2014

Common structures and elements among the cases. Table 4.7 lists examples of recurring components in the cases of co-managed volunteer programs that emerged in the study, by order of frequency. Of the 27 examples listed, 15 are employed by all of the cases, and 22 by at least 4 cases.

Table 4.7
Common Structures and Elements among Cases of Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs

Program Structure or Element	NPS Unit					
	Aca	Ar & C	CV	GG	Na Ma	Yo
Having a paid volunteer coordinator at the NPS unit	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of NPS rangers to lead volunteer groups	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of interns as volunteers	•	•	•	•	•	•
Used partnership to expand volunteer program staff	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of long-term (a month or more) volunteers	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of days of service volunteer programs	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of student or school volunteer programs	•	•	•	•	•	•
NPS unit provides parks a needs priority list to the nonprofit partner, to include volunteer programs	•	•	•	•	•	•
Periodic NPS unit and nonprofit meetings to discuss collaboration plans, including for volunteer programs	•	•	•	•	•	•
Some volunteer programs led primarily by the nonprofit	•	•	•	•	•	•
Some volunteer programs jointly led by the partners	•	•	•	•	•	•
Adherence to 12 components of effective volunteer program management by single organizations	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of nonprofit funds to pay for volunteer program items or staff that the park cannot purchase	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of experienced volunteers to lead other volunteers	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use of branded volunteer programs to attract volunteer support, stewardship, and donors	•	•	•	•	•	•
Co-location of partner staff	•	•	•	•		•
Some volunteer programs led primarily by the NPS unit	•	•		•	•	•

Program Structure or Element	NPS Unit					
	Aca	Ar & C	CV	GG	Na Ma	Yo
Having a paid volunteer coordinator at the nonprofit	•		•	•	•	•
Long-serving staff in key volunteer program positions	•		•	•		•
Use of cooperative agreements governing the volunteer program partnership	•		•	•		•
Staff from other nonprofits lead volunteer groups		•	•	•	•	
Use of other nonprofit partners to provide support specifically for the volunteer program		•	•	•	•	
Formal drop-in volunteer programs	•		•	•		
Use of interns to help coordinate volunteer programs	•			•		•
Lodging provided for at least some volunteers		•		•		•
Development of vision, mission, and goal statements specifically for the volunteer program			•	•		•
Use of endowments to support volunteer programming	•			•		

Key to abbreviations: Aca=Acadia, Ar&C=Arches & Canyonlands, CV=Cuyahoga Valley, GG=Golden Gate, NaMa=National Mall, Yo=Yosemite

The following four categorical sections provide cross-case comparisons related to why and how the volunteer program partners collaborate (Category 1), how their volunteer programs are designed and structured (Category 2), impacts that the collaboration and design are having on both the partnership and on the co-coordinated volunteer programs (Category 3), and pressures exerted on each case that lead to either conformity or distinctiveness in the co-coordinated volunteer programs (Category 4).

Category 1: Reasons and Approaches for Collaborating to Co-coordinate Volunteer Programming

In this category, explanations are offered from the cases related to the reasons why and ways in which they chose to collaborate around the volunteer program at each NPS unit. The category is subdivided into six themes:

1. Reasons for forming the volunteer program collaboration,

2. Stages of development of the volunteer program collaboration,
3. Balancing autonomy and interdependence in the collaboration,
4. Strategies to support successful collaboration,
5. Strategies to forestall or address collaboration challenges, and
6. An unanticipated strategy that supports collaboration.

Reasons for forming the volunteer program collaboration. The cases chose to collaborate for a variety of reasons, and typically out of multiple motives. Their reasons include meeting mutual goals, responding to a crisis, because of inspirational leadership, out of ambition, to tap different skills across sectors, organically expanding existing relationships, to get more resources or expertise, to grow, because peer organizations have also done so, to address complex problems one organization could not solve alone, and/or to be more adaptable in the face of challenges, government restrictions, opportunities, turbulence, and complexity.

Participants from all the cases gave these types of reasons for expanding their existing partnerships and collaborating around volunteer programs. A representative sample of their rationales is provided in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8
Reasons for Collaborating on Volunteer Programs

Site—Organization	Quote
Acadia—Friends of Acadia	The leadership . . . really wanted to see us involved in on-the-ground stewardship, developments, and opportunities. . . . it might have been a hybrid of both need and the interest of the early leadership.
Acadia—NPS	Well, the crisis was the fact that stuff wasn't getting done, and the park had very little staff with which to do it.
Arches-Canyonlands—NPS	The volunteer program is designed to fill gaps, that is, what park staff can't complete in a fiscal year, to allow NPS staff to do other work.
Arches-Canyonlands—Friends group	The Friends wanted to have a more significant impact . . . This led to conversations with NPS staff . . . that led to the creation of the Cultural Resource Monitoring program . . . to help the NPS protect and preserve cultural and historical resources in the parks. They [NPS] they realized that these were areas where NPS needed more boots on the ground.

Cuyahoga Valley—NPS	I think the thought was that the partner could bring to the table—maybe someone more cost-effectively could have been it. Maybe more re: flexibility in the hiring process. That they could be a little more nimble maybe, we like to say in government . . . We are cutting-edge, and we always go up against what the rules are and see how far we can go to see what we can do to have really vibrant programming here.
Cuyahoga Valley—Friends group	The park and the Conservancy saw this co-management role as a win-win situation for both of us. We would provide a higher level of service for the volunteer program, bring additional staff to the picture, and we would have access to volunteers for their time and their potential financial support.
Cuyahoga Valley—Friends group	They were short on staff, and it was a time when the Park Service budget was really beginning to crumble . . . The Friends group at the same time was looking to expand its role in community engagement. And we realized that there would be a really nice synergy if they took the volunteer program on as a component of community engagement.
Golden Gate—Conservancy	I think it was organic. I think that the volunteer hub . . . landed in the Conservancy because I think that we have the most flexibility in terms of being the liaison between all of the partners.
National Mall—NPS	It kind of evolved out of the partnership that we already had based on trying to meet a need that . . . had never been met . . . It all comes back to the mission and goes toward helping us to achieve our mission better.
National Mall—Trust	They have certain regulations that they must follow that we don't have to follow. And so we are often in a situation where we say, 'Let's do this. We can pay for it" . . . We're a 20-person nonprofit. We're ready to go.
Yosemite—NPS	The Yosemite Association was set up in large part to do the things the Park Service legally couldn't do, like publications.
Yosemite—Conservancy	As the park and 'visitorship' grew, there was a larger need for volunteer assistance. The Park Service couldn't handle it all . . . The Park Service has been adamant as our defenders and said, 'look, we need these guys to help us. We cannot manage visitors without them.'

The partners collaborated on the volunteer programs purposefully because they needed more resources and expertise, wanted their programs to grow, wanted to address more needs in the parks, and sought to engage more visitors and volunteers. NPS funding reductions (cited in Chapter 1 and mentioned by interviewees) not only meant there was a greater need for volunteers, but also fewer park staff to work with them.

Because the NPS units and their dedicated nonprofit partners have goal congruity and share the same mission—to support and care for the parks—diminution of the NPS capacity to meet its mission translates to the nonprofit not meeting its mission either. At the same time the situation created an opportunity for the nonprofit partners to expand their efforts and outreach to potential donors (both volunteers and park visitors) through helping to run the volunteer program.

Support of organizational leaders. Interviewees at five of the six cases described the roles of high-level leaders who not only inspired, but also supported or led the interorganizational collaborations. These embedded actors used skills, connections, resources, and strategies to realize their interests within their organizations. In addition, they took advantage of field conditions that created an atmosphere where change was possible. These highly placed individuals played a key part in promoting the idea of cross-sector collaboration around the volunteer programs. They were then influential in getting the collaborations started and in supporting them once they began.

The Friends group executive director for Arches & Canyonlands was the organization's only employee when she worked with the NPS to create the Cultural Resource Monitoring program in 2011, in which Friends group volunteers helped protect petroglyphs and other historic sites. She later worked with the park to establish additional volunteer programs led by the Friends group to meet park needs. At both Cuyahoga Valley and Golden Gate, pairs of institutional entrepreneurs teamed together to expand the role of the nonprofit organizations into playing significant roles in coordinating volunteer programs. The partners consisted of the park superintendents and the executive directors of the nonprofit partners. In both cases the nonprofit executive

directors had previously served in management positions at the NPS units. The Cuyahoga Valley NPS superintendent had a specific vision for expanding the volunteer program:

> The park superintendent identified the need for a bolder volunteer program . . . The superintendent thought that there was a need to have a high-level, creative visionary strategic thinker to manage the program. Add to that a second management person to focus on the administrative needs of the program. He recognized that it would be impossible for the NPS to hire and sustain two full time positions. His vision was for the NPS to pass enough money to the nonprofit to provide two full-time positions and then have a park ranger on at least a part-time basis manage the required NPS functions.

The superintendent's Conservancy partner had a similar vision:

> You could argue is it all part of [his] grand scheme. He was sort of the visionary for 16 years as our park superintendent and now he works at the Conservancy . . . it probably couldn't have happened without him being an advocate for the level of comfort with partnerships. I think [he] . . . had ambitions greater than the federal government would ever accomplish.

These leaders then co-led efforts to enact this shared vision at Cuyahoga Valley, the only NPS unit in which day-to-day volunteer program coordination is led by the nonprofit partner.

At Golden Gate, the two organizational leaders worked in complementary ways to enact a common vision for collaboration between the NPS unit and the Conservancy, as described by the NPS volunteer coordinator:

> Greg . . . was our Chief of Interpretation here at Golden Gate before he took over the Parks Conservancy. And he had that same vision, that same direction to try and make a difference. So when situations happened they both would jump in. It was Brian who, after a group of us went to a training course in the early 90s—it was a horrible Park Service training course . . . And we came back saying, 'you know . . . we feel if we just had a committee in the park that . . . really keyed in on what we wanted to get accomplished, we could get and hit goals.' And he said 'okay, who do you want on it? Send me a list.' And so he allowed the bottom to tell the top what could be done, and went with it . . . And Greg . . . will write

> anything for you to get people geared up and wanting to help. So that combination was tremendous.

These leaders had a vision for co-collaborative volunteer programs and the skills, connections, charisma, and persuasive skills to work to initiate and sustain the new ideas they were promoting around volunteer co-management. They seized opportunities and worked within their existing rules and systems to transform volunteer structures and programs. They tapped their organizations' capacity for change within the existing rules and had the ability to articulate their vision to others whom then they gave the charge of carrying it out.

At the program level, design and enactment of co-coordinated volunteer CSSPs are in the hands of volunteer coordinators and their immediate supervisors. These actors must translate visions into action, and in some of the cases program staff displayed entrepreneurialism that was similar to that of their leaders. Ambition for improving the volunteer program was a clear driver for partners at Cuyahoga Valley, said an NPS interviewee:

> We don't want to just do what Congress cares to fund us for . . . I think it's that kind of like, maybe frustration with the hierarchy and within our own organization and the limitations of that, both intellectually and in vision, and financially. We're more ambitious. And we have a big population. We have ambitions but we're sitting around all those other people who can help us.

The Cuyahoga Valley NPS volunteer coordinator expressed similar sentiments, noting that the co-managed program's success is the result of a team thinking and acting entrepreneurially:

> I think it was—we could really blow this thing up [in scale]. And I think that was our realization that got [the partners] to start talking to say, 'look if we were to bring this together, what could it be?" And part of what could be is that it could be a whole lot better. And that's what I have seen.

> The growth just in the five years of having just kind of playing with the 'what if?'

Thus, there is evidence in four of the cases of essential leadership at the highest levels of the partnerships, and in some cases at the program and middle management levels.

Stages of development of the volunteer program collaboration. The six cases are at very different levels of development, from Arches & Canyonlands, which launched its first multifaceted volunteer program initiative in 2014, to Yosemite, where the NPS and nonprofit partners have collaborated around volunteer programming since 1923. Whatever their current level of partnership development, all the cases indicated that they had passed through very similar stages of development. In general terms, these stages could be characterized as a sequence that includes problem setting, direction setting, implementation, and periodic evaluation/reassessment of the partnership.

For some cases, this process was formalized, for others it was mostly informal, and for others it was a combination of formal and informal discussions, agreements, and activities. Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite have formal agreements that govern their volunteer program partnerships. These sites also have formal sub-agreements around specific volunteer projects or initiatives, as does Acadia. All the partnerships identified areas of need (i.e., problem-setting), set priorities and agreed on roles and responsibilities of each partner on specific volunteer projects (direction setting), collaboratively conducted and managed volunteer programs (implementation), and assessed the results and value of their partnership (except the partnership at Arches and Canyonlands, which is too new).

Along related lines, interviewees from each partnership were asked whether their volunteer program partnership development was trending toward growth, maintenance, or

retrenching. All said the level and scope of the volunteer partnership was either maintaining or increasing; all also said they would like it to increase. At the same time, nearly all the answers were conditional and contingent on resources, staffing, and partner assessments of the value of the program (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9
Do You See the Volunteer Program Partnership as Growing, Maintaining, or Decreasing?

Site—Organization	Response
Acadia—NPS	I am pretty happy with the way things are . . . I would not want to see a much bigger crowd than we had, say on Tuesday morning. If . . . it starts to swell then that really does put a tax on our current resources.
Acadia—Friends of Acadia	Numbers of volunteers . . . have been increasing every year . . . we're not trying to increase it. So at some point maybe we're going to have face down the road when, if this trend continues, we're going to have to add another staff person. Or . . . move toward year-round staffing and better training.
Arches & Canyonlands—Friends group	I would just like to see more participants, more volunteers to have a stronger partnership between both organizations.
Cuyahoga Valley—Friends group	There's room for growth if there are resources to allow it to grow, but I think we also have to be careful of not growing it beyond our resources to manage it well.
National Mall—NPS	I'd like for the partnership to continue to grow . . . We have a way to go, but I think we can get there through some of these methods that we described earlier in terms of understanding and 'getting real' [laughs].
National Mall—Trust for the National Mall	[There] are the only two choices. Either NAMA says, 'we can take on more,' or NAMA says 'you can take on more, and we'll divest ourselves of some responsibilities." Although without one or two of those things happening, we can't aggressively grow the program.
Yosemite—NPS	There's what I see, and there's what I want. I see it maintaining right now . . . I would love to see it grow . . . I think there is not a lot of move for [the Conservancy] to get more money to be able to expand, but I would love to see us have that opportunity to have more.
Yosemite—Conservancy	I see it growing, and I don't see the park becoming any less engaged with us. . . . They just don't have the staff and the money to do it, you know? It's going to just become ever-more dependent on volunteers . . . As to how we go about doing that, I think it is still an adjustment.

According to interviewees, their partnerships and programs continue to emerge, evolve, and face ongoing challenges related to growth.

In terms of the level of development of their volunteer program partnership, all the cases address needs around conservation, historical preservation, and community engagement. By working together across the public and nonprofit sectors, they strive to have a wider impact than they can acting alone or just within their sectors. Three of the cases offered evidence that they have moved into a higher level in their relationship, where distinctions between the partners and their organizations have begun to blur or even disappear. Several interviewees from Golden Gate made statements to this effect:

- NPS volunteer coordinator: You could have us all in the same room, out of uniform, and you wouldn't be able if you did not know us . . . which one was Park Service and which was Conservancy, because as far as we're concerned we work for Golden Gate National Park's volunteer program.
- NPS ranger: The partnership here is just seamless. I mean I think of the Conservancy as co-workers, not as another organization. When it comes to 'us' and 'them,' there is no 'them.' It's just an 'us.'
- Volunteer coordinator: From day one that I started working here, the partnership aspect was made clear to me and how vital it was to what we do. . . . I always encourage my team to consider the partnership before they consider just the benefit to us."
- Conservancy staff: At the volunteer level we don't see boundaries between the organizations. We treat everybody equally.

Organization and volunteer program leaders at Cuyahoga Valley expressed similar views about their partnership:

- Conservancy group executive director: As you talk to NPS staff, they will describe the team as a unit. . . . It's the 'volunteer center staff,' and it doesn't matter who works for the NPS and who works for the Conservancy. We have a culture in our organization . . . that we work for the National Park Service.
- Cuyahoga NPS volunteer program manager: I never think of it as 'us' and 'them.' I think . . . for the volunteer stuff it always goes under the Park Service brand. So in some ways, who cares how we made the sausage?

Similar comments were made by interviewees from Yosemite:

- NPS volunteer coordinator: I look at the Conservancy programs as just another Park Service program, the supervisor of which doesn't happen to be a Park Service employee. I don't really distinguish between [her Conservancy counterpart] and another division coordinator . . . I just don't see that line where it's non-Park Service for me.
- Conservancy volunteer coordinator: Yosemite is like a family and we're all kind of looking out for each other. . . . We have that same spirit and it seems to flow over everything that we're trying to deal with.

These three cases are also the largest—in terms of numbers of volunteers, volunteer projects and hours, partners, etc.—of the partnerships in this study.

Balancing autonomy and interdependence in the collaboration. In all of these partnerships the nonprofit was created specifically to support the other partner—the NPS site. In addition, in most cases they were already collaborating before they decided to expand their partnership to the volunteer program. Most organizational collaborations represent a balance of autonomy and interdependence between the partners, in which each stakeholder gives up some power, control, or resources but also receives some in return while maintaining its overall identity (Bedwell et al, 2010; Brinkerhoff, 2002; Cropper et al., 2010; Gray, 1985, 1989; Thompson et al., 2009). In interviews, representatives from the cases related this topic as a common challenge at the organizational and staff levels.

At the organizational level, some interviewees cited tensions around the reversal of traditional government-nonprofit roles in the sense that the nonprofit is giving funds to the government agency, rather than the other way around. At varying levels, the nonprofits in this study decide how the funds they raise will be spent at their NPS partner sites. This process is typically negotiated at the executive levels, whereby NPS staff draft priority lists of needs, there is high-level discussion, and funding decisions are made.

The Yosemite Conservancy, for example, awards funds for park projects via a formal grant program.

These decisions and decision-making processes regarding use of funds from nonprofits to their NPS partners occasioned tension in some staff, particularly NPS staff. For example, it is not uncommon for nonprofit partners to be given funds from donors for specific projects that may not address NPS goals. When these gifts do not align with NPS-identified priorities, NPS interviewees acknowledged that some of their colleagues felt that, as one interviewee put it, 'the tail is wagging the dog'—that is, the nonprofit is driving the agenda at the national park through its funds. NPS interviewees noted, however, that meeting donor wishes was a fact of life, regardless of whether it impacted the volunteer program or which partner received the funds. As noted by an NPS volunteer coordinator:

> Obviously, some people in the park have different focuses. Somebody working on trails, their view of what's needed in the park is different than someone working in education. And so, when that grant money comes in, it's viewed differently, especially by, say somebody from park staff . . . who doesn't get any benefit from funds.

On the other side, nonprofit partner interviewees at three of the sites (Yosemite, Cuyahoga Valley, and Golden Gate) said their policy was to not seek, or even to refuse, funds from donors that did not align with or could not be used to address park priorities. As noted by the leader of one of the nonprofit partners:

> Sometimes a donor's going to want to fund something that has not been identified as a priority for the park, and then you have to really work with the park to say, 'alright, if it isn't a priority can it still happen?' . . . Or you as a nonprofit have to say 'no' to your donor—that that can happen too. And frankly . . . we shouldn't be out asking for money for things that the park doesn't consider as important.

Overall, interviewees across the cases said their partnerships were a working balance of autonomy and interdependence. Several nonprofit interviewees, in fact, went out of their way to acknowledge that, whatever autonomy and influence their organizations had, their ultimate purpose was to serve and support their NPS partner (See Table 4.10).

Table 4.10
Balance of Autonomy and Interdependence in the Volunteer Program Partnerships

Site—Organization	Quote
Acadia—Friends of Acadia	It seems to be very important not take away the ownership from the park staff over their programs even though we are helping a significant amount to make that program happen.
Cuyahoga Valley—NPS	The partners need to have their own identity . . . they're not our pawns to do whatever the heck the government wants. They have their own desires, interests, priorities, things that they comfortably can do . . . You want them to be strong . . . it's a strong partnership when the other partner is strong.
Cuyahoga Valley—Friends group	I would say there's probably over time a greater interdependence. We tried to set this up in a team construct so that the Park Service staff and the Conservancy staff serve as a team, with little difference between who is a uniformed park ranger and who is not.
Golden Gate—Conservancy	I feel like we have a very strong identity. I . . . don't think it's a concern for us. I think that we could a better job of promoting during our programming . . . we have to strike a balance there . . . It can't be a hard sell.
National Mall—Trust	I don't think there is autonomy. At least from our side . . . We're there to help them with what they need to do. I don't think we do stuff on our own.
Yosemite—NPS	Even though I know that I actually am responsible for [her Conservancy counterpart's] work and her program and technically I oversee that, for her purposes she's in charge of it, and we're co-workers, we're colleagues, and it's not hierarchical . . . we are equals working together.
Yosemite—Conservancy	The balance of autonomy works very well . . . in terms of the day-to-day management of the Conservancy volunteer program I think the Conservancy has pretty much absolute autonomy in terms of recruiting, screening, training, the assigning of volunteers.

For the nonprofit partners, the primary identity-related challenge is ensuring that visitors, volunteers, and other potential donors distinguish them from their NPS partners

at park volunteer programs and events. In the largest cases, an unanticipated consequence of having a 'seamless' partnership was that potential supporters were sometimes unaware of the role of the nonprofit partner because it was working so closely with the NPS partner that the public did not recognize the nonprofit as a separate entity:

- Golden Gate Conservancy volunteer coordinator: We did a survey a few years back of volunteers . . . and we asked folks, 'so who do you volunteer for?' And some of them were like, 'I volunteer for Land's End.' 'I volunteer for park stewardship.' 'I volunteer for Trails Forever' [laughs]. Very few of them even got an organization in there.
- Friends of Acadia volunteer coordinator: One of our Board members first started volunteering with the Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday program, and when she got her t-shirt, she did ask the leader, 'why is this Friends of Acadia?' So it wasn't clear to her about how FOA was supporting the volunteer program.
- Friends of Cuyahoga Valley volunteer coordinator: A lot of times it looks like it is just the park . . . I might be there in my Conservancy shirt, but there really isn't a lot of messaging that we do . . . You know we might say quickly, '. . . this is brought on by the park and the Conservancy.' But really we don't have a big identifier right now as that.

To address this nonprofit identity/recognition issue, which impacts the nonprofit's ability to fundraise, the nonprofit partners typically use presentations, branded materials and volunteer clothing, training, and recognition events to get their organizational identity across to volunteers, park visitors, and potential donors. At Yosemite, Conservancy volunteers are allowed to set up tables and booths with information about their organization and to obtain contact information from visitors for follow-up donor solicitations.

Challenges to collaboration. In addition to the issues identified above around control of funds, autonomy, and identity of the partners, the cases in this study face challenges related to power sharing, different cultural norms and expectations, communication, resistance to change, technical and logistical complexities, and the

difficulty of sustaining relationships. Based on content analysis, numerous challenges to co-coordinating volunteer programs at NPS units were identified. Table 4.11 itemizes 27 challenges that emerged that were either (1) raised by interviewees at two or more cases, or (2) articulated as a significant challenge at a single case. The challenges or barriers are listed in order of the frequency they were mentioned.

Table 4.11
Volunteer Program Collaboration Challenges Described by NPS or Nonprofit Interviewees

Collaboration Challenge	Cases that raised it
Lack of appreciation of volunteer programs by some NPS staff or divisions	5
Resistance by some NPS staff to assuming volunteer leadership roles	5
Bureaucratic hurdles to collaborating/doing things in new or different ways	5
Overwhelmed trying to run the volunteer program at current staffing levels	4
Fear the nonprofit will take over/push its agenda on the park	4
Staff turnover disrupts collaboration and continuity	4
Volunteers have conflicting or confused identifications and loyalties	4
Volunteer coordinators are excluded from high-level program decision-making	3
Nonprofit maintaining a strong identity in order to fundraise effectively	3
Hard to collaborate in a spread-out park	3
Pressure to fund programs that are not park priorities	3
Remote location of NPS site hinders communication among partners	3
Challenges in sharing electronic files because of NPS computer firewalls	3
Lack of sufficient or effective communications	2
Lack of national-level NPS support of volunteer program co-management	2
Partner perceived as pushing or taking unilateral action	2
Doubt that the partnership is effectively meeting the mission of a partner	2
Concerns about power of one partner over another	2
Getting leadership support and buy-in to the collaboration	2
Supporting the volunteer program viewed as a money-loser by the nonprofit	2
Different organizational cultures	1
Lack of formal agreements between the partners	1
Lack of volunteer support of the nonprofit partner	1

The commonality of the above collaboration challenges, even in the largest, most established, and most structured cases of co-coordinated NPS-unit volunteer programs,

suggests that the occurrence of such challenges may be an inevitable—even a natural—component of interorganizational collaboration, even when the partners essentially share the same mission.

Strategies to support successful collaboration. Just as the partners in these cases identify and face a range of challenges, they also employ multiple strategies to maintain and strengthen their partnership and address challenges. The partnerships also use other, context-specific strategies. Moreover, the largest and most established cases have more strategies (both formal and informal) than the smaller and newer cases. Table 4.12 illustrates the range of strategies that interviewees said they employ to support collaboration, by case and from most-mentioned to least-mentioned. The new volunteer partnership at Arches & Canyonlands has encountered few challenges to date; the need has not yet arisen for a suite of strategies.

Table 4.12
Volunteer Program Strategies to Support Collaboration

Strategy	NPS Unit					
	Aca	Ar & C	CV	GG	Na Ma	Yo
Regular communication at multiple levels, including both formal and informal planning meeting	•	•	•	•	•	•
Working out problems as they arise, at the program level when possible	•	•	•	•	•	•
Annual high-level meetings/annual planning/multi-year plans to set the course for the program	•	•	•	•	•	•
Assigning/choosing volunteer roles and responsibilities based on history, areas of interest, need, and expertise	•	•	•	•	•	•
Having a cordial working relationship between partners	•	•	•	•	•	•
Having a strong relationship between the two partner volunteer coordinators		•	•	•	•	•
Evaluating the partnership to identify/address challenges	•		•	•	•	•
Co-location of partner staff	•		•	•		•

Strategy	NPS Unit					
	Aca	Ar & C	CV	GG	Na Ma	Yo
Having a good relationship between the organizations' top leaders		•	•	•	•	
Having formal agreements, MOAs, or MOUs for at least some volunteer program components	•		•	•		•
Multi-level negotiation related to expenditure decisions	•		•	•		•
NPS partner recognizes and supports the nonprofit partner's need to promote its identity to potential donors within volunteer program activities	•		•	•		•
Working together across organizations on grants and other funding opportunities	•		•	•		•
Applying creative solutions to problems, including working around established procedures and rules	•		•	•		•
Love for the site drives collegiality and problem solving, because mutual desire to protect the site is stronger than any conflict	•			•		•
Having a formal agreement governing the overall volunteer program partnership			•	•		•
Seeing the partner organization as part of one's own organization; breaking down barriers between the partners, shedding egos, seeing partners as a single team			•	•		•
Training of NPS staff and talking about the benefits of volunteers to get their buy in and support			•	•		•
Seeing partners as equals			•	•		•
Giving volunteer program leaders autonomy/flexibility			•	•		•
Backing the other partner up in times of crisis, legal issues, or need			•	•		•
The nonprofit not seeking, and even refusing donations or projects that do not align with park priorities			•	•		•
Trusting and respecting your counterpart partners			•	•		•
Compromising, give and take			•		•	
Having an interorganizational advisory group			•			
Applying lessons learned from past mistakes			•			
Avoiding redundancy of effort among the partners			•			

Key to abbreviations: Aca=Acadia, Ar&C=Arches & Canyonlands, CV=Cuyahoga Valley, GG=Golden Gate, NaMa=National Mall, Yo=Yosemite

The above list includes formal and informal systems, strategies, and attitudes to both support partners or to prevent and respond to or ameliorate conflicts that inevitably

attend collaboration. As listed in Table 4.12, 5 strategies are used by all of the cases, 14 are used by at least 4 of the cases, and 23 are used by at least half of the cases. The most frequently mentioned strategies are discussed below.

Constant communication. The importance of regular communication (both formal and informal) and ease of communication was a leitmotif in interviews. Participants said that not only was it vital that they and their partners communicate regularly—often daily—but that these communications were made simpler by co-locating staff:

- Acadia—NPS volunteer coordinator: We talk all the time. We have three adjacent cubicles.
- Acadia—Friends group volunteer coordinator: We don't hesitate to call up individual staff members with any issue or anything we want to talk about. So I really think that person-to-person link is critical. And it's strong here.
- Cuyahoga Valley Friends group executive director: I have worked with three superintendents and it has been important to develop a trusting relationship with each of them. We talk almost every day. We have formal, set meetings. When we sit down to do prioritizing there is never a surprise.
- Golden Gate—Conservancy volunteer coordinator: As far as communication goes, it really, I guess it is informal, but we're in contact every day . . . I think that we work very hard to hear each other.
- Golden Gate—NPS Ranger: Basically I talk to the Conservancy, the people I work with virtually on a day-to-day basis . . . I think communication is the key. I think being in the same building is . . . the best.
- National Mall—NPS volunteer coordinator: The Trust is literally almost across the road here [laughs], so that's kind of nice. They're in close proximity so we can get to each other very easily.
- National Mall—nonprofit volunteer coordinator: [We speak] several times a day . . . we constantly go to each other's offices. And when we're not, we're dealing with e-mail and phone calls, we're meeting at Starbuck's.
- Yosemite—NPS Ranger: As a result of these monthly meetings that we have had for many, many years, it's constantly a way to check in. . . . So that certainly is a very formalized thing that works extremely well.
- Yosemite—Conservancy volunteer coordinator: Another thing that is a priority is keeping all the communication lines open and current.

Formal agreements. Four of the six cases have formal agreements—cooperative agreements, memoranda of understanding, memoranda of agreement, etc.—that govern either the overall volunteer program partnership between the two primary partners or aspects of/programs within the overall partnership. For these cases, the agreements provide structure, allow for creative action, and articulate roles and responsibilities for cooperative volunteer efforts. The Friends of Acadia volunteer coordinator described the use of MoUs to govern four multi-million dollar endowments they have established that support volunteer programming:

> We . . . have memoranda of understanding . . . wherever there is a significant management, long-term funding that we proceed to establish a MoU . . . to make sure that the Park Service is assured that if the Friends of Acadia were to go away, that the funding would . . . proceed to some other organization or back to the Park Service for management.

At Cuyahoga Valley, a 2008 cooperative agreement between the NPS and the Conservancy was designed to be—and has become—a key tool for expanding the volunteer program, which had been coordinated until that time by a single NPS ranger as a collateral duty. The agreement allowed the partners to more effectively combine their resources and expand the number of positions to support volunteer efforts:

> What changed with the cooperative agreement was being able to take the funds directed towards staff that was then NPS staff directed over to the Conservancy that could then be able to spread those funds out to hire actually more people. Now we have a lot more people who are able to focus on volunteer management.

Subsequent and secondary agreements with other nonprofit partners—the Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad and Countryside Conservancy—not only created many more volunteer opportunities but also tapped staff at the other nonprofits to lead volunteers

who worked on their sites. As a result, Cuyahoga Valley has 167 different volunteer jobs with staff to supervise them.

Interorganizational support or advisory group. All the partnerships hold high-level cross-sector management team meetings on approximately an annual basis for planning. These groups operate along similar lines, with the management teams addressing the full range of their partnership, of which volunteer programming represents a part. Volunteer coordinators submit recommendations and requests for these meetings, but typically do not attend them. Of the six cases on this study, only Cuyahoga Valley uses an inter-partner advisory group, a 'sounding board' with high-level staff from both the NPS and the Friends group that provides counsel and direction to the volunteer coordinator at the Friends group. This group had not met much over the past year, however.

Proactively addressing conflicts. Another common tactic employed in the partnerships was for the volunteer program coordinators to try, as much as possible, to resolve issues and conflict at their level. In doing so, they sought to keep problems from festering, growing, remaining unresolved, or having to be addressed by higher-echelon staff. The volunteer coordinators said they were able to resolve most problems among themselves. Resolution was made easier, some noted, when there was trust and respect between the staffs at the NPS and the nonprofit partner (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13
Proactive Responses to Challenges

Park—Organization	Quote
Acadia—NPS	Addressing challenges—we first hope those challenges do not arise, and when they do, I suppose try and deal with them as best we can.
Acadia—Friends group	If they have issues among the three of them they talk it out on a staff-to-staff level. And that seems to work pretty well.

Arches & Canyonlands—NPS	We just communicate with each other directly. That's handy. We'll see how long this continues.
Cuyahoga Valley—Friends Group	We're the sounding board, and if there are things they can't resolve or that they just want another voice for they come to us. We meet a couple of times a year, but they also can come to us at any point.
Golden Gate—Conservancy	On the volunteer coordinator level, we've created a close bond . . . When we're all on the same page as coordinators, then it's kind of easy. We're not fighting against each other and kind of letting these conflicts role down to the program managers.
National Mall—Trust	[My NPS counterpart] and I try as best as possible to solve everything ourselves. Undoubtedly there's always going to be something that we just can't solve because it's just too big . . . Then of course [my counterpart] has a person she reports to. I have a person I report to, and we can always go to those respective people . . . but that's rare.
Yosemite—Conservancy	You work it out. We're always saying to each other . . . 'we're going to work it out. It's going to work out.' And it does. . . . The partners that I work with . . . contribute to such a pleasant cordial collaborative working environment. Everybody respects each other.
Yosemite—Conservancy	I think everybody involved respects everybody's position and their responsibilities. And it's because also of that mutual and common respect and relationship—person to person-type relationship. I think that also fosters the strong working relationship.

Other tactics they use include having a strong working relationship between the organizations' volunteer coordinators (five of the six cases), seeing their partners as equals, and giving volunteer program leaders autonomy and flexibility as a way to help get buy-in from them.

Love of place as an additional strategy that supports successful collaboration.

While the previously described collaboration strategies are commonly seen in the IOR literature (Gray, 1985, 1989), interviews revealed an additional strategy. Love of, or devotion to the NPS site is another factor that interviewees from three cases mentioned in addressing collaboration challenges and conflicts. While subjective and difficult to quantify, this concept was raised by staff in Golden Gate, Acadia, and Yosemite.

Multiple volunteer program staff at Yosemite, representing both the nonprofit and the NPS, suggested that a 'shared love of place' (as an NPS ranger termed it) and devotion to protecting it was such that it overrode many differences and challenges related to the collaboration:

- Yosemite NPS ranger: I've had an opportunity to work in four other national parks . . . I've not found anywhere else such a passion and love for a place by so many different people . . . I think that that shared love and passion from a large audience is . . . unique. It's just those shared values really from the beginning—going back to the beginning of the Cooperating Association. We were young together.
- Yosemite Conservancy volunteer coordinator: Yosemite is a jewel, and the people that I interface with see it as a jewel. We all have this feeling of wanting to protect it, keep it as pristine as possible, and do our part in making that happen. And we are mountain folk who love this place. We have that same spirit and it seems to flow over everything that we're trying to deal with when we have our challenges come up.

Category 2: Structures and Components of the Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs

This category focuses on study findings related to how the co-coordinated volunteer programs are designed and structured. The category is subdivided into six themes:

1. Application of 12 components of effective volunteer program management
2. Six additional components of effective volunteer program management related to co-management
3. Structural arrangements and designs
4. Importance of employee buy-in and support of the volunteer collaboration
5. Importance of treating volunteers like professionals or employees
6. Unanticipated volunteer motivator—love of place

Application of 12 components of effective volunteer program management. The cases were examined to determine the degree to which they employed a dozen components of effective volunteer programs described in SHRM research, as well as the

level and scale of their adoption. The 12 components are derived from SHRM studies of volunteer programs coordinated primarily by a single organization (Boyce, 1971; Brudney, 2004, 2005, 2010; Brudney & Nezhina; 2005; Connors, 2012; Ellis, 2002; Naylor, 1967; Penrod, 1991; Safrit, 2006; Safrit et al., 2005). These criteria were included in a survey of the 14 identified NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships to help select the cases for the study. Interviews and documents from site visits allowed for exploration of how the components were used by the cases.

1. Written policies to govern the co-coordinated volunteer program,
2. Providing resources for volunteer programs (financial or other), including for a paid volunteer coordinator,
3. Training for paid staff who work with volunteers,
4. Creating job descriptions for volunteers,
5. Providing liability coverage for volunteers,
6. Outreach to recruit volunteers,
7. Orienting volunteers,
8. Designing or providing basic and ongoing volunteer training,
9. Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers,
10. Creating higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers,
11. Evaluating volunteers, and
12. Recognizing volunteer program staff and volunteers.

Overall, the volunteer programs examined in the study had significant alignment with these components. Not only did their co-coordinated programs employ all of these program practices to some degree, but several did so at high levels, as expressed in case self-assessments and later confirmed via analysis of interviews and program documents.

Written policies to govern the co-coordinated volunteer program. All NPS volunteer programs are governed by and follow an NPS document, "Director's Order #7: Volunteers in Parks" (2005). This 9-page directive provides brief guidelines and rules to all NPS units regarding 17 aspects of Volunteers in Parks (VIP) volunteer programs, including definitions, VIP qualifications, approved volunteer activities, benefits,

uniforms, reporting, recruitment, training, recognition, termination, etc. This document provides only basic guidelines, however, and NPS units have latitude in designing their programs.

Four of the cases—Acadia, Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite—have specialized agreements or memoranda that govern all or part of their volunteer program partnerships. For these four cases, the formal agreements are guides for volunteer program action, direction, roles, responsibilities, and use of funds. Of the two cases that do not have such agreements, Arches and Canyonlands is a very new volunteer program partnership, and the NPS volunteer coordinator on the National Mall expressed a desire to have more formalized policies:

> There is a partnership agreement between the Park and the Trust, but nothing specifically on the volunteer program. That is something I am trying . . . to get done . . . It's absolutely vital if you are going to go into a partnership with somebody. You've got to put your cards on the table. You need to be aware of what each of those needs are so that there's an understanding.

Providing resources for volunteer programs (financial or other), including for a paid volunteer coordinator. Contrary to what some may believe, said interviewees, volunteer programs require a financial commitment—for staff, materials, transportation, supplies, training, recruitment, recognition, etc. In interviews, several volunteer coordinators made statements like the following:

- Golden Gate: I think the misconception about a volunteer program is that it's free. It is not free. It takes a lot of money to take care of people and housing, to take care of people for day-to-day money, to keep them fed. It takes a lot for all the supplies.
- Cuyahoga Valley: Volunteers are not free labor. It takes a lot of work to coordinate volunteers.

At the same time, the cases uniformly asserted that collaborating brought additional resources to support more volunteers and volunteer projects. The move toward co-coordination of volunteer programming was for each of the cases a conscious effort to tap additional resources and use existing resources more efficiently.

Providing resources to support volunteer programs represents an expression of recognition of their importance to the organizations. The cases showed a direct relation between the number of volunteer program staff and the size/scale/scope of the effort. Having more staff to lead volunteers allows for more volunteers and volunteer programs. All the NPS units in the study and all but one of the nonprofit partners have at least one paid professional who oversees volunteer programs. Two of the NPS volunteer coordinators are dedicated 100% to volunteer programming. For the other four NPS units, including the largest volunteer programs at Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite, the NPS volunteer coordinators have other duties that occupy up to 40% of their time.

Training for paid staff who work with volunteers. Nearly all the cases said they wanted to do more to train paid volunteer coordinator staff, regardless of whether they were offering a few or many staff training opportunities. In particular, several cases identified the need to train NPS staff working in park divisions that did not traditionally employ a lot of volunteers, such as in Maintenance or in Administration. Training was seen as a way of getting understanding and buy-in of NPS staff in divisions that traditionally did not use volunteers. The following responses were common:

- Acadia Friends group volunteer coordinator: We typically don't fund things like attending the state volunteer conference or attending any sort of training that the Park Service offers, or any risk management

kinds of trainings. We don't offer that. And so that's why I think it's a limitation.

- Cuyahoga Valley volunteer manager: We're really asking Park Service staff to move away from doing work directly themselves, and being program managers. And I know in Interpretation we're really aware of that and try to help staff make that shift, but I think we can train more in that area, and really help other divisions do that.

The cases with the most training for staff—Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite—made conscious efforts to include all NPS divisions staff in the training. The NPS volunteer coordinator at Golden Gate used her combined volunteer/training position to strengthen training of staff across the volunteer program partnership, as well as to redesign the standard NPS volunteer training that was provided to staff. The revamped training is now provided for NPS and Conservancy staff at Golden Gate, as well as to volunteer staff from other NPS units.

Even at Golden Gate, however, the volunteer coordinator felt that more training was needed and that some staff would never support the program:

> We're not quite there completely. We still have people who don't want volunteers, and in training #1 with that I said from Day 1 is, if a paid staff member, whether it be Conservancy or Park Service, does not want to work with volunteers, don't make them do it. Because you are going to kill your program, because they are going to make sure it doesn't work.

Making training hands-on and practical and tapping the experience of peers is a strategy that Golden Gate and other case sites have used:

> One training that we did . . . was like volunteer management 101. We did a lot of the basics, especially with the new volunteer managers with Maintenance. We brought in some of our other program managers that have been really successful in leading programs, and we had them work side-by-side and share experiences. And then we actually had a mock volunteer program, where the experienced volunteer managers led the new ones, and it seemed as if everybody got really excited, like 'oh, this is what we can do,' and it really generated a lot of ideas.

Creating job descriptions for volunteers. All the cases provided job descriptions for at least some volunteers. Long-term and stipended volunteers, including Student Conservation Association interns at Arches & Canyonlands, are eligible for time off, medical benefits, and employee assistance programs. However, the trend at most of the cases was to create formal job descriptions for longer-term volunteers who would work at parks for a month or longer. These long-term volunteers, to include interns, often had to formally apply for their positions and had much more responsibility than intermittent, short-term, or one-day volunteers. Several cases had no job descriptions for short-term volunteers; the comments from the NPS volunteer coordinator at Acadia about this were common:

> There are job descriptions for the Ridge Runners, for [seasonal Friends of Acadia volunteer program staff]. Anyone paid by Friends of Acadia has a job description. The volunteers who come in for Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday, whether as volunteers off the street such as you were on Tuesday, or the crew leaders, we do not have job descriptions for those.

In short, the more the volunteer position was like a regular job, with regular work hours and schedules and lasting for a considerable amount of time—the more likely it was to have a formal description and structure. The program at Cuyahoga Valley was an exception, as staff in the volunteer program created descriptions of 167 different volunteer jobs. In addition, they identified the mandatory and recommended trainings for each of those jobs.

Providing liability coverage for volunteers. As described in the NPS "Director's Order #7" (2005) governing VIPs in NPS units, volunteers receive the same benefits as federal employees with regard to the following:

1. Compensation for work-related injuries,
2. Immunity from liability pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, and

3. Claims for damage to loss of personal property incident to service. (p. 5)

Thus, all NPS volunteers who sign required paperwork from the federal Office of Workers' Compensation Programs are covered in the above areas, regardless of which NPS unit they serve. Volunteers who are recruited, trained, and supervised by nonprofit partner staff are also counted—and covered as—VIPs. This coverage is recognized as a benefit of partnership by several of the cases, including at Golden Gate:

- Conservancy volunteer coordinator: [Our NPS partner has] a lot of the legalities taken care of, you know they make it easy for us to be able to do programming in here . . . All of our volunteers are covered by their Workman's Compensation. So we can work on the foundation that they have already created.
- NPS volunteer coordinator: The Conservancy cannot take care of the Workers' Comp., or any kind of a tort claim or any of that—little more expensive if something happens. Park Service has an avenue for that. So the Park Service took on signing everybody up legally.

At Cuyahoga Valley, the NPS leases land to farmers who work tracts within the national park on a special use permit or lease. Volunteers working at these sites are technically the responsibility of the lessee. However, the NPS is prepared to cover them, even though the farmer is required to have liability insurance. As an NPS interpretive operations manager noted, if a visitor or volunteer is injured working at one of the farms, "because we're the government, we'd be sued anyway." Co-coordination of the volunteer program allows for liability coverage of many—sometimes thousands—of additional volunteers who work with or through the nonprofit partners than would be possible otherwise.

Outreach to recruit volunteers. The cases in this study employ standard and common techniques used by other organizations and recommended in the literature, to include traditional and electronic advertisements, word of mouth, local and national

media, print media, partner outreach and connections, social media, recruiting visits and other outreach to key constituencies, inducements, and targeted recruitment. It is worth noting that, except for at Arches & Canyonlands, the study sites did not have to do a lot of recruitment. At five of the sites, interviewees said their programs were sufficiently well-known and popular that it was no longer necessary to do a lot of outreach. In four cases, the sites were at or near capacity in terms of being able to accommodate and properly supervise volunteers (National Mall, Acadia, some programs at Cuyahoga Valley, and Yosemite). And finally, at Yosemite overall and for some volunteer projects within the NPS sites (the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial on the National Mall, Golden Gate's Raptor Observatory and Alcatraz programs), the site was so popular that there were more volunteers than demand or space for them:

- Cuyahoga Valley NPS volunteer coordinator: Sometimes—but I'm the little Dutch boy who puts his thumb in the dike and I am kind of holding back the torrent of water. I kind of felt like that over the past five years. I am fully at capacity. We don't advertise . . . people just contact me.
- Yosemite NPS volunteer coordinator: We turn away volunteers simply because we don't have a place for them to live while they are working. So we couldn't bring in another ten volunteers in the summer, because we don't have campsites for them to stay in.

By contrast, and because of its very remote location and lack of a nearby or established volunteer base, the volunteer program at Arches & Canyonlands struggles to identify and recruit volunteers beyond the stipended volunteers who serve as interns through the Student Conservation Association. To help address this challenge, the partners at Arches & Canyonlands expanded their volunteer programming into new areas, to attract and recruit more volunteers as well as to address some unmet needs. Because these programs

are new, the partners do not yet have data on the effectiveness of this approach as a recruitment strategy.

Orienting volunteers. All the cases provide introductory orientations to volunteers. The level, form, content, and amount of orientation provided vary, depending on the site, the position and its responsibilities, the duration of the work, the potential level of danger involved, whether the volunteer is long- or short-term, and other factors. Volunteer orientation is required in the directive to all NPS units using volunteers (NPS, 2005). However, because the federal guidance is so basic—the only verbiage under this sub-heading is "Each VIP will receive appropriate orientation and job training" (NPS, 2005, p. 8)—that each case has customized volunteer orientations to fit its needs and capacity.

Designing or providing basic and ongoing volunteer training. As with orienting volunteers, all the cases provide some training to volunteers, which is also mandated by the federal directive for NPS volunteer programs (NPS, 2005). The level and amount of training volunteers receive varies a great deal, both within and among the cases depending on the type, level of responsibility, duration of the volunteer work, and the capacity and emphasis each case has for or places on training. Some of the cases in the study provide much more volunteer training than others.

At the National Mall, volunteers prior to 2012 received only an orientation before volunteering at monuments and memorials. Since 2012 and with support of the Trust for the National Mall, new interpretive volunteers attend day-long formal trainings over four consecutive weekends. Acadia offers formal and on-the-job training for long-term interns, but drop-in volunteers receive only a basic orientation and safety tips. Cuyahoga

Valley created a matrix of required and recommended trainings. They, along with Yosemite and Golden Gate, also provide continuing education to help volunteers build skills and competencies. Yosemite and Golden Gate offer in-depth training for long-term volunteers, and more basic training for short-term, drop-in, and incidental volunteers.

In each case, the NPS and nonprofit partners collaborate on some or all aspects of volunteer training, with each partner typically taking the lead in programs where they have the greater programmatic responsibility. For example, most of the training provided to weeklong volunteers in Yosemite—one of the programs coordinated by the Yosemite Conservancy—is provided by Conservancy staff. However, a park ranger also speaks to them as part of their training. As the Yosemite Branch Chief of Field Operations noted:

> The Conservancy volunteer supervisor has a lot more oversight and direct contact with the volunteers. So I am . . . there for support and direction . . . I'll be part of their training, and basically talk about the Park Service and expectations that the Park Service may have of the volunteers.

Some volunteer training is very specialized and is therefore only offered to long-term volunteers, as with people who volunteer with the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory. As its director relates:

> We do exactly one volunteer recruitment every year, to bring in new people to be part of the fall migration. And in fact the banding activity requires so much training that we only bring in new banders every other year. So over time we've learned that we need to give people as full a training as possible. It takes two full years to do that, and we ask for that kind of commitment from our banders over time.

For both short- and long-term volunteers, a significant portion of training is learned on the job and under the guidance of NPS rangers, nonprofit partner staff, or more experienced volunteers.

Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers. Each of the cases said they had ongoing communications with their volunteers, through in-person, telephone, e-mail, social media, or web site interactions. Communications were more frequent and targeted within specific volunteer projects, particularly those for which there were dedicated NPS or nonprofit staff assigned to lead or supervise volunteer participants. In those cases, the communication was directly between individual volunteers and their supervisor or leader. In a few instances, such as for the National Mall's Rails and Trails program or the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory program, volunteer leaders are experienced volunteers.

The cases use multiple strategies to increase the number of staff who manage volunteers and volunteer programs. One strategy is to use interns not just as volunteers, but also to help with volunteer planning and communications. At both Golden Gate and Cuyahoga Valley, approximately 70 interns directly support volunteer program planning and projects in the parks. By elevating the role of their interns, parks multiply the number of staff available for volunteer planning, programming, or coordination.

A second strategy is to use funds raised by the nonprofit to pay for additional staff (in addition to the nonprofit volunteer coordinator) who supervise or lead volunteers. At Acadia, Yosemite, and Golden Gate, endowments or other funds from the nonprofit pay for additional volunteer leader staff. A third strategy is to use cooperative agreements to shift funds from one partner to the other to pay for additional staff. At Cuyahoga Valley, the NPS provided $100,000 a year to pay for additional staff who work for the Friends group on volunteer program coordination. As noted by the Cuyahoga Valley NPS Division Chief for Interpretation, Education, and Visitor Service:

> It is a leap of faith on the part of the park that it's worth spending our money for them to hire staff, and you can sometimes get better people with specialized skills [than the NPS can do because of its hiring constraints] . . . People in the nonprofit sector, sometimes they lead with volunteer program management, or administrative types of experience first, which is helpful.

As a nonprofit organization, the Friends group at Cuyahoga Valley had fewer restrictions on hiring than the NPS, and thus could both move more quickly in making hires and hire with very specific skillsets such as volunteer coordination, public relations, and fundraising.

A fourth strategy to expand the number of staff who manage volunteers is to configure new staff positions, or reconfigure existing ones, to include volunteer supervision as part of the job. At all of the cases, for example, the NPS partner assigns some park rangers with collateral duties associated with volunteer program coordination. But while three of the cases in this study only give a handful of park rangers or nonprofit staff volunteer program duties, the other three orient or reorient scores of staff in this way—over 100 each at Golden Gate, Yosemite, and Cuyahoga Valley. Education and training are provided to help these staff understand and appreciate the value of assuming leadership roles and of working with volunteers.

A final strategy used at varying degrees by the cases is to tap longtime and trusted volunteers to take on expanded roles in the volunteer program. At the different case sites, experienced volunteers plan events, supervise other volunteers, serve on planning or administrative teams, or play other volunteer leadership roles. Table 4.14 illustrates the degree to which each of the cases employs these five strategies for increasing the number of staff who help manage volunteers and volunteer programming.

Table 4.14
Numbers and Types of Volunteer Program Leadership Staff, both Paid and Volunteer

NPS Unit / Case	NPS Vol. Mgt. Staff	NPS Collat-eral Duties	Nonprofit Vol. Mgt. Staff	Nonprofit Part-time Staff	Interns	Veteran Vol-unteers	Total
Acadia	2	21	1	3	4	25	56
Arches & Canyonlands	2	10	1	0.5	0	1	14.5
Cuyahoga Valley	24	5	14	2	74	27	136
Golden Gate	4	55	22	35	70	100	286
National Mall	3	12	1	0	1	0	17
Yosemite	2	35	2	7	40	15	101

Creating higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers.

Interviewees at each case were asked how—and how much—they gave greater responsibilities to experienced volunteers or volunteers with specialized skills, to include use of such individuals as volunteer coordinators, planners, or supervisors. In Arches & Canyonlands, the structure of the program was such that the opportunity of having many long-term volunteers simply had not arisen. Until 2014, nearly all the park volunteers were interns with the Student Conservation Association. These interns worked for one season, so there were no returning veterans—and there were virtually no local volunteers. Under the new co-coordinated program structure, the goal is to develop stronger volunteer roles as the Friends group's volunteer programs grow over time.

Acadia, Golden Gate, and Yosemite systematically employ veteran volunteers to lead or supervise other, newer volunteer activities. In addition, Yosemite uses a volunteer leadership team (VOLT) to help with planning and goal-setting for the program. National Mall volunteers served on a 2014 park-wide volunteer program evaluation assessment team along with NPS and nonprofit volunteer program

coordinators. At Cuyahoga Valley, experienced volunteers serve as CPR trainers and sit on the volunteer program steering committee and other *ad hoc* committees.

None of the parks, however, described systematic plans to develop volunteer leaders or include their voice in strategic-level park planning. Rather, in most cases volunteer leaders earn their stripes through years of service. In most of the cases, the limited number of formal volunteer roles means that parks are not tapping the experience or specialized skills that many volunteers can offer. In this study, the cases with the greatest range of volunteer job types—Cuyahoga Valley and Golden Gate—have tapped the knowledge, skills, and abilities of their volunteers on a far greater scale than the other cases.

Evaluating volunteer programs. Of the 12 components of effective volunteer program management examined in this study, evaluation was the weakest across the cases. Moreover, the data the cases collect does not align with many studies of volunteer programs, which often measure volunteer retention and volunteer and/or staff satisfaction with aspects of the volunteer program. All NPS units gather and report basic information about their volunteer efforts to the national NPS office and thence to Congress. This requirement focuses primarily on numbers of volunteers, projects, and volunteer hours. Working together, the NPS and nonprofit volunteer staff compile these numbers, which the nonprofits also use in their reports, newsletters, and solicitations. In addition, the cases commonly enumerate and describe the projects that were worked on or completed by volunteers—miles of trails created or rehabilitated, acres of invasive plants removed, boardwalks built, pounds of trash removed, etc.

Park and nonprofit reports also calculate the value of volunteer service hours, typically based on a formula provided by Independent Sector, whose estimated value of volunteer time was $22.55 per hour in 2014 (Independent Sector, 2014). Volunteers and their hours are often broken down by NPS division, by type of volunteer (interns, long-term, drop-in, etc.), and projects worked on by students vs. adults or corporate groups. Amounts budgeted and expended on volunteer activities are reported. At Cuyahoga Valley and Yosemite, the number of volunteer contacts with visitors is also tabulated. Finally, most of the sites obtain feedback from volunteers on the effectiveness of the trainings that volunteers receive. Interviewees from these sites said they then use this information to make adjustments and improvements in training offerings. The response on this topic from the volunteer coordination at the Trust for the National Mall was typical: "we always have the volunteers do an assessment—a questionnaire of [the training] they went through. So we utilize that information as well in helping to evolve the agenda."

However, the cases have not assessed the impact of volunteer efforts on the NPS units, on the needs the volunteers are addressing, on visitors' experiences in the parks, or on the volunteers themselves. They do not systematically measure volunteer retention rates, the level of satisfaction of volunteers with their experience, or the satisfaction of NPS and nonprofit staff with the volunteer programs or with volunteers.

Volunteer program staff at the cases had a lot to say about their program assessments, the shortcomings and limitations of which they were well aware. All expressed desire to know more about their programs and the impacts they were having in various areas or on different stakeholders. Interviewees, whether they represented NPS

staff or nonprofit partners, gave three primary reasons for not conducting more in-depth program evaluation: (1) insufficient time, expertise, and money; (2) federal restrictions on the types of information they could gather and from whom they could gather it; and (3) bureaucratic challenges in conducting more sophisticated assessments (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.15
Challenges in Conducting More Meaningful Volunteer Program Evaluation, by Case

NPS Unit	Quote
Acadia	Friends group: I have a real problem with evaluation because . . . evaluation is very expensive to undertake, especially to get the quality kinds of result you are interested in, in terms of using results to make any sort of substantive change in the program . . . We've been burned before as an organization by evaluation that gets done and the answer to the evaluation question was 'yes,' 'no,' and 'maybe.' NPS: We probably don't know as much as we should. Just about everything that we do know, is anecdotal . . . The supervisors essentially will come and say 'yes, this has been a big help.' And that's basically what we get.
Arches & Canyonlands	Friends group: Concedes that volunteer assessment has not been given enough thought to date. Doing evaluation is difficult to do to begin with, they said, and is more so when the organization only has one paid staff person. NPS: We'd have to go through a formal process to get approval to survey visitors . . . but it would be great if, for example, a university would do such a study. Visitors would probably say things like, "if it has not been for the volunteer, I would never have seen anybody from the Park during my visit."
Cuyahoga Valley	Friends group: We're limited from the Park Service . . . We can only get the set volunteer agreement that has the set questions. I can't modify anything or add anything . . . I can't get the age of a person and collect and report out age demographics. Friends group: [The NPS tends] to be very numbers-driven. Success is measured by the number of volunteers and the number of volunteer hours, not the quality of the program . . . The number of volunteers can be the worst measure of a volunteer program, because it doesn't get at that impact question. It just tends to be focused on 'we want more volunteers'. . . I think you want to measure impact and I don't think we do it well . . . I don't think we have the tools to do it. Good evaluation takes time and money.

Golden Gate	NPS: You know, our impact with the visitor is always going to be through the visitor surveys. And the visitor surveys aren't yet asking specifically about volunteers. They've been kind of the same questions for a very long time.
National Mall	NPS: I think that feedback, follow-up is something we're missing . . . We need better follow-up, which will help us with better training, which will help us with a lot of things. I don't feel we have any kind of evaluation process . . . we need some extra people. That's why it's fallen through the cracks.
Yosemite	Conservancy: We're actually probably relying a little too much on the anecdotal vs. the quantitative. NPS: [Program evaluation is] definitely something on my list of things I should be doing, but it just hasn't been something I've been capable of.

Interviewees expressed interest in knowing more about the impacts of their co-managed volunteer programs. These interests represent both the missions of the organizations where they work and also the goals and curiosity of individual interviewees. For example, a staff member at the Friends of Acadia would like to conduct longitudinal surveys with long-time volunteer crew leaders to fine-tune those programs. The NPS volunteer coordinator at Arches & Canyonlands would like, by contrast, to survey visitors about the level and value of the help they received from park staff and volunteers while visiting the parks.

The executive vice president at the Trust for the National Mall would like to know how well the Trust's investments in the volunteer program are meeting the goals of the Trust as well as how to quantify how day-to-day volunteer activities contribute to the Trust's mission: "I know it's good, but I just can't measure how it's good." Along related lines, the NPS volunteer coordinator at Yosemite wants to know if park volunteers are more likely to donate to the park. Finally, for the director of the Cuyahoga Valley friends group, it would be good to know broader impacts of volunteer programs:

> What gets done in a park that wouldn't be gotten done without volunteers . . . I wish we could figure out better systems for measuring that. And the

> thing we hardly ever talk about is the impact on somebody's life. Even if we talk about it we don't measure it . . . I wish the Park Service would look at ways to measure impact that are not just metric, number-driven, even though everybody focuses on metrics today. I think when it comes to volunteerism there is so much more there.

She and other volunteer program coordinators believe that such broader impacts are occurring; they are just not being measured.

Recognizing volunteer program staff and volunteers. All the cases recognize their volunteers, jointly in specific volunteer programs for which the partners share responsibility. Typical forms of recognition include celebration meetings, presentations, and meals; giving of token thank-you gifts; thank-yous that are included in mass e-mails or newsletters; special recognition for prolific or impactful volunteers; and the awarding of volunteer passes to volunteers who have donated a specified number of hours over the past year. Most of the cases hold recognition events on an annual or semi-annual basis; Cuyahoga Valley does so each quarter. Expenses for recognition items and events are often shared by the partners.

In addition to standard recognition activities, the interviewees described some more creative ways in which they honor volunteers. At Acadia, one recognition event is held on a boat ride, and they host a cross-volunteer recognition event each year. At Cuyahoga Valley, NPS and Conservancy staff do the cooking and serving at annual volunteer picnic. And participants in the week-long, month-long, and corporate weekend programs at Yosemite have a celebration cookout in their campground provided by the Yosemite Conservancy.

Six additional components of co-coordinated volunteer programs. Findings from analysis of interviews and documents from the cases illustrate that the context of the

volunteer programs in this study differs somewhat from traditional volunteer programs that are led by a single organization. Specifically, these programs are co-managed, and therefore include collaboration-related design and implementation considerations that do not arise in volunteer programs led by a single entity. Six additional considerations emerged for volunteer program management where the volunteer program is coordinated by more than one organization. Interviewees repeatedly mentioned and described the following collaboration-based elements of their co-coordinated volunteer programs:

1. Role of technology for cross-partner communication, record-keeping, volunteer communication, planning, and as a way and means of volunteering;
2. Daily communication among partners about aspects of the volunteer program;
3. Co-location of partner staff;
4. Effective working relationships between the partner organization's volunteer coordinators;
5. Having a shared volunteer program mission/vision among the partners; and
6. Longevity of key volunteer program staff.

The role of technology. In the 21st century, e-mail and other electronic means have become the primary vehicles for work and communication in many fields; volunteering is no exception. In the cases examined in this study, technology is a key tool employed within and across organizations and with volunteers and is used for meetings, planning, recruitment, sign-ups, scheduling, creating an identity for the nonprofit with volunteers, responding to crises, sharing information, recognizing volunteers, and recording and reporting information about volunteer programs. Telephone and face-to-face communications continue and remain vital, but the rising prevalence and importance of electronic communication in volunteer programming in general and in co-managed volunteer programs in particular were surprising.

For the co-coordinated volunteer programs in this study, it was apparent that they simply could not operate at the level they do without technology. Communicating across offices, across parks that sprawl 800,000 acres or which are 60 miles long, and with tens of thousands of potential volunteers across the U.S. and internationally could not be done without technology. Several interviewees gave technology-based answers to the broader question, 'How do you communicate in the co-coordinated volunteer program?:'

- Golden Gate NPS volunteer coordinator: The world isn't what it was when I started in the job . . . We didn't e-mail each other . . . Now [when] we meet, we've already had 30 conversations on the phone, by e-mail . . . I think that the media age is bringing about some big changes.
- Cuyahoga Valley volunteer: [My volunteer supervisor] and I do a lot of e-mailing back and forth . . . The communication level I think is much better now . . . they're taking more of an electronic—the Internet—and using it to their advantage.
- National Mall NPS volunteer coordinator: We have constant connection with [volunteers] through all the communication—through e-mail.
- Golden Gate Conservancy volunteer leader: We have a Google online spreadsheet that project leaders can look up and see exactly where they are supposed to be. . . Once we have the connection with a group that wants to come out with a specific program, we include the project leaders in the communication . . . We send a confirmation that outlines all of the details . . . so both parties have that information and we give them access to their contact information so that they can communicate with any of the specifics. So everything is kind of kept in a record and everybody receives the same standard communication.

The cases also use web sites and social media such as Facebook and Twitter to communicate with volunteers. Among the partners in the co-managed volunteer programs, e-mail is so important for communication that NPS security restrictions on file sharing were cited as a major communication issue by three of the cases (Cuyahoga Valley, Yosemite, and Golden Gate). At Golden Gate, they are moving toward expanded

use of technology for the volunteer program, as noted by the Conservancy volunteer coordinator:

> I would like to have a fully functional cloud-based database system, which we are in the process of doing right now . . . we have about half of our program managers up and running on it now for this year . . . my dream is that in five years . . . everyone will have all of their stats and records in the system, and we can pull data on our programming in real time.

For many volunteers, electronic communication is the first and only contact they have with the NPS or nonprofit partner before they show up to volunteer. All the other steps—getting information, reading descriptions of volunteer roles, applying, logistics, scheduling, responding to questions, etc.—are conducted electronically. For this reason, most of the cases in this study have substantial detail about their volunteer programs and how to participate in them on their web sites. In response to the question, "What kinds of things do you send to volunteers in e-mails?" the National Mall NPS volunteer coordinator responded as follows:

> A lot . . . further opportunities to get involved in whatever we're doing at the time, because we're always doing something. We pass along information that might be important in terms of road closures or any big changes to anything in the park, a ranger speaker series—just try to get everything out there to them that the staff gets . . . any correspondence that I think would be important for them to do their job . . . I also do a lot of recruitment for certain things.

Technology has become such an important part of volunteer programs, in fact, that it is a growing a medium for volunteering itself. Golden Gate created an entire category of volunteering that is based on and which uses technology as the means of and mechanism for volunteering. Volunteers in this program work online to create ads, publications, commercials, and documentaries; build graphics; make videos; design exhibits; create and maintain web sites; and design marketing campaigns for NPS units or

their nonprofit or concessionaire partners. In most cases, the volunteers do this work from home or school, creating a new mechanism for serving NPS units and for reaching out to a younger, more technology-savvy demographic that the parks are trying to attract.

Daily communication among volunteer program partners. Despite the importance of technology, face-to-face interaction remains vital. The role and importance of communication among the partners in the co-managed volunteer program has already been described, and therefore does not need to be reiterated here. The key point is that constant communication is not only a hallmark and requirement of IORs and CSSPs, but also of co-managed volunteer programs. The focus of the partnerships in this study is on volunteer programming, and without daily communication among key staff—in particular the volunteer coordinators at the NPS and nonprofit partner organization—the volunteer program would not be as successful. The stress on daily communication between the partners, as opposed to merely 'regular' or 'frequent' communication, was articulated across the established cases. Interviewees also referred to such inter-organizational communication as 'essential,' 'vital,' and 'critical.' Therefore, constant communication across the partnership was cited as a necessary and recommended component of co-managed volunteer programs and something not addressed in SHRM research that focuses on volunteer programs led by a single organization.

Co-location of volunteer program partner staff. If daily communication is necessary for volunteer program co-management, co-location is the primary way in which this communication is assured. Five of the six cases co-locate staff at the NPS units. Co-location translates to multiple communication-related benefits, including the opportunity to resolve issues more quickly, promote thinking and acting as a team,

decrease incidences of miscommunication, and leverage additional perspectives on questions, challenges, and opportunities. The Cuyahoga Valley NPS volunteer coordinator offered an example of possibilities for cross-pollination of ideas when partners are co-located:

> Sometimes when [Friends group office mates] are planning out a corporate event . . . they will need another person there to lead something, but all of a sudden they are like, 'alright, here's our plan. What else can we do?' And so . . . we bounce those ideas back and forth between us so that at the end of the day [the corporate volunteers] are having a great experience.

Constant communication among the partners was a common ingredient of the cases, and co-locating staff is a way to promote such communication.

Effective working relationships between the volunteer coordinators at the partner organizations. If daily communication is key to cross-sector co-coordinated volunteer programs, then it is important to have a strong working relationship between the key organizational interlocutors or communicants. In the cases examined in this study, those communicants are the volunteer coordinators at the NPS unit and the primary nonprofit partner organization. These coordinators work together on most aspects of the co-managed volunteer program, including planning, budgeting, volunteer orientation and training, scheduling, volunteer supervision (at most of the sites), troubleshooting, grant writing, volunteer recognition, evaluation, and reporting. And while interviewees from all the cases stressed the good relations and communications between the partners, the strong working relationship between the volunteer coordinators was cited by interviewees at Golden Gate and Yosemite as a critical ingredient in the success of the programs:

- Golden Gate Conservancy volunteer manager: I think we need to give a lot of credit to like the people that created this program . . . like [the NPS and Conservancy volunteer coordinators who] have kind of built it up while they have been here in the parks. I think the level of trust

between the two organizations, and personally between them, has really allowed it to grow.

- Yosemite NPS volunteer coordinator: [My Conservancy counterpart] and I have a great relationship, and we work really well together . . . we're co-workers, we're colleagues, and it's not hierarchical . . . [She is] on my volunteer leadership team, helped to create the goals for the park-wide volunteer program. She helps us select our volunteer award-winners every year. She's involved in all of our policymaking for how we run volunteers . . . I think having those relationships is critical to start with, because [she] and I do respect each other.

The positive personal as well as professional relationships between the volunteer coordinator partners in these cases stood out among the cases, helping in multiple aspects of their interaction around volunteer programming. Most of the sites also expressed that their top leaders—park superintendents and nonprofit executive directors or presidents—also had strong relationships which helped the volunteer program partnership.

Having a shared mission and vision specifically for the volunteer program. All the cases said they have a common vision and mission around the volunteer program. Three partnerships—Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite—go further and have developed formal volunteer program vision, mission, and goal statements. The result, as in the cases of Golden Gate and Yosemite, of years of consideration, these statements guide long-term planning for volunteer efforts. The volunteer program mission at Golden Gate, for example, is to "deepen engagement with the park by individuals and groups through a commitment to the preservation and enhancement of the park's resources" (U.S. Dept. of the Interior, n.d., p. 2).

The three cases with formal vision, mission, and goal statements are also by far the largest co-coordinated volunteer programs (i.e., the most volunteers, volunteer projects and hours, partners, etc.), suggesting that, (1) as volunteer partnerships grow, it is increasingly useful to promulgate formal mission statements specifically for the

volunteer programs; and (2) creation of such statements and designing programs based on them is a useful practice for managing co-coordinated volunteer programs.

Longevity of key staff. A final additional finding related to practices for co-managed volunteer programs is that it is important to maintain stability and longevity of key staff across the partnerships—volunteer coordinators and top leaders such as park superintendents and nonprofit executive directors/presidents. This idea was introduced spontaneously in four cases (Acadia, Golden Gate, Cuyahoga Valley, and Yosemite). At Golden Gate, the volunteer-program-supporting leaders of both the NPS unit and the Conservancy were in place for more than 20 years, the Conservancy volunteer coordinator has been in her position for ten years, and the NPS volunteer coordinator has served in that capacity for more than 25 years. Some of the other interviewees identified benefits of long-serving staff who are in the right places:

- Cuyahoga Valley, NPS: One of the cultures has to do with the longevity of a lot of the people that have stayed . . . People probably could have gone on and moved on and realized their ambitions in another position . . . And instead, many of them . . . have hung in . . . people who have just decided to realize their ambitions within the boundaries and abilities of what this place can fund . . . It wasn't about the money and the recognition . . . promotional thing up the ladder—you can actually accomplish more . . . You have a combination of ambitious people that have stayed and wanted to grow in place.
- Acadia Friends: I have been with the organization since 1997 . . . We've just been blessed at FoA . . . to have had a terrific . . . kind of long-term staff who have been here. [The volunteer coordinator's] predecessor had been here 17 years as well, in different roles in the organization. And the woman who was president . . . started as the stewardship person at FoA, so she ran the relationship with the park over the volunteer program for years.

Interviewees also suggested the value of longevity in terms of the challenges associated with its absence—i.e., when there was a lack of stability in key positions or

replacement of a respected volunteer coordinator with someone else who was not as effective. The following excerpts identify some issues related to lack of stability in program staff or leaders:

- NPS volunteer coordinator: I went through five volunteer managers before [the current nonprofit volunteer was hired], so there was kind of a regular turnover. [She] has been here for ten years, and we are lucky to have her. She has built her team onto a higher level.
- NPS volunteer coordinator: It's been sort of a revolving door . . . it's one thing to have [the nonprofit volunteer coordinator's] support and whatever good relations that I have, but she needs support as well, and that's been a challenge when [her directors] have just come and gone really quickly . . . First it was [A], and I spent a lot of time talking to [A] about the philosophy . . . you could hear [A's] brain going, 'oh, I get it now,' and as soon as [A] got it, [A] left. And then I had to start over with [B], and it was the same thing.

According to interviewees, long-serving volunteer program staff and supportive leaders have learned key lessons over the years from both successes and mistakes of working in partnership. They have developed trusting and effective working relationships with each other. In addition, they acculturate new staff into the co-coordinated volunteer program. By doing so, they create an atmosphere in which collaboration is the expected norm, and not an unorthodox experiment. As the NPS volunteer coordinator at Cuyahoga Valley described,

> To me the partnership never seemed unusual, because I was in a co-managed program at the Environmental Education Center which was a model for this volunteer piece . . . So my view of it is that that's always been fluid . . . I've always felt that if you are going to be a partner with someone, you should have aligning core values in what you're doing. I've always felt that between the Conservancy and the Park Service. So that did not seem unusual to me.

Two of the interviewees—ones who also touted the value of stability and longevity—cautioned that staying in one place too long can lead to set ideas and stifle creativity. However, given that nearly half of the interviewees stressed the importance of

stability and longevity of valued staff, the evidence from interviews suggests that maintaining effective staff over time is an important element of these co-coordinated volunteer programs.

Structural arrangements of co-coordinated volunteer programs. Volunteer programs require structure in order to work. The cases each include a combination of structural arrangements of the volunteer programs, from *ad hoc*/informal structures to highly centralized systems. All the cases, for example, include short-term, one-day volunteer opportunities with little training, record-keeping or follow-up with volunteers. Such *ad hoc* activities generate lots of individual volunteers and many hours of service, but the volunteer work is basic and usually does not go beyond trash pick-up, exotic plant removal, native planting, painting, or other simple manual labor. Higher-level volunteer skills are untapped, and most short-term volunteers do not return.

The co-managed volunteer programs in this study are also partly decentralized, as the partners or units within each organization each coordinate some elements of volunteer activities. The Yosemite Conservancy and Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks, for example, act as clearinghouses and points of contact for individuals who want to participate in the volunteer programs that their organizations administer. Decentralization gives the partners greater flexibility and autonomy, but can be problematic if volunteers identify with a particular organization, activity, or project leader instead of feeling a part of the larger VIP program to serve the overall NPS unit.

Finally, all the cases are also partly centralized. Virtually all the volunteers within them are considered as volunteers in parks (VIPs) for federal reporting purposes. At Cuyahoga Valley, day-to-day coordination of the volunteer program is under the

direction of the volunteer coordinator at the Conservancy of Cuyahoga Valley National Park. NPS volunteer coordinators at Yosemite and Golden Gate consider all the partner volunteer programs and their staff as extensions of their overall coordination. And at each of the NPS units, NPS staff prioritize needs in the parks that the nonprofit partners and volunteer programs will then help address.

Importance of employee buy-in and support for volunteers and volunteer programs. When organizations simultaneously face staff reductions and influxes of volunteers, it is not surprising that some staff fear their jobs are being—or might be—replaced by volunteers. By rule, VIPs may not displace NPS staff (NPS, 2005). Nonetheless, this worry can lead to staff resentment of volunteers, lack of interest in volunteer programs, or failure to grasp the benefit of volunteer programs. Tensions of this nature were described at five of the six cases.

Interviewees felt that communication and education were needed to secure employee buy-in of the co-coordinated volunteer programs. Such programs, they argued, are now essential to meeting basic needs in the parks. Moreover, instead of threatening park ranger positions, volunteers are actually a tool to help rangers accomplish more than they can acting alone. Finally, interviewees noted how important it was to work with and educate rangers on the value of volunteer programs and help them go through a change in their paradigm related to volunteerism in their parks. Table 4.16 captures some of the sentiments expressed on this topic.

Table 4.16
Getting Staff Buy-in for Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs, by Case

NPS Unit	Quote
Cuyahoga Valley—NPS	We're really asking Park Service staff to move away from doing work directly themselves, and being program managers . . . I think that is one on the places where growth in the volunteer program is challenging, because

	we're asking people to change how they do their jobs. And people's willingness and ability to do that varies, especially with long-term staff who were here when we had a small volunteer program and they were more directly delivering services themselves.
Cuyahoga Valley—NPS	When we first decided to have visitor center volunteers, there was a huge uproar in this division . . . I learned a lot in how that was communicated, and now it's really kind of funny to react, to watch [NPS] people say, 'I really like it a whole lot better when I have volunteers helping me at the Visitor's Center.' Some of it is learning how to communicate.
Golden Gate	It's hard to take somebody that was hired for a maintenance purpose and all of a sudden tell them, 'hey, you're going to be welcoming volunteers, you're going to be leading groups, you're going to be managing a program' . . . The program really has grown in a lot of people that were originally hired for maintenance roles and have really come out and started to shine in the way that they have been able to work with groups . . . I think some leaders have really embraced it. Others have been a little bit more hesitant. It helps to provide training, build confidence, and have them see other programs that have been successful.
Yosemite	There's goals to be met, and we can't reach it without extra human power. And there's always that tension of, are we replacing an employee with a volunteer? Someone may see that and think, 'what happened to the employee that was doing this last year? But the back story is that the funding's been cut. We can't afford an employee, so we're going to have a volunteer . . . and they are going to help us.

All the cases also suggested that they needed to do more to help other staff and other NPS divisions understand the value of the co-coordinated volunteer program and support them so they can grow and better address growing park needs. There have been volunteers at national parks for a long time, and, as one Yosemite ranger pointed out, many NPS staff started out as park volunteers themselves, and thus do not see volunteers as threats:

> Most of us volunteered at some point in our career to get to where we are now . . . and know the benefits of that we got from volunteering, and so it's not a stretch for most of them to involve volunteers in their own projects.

Treating volunteers like employees. Most of the volunteer coordinators described formalized volunteer programs and agreed that volunteers should be treated

like professionals or like regular staff. As noted with relation to volunteer job descriptions, the more long-term the volunteer position is, the more the volunteer is treated like a regular employee across the cases. Interns have formal application processes, interviews, and regular performance reviews. Short-term volunteers do not. Long-term volunteers receive more training, are given greater responsibilities, and are more likely to be asked to assume higher-level volunteer roles than short-term volunteers. At most of the case sites, furthermore, all types of volunteers have specific duties and regular schedules.

For the volunteer program partners, making such distinctions between volunteer types is simply common sense; even with their combined efforts/staffs/resources, they cannot treat all volunteers like full-time staff. Therefore, the longer-term and higher-responsibility positions necessarily receive more attention. At the same time, however, interviewees were at pains to assert the importance of all their volunteers and that the volunteers are valued. Statements like the following were common:

- National Mall, NPS volunteer coordinator: If I hear the words, 'I'm just a volunteer' one more time—I yell at everybody who says that. I'm like, 'you're not just a volunteer." That's part of what I am trying to do around here. I try to really advocate for our volunteers and make people feel a part of the program, make people feel that they are no less important.

Whether or not volunteers receive the same benefits, interviewees asserted that every volunteer was important, valued, and worthy of support from the volunteer program and other staff.

Unanticipated volunteer motivator. Under findings in Category 1, shared devotion to or love of a national park site emerged as a factor that helped volunteer program partners resolve conflicts between them. A variation on love of an NPS site

emerged related to volunteer motivation. This study did not ask why people volunteered at NPS units. However, interviewees at five cases—and without prompting—cited an unanticipated reason why individuals volunteer at their parks, which one described as 'love of place.' This love, as they related, is not precisely a love of volunteering, of giving back, of helping others in need, of the environment, of learning, of being occupied, or even of the work (which can be arduous or tedious). Rather, many people volunteer at these NPS sites because they love the park itself or some component of it. They love to be in or at that particular spot. They love to help protect that park or park program, and they love helping make it possible for others to appreciate it.

The concept came up repeatedly in the interviews, and is relevant to the findings because some of the cases have tapped this motivation to help expand and improve their volunteer programs. At Acadia, the family of a woman who loved to cross-country ski on the snow-covered carriage roads in the park established a multi-million dollar endowment through the Friends group; half of these funds support volunteer activities to groom the winter trails. On the National Mall, individuals travel from as far away as Alaska—at their own expense—to volunteer at the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial (VVM). Most of the non-local volunteers are also Vietnam veterans, as are many of the other dedicated VVM volunteers, some of whom have been volunteering (solely) at this memorial for 30 years.

The Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad Park inspires a volunteer ardor that can only be termed as love. A restored locomotive and passenger cars that provide rides through the park, the railroad has 2,300 volunteers, most of whom volunteer only for the railroad and far more than are actually needed. An NPS interviewee at Cuyahoga Valley

noted that a couple of these volunteers, before they died, asked to be buried in their volunteer uniforms. Their obituaries, she added, devoted "an incredible amount of ink to their volunteer experiences, which was maybe just a short part of their lives." Similar love was described in volunteers at Alcatraz and the raptor observatory program (with its nearly 90% volunteer retention rate) in Golden Gate, where NPS and Conservancy interviewees said it was not uncommon for some volunteers to serve for 25-30 years and to do so only at 'their' site.

The apotheosis of this phenomenon was observed at Yosemite, which inspired John Muir to rapturous expression on the handiworks of God in the 1800s and which now draws millions of visitors each year. Many more people want to volunteer each year at Yosemite than can be accommodated, and the volunteer program is designed around scheduling, tasking, housing, feeding, and supervising the maximum number possible. Volunteers, said several of the Yosemite volunteer program interviewees, are drawn to the place itself:

- NPS volunteer coordinator: This is a place that people really deeply love, and I think at a lot of other parks people . . . volunteer at them because they are . . . available and nearby. A lot of the volunteers we have coming to Yosemite never want to go anywhere else . . . This is THE place they come to . . . the same people come back for the same weeks for 20 years. It's about Yosemite, it's not just about being at a park. It is a love of a very specific place.
- NPS Volunteer manager supervisor: I've not found anywhere else such a passion and love for a place . . . And this brings up with how many volunteers are willing to work here and potentially the conditions that they have to live in to work here.
- NPS Volunteer program manager: People just want to spend time in Yosemite. It's the draw of the mountains.

There was no evidence that love of place as a motivation for volunteering is related to co-coordination of the volunteer program. However, volunteer program co-

coordination results in there being more opportunities for volunteers to engage at the sites they love. For certain individuals, love of a place is not just a reason, but the primary reason they volunteer.

Category 3: Impact of Volunteer Program Collaboration

Findings under this category present data from document analysis and interviews of impacts that co-management of volunteer programming has had within and across the NPS units examined in this study. Interviewees and documents describe a range of impacts derived from a variety of formal and informal data collection methods that include numerical counts and comparisons, training and program evaluations, interviews, surveys, observations, and discussions. Discussion of impacts is divided into three themes:

1. Impact on the collaboration and partnership,
2. Impact on the volunteer program, and
3. Impact on volunteers.

Impact on the collaboration and partnership. In nearly every case, interviewees from both sides of the partnerships indicated that their collaborative relationship around the volunteer program was working well. Interviewees from most of the cases said the volunteer program collaboration had resulted in growth and improvement in relationships, trust among the stakeholders, development of norms, or expansion of networks. As all of them increased the number of staff working on their volunteer programs, the number of partners, sources of support, and formal and informal agreements governing the programs, there is no question that the volunteer program collaborations resulted in growth in relationships, partnerships, and networks.

Most of the cases also asserted that their relationships were improved. When asked, for example, how the volunteer program collaboration impacted the larger partnership between the primary partners for each case, several interviewees said it had a positive impact:

- Cuyahoga Valley—Friends group, volunteer coordinator: Oh, absolutely [the partnership is richer] . . . And now I am getting requests . . . for volunteers where it never was the case before and it's because they have seen the track record that we have been able to do with volunteers. The relationship that I have built . . . has really changed the perceptions of a lot of park staff.
- Golden Gate—Conservancy, volunteer coordinator: I think we do set an example [of partnership for the larger collaboration between the two organizations], and that's been said by many people. I think that we work very hard to hear each other, to understand history, where we are coming from and also our future, where we are going in a collaborative way. I think that when we're together we really set an example of how to work in a seamless fashion in a partnership.
- Yosemite—NPS, volunteer coordinator: I think it's a very positive relationship, and it really shows how cooperatively we can work together to achieve mutual goals.
- Acadia—Friends group, volunteer coordinator: When you get to know somebody on a personal level, you establish trust . . . by knowing them and working with them personally there is that level of trust that gets established.

Although they lacked data to support their views, interviewees nonetheless felt that they could tell that their relations with the partner organization were working well—terms they employed included "strong," "respectful," "seamless," "honest," "effective, "positive," "great," and "productive."

All the cases expanded their existing network structures through their collaboration on the volunteer programs. For some, like Arches/Canyonlands and the National Mall, the expansion has been incremental, with a few new programs, staff, and trainings being added to the traditional program that had previously been managed solely by the NPS. At Cuyahoga Valley, Acadia, Golden Gate, and Yosemite, the expansion

has been much greater—even exponential in some cases such as in Cuyahoga Valley where over 100 staff supervise volunteers (from one staff person a few years before) or in Golden Gate, which also started out with a single person managing the volunteer program and which now leverages 286 staff. At the National Mall, Cuyahoga Valley, Arches/Canyonlands, and Golden Gate, multiple nonprofits are dedicated to supporting volunteer programs at those respective units. Yosemite and Acadia have only one, but these groups represent restructuring and evolution of what had been multiple independent nonprofits that support volunteer efforts. Collaboration has resulted in both creation and expansion of networks and structures that support volunteer programs in each case.

A final area of impact on the partnership relates to the ability of the partners to adapt and respond to challenges, opportunities, and turbulence; leverage skills across fields; generate innovative ways to address complex issues; and fill gaps created by reductions in government support and leadership. The area of adaptability was one of the study's five research questions. Nearly all the cases affirmed that working together on volunteer programming enhanced their adaptability. Specifically, they identified the following ways in which collaboration engendered greater flexibility, adaptability, nimbleness in response to needs and opportunities:

1. Weather and compensate for shortfalls and reductions in federal NPS funding;
2. Respond more quickly to opportunities such as grants;
3. Respond when new needs arise in the parks by using volunteers;
4. Respond in times of natural or manmade disasters, injuries to visitors, finding lost visitors, illegal activity in the parks, etc.;
5. Make purchases they could not otherwise, do things more quickly, or meet unforeseen needs;
6. More easily create / put on new programs and special events;
7. Hire staff more easily and quickly;
8. Increase efficiency and accuracy in recording data about volunteer program activities (because more staff available to work on it);

As detailed in Table 4.17, interviewees believe that working together has allowed them to be more flexible and adaptive around the volunteer program.

Table 4.17
Greater Adaptability as an Impact of Volunteer Program Collaboration

Park—Organization	Quote
Acadia—NPS	Certainly our ability to respond to changing conditions, challenges, turbulence, or opportunities is greater as the partnership can sometimes provide funding to meet unforeseen needs.
Acadia—Friends group	We can bring resources that the Park Service just doesn't have . . . and we can provide nimbleness as well, if that's a word, to move more quickly than the Park Service can, with tools, with people, with recognition, with food, with whatever else is needed. We can supply it more easily than they can.
Arches & Canyonlands—NPS	Having a partner that can help bring able bodies to any effort—in our case providing visitor information, trail patrols, boundary patrols, cultural site monitoring, exotic vegetation removal, special events, helps us greatly during these times of increased costs and flat to declining budgets.
Cuyahoga Valley—NPS	Our ability to respond to changing conditions, challenges, turbulence, or opportunities is greater . . . We have more capacity to both recognize the challenges and opportunities, as well as to handle the response . . . We've gone through times where the government money stabilized the partners, and . . . where the partner's money has stabilized the crazy government budgets.
Golden Gate—Conservancy	We're easing the burden on the program managers and also the volunteers. We're making it easy for both of us to engage volunteers in the park.
Yosemite—NPS	There are definitely times when I [have the Conservancy] buy something for me because I can't buy it. I would say 'yes' in term of being more adaptive and responsible.

Impact on the volunteer program. As noted in the discussion of why the volunteer program partnerships were formed, the desire of the stakeholder for more volunteers, programs, staff, capacity to meet needs in the parks, community partners, etc., was a common theme among the cases. The cases have quantitative evidence of program growth, despite concerns expressed by interviewees about the limits of relying on numbers to evaluate volunteer program impacts. Their numbers demonstrate that co-

coordination of volunteer programs has led in each case to more volunteers, more volunteer hours, more partners, and more volunteer programming.

At Cuyahoga Valley, for example, the number of volunteer hours increased 31% from FY 2011 to FY 2012. Arches & Canyonlands added five new volunteer initiatives. On the National Mall, where no interpretive volunteers had received formal training prior to 2012, over 400 received it in the next two years after the NPS and Trust created and jointly provided semi-annual trainings. And at Golden Gate, 35,000 volunteers gave nearly 500,000 hours of service in FY 2014. Across the cases, more volunteers have translated to more and larger programs, more volunteer activity, more projects being undertaken and completed, and more visitors being assisted by volunteers.

In addition to data from documents, all the cases offered anecdotal evidence of positive impacts of their collaboration on the volunteer program. Interviewees said they believe their collaborative volunteer programs are working based on information gleaned from staff, volunteers, and visitors. Through discussions, observations, and site visits, volunteer program staff and their administrators procured qualitative evidence of program impacts in addition to the quantitative data they collect related to program growth (see Table 4.18).

Table 4.18
Anecdotal or Qualitative Evidence of Success of Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs, by Case

NPS Unit	Organization and Quote
Acadia	Friends group: For me the real indicator is with the volunteer crew leaders . . . I think it's more of just anecdotal feeling of—people wouldn't come back year after year if they were having a miserable time . . . What matters most is that the Park Service, number one, is satisfied with the work that is being done . . . And that, to me shows that yes, we are making a positive difference. And they keep saying 'thank you.' So that's good. That's what you want to hear.

	NPS: When the trails foreman, the carriage roads foreman, or their people come to those meetings, they are full of good words. They will tell the volunteers, "yes, it's been a real help. It's saved us a lot of work."
Arches & Canyonlands	Friends group: Impacts are mostly measured informally, but feels strongly the partnership around the volunteer program is strengthening the relationship between the partners, is increasing the size, scale, and impact of the volunteer program, and is creating a better experience for visitors.
Cuyahoga Valley	Friends group: The impact is so much greater than the dollar. It's that you create a community of advocates for your National Park. And people that volunteer in a park tend to love it. They tend to donate . . . What gets done in a park that wouldn't gotten done without volunteers—we do a little bit of measuring of that, but again more anecdotally. NPS: One thing I hear anecdotally a lot is how important volunteering is to the people who volunteer . . . I am not talking about the one-off volunteers. I am talking about these highly engaged people. Some people really express how important it has been in their aging. It's something that keeps them engaged, keeps them interested, creates social networks of them.
Golden Gate	NPS: We have had our share of 'thank you very much, this made the difference.' 'Your intern made the difference for my kid. Now my kid is interested in doing this kind of work' . . . I get a lot of the kids that we have out in the ed. programs back here bringing their parents with them, saying, 'see, I was showing them what we did in school.' That's telling me the volunteer program has a strong impact.
National Mall	Trust: The Days of Service piece, while probably still anecdotal for us, I feel like is much more tangible because it's large groups. We just had a Day of Service with Volkswagen; it's one of our large corporate partners. To have the CEO of Volkswagen call up and say, 'That was an awesome day!'—that's really good work for us. That's what we want to have happen.
Yosemite	Conservancy: What I have heard over and over is volunteers saying . . . some visitors they saw were really grumpy, they were able to help them, and the visitors were happy when they left . . . That's one of those metrics we don't have. NPS: The other piece of evaluation I get personally is when I go that one night to dinner with these groups . . . And during that time they're asking me a lot of questions . . . mostly I get a lot of, 'this is what's going well.' . . . I sort of get a really good feeling for what's working, what's not, and just their enthusiasm about what they're doing . . . and how satisfied people are with the program.

Responses like this suggest that volunteer program coordinators think they have quantitative and qualitative evidence to believe, overall, that collaborating around the volunteer program has been successful in terms of enlarging and improving volunteer activities at the NPS units they support.

Impact on volunteers. In addition to impacting program size and the quality of the partnership, interviewees expressed belief and hope that their collaborative efforts will also yield other impacts that redound on the volunteers, the partners, and the parks they jointly support. Although they used different terms to describe this, representatives at all but one of the cases hoped that through volunteering, participants would become long-term supporters or stewards of the parks they serve. For the nonprofits, stewardship was sometimes viewed in terms of financial donations, which would then be used to pay for more parks programs and activities.

For NPS staff, stewardship also refers to long-term volunteering and advocacy on behalf of the parks and their activities, to include volunteer programs. The Friends of Arches & Canyonlands Parks, for example, sees stewardship as the primary purpose of its participation in the volunteer program and as a direct expression of its mission. Other examples of these sentiments include the following:

- Golden Gate Volunteer supervisor: I also think it's helpful to give people a sense of ownership of the Park. And that helps them build a relationship . . . It's just it makes them feel more connected to the park if they actually got to do something, either to help make a difference or to just be a part of it.
- Cuyahoga Valley Friends group volunteer coordinator: Our whole mission . . . boils down to basically we're trying to create a community of park stewards . . . Our goal is to get them to engage in volunteerism and park stewardship on multiple occasions . . . Obviously too, if we see that they are giving more of their dollars, that is another kind of side benefit.

- Cuyahoga Valley NPS Division chief: The development director at the Conservancy . . . saw value in this [partnership] because he saw a nexus between volunteerism, member donations, this kind of three legs of community engagement.
- Yosemite NPS volunteer coordinator: The three goals of our program are first, to get the work done that needs to happen in the park. Second, to give meaningful experiences to our volunteers. And third, to engage our volunteers in stewardship work to help create that stewardship ethic.
- Golden Gate Conservancy volunteer program manager: [The person who started the raptor observatory said he wanted to create volunteer programs] 'that would run for 30-50-100 years, and I wasn't looking so much for any old volunteer. I was looking for a constituency.' He wanted a constituency of volunteers . . . who would have no whim about calling up the superintendent of the GGNRA and saying, 'this program is so valuable. Do not cut it.'

Although they gather basic numbers and counts related to volunteer activities, to date none of the cases has conducted in-depth evaluation studies of the impact of their programs on those who volunteer for them, and none indicated that they had plans to do so.

Category 4: Pressures Driving Both Conformity and Distinctiveness in Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs

In their designs, goals, structures, staffing, and activities, and other components, the six cases demonstrate both many similarities and many differences. Table 4.7 lists examples of common components in the cases of co-managed volunteer program examined in the study. More than half (15) of the 27 examples are used by all six cases, and 22 are employed by at least four of the cases. The case vignettes, by contrast, also describe significant differences in each. The study examined reasons for this combination of convergence and divergence of forms at the sites, and the following findings are divided into two themes:

1. Pressures for conformity, and

2. Pressures for distinctiveness.

Pressures for conformity. Interviewees described three reasons or factors that led them to develop similar forms in their co-managed volunteer programs over time: (1) rules, laws, reporting requirements, and regulations to which they all have to conform; (2) copying, adapting, or adopting ideas from other volunteer programs; and (3) exposure to similar ideas and strategies as a result of attending the same trainings and conferences or participating in associations. Each of these factors is discussed below.

Rules, requirements, and regulations. All the programs are governed by Director's Order #7 (NPS, 2005), a directive that provides rules to govern volunteer programs at NPS units in areas such as volunteer qualifications, approved volunteer activities, reimbursement, benefits, uniforms, reporting requirements, recruitment, training, recognition, and termination. In addition, all the cases must report the same types of data, and in the same format, regarding their volunteer program activities. Other NPS director's orders regulate how programs may be managed (#2), communications, including electronic communications (#5, #15), agreements (#20), youth programs (#26), cooperating associations (#32) and other aspects of volunteer programming (U.S. Department of the Interior, n.d.a).

As 501c3 organizations, the nonprofits in the study must meet standard nonprofit federal requirements relating to establishing by-laws, boards of directors, budgetary standards, and financial audits. The nonprofits are also governed by Director's Order #21 (NPS, 2008), which addresses donations, fundraising, records management, and other philanthropic work in and for NPS units. Interviewees said that many of the common

components and structures of their volunteer programs are the result of adherence to these federal rules, guidelines, and restrictions.

At the same time, federal rules, restrictions, and funding cutbacks are key reasons why the co-collaborative volunteer programs were formed. The defining similarity among the cases is that they chose to share coordination of volunteer programming at their respective NPS units. Initially, all the volunteer program partnerships were formed around obvious needs that the parks could not adequately address—degraded trails, long lines at visitor centers, etc. And while the idea was not to circumvent federal rules, a key common goal of the co-collaboration was to take fuller advantage of what is allowed under the law by tapping the greater flexibility of the nonprofit partners, as noted by the executive director of the Friends group at Cuyahoga Valley:

> Cuyahoga Valley National Park . . . wanted a volunteer program that was more responsive, flexible, and able to respond to visitor and community needs. It is much easier for a nimble nonprofit to change course and grab opportunities than it is for a government agency/bureaucracy. As a nonprofit, we could easily add an internship position . . . without going through the complex government personnel system. We are able to market volunteer positions . . . quickly, as we can easily expend funds, don't have a layered approval system.

Copying, adapting, or adopting ideas from each other. Interviewees from each case were asked if they borrowed ideas or copied from others in designing their co-coordinated volunteer programs. Staff at four of the cases said they did, and staff at five cases said other parks had borrowed ideas from them. "We looked at a lot of different parks and what they were doing," said the Cuyahoga Valley Conservancy volunteer coordinator in a statement echoed at other sites. The NPS volunteer coordinator at Arches & Canyonlands adapted information in her volunteer manual from other park

manuals. She added it was common for NPS volunteer coordinators to get ideas from other NPS sites.

Exposure to similar ideas and strategies via trainings and associations. NPS volunteer program staff and their nonprofit partners attend trainings sponsored by the NPS via a two-day intensive volunteer management course. After attending the standard NPS course and finding it of little practical value, the NPS volunteer coordinator at Golden Gate worked with other NPS staff to revamp the course to make it more applicable:

> It's in a module format now so you can do whichever modules matter to your park . . . The training . . . includes how to greet a volunteer, how to do all the paperwork, how to recruit them to start with, how to write job descriptions that matter, how to put things up on volunteer.gov. And so with everybody having the same knowledge, it's made a huge difference.

This re-worked course is attended by NPS and nonprofit volunteer program staff from NPS units across the country, providing a normative and standardizing influence on volunteer programs.

Since 1994, the National Park Foundation has supported the Friends Alliance, which represents nonprofit organizations that partner with national parks. Its goals are to share information, clarify NPS policies, promote partnership and philanthropy to support NPS units, and help address issues that arise between the NPS and nonprofit support groups (National Park Foundation, 2014a). Four of the Alliance's current steering committee members, including its president, represent cases in this study. Through its activities, the Friends Alliance (as well as the Association of Partners for Public Lands, which puts on a national conference each year to share practices) serves as a normative influence on co-coordinated volunteer programs.

Interviewees from most of the cases indicated they were well aware of each other's programs, particularly of the three largest ones at Golden Gate, Yosemite, and Cuyahoga Valley, each of which has received national recognition. Three of the sites said they also made a point of copying their own successes (or learning from their own mistakes), in addition to mimicking others. Overall, findings suggest that legal requirements, copying, sharing, and development of common trainings and standards influence these widely dispersed co-managed volunteer programs to implement many of the same structures and programs.

Pressures for distinctiveness. Although the cases demonstrate many instances of similar structures and activities, there is also significant and obvious evidence of divergence among them. These differences, findings suggest, are related to unique/distinctive, intangible, physical, individual, or historical factors at each location and within each partnership. Although the six cases are all instances of co-coordinated volunteer programs at NPS units, they vary considerably in terms of their physical locations, landscapes, climates, adjacent population densities, type of NPS units, sizes, natural and manmade features, accessibility, and other elements. Some of these differences are sufficiently robust that they influence design features of the co-managed volunteer programs. The differences are durable and likely to resist pressures toward isomorphism over time.

Thus, parks with little or no housing for volunteers (National Mall, Cuyahoga Valley, Arches & Canyonlands) rely on commuters, local residents (not available at remote parks), or people who are willing to volunteer while on vacation. Sites with long, cold winters (Yosemite, Acadia) schedule nearly all their volunteer programs during

warm-weather months. Parks with many wealthy neighbors (Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, Acadia, National Mall) are more likely to get endowments or significant corporate support to support volunteer activities. Parks with iconic natural or manmade features have less need to recruit, and sometimes must defer or turn volunteers away (Yosemite, National Mall, Golden Gate). And sites located near schools have a much easier time establishing youth-related volunteer and service-learning programs than parks in remote areas. Specific way in which distinctive features of each park have helped to mold its co-coordinated volunteer program are described in the vignettes for each case.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented cases vignettes and findings that emerged from analysis of interviews and documents from the six cases. Results were grouped into categories that explored how and why the partners collaborated around volunteer programming, the structures and components of their co-coordinated volunteer programs, and impacts of collaboration on the partnerships, the volunteer programs, and on volunteers. Quotes from interviews and documents were provided in support of findings. Several unanticipated findings were described, most of which were related to the context of managing a volunteer program in a collaboration involving two or more organizations. Chapter 5 presents interpretation of the findings, implications of the study for research and practice, recommendations for further research and conclusions.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

Co-coordinated volunteer programs at U.S. National Park Service (NPS) are a relatively new and heretofore unexamined phenomenon. Only 14 of 407 NPS units operate their volunteer programs such that an NPS unit and its direct-support nonprofit partner jointly manage volunteer programming. At the same time, public funding for the NPS has been flat or reduced for decades (Connally, 1982; Rettie, 1995; Runte, 2010), and there is more need than ever for volunteers in the parks. This multi-case research study sought to understand how interorganizational relationships between NPS units and their nonprofit partners function as manifested through six cases of co-coordinated volunteer programs. The study explores five research questions:

1. How and why do NPS units and their nonprofit partners collaborate to co-coordinate volunteer programs?
2. What are the structures and components of the co-coordinated volunteer programs?
3. How do the co-coordinated volunteer programs adhere to research-based elements of effective volunteer program management and interorganizational relations?
4. What are similarities and differences in how the co-coordinated volunteer programs function at the selected sites?
5. How well are the partnerships able to adapt to changing conditions?

This chapter first discusses four categories of findings that emerged from data analysis and were presented in Chapter 4. Based on this discussion, the overall conclusions of the study are presented. The chapter then presents implications in the light of theory, within and beyond the conceptual framework that was used. It concludes with a discussion of applicability of the study and recommendations for further research.

In general terms, the cases collaborate, in their broadly mutual interests and from a common vision, to use volunteers to protect and care for their NPS sites and enhance

visitors' ability to enjoy them. In their volunteer program partnerships, the cases adhere to many of the precepts, actions, and impacts predicted by IOR and New Institutionalism theories as well as SHRM research on effective volunteer program management. At the same time, the cases also add to and diverge from IOR, New Institutionalism, and SHRM theories and predictions. The differences are due primarily to (1) the fact that the volunteer programs selected for this study are administered as cross-sector collaborations as opposed to by a single organization; (2) the distinctive conditions and features at each NPS site that drive differences in program needs, structures, and activities; and (3) the intangible, often affective, factors associated with volunteer programs and volunteering in national parks, including the influence of individual actors and the attraction of these iconic sites.

Reasons and Approaches for Collaborating to Co-coordinate Volunteer Programs

Broadly speaking, the cases divide or share volunteer program responsibilities through formal and informal arrangements that are based on mutual agreement, needs, and desires—what most of them termed a 'common vision.' These agreed-upon divisions, which are sometimes codified in memoranda or agreement documents, are in turn influenced by individual and collective partner needs, ambitions, capacities, interests, available resources, and expertise in each partnership. Collaboration decisions are also influenced by how things were done in the past, the strength of the partnership, as well as the will, talents, and relationships of the key stakeholders.

Most of the NPS units have more than one nonprofit partner that supports its volunteer program. However, in each case the primary volunteer program partnership is between the NPS unit and a single nonprofit that is established and dedicated to

supporting the NPS unit. This finding is supported by Leigh (2005), who observed that NPS collaborations with official 'friends' organizations, trusts, or foundations were stronger and much more likely to endure than those with other nonprofit organizations because of the congruent mission of the two organizations. The other partners are more narrowly focused and typically only support volunteer programming related to their interest area. Overall shared volunteer program policy and planning decisions are made jointly by top management from the partners. Implementation is led by volunteer program coordinators and their staff, who are typically co-located and communicate on a daily basis.

In concrete terms, elements of collaboration vary by site and program, are multifaceted, and can manifest in joint planning, recruiting, cost-sharing, volunteer supervision, use of equipment, transporting volunteers, feeding and outfitting volunteers, logistical arrangements, writing grants, gathering data, training, report writing and submittal, recognizing volunteers and donors—basically any aspect of volunteer programming, depending on the partnership. Types and levels of collaboration also vary by specific volunteer program within the larger partnership.

Each of the cases has multiple, distinct volunteer programs, and in each case coordination of individual volunteer programs fits into one of three categories: (1) programs coordinated by the NPS, (2) programs coordinated by the nonprofit partner, and (3) programs that are jointly coordinated by the partners. The three largest cases (Yosemite, Golden Gate, and Cuyahoga Valley) have created vision, mission, and goal statements specifically for the volunteer program that are used in part to guide how the partners collaborate.

Researchers posit that cross-sector social partnerships can achieve additional goals beyond those accruing to within-sector collaboration, including leveraging skills across fields, generating solutions to complex social issues, filling gaps created by reduction in government support and leadership, and greater adaptability to crises, change, and turbulence (Ashby, 1956, 1960; Austin, 2000b; Barringer & Harrison, 2000; Brinkerhoff, 2002; Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Cropper et al., 2010; Emery & Trist, 1965; Gomes-Casseres, 1996; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Gray, 1985, 1989, 2000; Gray & Wood, 1991; Heuer, 2011; Klitgaard & Treverton, 2004; Koschmann et al., 2012; Mandel & Keast, 2010; Pasquero, 1991; Pfeffer & Nowak, 1976; Selsky, 1991; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Trist, 1983; Van de Ven, 1976). Adaptability yields benefits such as leveraging skills across fields, tapping innovative ideas, and being able to respond either more nimbly than government can or when government simply cannot respond.

Across the cases and from both sides of the CSSPs, respondents confirmed that collaborating on volunteer programs allows them to be more flexible, adaptable, and able to respond to opportunities and challenges. In practical terms, this adaptability plays out in areas such as more effectively making purchases, hiring, identifying and securing resources, gathering data, reporting, creating new programs, dealing with legal issues and liability, and responding to unexpected events and challenges. Indeed, being more nimble and responsive was a primary reason that several cases identified for forming the volunteer CSSPs in the first place.

Perhaps the strongest evidence of the greater adaptability of the cases is the clear evidence they provide of growth of their programs. In an era when other NPS units struggle to dedicate even part of a single ranger's time to volunteer coordination (NPS &

Walker Davidson, LLC, 2007), most of the cases in this study, operating under the same challenges of federal funding, have expanded their numbers of volunteers, volunteer hours, volunteer programs, and partners. Indeed, in several cases the programs have expanded so much that some must now apply their adaptability skills to keep from being overwhelmed by all their volunteers.

Structures and Components of the Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs

The co-coordinated volunteer programs are, for the most part, formally structured, which is not surprising given their scale, depth, and complexity, particularly in the larger partnerships. Twenty-seven examples of volunteer program structures that are employed by the six cases, and program structures are detailed in Chapter 4. In general terms, structures address staffing, responsibilities, types of volunteer activity, decision-making, training, volunteer supervision, use of funds, volunteer program coordination, reporting, etc. There is a clear parallel between scale of structures and scale of effort; the cases with more volunteers, volunteer programs, and volunteer supervisors have and use more processes, formal agreements, guidelines, and systems.

One of the most important structuring elements related to program size and impact is the configuration (or reconfiguration) of staff, intern, and experienced volunteer positions so that their roles encompass managing volunteers. Volunteers must be trained, supervised, and supported, and three of the cases (Yosemite, Golden Gate, and Cuyahoga Valley) have each been able to dedicate over 100 staff and veteran volunteers to oversee volunteers and the volunteer program, allowing for a scale of volunteer programing that dwarfs that of the other cases, both in terms of the numbers of volunteers and volunteer programs as well as in the range and depth of the roles that volunteers play.

Adherence of volunteer program structures and components to research-based elements of effective volunteer program management and interorganizational relations (IOR). Because this category encompasses two broad areas of research, discussion is divided into the two parts: (1) IOR (and its sub-theory of Cross-Sector Social Partnerships, or CSSPs), and (2) research under Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) related to volunteer program management. The cases demonstrate fidelity to theory related to IOR in general and with the IOR sub-theory of CSSPs in particular (Cropper et al., 2010; Emery & Trist, 1965; Gray, 1985, 1989; Pfeffer & Nowak, 1976; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Van de Ven, 1976). IOR and CSSP theories, this study finds, are sufficiently flexible to apply in the variant context of CSSPs in which the traditional government-as-funder and nonprofit-as-grantee roles are reversed. Thus, even though in these cases the nonprofits are giving funds to the public agency (i.e., to NPS units), the cases formed partnerships for reasons commonly cited in the IOR and CSSP literature, developed in sequences and stages foretold in those theories, seek to balance autonomy and interdependence in their interactions as suggested by research, face predicted challenges, apply a range of theory-forecasted strategies to address challenges (some more successfully than others), and describe benefits of collaboration that align with what is predicted by IOR and CSSP.

Reasons for collaborating. IOR and CSSP theories postulate that organizations collaborate for multiple reasons, such as encouragement or requirements from funders, out of a common vision, in response to crises, because of inspirational leaders, to gain resources or expertise, to expand, to economize, and/or to be more nimble and responsive in the face of challenges, opportunities, and turbulence (Andriof & Waddock, 2002;

Ashby, 1956, 1960; Barringer & Harrison, 2000; Cropper et al., 2010; Emery & Trist, 1965; Gomes-Casseres, 1996; Gray, 1985, 1989; Gray & Wood, 1991; Pasquero, 1991; Pfeffer & Nowak, 1976; Selsky, 1991; Trist, 1983; Van de Ven, 1976). Additional goals drive CSSPs, such as recognition of the limits of government programs, seeking innovative solutions, drawing on different skills across fields, and addressing complex 'metaproblems' that single organizations or sectors cannot solve alone (Austin, 2000b; Brinkerhoff, 2002; Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Gray, 1985, 1989, 2000; Heuer, 2011; Klitgaard & Treverton, 2004; Koschmann et al., 2012; Mandel & Keast, 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010; Trist, 1983; Waddock, 1989, 1991).

Representatives from across the cases cited the above reasons for expanding their existing partnerships and collaborating around volunteer programs. They wanted to be more cost-effective, get around federal restrictions on NPS action by having the nonprofit partner do it instead, add volunteers and volunteer program staff, increase the number of volunteer projects and number of visitors who are helped by volunteers, and better address their common missions of meeting needs in their NPS units. Collaboration, they hoped, would allow them to leverage their combined talents and resources to have a greater impact.

Stages of partnership development. In terms of their stages of development, all the cases described following the IOR research-predicted sequence of problem setting, direction setting, implementation, and periodic evaluation/reassessment of their volunteer program partnerships (Astley & Fombrun, 1983; Gray, 1985, 1989; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994; Spekman et al., 1996). In doing so, they used formal, informal, or a combination

of formal and informal discussions, agreements, and activities. In addition, all the cases indicated that their level of collaboration was either maintaining or increasing.

Selsky & Parker (2005, 2010) also suggest that CSSPs range from transactional to integrative and may be characterized as occurring at one of three 'platforms':

1. Resource dependence: narrow collaboration to secure resources, cope with turbulence, or gain competitive advantage.
2. Social issues: broader partnership to more efficiently address a shared social 'metaproblem" neither partner can address alone.
3. Societal sector: the relations, actions, and roles of the partners begin to blur, as an "organization in one sector adopts or captures a role or function traditionally associated with another sector" (2005, p. 853).

The cases in this study fit into platforms two and three, as they all address social needs (around conservation, historical preservation, and community engagement). By working together across the public and nonprofit sectors, they strive for a wider impact than they can acting just within their sectors. Interviewees at three of the partnerships (Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite) provided evidence that they have moved into the 'societal sector platform' stage in their partnership, where distinctions between the partners have begun to disappear. As one Golden Gate ranger put it, "When it comes to 'us' and 'them,' there is no 'them.' It's just an 'us.'"

Balancing autonomy and interdependence. IOR scholars characterize effective collaborations as being a balance of autonomy and interdependence between the partners, in which each stakeholder gives up some power, control, or resources but also receives some in return while maintaining its overall identity (Bedwell et al, 2010; Brinkerhoff, 2002; Cropper et al., 2010; Gray, 1985, 1989; Thompson et al., 2009). In interviews, participants from four cases identified this balance as a challenge at the staff and organizational levels. They described tensions around the reversal of traditional

government-nonprofit roles in that the nonprofit is giving funds to the government agency.

Some NPS staff were described as reluctant to support the volunteer program partnership because it could lead to loss of their jobs or the nonprofit partner making decisions about park priorities instead of the NPS. Concurrently, several interviewees from the nonprofit partners noted that as a result of having a 'seamless' or transparent volunteer program, many visitors, volunteers, and potential donors did not recognize the role of the nonprofit, which depended on a clear identity to attract and focus donations. Overall, these goals and issues around the balance of autonomy and interdependence align with and support IOR theory.

Partnership challenges. Beyond balancing autonomy and interdependence, the IOR and CSSP literature suggests such partnerships face additional challenges around power sharing, power disparities, communication, different cultures, resistance to change, technical and logistical complexities, and the difficulty of sustaining relationships (Brinkerhoff, 2002; Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Gray, 1985, 1989; Huxham & Vangen, 1996; Hibbert & Huxham, 2010). The cases in this study all described similar challenges; Table 4.11 lists 23 examples of challenges related to the above areas, the majority of which were identified by more than half of the cases. The findings thus support assertions in IOR research that the emergence and incidence of such challenges is an inevitable—even a natural and therefore predictable—component of interorganizational collaboration (Gray, 1989), even when traditional government-nonprofit roles are reversed.

Given that the partners in the cases have almost complete mission congruity, a basic assumption might be that it is easier for organizations to collaborate if they have so much in common. However, study findings do not support this; all the cases face ongoing barriers and challenges in collaborating around their volunteer programs. The challenges they grapple with, as well as their strategies for dealing with them, align with findings from IOR and CSSP studies of traditional, non-goal-congruent partnerships. By extension, it is just as important for goal-congruent partners to anticipate and develop systems for addressing conflict as it is for other partnerships. Assuming otherwise will likely lead to the organizations being less prepared to respond when challenges inevitably arise.

Since, in five of the cases, a nonprofit partner provides funds to the government organization instead of the other way around, one might expect concomitant role switches and associated conflicts around power, control, and hegemony. Indeed, concerns about money and control were mentioned as existing at all five cases where nonprofit funds go to the NPS units. The concern, as one interviewee described it, was that the 'tail' (i.e., the nonprofit) was 'wagging the dog' (the NPS unit) and dictating to the park because of the money the nonprofits controlled. IOR-predicted issues over money and control apply even when funds go from the nonprofit to the public agency instead of the traditional structure, and thus this study supports existing IOR theory in a new context and suggests that challenges over money—like challenges in general—are unavoidable in interorganizational relationships.

Strategies for addressing partnership challenges. Just as IOR and CSSP studies identify a range of challenges that partners face, they also recommend actions to support

successful collaboration and overcome challenges. Some of the more commonly mentioned strategies include communication, democracy and equality in the partnership, using an interorganizational decision-making process, establishing trust, formal and informal agreements, supportive leaders, acting in good faith, adaptability, having a shared vision and goals, evaluation, sharing risks, proactively addressing conflicts, commitment, determination, and the ability to learn from mistakes (Bryon et al., 2006; Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Gray, 1989; Huxham & Vangen, 1996; Staber & Sydow, 2002; Walter, 1987).

The volunteer program partnerships in this study employ many of the above general strategies as well as several context-specific ones described in Chapter 4. Moreover, the largest and most established cases have and use more of these strategies than the smaller, newer cases. This finding echoes results from Lamoureux's (2009) study of volunteer tourism partnerships, in which 80% of the long-lasting and successful partnerships had at least two distinct conflict management strategies, while 80% of the failed partnerships had no or only one conflict management strategy.

As in other IOR collaborations described in the literature, the cases use both formal and informal strategies to prevent and respond to conflicts that arise in their partnerships. Key strategies included daily/constant communication, agreements describing roles and responsibilities of the partners, high-level annual meetings to set priorities, use of joint support or advisory groups, and addressing issues immediately so they do not fester or escalate. One additional and unanticipated factor that supported successful collaboration was love of and devotion to the NPS site by staff from the partner organizations. At three of the cases, interviewees described a 'shared love of

place' as helping the partners see the larger picture of their shared responsibility for park stewardship. This shared 'spirit,' as one of them termed it, was greater than disagreements they might have, and helped to prevent or defuse conflict.

Application of components of volunteer program management in a co-coordinated environment. Since 1967, SHRM researchers have identified and assessed components of effective volunteer management practices and structures, primarily in cases where a single organization coordinates the volunteer program. Based on that work, this study distilled 12 components of best volunteer program management practices and explored the incidence of these components at and across the cases as well as the level and scale of their adoption and activity under each component:

1. Written policies to govern the co-coordinated volunteer program,
2. Providing resources for volunteer programs, including for a paid coordinator,
3. Training for paid staff who work with volunteers,
4. Creating job descriptions for volunteers,
5. Providing liability coverage for volunteers,
6. Outreach to recruit volunteers,
7. Orienting volunteers,
8. Designing or providing basic and ongoing volunteer training,
9. Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers,
10. Creating higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers,
11. Evaluating volunteers, and
12. Recognizing volunteer program staff and volunteers.

(Boyce, 1971; Brudney, 2004, 2005, 2010; Brudney & Nezhina; 2005; Connors, 2012; Ellis, 2002; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; Naylor, 1967; Penrod, 1991; Safrit, 2006; Safrit et al., 2005; Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013)

As detailed in Chapter 4, all the cases utilize these 12 strategies at some level, and at high levels in many instances. The three largest volunteer program partnerships (Cuyahoga Valley, Golden Gate, and Yosemite) demonstrated higher fidelity to the components than the other cases, a trend that was observed in categories across the study. The cases also employ additional practices related to co-managing volunteer programs, which supports

arguments by Rochester (1999), Rehnborg (2009), Macduff et al. (2009), Brudney and Meijs (2014), and Hager and Brudney (2015) that best volunteer management practices are contingent on conditions, contexts, and circumstances as opposed to there being a single, universally applicable list of ways to manage volunteers.

In the area of volunteer liability coverage, which is governed by federal rule and is the same for all NPS units, all the cases demonstrated the same level of adherence. In general, the cases were strongest in providing basic resources to support the volunteer program (including having paid coordinators) and orienting volunteers. At the other end of the spectrum, none of the cases has a formal system for assessing their volunteer programs beyond conducting basic counts and surveying training participants. In the other areas, there are varying levels of disparity among the cases in their level and scale of employment of volunteer management components.

The application of SHRM-recommended elements of effective volunteer program management represents a broad area in which the cases align with SHRM research calling for the formalization of volunteer programs. Another area of formalization and alignment noted in the interviews and documents is that interviewees said volunteers should be treated like other staff (Brudney, 2010; Naylor, 1973; McCurley & Lynch, 2011). However, the cases' adherence to this precept is based on practical realities and is conditional, depending on the volunteers' term of service and the level of complexity and responsibility of their work. Long-term and higher-level volunteers are treated much like employees, with job descriptions, job applications, interviews, scheduled tasks, benefits, more autonomy, etc. For an NPS unit, however, it makes no sense to treat drop-in and one-time volunteers in this way, and it would be unnecessary and logistically impossible

to do so, for example, on a day of service when 250 new volunteers show up to do a beach clean-up or to pull weeds.

Structural arrangements of volunteer programs. In an overview of volunteer program management strategies, Brudney (2010) suggests that volunteer programs led by a single organization typically fall into one of three broad structural arrangements, in order of increasing comprehensiveness:

1. *Ad hoc*—volunteer activity that occurs to meet crises or other exigencies and which is short-term and typically requires little training or skill.
2. Use of a clearinghouse—an established entity through which both agencies needing volunteers and volunteers seeking opportunities can be matched. Volunteer programs can also be decentralized within an organization.
3. Centralized—serving an entire agency, in which there is a single coordinator responsible for leading and managing volunteer programming.

As detailed in Chapter 4, the cases in this study do not fit neatly into these categories. Rather, each case includes elements of all three structures, with (1) short-term (*ad hoc*) days of service requiring little training, skill, or commitment; (2) decentralized efforts in which different partners coordinate different volunteer programs, allowing for flexibility and autonomy; as well as (3) centralized elements such as a single overall coordinator and annual cross-partner planning, policy-making, and budgeting. These structures have evolved over time at each of the cases based on needs, tradition, and formal and informal agreements.

Overall, the alignment of SHRM research on these cases in this study is broad and convincing. The evidence of this alignment in these previously unexamined co-managed volunteer programs—as opposed to traditional studies of volunteer programs led by a single organization—argues for wider applicability of the relationship between adherence

to recognized SHRM volunteer management practices and effective volunteer programming.

Extending research on volunteer program management in a co-coordinated context. The structure of the volunteer programs in this study differs from traditional volunteer programs in two respects. First, these programs are co-managed and include collaboration-related design and implementation considerations that do not arise in volunteer programs led by a single entity. Second (and less significantly), the study found that people volunteer at NPS units out of an additional motive from those identified in SHRM surveys. Thus, while the cases reflect SHRM research and practice, they also extend it in areas related to the fact that the volunteer programs are collaborative efforts and not administered by a single organization.

Specifically, findings stretch existing SHRM research and suggest the importance of technology, constant communication among volunteer program partners, co-locating staff to ensure communication, effective working relationships between the volunteer coordinator partners, and long-serving supportive leaders and staff in key positions as needed strategies to manage volunteer programs that are coordinated by more than one organization.

One of the interviewees stated explicitly, and others suggested, that their adherence to and application of SHRM-suggested elements of volunteer program management were substantially strengthened through their partnership. In other words, the expertise, funds, connections, and other resources provided through the partnership raised the ability of the volunteer program to formalize and implement strategies for managing it.

Another finding that stretches SHRM research relates to the additional reason that several interviewees described as a motivating factor for volunteers at their NPS sites. As noted in Chapter 2, surveys of volunteers suggest their motivations include altruistic, material, social, educational, career-related, civic, or religious purposes (Brudney, 2010; Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Edwards et al., 2012; Hall et al., 2006; Haski-Leventhal & Cnaan, 2009; McCurley & Lynch, 2011; Points of Light Foundation, 2004; Spring et al., 2009; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013; Waikayi et al., 2012). However, interviewees in this study said many of their volunteers were motivated out of sheer love for the NPS unit itself or features within it. Indeed, interviewees identified this 'love of place' as the strongest motive for many volunteers, one that translated to individuals returning to volunteer at the same place repeatedly over as much as 30 years, even when the volunteer work is tedious or physically challenging. While difficult to measure, this affective motivation is recognized and tapped by cases in this study. For volunteers drawn by love of a place, the opportunity that volunteering provides to be in and serve that place is a singular motivator. It is likely that this phenomenon also occurs at parks that do not have co-managed volunteer programs, but such sites were not part of this study.

Impacts of Volunteer Program Collaboration

IOR and CSSP theories suggest that well-designed collaboration can result in broader and deeper impacts on the partner organizations, on their partnerships, and on the societal needs the partners are trying to address (Cropper et al., 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Gray, 1985, 1989; Klitgaard & Treverton, 2004; Selsky & Parker, 2005,

2010). More specifically, Gray (2000) says that interorganizational relationships can lead to four specific impacts on the partnerships:

1. Creation of shared meaning—Partners develop a "common interpretation about the problem domain" (p. 246) and actions needed to address it.
2. Generation of social capital—Partners build social resources around the needs they are addressing, such as relationships, norms, or networks.
3. Changes in network structure—Partners expand structures or networks.
4. Shifts in the power distribution—The partnership results in "a more equal distribution of power" (p. 246) among stakeholders.

With regard to creating shared meaning, this outcome in many ways was the starting point for the cases, as they formed their volunteer program partnerships based on a shared mission and vision. Shared meaning was the foundation for expanding their existing partnerships into or within the area of volunteer programming. The partners began with significant vision and goal congruity ("We have a common vision," "We have shared goals and vision," "It's . . . a unified vision for the park," "Our vision is the same," etc.), and the study explored how that was applied toward co-managed volunteer programming. Thus, the cases are a step ahead of most other IOR and CSSP collaborators, who must expend time and energy to identify areas where their interests and goals overlap. The cases' oft-repeated challenge in this area related to convincing other NPS divisions and staff of the value of the volunteer partnership, which was seen as an ongoing task of education and outreach.

The cases offered abundant evidence that collaboration had resulted in expansion of partnerships, alliances, affiliations, and networks around the volunteer program. Most of the cases also asserted anecdotally that their relationships are improved as well as expanded. In three cases, interviewees said that their successful partnership around the

volunteer program served as a model for the overall partnership between their two organizations. Along similar lines, the cases all significantly expanded the network structures of the partners, adding staff, programs, agreements, procedures, trainings, and other partners.

In terms of shifts in power distribution, 12 interviewees were asked if the partnership had led to a "more equal distribution of power" among the stakeholders. Responses were inconsistent, and in some cases the partners disagreed with each other, which did not occur on other questions. It is possible the question lacked clarity or the topic is sensitive, given responses to the related question about the partners' balance between autonomy and interdependence. Only one NPS volunteer coordinator expressed a personal concern that the nonprofit partner might be trending toward hegemony in the relationship: "sometimes [they] would like to dictate how . . . things are done in the program." Others said this was not the case at all, including the nonprofit counterpart of the NPS volunteer coordinator quoted above. Therefore, no conclusions can be drawn in this area.

Overall, findings from interviews and documents support IOR Theory and its sub-theory of CSSP as lenses for understanding many aspects of the co-collaborative volunteer program partnerships between NPS units and their nonprofit partners. In some examples and particulars, the cases add other reasons for, methods of, or benefits of collaborating, but these reasons complement what is in the literature and do not substantially depart from it. At the same time, however, IOR and CSSP theories do not address other components of the cases, including their level of adherence to and divergence from principles of effective volunteer program management as articulated in

research and practice related to SHRM or similarities and differences in the cases as predicted by New Institutionalism Theory.

SHRM studies, for example, consistently show that use of research-based volunteer program management practices is positively related to outcomes such as volunteer satisfaction, more successful volunteer recruitment, and volunteer retention (Hager & Brudney, 2011; Kaufman et al., 2003; Safrit & Schmiesing, 2005; Schmiesing & Safrit, 2007; Tang et al., 2009; Vinton, 2012; Waikayi et al., 2012; Wisner et al., 2005). Because of the qualitative nature of this study, no measurements were made of outcomes in these areas. One popular volunteer program, the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory, formally measured an annual volunteer retention rate of 87-90%. All but one case said they were successful in recruiting volunteers, and four cases indicated that they are near, at, or over capacity for managing them. It cannot be shown, however, that the cases' success with recruitment relates to their use of volunteer management practices.

Similarities and Differences in the Six Co-coordinated Volunteer Programs

Findings were mixed related to alignment of the cases with New Institutionalism Theory, in particular regarding the prediction that organizational forms and practices will become more similar or isomorphic over time within institutional fields because of social or symbolic pressures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Zucker, 1977).

Similarities. On the one hand, the cases have developed many similar program structures and employ many similar strategies due to isomorphic pressures. They acknowledge learning and copying from each other (mimesis), being driven by similar

rules and requirements (coercion), and adopting standards that they in some cases developed and disseminated (norms). In alignment with the New Institutional idea that organizations 'decouple' their symbolic and technical practices when the prescriptions of institutional social pressures contradict technical or fiscal requirements (Greenwood et al., 2008; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1977), interviewees in three cases said that when faced with conflicts between social and financial imperatives, they acted to support their partnerships, even if those decisions were more costly or less efficient. New Institutionalism also accurately suggests that endogenous entrepreneurs at the case sites play vital roles in establishing and maintaining the co-managed volunteer programs (DiMaggio, 1988; Maguire et al., 2004; Sahlin-Anderson & Engwall, 2002). Leaders at four of the cases served as institutional entrepreneurs who changed existing structures and established new ones.

Differences. However, it was also easy to discern during site visits how distinctive each case is in its program emphases, the roles partners play, in its scale and scope, in how it is staffed, in what its volunteers do, in the strength of its partnerships, and even in its volunteer program philosophy. Some of these differences are derived from fundamental physical elements in and around the parks—their latitude and weather, proximity to or distance from population centers (and thus from volunteers), physical and manmade features in them, and varying needs in each park. Other differences are the result of volunteer program management practices, an idea advanced by Hager & Brudney (2011), who distinguish between 'nature and nurture' in volunteer programs. Some elements, like physical conditions and the volunteer pool, are beyond the control of program management; i.e., nature, or what Parsons (1964) referred to as 'unalterable

features.' Other aspects are subject to a measure of control by management (i.e., nurture).

And while nothing in the cases contradicts New Institutionalism ideas around the roles of endogenous entrepreneurs, this theory does not fully address the many roles that leaders at various levels play in the cases, as described by interviewees. Thus, New Institutionalism, like IOR Theory and SHRM research on volunteer program management, provides only a partial explanation of the phenomenon of study, and a multi-theory is essential to gain a more nuanced and complete understanding.

Conclusions

Based on study findings, several overall conclusions can be offered. It is clear that, in the cases examined, the NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnerships have resulted in expansion of volunteer programming, to include significantly more volunteers, volunteer hours, revenue sources, and volunteer projects conducted. The volunteer program partnerships also strengthen the relationship between the two organizations and allow for the partners to more flexibly and nimbly respond and adapt to both opportunities and challenges. The success of the NPS-nonprofit volunteer program partnership also attracts additional partners and accompanying resources and expertise.

Nonetheless—and despite the fact that the partners started with the advantages of having an existing partnership as well as congruent missions—collaboration around volunteering is an ongoing challenge due to the partners' varying priorities, personalities, and cultures. Formal and informal structures, agreements, and strategies are strategies for being able to adapt and to respond effectively to inevitable challenges. The largest

programs are consistently characterized by having more structures and strategies in place, both formal and informal.

Supportive, effective, and collaborative leaders are vital at both the top of the partner organizations and at the volunteer program management levels. The largest and most impactful programs indicated that the leaders of the partner organizations and volunteer programs had strong, positive relationships.

The largest and most impactful co-managed volunteer programs are characterized by greater adherence to a combination of established practices derived from Interorganizational Relations Theory and Strategic Human Resource Management research around volunteer program management by a single organization. At the same time, the volunteer program partnerships employ additional strategies for leading co-managed volunteer programs. They also respond and adapt effectively to the idiosyncratic features at and around their NPS sites, customizing volunteer program elements to their unique conditions and tapping the talents and energies of individuals and groups in distinctive ways.

Finally, volunteer program leaders at the cases perceive volunteers as much more—and more valuable—than just free labor. Volunteers are also seen as stewards who have the potential to serve, grow, advocate for, protect, and provide financial and other resources to the NPS sites over the long term. Growth of volunteer programs appears to be related to the wider appreciation and application of this concept by other NPS and nonprofit staff.

Implications and Recommendations for Theory and Research

Findings from the study offer a number of implications for theory, in multiple disciplines, as well as suggest additional areas for study of aspects related to the phenomenon of co-managed volunteer programs in the U.S. National Park Service. The areas of implications and recommendations are addressed separately below.

Implications for theory and research. Across the cases, there is evidence suggesting that effective co-coordinated volunteer programs at NPS units apply of a range of research-identified structures and practices. These practices include adoption of SHRM-recommended activities for volunteer program management, a combination of more and less centralized structural arrangements, efforts to secure employee buy-in of the program, and treating longer-term volunteers like regular employees. The 12 SHRM-recommended activities were used by all the cases. In addition, and as a result of the interorganizational form of their volunteer program, the cases also emphasized the importance of technology for communications, co-location of staff, having a shared vision for the volunteer program, and longevity of key volunteer program staff and supportive organizational leaders.

The cases with the largest programs (i.e., most volunteers, most volunteer hours and programs, most partners, etc.) also employ multiple strategies to increase the number of staff who help oversee volunteer programming, to include the following:

- Use of interns as volunteer program leaders, supervisors, or planners,
- Transfer of NPS funds to the nonprofit to pay for staff there,
- Use of nonprofit fundraising to pay for additional volunteer program staff,
- Including line items for volunteer staff support in budgets of grants that will fund volunteer programming
- Configuring or reconfiguring NPS and nonprofit positions so that supervising volunteers and volunteer programs is part of their job role, and

- Grooming and then using experienced volunteers to supervise other volunteers.

In alignment with New Institutionalism, the cases also copied and adapted ideas from more established programs, took advantage of training and development opportunities, and worked with peers to identify and share best practices.

Results from data analysis support the use of a combination of IOR, New Institutionalism, and SHRM research as helpful lenses for understanding the phenomenon of co-coordinated volunteer programs. The complex and multifaceted nature of the phenomenon of co-coordinated volunteer programs at NPS units calls for a multi-perspective approach. The results suggest a combination of disciplines in the cases, as indicated, for example, by the finding that SHRM prescriptions related to effective components of volunteer program management should include elements from IOR when volunteer programs are managed by more than one organization.

Although aspects of leadership are addressed under both IOR and New Institutionalism Theories, the important roles of both top and program-level leaders are not sufficiently illuminated by the conceptual framework used in the study. At five of the six cases, interviewees described key roles that top leaders played in the formation, design, implementation, and improvement of their co-managed volunteer programs. For example, these top leaders and some of the program-level coordinators exhibited traits, behaviors, and skills that influenced others to implement new ideas (Fleischman, 1953; Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950; Stodgill, 1948). They exercised power and influence to help make changes in existing partnerships (Mintzberg, 1983; Yukl & Tracey, 1992).

Leaders at the case sites formed strong trust and exchange relationships (Graen & Cashman, 1975), inspired followers with their vision and charismatic qualities (Conger,

1989; House, 1977), and were able to transform their organizations and employees within them (Burns, 1978). Finally, they exercised shared or distributed leadership and empowered others to make change (Pearce & Conger, 2003). Given the many references by interviewees to the roles, qualities, and actions of organization and volunteer program-level leaders, future research on co-coordinated volunteer programs informed by leadership theories could add to the understanding of this phenomenon from a leadership perspective.

The co-coordinated volunteer programs between NPS units and their nonprofit partners are examples of organizational changes made to existing partnerships in which the nonprofit had traditionally focused on raising funds for the NPS unit or had more limited involvement with the volunteer program. Interviewees described processes and challenges attendant with this change that resonate with Organizational Change theories. The actions involved in considering, getting buy-in for, initiating, implementing, expanding, improving, and sustaining new ways of operating and collaborating are examples of organizational change processes.

Specifically, interviewees described processes involved with staff acceptance and buy-in (Piderit, 2000) related to increased nonprofit roles in the volunteer program, and challenges around the convergence of staff and cultures (Hofstede, 1983; Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1993). Theories by Lewin (1947), Weick and Quinn (1999), Van de Ven and Poole (1995), Hannon and Freeman (1984), and others could help explain the drivers and pace of change in the cases. And concepts promulgated by Katz & Kahn (1978), Tsoukas and Chia (2002), and Buckley (1968) might provide illumination of the complexities of change in open, complex social systems such as those

represented in the cases. Future research on co-coordinated volunteer programs informed by organizational change theories could increase understanding of these types of partnerships from the lens of organizational change.

Giddens' (1984) Structuration Theory describes society as a complex of structures that both enable and constrain human action, to encompass the kinds of actions taken by stakeholders in this study to expand traditional partnerships into volunteer programming. Individuals who make changes in their organizations to enact co-coordinated volunteer programs act as purposeful agents who have clear rationales for their actions as well as the ability to articulate those reasons and convince others of their soundness (i.e., get buy-in and support). These leaders/agents exploit the enabling aspects of structures around them to overcome the constraining aspects of those structures and enact change. As a result, their partnerships work within existing structures to actively change those structures (Giddens, 1984). Future research could examine the structures that enable and constrain human action and change in co-coordinated volunteer programs, as well as ways that leaders work within those structures to make change.

Elements of the cases also relate to adult learning and thus to Adult Learning Theory. Multiple interviewees referred to the need for educating staff on the importance of the volunteer program, the volunteer partnership, and the benefits and necessity of assuming new roles as volunteer leaders and coordinators. Adult learning related to change of paradigm includes a learning process to support working and collaborating in new ways. Future studies could examine learning processes of individuals to develop

new paradigms around the value of volunteers, volunteer management, and cross-sector collaboration.

Recommendations for further research. The use of a tripartite conceptual framework for this study (IOR, SHRM, and New Institutionalism) helped provide a layered understanding of the complex and evolving nature of co-managed volunteer programs at NPS units. The three theoretical lenses allowed for analysis not only from multiple individual theoretical perspectives, but also from a combined perspective. However, and as noted under the implications section, other theories also appeared to have direct relevance to the study and would likely illuminate aspects of the phenomenon.

It was clear, for example, that strong and supportive leaders played vital roles in establishing most of the programs. Additional research from a leadership perspective might be able to determine whether the very creation and existence of the programs depends on such leaders, whether leader roles remain equally important over time, or the relative importance of the top leaders versus the program-level coordinators who make the collaboration happen on a day-to-day basis. If such programs are not possible without a powerful supporter at the top, then other sites that would like to initiate this type of partnership would have to either convince their leaders to support them, or get different leaders.

Studies of evaluation emerged as a clear area for additional research. The cases collect basic numbers on volunteers, hours, and projects, but none of the cases has a robust program to measure impacts on any of its stakeholders. The lack of such information was a source of frustration at every site. Due to insufficient staff expertise,

costs involved, and the difficulty of securing U.S. Office of Management and Budget approval for formal studies, the sites also said they had no immediate plans for conducting rigorous studies.

The cases offer quantitative evidence of program growth and qualitative evidence of success in some areas. However, they have not systematically examined or assessed the impact of their partnership on the volunteer programs. Given their lack of resources to evaluate their co-coordinated volunteer programs, future research studies could be helpful in understanding the impact of the programs and of the partnerships on park needs, visitors, volunteers, staff, partners, and other stakeholders by providing evidence of how and why the programs work. Therefore, it would be helpful to the sites and the NPS in general to have academic studies that examine program elements such as volunteer and staff satisfaction, volunteer retention, impacts of volunteers on visitors to the parks, correlations between volunteering and giving, and assessments of the degree to which volunteers are actually addressing the park needs the programs are designed to meet. All the cases except the new one at Arches & Canyonlands said they thought/felt/believed that their volunteer program partnerships were successful, but additional studies could both better measure those successes and identify areas where more efforts are needed.

This study examined six examples of co-coordinated volunteer programs in U.S. national parks. It would be instructive to also conduct research on the other eight cases of this phenomenon to see if they are simply not as far along, whether they face different challenges from the cases in this study, or if their goals for volunteer program co-management differ from the cases in this study. Along similar lines, it would also be

useful to examine some other examples of NPS units that have nonprofit partners but which have not expanded their partnerships around the volunteer program, to see why they have not elected to follow this route and the state of their volunteer programs.

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

Implications for practice that may be gleaned from the study are organized into two categories: (1) implications for collaboration practice, and (2) implications for volunteer program design practice in cases of co-managed programs. Findings indicate that the larger examples of co-coordinated volunteer programs (more volunteers, programs, partners, etc.) among NPS units and nonprofit partners are purposeful and created in order to achieve specific goals and objectives based on a mutual vision of the partners. The co-managed programs have strong, active support from leaders of both organizations, as well as buy-in from other management staff who administer the overall program. Management support is manifested in provision of financial resources to the volunteer program and creation of staff positions to coordinate it.

Implications for collaboration practice. Formal agreements spell out and govern the volunteer program partnership, including roles and responsibilities, commitment of financial and other resources, processes for decision-making and planning, and procedures for making changes and for resolving differences. An interorganizational advisory group, with management and program coordination staff from both partners can provide ongoing guidance and improve communication. Responsibilities for the various volunteer programs at the NPS unit are divided based on mutual discussion, design, and agreement. Typically, there is a combination of programs

led by the NPS, by the nonprofit, and administered jointly, although NPS staff is the ultimate arbiter of what, where, how, and when volunteer work is done in the park.

The larger cases co-locate volunteer program staff to facilitate daily communication and joint planning and to prevent miscommunication. Vision, mission, and goal statements are developed specifically for the volunteer program. In the largest programs, a shared identity grows around the joint volunteer program that blurs distinctions between the two organizations and their staffs, promotes harmonious collaboration, and helps creates an effective team and balance between autonomy and interdependence among the stakeholders. And while both partners typically saw volunteer programs as an opportunity to build stewardship among volunteers, the nonprofits typically perceived stewardship as related to financial support, while NPS staff viewed it more in terms of long-term volunteering and advocacy.

In addition to formal staffing structures, agreements, co-location, and advisory groups, successful volunteer program partnerships at NPS units have informal practices and arrangements that support their collaboration. Informal practices include effective working relationships among key partner staff (particularly between the two volunteer coordinators), addressing conflicts immediately so they do not escalate, and establishing and maintaining trust among partners. Such collaborations are sensitive to the different needs and cultures of the other organizations, see partners as equals, are willing to compromise, are guided by the larger goal of caring for the park they mutually serve, and are the flexible and creative to learn from both mistakes and successes.

The lack of formal and rigorous volunteer program assessment was a gap identified and recognized at every site. The partnerships lacked the expertise, time, and

resources to measure program impacts on volunteers, park visitors, staff, and park needs. They were also constrained by federal requirements and limits on the kinds of data that could be collected and from whom. To gain a better understanding of the impacts of their volunteer programs, partners need a freer hand to gather data at national parks, and to place a higher value on assessment and the information is can generate to help with volunteer program design and decision making.

Implications for volunteer program design practice. The study found that each site has a unique set of natural or manmade features, and these features offer both challenges and opportunities to the partners in terms of their co-managed volunteer programs. For example, Yosemite volunteer coordinators must always think about and plan around lodging because 95% of volunteers must be housed within the park. Other cases house few or none of their volunteers. Arches & Canyonlands struggle to recruit volunteers because of their remote location and lack of volunteer housing. Acadia, because its climate dictates that most visitors come to the park only in the summer, has a large-scale drop-in volunteer program for park visitors during the summer. Some other parks rarely or never use drop-ins, because they have year-round resident volunteers on whom they can call. These 'natural' or 'unalterable' conditions are durable, beyond the control of volunteer program managers, and likely mean related differences in volunteer program structures will last over time.

But other differences in the volunteer programs are the result of co-management practices by the partners. Thus, while it is true that Yosemite is a huge draw for visitors (and potential volunteers), it also has a far more robust volunteer program than other high-profile and heavily-visited national parks such as Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon.

Cuyahoga Valley, which lacks the grandeur of many other national parks, nonetheless has 167 separate volunteer jobs and 136 people who help coordinate the program. By contrast, many well-known and much-visited NPS units in the U.S. have only one part-time NPS ranger who coordinates their volunteer program. A few of the cases include volunteer program staff in high-level decision making and planning related to overall programming, but most do not, suggesting that some cases see volunteer programs as more important than other cases.

These findings echo Hager and Brudney (2011), who say that while some innate conditions that volunteer managers face are beyond their control—i.e., they represent 'nature—others can respond to management practices –i.e., 'nurture.' Clearly, some NPS sites have built-in advantages, such as a year-round hospitable climate, easy access by large numbers of potential volunteers, public transportation that serves the park, or especially appealing features. Yet most NPS sites nationwide, despite having advantages and volunteer needs similar to the cases in this study, have not partnered with nonprofit groups or expanded their volunteer programs.

The implication of these findings is that larger-scale NPS co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships use not one or two, but rather a suite of strategies. They

- Have and use strong support from creative, ambitious, and collaborative organizational leaders;
- Apply research-based strategies to establish well-designed volunteer programs;
- Establish both formal and informal structures and agreements to govern the co-managed volunteer program, to include clear roles and responsibilities for each partner;
- Exploit natural advantages to attract support and volunteers (and also their disadvantages—Golden Gate tapped and then retained many new volunteers who offered to help after the Loma Pieta earthquake in 1989);
- Establish effective working relationships between volunteer coordination staff at the partner organizations;

- Create more positions to manage or oversee volunteer activities through
- Configure or reconfigure positions to multiply the number of staff to support the volunteer program, including
  - Using interns to help manage volunteer programs (not just as volunteers)
  - Dedicating nonprofit funds to support volunteer management positions
  - Shifting federal funds to the nonprofit to pay for volunteer management positions there via cooperative agreements
  - Configuring or reconfiguring NPS and non-profit staff positions to partly focus on volunteer management
  - Creating volunteer program leadership roles for experienced volunteers
- Employ other creative strategies to expand the number of staff who lead volunteers;
- Customize volunteer activities around specific needs, features, and partner strengths and interests;
- Have constant, open, trusting, respectful relations and interactions on the co-located cross-partner volunteer team;
- Substantially break down barriers between their organizations and cultures and see their partners as colleagues and as being on a single team with a shared mission;
- Have long-serving, high-performing staff who have learned how to collaborate and who pass this knowledge along to new staff; and
- Have the ambition and creativity to persevere and learn from successes and failures.

The overall implication for practice of these findings might be stated as follows: the more that volunteer program managers are able to employ the strategies used by the cases described in this study, and the more effectively they are able to do so, the more likely they are to grow their volunteer program and address their goals. Volunteer managers in these NPS-nonprofit partnerships should view these various tactics as a menu or "tool box" (Hager & Brudney, 2015, p. 252), from which they may select the most practical and effective combination of practices to meet their mutual volunteer program goals.

Several of these ideas are exemplified in a statement from the NPS volunteer coordinator at Golden Gate, which leverages 286 people to help lead the volunteer program. Over one-third of this total are volunteers, while only 4 (or 1.4%) are officially designated as NPS volunteer program staff:

> [People from other parks tell me,] 'You know all these big parks can do that because look how much extra staff they have.' But I don't tend to hear them on relating to '. . . we could kind of do something like that here on a smaller scale.' . . . I always hated hearing, 'well, you have a big park and that's why it works.' It all works because the people here care enough about what they are doing to go over and beyond those challenges and not give up on the challenges. I tend to listen to conference calls and webinars and hear, 'yeah, well, my maintenance guy won't talk with me about that.' Never once do I hear, 'gee, I talked to [A] at Golden Gate, who told me how she got her program off the ground, and I was able to tell my maintenance foreman about it, and boy, that really changed his attitude or her attitude.' So those are things I look forward to—I hope in the next few years before I retire I stop hearing, 'well, you don't understand. I am a small park,' or 'you don't understand. I am a middle-sized park and we don't have the same resources that you do at Golden Gate.'

Implications for human resource development. Study findings also hold practice implications for human resource development (HRD) professionals at the NPS units and at their nonprofit partners, as well as for higher education HRD programs. Those who provide professional development at NPS sites must understand how these partnerships work so they can be in a position to provide opportunities for staff to get the training and develop the buy-in needed to support change processes required for successful volunteer program collaboration and implementation.

In addition, and as echoed by Kuchinke (2010), effective NPS-nonprofit partnerships seek to develop staff as volunteer leaders, and volunteers as lifelong stewards, thus supporting the broader development and flourishing of the human capital that undergirds NPS units. Partnerships like those in this study can inform university HRD curricula related to the importance (and mechanics) of interorganizational collaboration, of human development as part of HRD, and of leveraging resources to maximize impacts in an era of cutbacks of public funding.

Applicability of the Study

There is a hierarchy of applicability, relevance, and potential use of the findings from this study. Results are directly applicable to two particular groups. The most applicable group is the six cases chosen for the study based on their high scores on the selection survey instrument. Interviewees at all the study sites expressed interest in the finished study, asked whether it would be provided to them, and wondered what would be 'done with' the findings. These requests appear to reflect a desire to gain a deeper understanding of their programs, to compare their programs with the others in the study, and to glean ideas about how to improve their efforts. Several also said that they felt this partnership model deserved more recognition and was likely to expand to additional NPS sites; they hoped the study could be a vehicle toward that end.

The second-most applicable group is the other eight cases of NPS-nonprofit co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships that were not chosen for inclusion in the study based on their lower scores on the selection instrument. They also said they wanted to learn more about what their peers are doing and get examples and ideas from other programs that they can use. These two groups constitute the 14 examples that were identified of the phenomenon of co-coordinated volunteer program partnerships in the 407-unit National Park Service.

The next level of applicability is to the other NPS units that have direct-support nonprofit partners (approximately 60), but which still run their volunteer programs in the traditional way and not via co-coordination with a nonprofit partner. Besides these NPS sites, there are other examples of federal and state conservation lands with nonprofit partnerships that do not include co-coordinated volunteer programs with nonprofit partners, but which might consider doing so.

Beyond collaborations on conservation lands, findings related to volunteer program management in general may be applicable to other NPS or other federal, state, or local government organizations that use volunteers. There are other government-nonprofit partnerships in which (1) a public facility or entity uses volunteers (local parks, libraries, schools, military organizations, hospitals, historic sites, etc.), (2) the nonprofit partners provide funding to the public facility or entity, but (3) there is no co-coordination of the volunteer program. Lastly, experiences and lessons from the co-coordinated volunteer programs may have application to other partnerships that are formed in order to co-coordinate programs, as the study cases represent innovative examples of how organizations collaborate, the challenges they face, how to address challenges, and the benefits that derive from such partnerships.

Final Thoughts

Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much.
Helen Keller

The basic idea behind the above quote—that more can be accomplished by collaborating than by acting alone—is a key conclusion for the study. The six cases examined in the study were already working together before they expanded their partnership into the area of volunteer programming. Acting out a shared mission, a shared sense of frustration at being unable to adequately meet needs in their parks, as well as from a desire to do more, and translated into innovative cross-sector social partnerships, stakeholders at the study sites are on the cutting edge of public-private partnerships to leverage resources and expertise toward using volunteers at NPS sites and on other conservation lands.

Although the first NPS cooperative agreement with a volunteer component was implemented in 1923, large-scale examples of co-coordination between NPS units and their direct-support nonprofit partners are a recent phenomenon. The needs that led to creation of these volunteer program partnerships—reduced NPS funding and staff, crumbling infrastructure at NPS sites, unmet maintenance needs, and ever-growing numbers of visitors at national parks—are not likely to abate. On the contrary, given recent history, needs for volunteers in parks are liable to increase at the same time as parks have diminished capacity to lead them. The cases in this study demonstrate creative ways to increase that capacity.

The sites can serve as models—both of actions to take and pitfalls to watch out for—for current examples of these collaborations in the NPS as well as for other conservation land partnerships. Study results suggest that these cases continue to evolve in order to face challenges that attend cross-sector collaborations and constricted fiscal environments.

For scholars, the study extends knowledge in multiple areas of research and in variant contexts of collaboration, volunteer program management, and program institutionalization. The study also highlights the complexity of programs involving multiple organizations, cultures, actors, and activities working in collaboration and suggests a multi-theory perspective is necessary to illuminate and gain a deeper understanding of this phenomenon. For practitioners, the goal of the study is to provide useful information, for existing or potential partnerships of this type, to help such sites initiate, implement, improve, expand, and sustain cross-sector social partnerships to co-manage volunteer programs in the national parks and on other conservation lands.

References

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ackoff, R. L. (1974). *Redesigning the future: A systems approach to societal problems*. New York: Wiley.

Akingbola, K. (2013). A model of strategic nonprofit human resource management. *Voluntas, 24*, 214-240.

America's Summit on National Parks. (2012). National parks for a new century: Statement of joint principles. Retrieved from www.2016parksummit.org/pdf/final-sop.pdf

Andriof, J., & S. Waddock. (2002). Unfolding stakeholder engagement. In J. Andriof, S. Waddock, B. Husted, & S. S. Rahman (Eds.), *Unfolding stakeholder thinking: Theory, responsibility and engagement,* pp. 19-42. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational learning.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ashby, W.R. (1956). *An introduction to cybernetics*. London: Chapman & Hall.

Ashby, W.R. (1960). *Design for a brain: The origin of adaptive behavior*. London: Chapman & Hall.

Astley, W. G., & Fombrun, C. J. (1983). Collective strategy: Social ecology of organizational environments. *Academy of Management Review, 8*, 576-587.

Austin, J. (2000). *The collaboration challenge: How nonprofits and businesses succeed through strategic alliances*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, J. (2000a). Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and businesses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(1), 69-97.

Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Barnes, M. L., & Sharpe, E. K. (2009). Looking beyond traditional volunteer management: A case study of an alternative approach to volunteer engagement in parks and recreation. *Voluntas, 20*, 169-187.

Barringer, B., & Harrison, J. (2000). Walking a tightrope: Creating value through interorganizational relationships. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 367-403.

Battilana, J. (2006). Agency and institutions: The enabling role of individuals' social position. *Organization, 13*, 653-676.

Beck, N., & Walgenbach, P. (2005). Technical efficiency or adaptation to institutionalized expectations? The adoption of ISO 9000 standards in the German mechanical engineering industry. *Organizational Studies, 26*(6), 841-866.

Beckert, J. (2010). Institutional isomorphism revisited: Convergence and divergence in institutional change. *Sociological Theory, 28*, 150-166.

Bedwell, W. L., Wildman, J. L., DiazGranados, D., Salazar, M., Kramer, W. S., & Salas, E. (2012). Collaboration at work: An integrated multilevel conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review, 22*, 128-146.

Bergerson, A. A. (2007). Exploring the impact of social class on adjustment to college: Anna's story. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(1), 99-119.

Bolton, M. K. (1993). Organizational innovation and substandard performance: When is necessity the mother of invention? *Organization Science, 4*, 57-75.

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher, 34*(6), 3-15.

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2003). *Strategy and human resource management*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boxenbaum, E., & Battilana, J. (2005). Importation as innovation: Transposing managerial practices across fields. *Strategic Organization, 3*(4), 355-383.

Boxenbaum, E., & Jonsson, S. (2008). Isomorphism, diffusion, and decoupling. In R. Greenwood, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 78-98. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Boyce, M. (1971). A systematic approach to leadership development. Washington: USDA, Extension Service (ERIC document reproduction service no. ED 065-763).

Bratton, J. (2001). Strategic human resource management. In J. Bratton and J. Gold (Eds.), *Human resource management: Theory and practice*, pp. 37-71. Basingstroke, UK: Palgrave and Macmillan.

Bremer, S., & Graeff, P. (2006). Volunteer management in German national parks—from random action toward a volunteer program. *Human Ecology, 35*, 489-496.

Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2002). Government-nonprofit partnership: A defining framework. *Public Administration and Development, 22*(1), 19-30.

Brudney, J. L. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector: Planning, initiating, and managing voluntary activities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. L. (1999a). The effective use of volunteers: Best practices for the public sector. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 62*(4), 219-255.

Brudney, J. L. (2005). Using volunteers in the workplace. In Condrey, S. E. (Ed.), *Handbook of human resource management in government*, pp. 215-238. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. L. (2010). Designing and managing volunteer programs. In D. O. Renz & Associates, (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (3rd ed.), pp. 753-793. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. L., & Kellough, E. (2000). Volunteers in state government: Involvement, management, and benefits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*, 111-130.

Brudney, J. L., & Meijs, L. C. P. M. (2014). Models of volunteer management: Professional program management in social work. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 38*(3), 297-309.

Brudney, J. L., & Nezhina, T. G. (2005). What is old is new again: Achieving effectiveness with volunteer programs in Kazakhstan. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary Nonprofit Organizations, 16*(3), 293-308.

Brudney, J. L., & Nezhina, T. G. (2012). Evaluating the volunteer program, contexts and models. In T. D. Connors (Ed.), *The volunteer management handbook: Leadership strategies for success* (2nd ed.), pp. 363-388. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review, 66*(1), 44–55.

Buckley, W. F. (1967). *Sociology and modern systems theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Buckley, W. F. (1968). *Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Burns, L. R., & Wholey, D. R. (1993). Adoption and abandonment of matrix management programs: Effects of organizational characteristics and interorganizational networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 106-138.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Hants, UK: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2007). Volunteer management in arts organizations: A case study and managerial implications. *International Journal of Arts Management, 9*(2), 16-28.

Canyonlands Natural History Association. (2014). About CNHA. Retrieved from http://cnha.org/about.cfm

Cheung, C., & Ma, S. K. (2010). How older residents benefit from the management of volunteer service. *Administration in Social Work, 34*, 241-258.

Child, J., Lu, Y., & Tsai, T. (2007). Institutional entrepreneurship in building an environmental protection system for the People's Republic of China. *Organization Studies*, *28*(7), 1013–1014.

Choudhury, E. (2010). Attracting and managing volunteers in local government. *Journal of Management Development, 29*(6), 592-603.

Clarke, A., & Fuller, M. (2010). Collaborative strategic management: Strategy formulation and implementation by multi-organizational cross-sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 85-101.

Cnaan, R., & Goldberg-Glen, R. (1991). Measuring motivation to volunteer in human services. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27*(3), 269–284.

Cnaan, R. A., Handy, F., & Wadsworth, M. (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 25*, 364-383.

Committee on National Resources. (2013). America's best idea meets America's worst idea: Sequester takes toll on national parks, visitors and communities. Washington: DC: U.S. House of Representatives. Retrieved from http://democrats.naturalresources.house.gov/sites/democrats.naturalresources.house.gov/files/documents/2013-05-23_NatlParkSequesterCuts_.pdf

Conger, J. S. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Connally, E. H. (Ed.). (1982). *National parks in crisis*. Washington: National Parks & Conservation Association.

Connors, T. D. (2012). *The volunteer management handbook: Leadership strategies for success* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Covaleski, M. A., & Dirsmith, M. W. (1988). An institutional perspective on the rise, social transformation, and fall of a university budget category. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*(4), 562-587.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cropper, S., Ebers, M., Huxham, C., & Ring, P. S. (Eds.). (2010). *The Oxford handbook of interorganizational relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crotty, M. (2011). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Cunningham, I. (1999). Human resource management in the voluntary sector: Challenges and opportunities. *Public Money & Management, 19*(2), 19-25.

Dacin, M. T. (1997). Isomorphism in context: The power and prescription of institutional norms. *Academy of Management Review, 40*(1), 46-81.

Daloz, L. A. (2012). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners* (2nd ed., with new foreword, preface, and afterword). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Davis, G. F. (1991). Agents without principles? The spread of the poison pill through the intercorporate network. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 583-613.

Deephouse, D. L. (1996). Does isomorphism legitimate? *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(4), 1024-1040.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: culture and environment*, pp. 3-21. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1991). Constructing an organizational field as a professional project: U.S. art museums, 1920-1940. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, pp. 267-292. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Drori, G. S., Jang, Y, S., & Meyer, J. W. (2006). Sources of rationalized governance: Cross-national longitudinal analysis, 1985-2002. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 51*(2), 205-229.

Duncombe, S. (1985). Volunteers in city government: Advantages, disadvantages and uses. *National Civic Review, 74*(9), 356-364.

Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(6), 1401-1440.

Edwards, H. C., Safrit, R. D., & Allen, K. (2012). Volunteer demographics. In T. D. Connors (Ed.), *The volunteer management handbook: Leadership strategies for success* (2nd ed.), pp. 10-42. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1980). Cultural orientations, institutional entrepreneurs, and social change: Comparative analysis of traditional civilizations. *American Journal of Sociology, 85*(4), 840-869.

Ellis, S. J. (2002). *The volunteer recruitment (and membership development) book* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Energize, Inc.

Emery, F., & Trist, E. L. (1965). The causal texture of organizational environments. *Human Relations, 18*, 21-32.

Evan, W. M. (1965). Toward a theory of inter-organizational relations. *Management Science, 11*(10), B217-B230.

Fennell, M. L., & Alexander, J. A. (1987). Organizational boundary spanning in institutionalized environments. *Academy of Management Journal, 30*(3), 456-476.

Ferreira, M. R., Proença, T., & Proença, J. F. (2012). Organisational influence on volunteer satisfaction and attitudes towards HRM practices: The case of hospital volunteers. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing, 9*(1), 27-42.

Financial statements. (2014). *Yosemite Conservancy, 5*(2), 24-25.

Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2004). The diffusion of ideas over contested terrain: The (non)adoption of a shareholder value orientation among German firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 49*(4), 501-534.

Fleischman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 37*, 1-6.

Fligstein, N. (1985). The spread of multidivisional form among large firms, 1919-79. *American Sociological Review, 50*, 377-391.

Fligstein, N. (1987). The intraorganizational power struggle: The rise of finance presidents in large firms, 1919-79. In Calhoun (Ed.), *Comparative social research*, *52*: 44-58. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fligstein, N. (1990). *The transformation of corporate control*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press.

Fligstein, N. (1997). Social skill and institutional theory. *American Behavior Scientist, 40*, 397-405.

Fligstein, N. (2001). Social skill and the theory of fields. *Sociological Theory, 19*(2), 105-125.

Freeman, R. E. (1994). The politics of stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 4*(4), 409–421.

Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks. (2013). Volunteer Stewardship Program overview. Unpublished manuscript.

Friends of Arches and Canyonlands Parks. (2014). *About*. Retrieved from http://bateswilson.org/about/

Frumkin, P., & Galaskiewicz, J. (2004). Institutional isomorphism and public sector organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 14*(3), 283-307.

Galaskiewicz, J. (1985). Professional networks and the institutionalization of a single mind set. *American Sociological Review, 50*, 639-658.

Galaskiewicz, J., & Wasserman, S. (1989). Mimetic and normative processes within an interorganizational field: An empirical test. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34*(3), 454-479.

Galaskiewicz, J., & Burt, R. S. (1991). Interorganizational contagion in corporate philanthropy. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(1), 88-105.

Garud, R., Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2007). Institutional entrepreneurship as embedded agency: An introduction to the special issue. *Organizational Studies, 28*(7), 957-969.

Garud, R., Jain, S., & Kumaraswamy, A. (2002). Institutional entrepreneurship in the sponsorship of common technological standards: The case of Sun Microsystems and Java. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 196-214.

Gendron, Y., Suddaby, R., & Lam, H. (2006). An examination of the ethical commitment of professional accountants to auditor independence. *Journal of Business Ethics, 64*(2), 169-193.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ginsberg, A., & Buchholtz, A. (1990). Converting to for-profit status: Corporate responsiveness to radical change. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 445-477.

Goldsmith, S., & Eggers, W. D. (2004). Governing by network: The new shape of the public sector. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Goll, I., & Rasheed, A. A. (2011). The effects of 9/11/2001 on business strategy variability in the US air carrier industry. *Management Decision, 49*(6), 948-961.

Gomes-Casseres, B. (1996). *The alliance revolution: The new shape of business rivalry*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodrick, E., & Salancik, G. R. (1996). Organizational discretion in responding to institutional practices: Hospitals and cesarean births. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(1), 1-28.

Googins, B. K., & Rochlin, S. A. (2000). Creating the partnership society: Understanding the rhetoric and reality of cross-sector partnerships. *Business and Society Review, 105*(1), 127-144.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. *Human Relations, 48*, 1-17.

Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gray, B. (2000). Assessing inter-organizational collaboration: Multiple conceptions and multiple methods. In D. O. Faulkner & M. De Rond (Eds.), *Cooperative strategy: Economic, business, and organizational issues*, pp. 243–260. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gray, B., & Wood, D. J. (1991) Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27*(1), 3-22.

Greening, D. W., & Gray, B. (1994). Testing a model of organizational response to social and political issues. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 467-498.

Greenwood, R., & Meyer, R. E. (2008). Influencing ideas: A celebration of DiMaggio and Powell (1983). *Journal of Management Inquiry, 17*(4), 258-264.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K. & Suddaby, R. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The big five accounting firms. *Academy of Management Journal 49*, 27-48.

Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutional fields. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 58-80.

Greve, H. R. (1998). Patterns of competition: The diffusion of market position in radio broadcasting. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 29-60.

GSEHD (Graduate School of Education and Human Development). (2013). *Doctoral handbook* (2013-2014 ed.). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-30). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guest, D. E. (1987). Human resource management and industrial relations. *Journal of Management Studies, 24*(5), 503-521.

Guest, D. (1989). Personnel and HRM: Can you tell the difference? *Personnel Management, 21*, 48-51.

Guillen, M. F. (2001). *The limits of convergence: Globalization and organizational change in Argentina, South Korea, and Spain*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gulick, L. H., & Unwick, L. F. (1954). *Papers on the science of administration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hager, M. A., & Brudney, J. L. (2004). *Volunteer management practices and retention of volunteers. Volunteer management capacity study series, #2*. Washington: The Urban Institute.

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. (2011a). Universalistic versus contingent adoption of volunteer management practices. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), Toronto, ON, Canada, November 16-19.

Hager, M. S., & Brudney, J. L. (2015). In search of strategy: Universalistic, contingent, and configurational adoption of volunteer management practices. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 25*(3), 235-254.

Hall, C. M. (1999). Rethinking collaboration and partnership: A public policy perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 7*(3/4), 275-289.

Hall, M., Lasby, D., Gummulka, G., & Tyron, C. (2006). *Caring Canadians, involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2004 Canada survey of giving, volunteering and participating*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

Han, S. K. (1994). Mimetic isomorphism and its effect on the audit services market. *Social Forces, 73*(2), 637-664.

Hannon, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review, 49*(2), 149-164.

Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Haski-Leventhal, D., & Cnaan, R. A. (2009). Group processes and volunteering: Using groups to enhance volunteerism. *Administration in Social work, 33*, 61-80.

Haunschild, P. (1993). Interorganizational imitation: The impacts of interlocks on corporate acquisition activity. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 564-592.

Haveman, H. A. (1993). Follow the leader: Mimetic isomorphism and entry into new markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 593-627.

Herriott, R. E., & Firestone, W. A. (1983). Multisite qualitative policy research: Optimizing description and generalizability. *Educational Researcher, 12*, 14-19.

Heuer, M. (2011). Ecosystem cross-sector collaboration: Conceptualizing an adaptive approach to sustainability governance. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 20*, 211-221.

Hibbert, P., Huxham, C., & Ring, P. S. (2010). Managing collaborative interorganizational relations. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Interorganizational Relations*, pp. 390-416. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., Lee, C.A., Schenck, R. E., & Pennings, J. M. (1971). A strategic contingencies theory of interorganizational powers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 8*, 61-82.

Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2001). *Strategic management: An integrated approach*. San Diego: South-Western College Publications.

Hirsch, P. M. (1986). From ambushes to golden parachutes: Corporate takeovers as an instance of cultural framing and institutional integration. *American Journal of Sociology, 91*, 800-837.

Hodson, P., Connolly, M., & Younes, S. (2008). Institutionalism in a newly created private university. *Quality Assurance in Education, 16*(2), 141-147.

Hofstede, G. (1983). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies, 14*(2), 75-89.

Holm, P. 1995. The dynamics of institutionalization: Transformation processes in Norwegian fisheries. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(3), 398-422.

Honan, E., Knobel, M., Baker, C., & Davies, B. (2000). Producing possible Hannahs: Theory and subject of research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 6*(1), 9-32.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*, pp. 189-207. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Human Resources Guide. (2013). What is human resource management[?]. Retrieved from http://humanresourcesguide.net/what-is-human-resource-management/

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, 4*(4), 410–434.

Hustinx, L., Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Brudney, J. L., Pessi, A. B., & Yamauchi, N. (2010). Social and cultural origins of motivations to volunteer: A comparison of university students in six countries. *International Sociology, 25*(3), 349-382.

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (1996).Working together: Key themes in the management of relationships between public and non-profit organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *9*(7), 5-17.

Independent Sector. (2014). Independent Sector's value of volunteer time. Retrieved from http://independentsector.org/volunteer_time

Ingram, P., & Clay, K. (2000). The choice-within-constraints: New institutionalism and implications for sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 525-546.

Ingram, P., & Simons, T. (1995). Institutional and resource dependence determinants of responsiveness to work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1466-1482.

James, G. E. (1996). *Strategic alliances: Elixirs, poison pills or virtual integration? A longitudinal exploration of industry-level learning in biotech* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest (UMI No. 9709497).

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 9*(1), 36-41.

Kapucu, N. (2006). Public-nonprofit partnerships for collective action in dynamic contexts of emergencies. *Public Administration, 84*(1), 205-220.

Kapucu, N. (2009). Interorganizational coordination in complex environments of disasters: The evolution of intergovernmental disaster response systems. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, 6*(1) (Article 47), 1-26.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, N. (1950). *Productivity, supervision, and morale in an office situation*. Ann Arbor: MI: Institute for Social Research.

Kaufman, R., Mirsky, J., & Avgar, A. (2003). A brigade model for the management of service volunteers: Lessons from the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 9*(1), 57-68.

Keast, R., & Brown, K. (2006). Adjusting to new ways of working: Experiments with service delivery in the public sector. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 65*(4), 41-53.

Klitgaard, R., & Treverton, G. (2003). *Assessing partnerships: New forms of collaboration*. Arlington, VA: IBM Endowment for the Business of Government.

Konrad, A. M., & Linnehan, F. (1995). Formalized HRM structures: Coordinating equal employment opportunity or concealing organizational practices. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*, 787-820.

Koschmann, M. A., Kuhn, T. T., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2012). A communicative framework of value in cross-sector partnerships. *Academy of Management Review, 37*(2), 332-354.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). [Chapter 6: Finding links to past research: The literature review, pp. 100-124]. New York: Longman.

Kuchinke, K. P. (2010). Human development as a central goal for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International, 13*(5), 575-585.

Lamoureux, K. M. (2009). *Success factors of cross-sector volunteer tourism partnerships involving U.S. federal land agencies* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest (UMI No. 3360151).

Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organization studies*, pp. 215-254. London: Sage.

Leca, B., Battilana, J., & Boxenbaum, E. (2008). Agency and institutions: A review of institutional entrepreneurship. Retrieved from http://egateg.usaidallnet.gov/sites/default/files/Review%20of%20Institutional%20Entrepreneurship.pdf

Leca, B., & Naccache, P. (2006). A critical realist approach to institutional entrepreneurship. *Organization, 13*, 627-651.

Leedy, P. (1993). *Practical research: Planning and design*. New York: McMillan Publishing.

Lehrman, W. G. (1994). Diversity in decline: Institutional environment and organizational failure in the American life insurance industry. *Social Forces, 73*, 605-635.

Lieberman, M.B., & Asaba, S. (2006). Why do firms imitate each other? *Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 366-385.

Leigh, J. S. A. (2005). *U.S. National Park Service cross-sector partnerships for environmental sustainability and cultural resource preservation* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest (UMI No. 3167642).

Lengnick-Hall, M. L., Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Andrade, L. S., & Drake, B. (2009). Strategic human resource management: The evolution of the field. *Human Resource Management Review, 19*, 64-85.

Leinesch, W. C. (1982). How much will we pay to save the parks? In E. H. Connally (Ed.), *National parks in crisis*, pp. 147-152. Washington: National Parks & Conservation Association.

Levine, S., & White, P. E. (1961). Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 5*, 583-601.

Levitt, B., & Nass, C. (1989). The lid on the garbage can: Institutional constraints on decision making in the technical core of college-text publishers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34*, 190-207.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. *Human Relations, 1*(2), 143-153.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Liao-Troth, M. (2008). Introduction: Challenges in volunteer management. In M. Liao-Troth (Ed.), *Challenges in volunteer management* (pp. ix–xii). Charlotte: IAP Information Age Publishing.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). *The good high school*. New York: Basic Books.

Litwak, E., & Hylton, L. F. (1962). Interorganizational analysis: A hypothesis on co-ordinating agencies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 6*(4), 395-420.

Lomi, A. (1995). The population ecology of organizational founding: Location dependence and unobserved heterogeneity. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 111-144.

Lotia, N., & Hardy, C. (2010). Critical perspectives on collaboration. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of interorganizational relations*, pp. 366-389. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macduff, N., Netting, F. E., & O'Connor, M. K. (2009). Multiple ways of coordinating volunteers with differing styles of service. *Journal of Community Practice*, *17*, 400–423.

Maguire, S. Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2007). Institutional entrepreneurship in

emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*, 657-679.

Mandell, M. P., & Keast, R. (2010). Voluntary and community sector partnership: Current inter-organizational relations and future challenges. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Interorganizational Relations*, pp. 175-202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maynard, M. (1994). Methods, practice and epistemology: The debate about feminism and research. In M. Maynard & J. Purvis (Eds.), *Researching women's lives from a feminist perspective*, pp. 10-26. London: Taylor & Francis.

McCurley, S., & Lynch, R. (2011). *Volunteer management: Mobilizing all the resources of the community* (3rd ed.). Plattsburgh, PA: Interpub Group.

McDade, S. (2003). *Notes on writing chapter II of a dissertation: The literature review*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Educational Leadership, George Washington University, Washington, DC.

McDonald, C., & Warburton, J. (2003). Stability and change in nonprofit organizations: The volunteer contribution. *Voluntas, 14*(4), 381-399.

McIvor, G. (1992). *Sentenced to serve: The operation and impact of community service by offenders.* Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

McKeown, T., & Lindorff, M. (2011). Temporary staff, contractors, and volunteers: The hidden workforce in Victorian local government. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration, 70*(2), 185-201.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Simpson, E. L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., & Kendall, P. L. (1990). *The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*, 440-463.

Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1983). *Organizational environments*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. W., Scott, W. R., & Deal, T. E. (1981). Institutional and technical sources of organizational structure. In H. D. Stein (Ed.), *Organization and the human services*, pp. 151-178. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mezias, S. J. (1990). An institutional model of organizational practice: Financial reporting at the Fortune 200. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*(3), 431-457.

Mezias, S. J., & Scarselletta, M. (1994). Resolving financial reporting problems: An institutional analysis of the process. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 654-678.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853-886.

Mizruchi, M. S., & Stearns, L. B. (1988). A longitudinal study of the formation of interlocking directorates. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*, 194-210.

Mizruchi, M. S., & Fein, L. C. (1999). The social construction of organizational knowledge: A study of the uses of coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(4), 653-683.

Mohr. J., & Spekman, R. (1994). Characteristics of partnership success: Partnership attributes, communication, behavior, and conflict resolution techniques. *Strategic Management Journal, 15*(2), 135-152.

Monkman, J., & Monkman, M. (2007). *Wild Acadia: A photographic journey to New England's oldest national park*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mutch, A. (2007). Reflexivity and the institutional entrepreneur: A historical exploration. *Organization Studies, 28*(7), 1123-1140.

National Park Foundation. (2014). *Annual report 2013*. Retrieved from www.nationalparks.org/sites/default/files/kcfinder/files/annual_report_fy13_web.pdf

National Park Foundation. (2014a). *National Park Friends Alliance*. Retrieved from www.nationalparks.org/our-work/programs/national-park-friends-alliance

National Park Hospitality Association. (2013). *Association*. Retrieved from www.parkpartners.org/Association.html

National Park Service. (2005). *Director's order #7: Volunteers in parks*. Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/DO-7.htm

National Park Service. (2007). *Final National Mall plan / environmental impact statement* (vol. 1). Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior.

National Park Service. (2008). *Director's order #21: Donations and fundraising*. Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/DO21-reissue.pdf

National Park Service. (2011). Cooperative agreement between the National Park Service, Cuyahoga Valley National Park (CVNP) and the Conservancy for the Cuyahoga Valley National Park (Conservancy). Unpublished document.

National Park Service. (2013). Research links: NPS anniversaries. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/news/researchlinks.htmf

National Park Service. (2013a). Volunteer. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/gettinginvolved/volunteer/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014). Acadia National Park, Maine. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/acad/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014a). Arches National Park, Utah. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/arch/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014b). Canyonlands National Park, Utah. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/cany/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014c). Hovenweep National Monument, Utah. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/hove/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014d). Natural Bridges National Monument, Utah. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/nabr/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014e). Cuyahoga Valley National Park, Ohio. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/cuva/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014f). Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/goga/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014g). National Mall & Memorial Parks, District of Columbia. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/nama/index.htm

National Park Service. (2014h). Yosemite National Park, California. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/yose/index.htm

National Park Service. (2015). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/faqs.htm

National Park Service. (n.d.). Bureau highlights. Retrieved from www.doi.gov/budget/appropriations/2013/highlights/upload/BH071.pdf

National Park Service, & Walker Davidson, LLC. (2007). *VIP program assessment report*. Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior.

National Parks Conservation Association. (2013). 401 national parks: Billions of reasons to protect them. Retrieved from www.npca.org/protecting-our-parks/park-funding/park-funding.html

Naylor, H. H. (1967). *Volunteers today: Finding, training and working with them*. New York: Dryden Association Press.

Naylor, H. H. (1973). *Volunteers today: Finding, training and working with them.* New York:

Dryden Associates.

Negandhi, A. R. (Ed.) (1975). *Interorganizational theory*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(1), 145-179.

O'Riain, S. (2000). States and markets in an era of globalization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 187-213.

Osborne, S. P., & McLaughlin, K. (2002). Trends and issues in the implementation of local voluntary sector compacts in England. *Public Money and Management, 22*(1), 55-64.

Osborne, S. P., & McLaughlin, K. (2004). The cross-cutting review of the voluntary sector: Where next for local government-voluntary sector relationships? *Regional Studies, 38*(5), 573-582.

Palmer, D., Biggart, N., & Dick, B. (2008). Is the new institutionalism a theory? In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 739-768. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Palmer, D. A., Devereaux Jennings, P., & Xueguang, Z. (1993). Late adoption of the multidivisional form by large U.S. corporations: Institutional, political, and economic accounts. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 100-131.

Parsons, T. (1964). Evolutionary universals in society. *American Sociological Review, 29*, 339-357.

Parsons, T., Shils, E. A., & Smelser, N. J. (1951, 2001). *Toward a general theory of action: Theoretical foundations for the social sciences*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Pasquero, J. (1991). Supraorganizational collaboration: The Canadian environmental experiment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *27*(1), 38-64.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. S. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Penrod, K. M. (1991). Leadership involving volunteers: The L-O-O-P model. *Journal of Extension, 29*(4), 9-11. www.joe.org/joe/1991winter/a2.php

Perkmann, M., & Spicer, A. (2007). Healing the scars of history: Projects, skills and field strategies in institutional entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies, 28*(7), 1101–1122.

Pfeffer, J., & Nowak, P. (1976). Joint ventures and interorganizational interdependence. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(3), 398-418.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The external control of organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.

Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 783-794.

Points of Light Foundation. (2004). *50+ volunteering: Working for stronger communities*. Washington, DC: Author.

Powell, W. W. (1991). Expanding the scope of institutional analysis. In W. S. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, pp. 183-203. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powell, W., & Colyvas, J. (2008). New institutionalism. In S. Clegg, & J. Bailey (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of organization studies,* pp. 976-980. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.). (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(1), 116-145.

Preissle, J. (2008). Subjectivity statement. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (vol. 2). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Propst, L., & Rosan, L. (1997). *National parks and their neighbors: Lessons from the field on building partnerships with local communities*. Tucson, AZ: Sonoran Institute.

Ralston, D. A., Gustafson, D. J., Cheung, F. M., & Terpstra, R. H. (1993). Differences in managerial values: A study of U.S., Hong Kong and PRC managers. *Journal of International Business Studies, 24*(2), 249-275.

Ramanath, R. (2009). Limits to institutional isomorphism. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38*(1), 51-76.

Rao, H., Greve, H. R., & Davis, G. F. (2001). Fool's gold: Social proof and the initiation and abandonment of coverage by Wall Street analysts. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 502-526.

Rao, H., & Neilsen, E. H. (1992). An ecology of agency arrangements: Mortality of savings and loan associations, 1960-1987. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 3*, 448-470.

Rehnborg, S. J. (2009). *Strategic volunteer engagement: A guide for nonprofit and public sector leaders*. Austin: University of Texas, RGK Center for Philanthropy & Community Service. Retrieved from www.volunteeralive.org/docs/Strategic%20Volunteer%20Engagement.pdf

Rettie, D. F. (1995). *Our national park system: Caring for America's greatest natural and historic treasures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Rhodes, R. W. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies, 44*(4), 652-667.

Ridder, H., & McCandless, A. (2010). Influences on the architecture of human resource management in nonprofit organizations: An analytical framework. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39*(1), 124–141.

Ridenour, J. M. (1994). *The national parks compromised: Pork barrel politics and America's treasures*. Merriville, IN: ICS Books, Inc.

Ring, P. S., & van de Ven, A. H. (1996). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *The Academy of Management Review, 19*(1), 90-118.

Rochester, C. (1999). One size does not fit all: Four models of involving volunteers in voluntary organizations. *Voluntary Action*, *1*(2), 47–59.

Ross, J. D. (1981). A definition of human resources management. *Personnel Journal, 60*, 781-783.

Runte, A. (2010). *National parks: The American experience* (4th ed.). Plymouth, UK: Taylor Trade Publishing.

Safrit, R. D. (2006). Energize your volunteer administration skills with a little P.E.P.! Retrieved from www.volunteerlink.net/datafiles/D044.pdf

Safrit, R. D. (2012) Evaluating impact of volunteer programs. In T. D. Connors (Ed.), *The volunteer management handbook: Leadership strategies for success* (2nd ed.), pp. 389-410. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Safrit, R. D., & Schmiesing, R. (2012). Volunteer models and management. In T. D. Connors (Ed.), *The volunteer management handbook: Leadership strategies for success (2nd ed.)*, pp. 3-30. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Safrit, R. D., Schmiesing, R. J., Gliem, J. S., & Gleim, R. R. (2005). Competencies for volunteer administration: An empirical model bridging theory with professional best practice. *Journal of Volunteer Administration, 23*(3), 5-15.

Sahlin-Andersson, K., & Engwall, L. Eds. (2002). *The expansion of management knowledge*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Salaman, G., Storey, J. Billsberry, J. (2005). *Strategic human resource management: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Salamon, L. M. (Ed.). (2012). The state of nonprofit America (2nd ed.). Washington: Brookings.

Schmiesing, R. J., & Safrit, R. D. (2007). 4-H youth development professionals' perceptions of the importance of and their current level of competence with selected volunteer management competencies. *Research in Brief, 45*(3). Retrieved from www.joe.org/joe/2007june/rb1.php

Schoonhoven, C. B., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Lyman, K. (1990). Speeding products to market: Waiting time to first product introduction in new firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*, 177-207.

Schuler, R. S. (1992). Strategic human resources management: Linking the people with the strategic needs of the business. *Organizational Dynamics, 21*(1), 18-32.

Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, W. R., & Meyer, J. W. (1983). *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Seitanidi, M. M., Koufopoulos, D. N., & Palmer, P. (2010). Partnership formation for change: Indicators for transformative potential in cross sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*(S1), 139-161.

Selsky, J. (1991). Lessons in community development: An activist approach to stimulating inter-organizational collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *27*(1), 91-115.

Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 849-873.

Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2010). Platforms for cross-sector social partnerships. Prospective sensemaking services for social benefit. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 21-37.

Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of the theory of organization. *American Sociological Review, 13*, 25-35.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Seo, M. G., & Creed, W. E. D. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review 27*(2), 222-247.

Shepsle, K. A. (1986). Institutional equilibrium and equilibrium institutions. In *Political science: The science of politics*, H. Weisburg (Ed.), pp. 51-82. New York: Agathon.

Shields, C. M. (2007). *Can case studies achieve the "gold standard"? Or when methodology meets politics.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Smith, K. G., & Ashford, S. J. (1994). Intra- and interorganizational cooperation: Toward a research agenda. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(1), 7-23.

Spekman, R. E., Isabella, L. A., MacAvoy, T. C., & Forbes, T. (1996). Creating alliances which endure. *Long Range Planning, 29*(3), 346-357.

Spring, K., Grimm, R., & Dietz, N. (2009). Community service and service-learning in America's schools, 2008. In J. S. Kielsmeier, S. Root, S. Lyngstad, & C. Pernu

(Eds.), *Growing to greatness 2009: The state of service-learning project,* pp. 13-26. St. Paul, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.

Staber, U., & Sydow, J. (2002). Organizational adaptive capacity: A structuration perspective. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 11*(4), 408-424.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Stodgill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership. A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Storey, J. (2001). *Human resource management*: *A critical text.* London: Thomson Learning.

Strang, D., & Sine, W. D. (2002). Interorganizational institutions. In J. Baum, (Ed.) *Companion to organizations*, pp. 497-519. Oxford: Blackwell.

Studer, S., & von Schnurbein, (2013). Organizational factors affecting volunteers: A literature review on volunteer coordination. *Voluntas, 24*, 403-440.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3*)*, 571-611.

Sutton, J. R., Dobbin, F., Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1994). The legalization of the workplace. *American Journal of Sociology, 99*, 944-971.

Tang, F., Morrow-Howell, N., & Hong, S. (2009). Institutional facilitation in sustained volunteering among older adult volunteers. *Social Work Research, 33*(3), 172-182.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Thompson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2009). Conceptualizing and measuring collaboration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *19*(1), 23-56.

Thompson, D. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 22-39.

Townley, B. (2002). The role of competing rationalities in institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal, 45,* 163-179.

Trim, P. R. J. (2004). Human resource management development and strategic management enhanced by simulation exercises. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(4), 399-413.

Trist, E. L. (1983). Referent organizations and the development of interorganizational domains. *Human Relations*, *36*, 247-268.

Trochim, W. (1989). Outcome pattern matching and program theory. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 12*, 355-366.

Trust for the National Mall. (2014). About the Trust for the National Mall. Retrieved from http://nationalmall.org/about-trust-national-mall

Tsoukas, H. & Chia, R., (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organizational Science, 13*(5), 567-582.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2013). *Volunteering in the United States, 2012*. www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *2010 population finder*. Retrieved from www.census.gov/popfinder/

U.S. Department of the Interior. (n.d.). *Golden Gate volunteers-in-parks program vision*. Washington: Author.

U.S. Department of the Interior. (n.d.a). *Director's orders and related documents*. Retrieved from www.nps.gov/applications/npspolicy/DOrders.cfm

U.S. Department of the Interior. (1940). *A brief history of the National Park Service*. Washington: Author.

Van de Ven, A. H. (1976). On the nature, formation, and maintenance of relations among organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 1*, 24-36.

Van de Ven, A. H., Emmett, D. C., & Koenig, R. (1975). Theoretical and conceptual issues in interorganizational theory. In A. R. Negandhi (Ed.), *Interorganizational theory*, pp. 19-38. Kent: OH: Kent State University Press.

Van de Ven, A. & Poole, M. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 510-540.

Villadsen, A. R. (2013). Similarity or difference? The relation between structure and strategy isomorphism in public organizations. *British Journal of Management, 24*, S62-S75.

Villadsen, A. R., Hansen, J. R., & Mois, N. P. (2010). When do public managers imitate each other? Mimetic decision making in contracting decisions of Danish municipalities. *Public Organization Review, 10*(4), 357-376.

Vinton, L. (2012). Professional administration of volunteer programs now more than ever: A case example. *Administration in Social Work, 36*, 133-148.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1950). Theory of open systems in physics and biology. *Science, 111*, 23-29.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1951). General systems theory: A new approach to unity of science. *Human Biology, 23*, 303-361.

Vorro, C., Dacin, M. T., & Perrini, F. (2010). Institutional antecedents of partnering for social change: How institutional logics shape cross sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 39-53.

Waddock, S. A. (1989). Understanding social partnerships: An evolutionary model of partnership organizations. *Administration and Society, 21*(1), 78-100.

Waddock, S. A. (1991). A typology of social partnership organizations. *Administration and Society, 22*(4), 480-515.

Waikayi, L., Fearon, C., Morris, L., & McLaughlin, H. (2012). Volunteer management: An exploratory case study within the British Red Cross. *Management Decision, 50*(3), 349-367.

Walter, V. A. (1987). Volunteers and bureaucrats: Clarifying roles and creating meaning. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 16*, 22-32.

Walter, V. A. (1993). For all the wrong reasons? Implementing volunteer programs in public organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review, 16*(3), 271-282.

Weber, M. (1905, 2002). *The protestant ethic and the 'spirit' of capitalism and other writings* (P. R. Baehr & G. C. Wells, Trans). New York: Penguin.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*, 361-386.

Wilderness Society. (2013, August 20). National parks need help! This infographic explains. Retrieved from http://wilderness.org/blog/national-parks-need-help-infographic-explains

Williamson. O. E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies*. Cambridge, MA: The Free Press.

Wisner, P. S., Stringfellow, A., Youngdahl, W. E., & Parker, L. (2005). The service volunteer—loyalty chain: An exploratory study of charitable non-for-profit service organizations. *Journal of Operations Management, 23*, 143-161.

Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27*(2), 139-162.

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management, 18*(2), 295-320.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yosemite Conservancy. (2011). *Yosemite Valley volunteer on-line training: An orientation to Yosemite National Park*. El Portal, CA: Author.

Yosemite Conservancy. (2014). History. Retrieved from www.yosemiteconservancy.org/history

Young, D. R. (2000). Alternative models of government-nonprofit sector relations: Theoretical and international perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(1), 149-172.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 525-535.

Zilber, T. B. (2002). Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meaning, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 234-254.

Zucker, L. G. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 726-743.

Zucker, L. G. (1983). Organizations as institutions. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, pp. 1-42. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Appendices

Appendix 1: NPS Site Selection Questionnaire

Dear XX:
Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire, and for contributing to this study, which seeks to expand knowledge and understanding of volunteer program partnerships supporting national park sites. The questions seek basic information about the design, structure, and scope of volunteer program partnerships and will be used to help select cases for the study. Please click on the appropriate response or enter the requested information.

The estimated time needed to complete the questionnaire is 15-20 minutes. When finished, click on the "SUBMIT" button. **Please respond by [date]**. If you have questions, contact me at xxxxx@gwu.edu or XXX-XXX-XXXX.

NPS Volunteer Program Partnerships Questionnaire
NPS-Unit Questions

* = Required response

Respondent Information

Name of National Park Unit*
Name of Respondent*
Title*
E-mail*
Phone*

Volunteer Program Partnership Information

You partner with one or more nonprofit organizations to co-coordinate, co-manage, or otherwise share roles for volunteer programs at an NPS site. How many years has co-coordination of the volunteer program been in place?*

What GS level is the designated NPS VIP Coordinator?*

In what park division or program is the VIP coordinator located? (Click on one.)*

- Interpretation
- Partnerships
- Maintenance
- Resource Management
- Administration
- Visitor Services
- Other:

What percent of the VIP coordinator's time is dedicated to volunteer programming or coordination?*

- Less than 25%
- 25%-49%
- 50%-74%
- 75%-100%

How many other NPS staff (paid or unpaid at your unit) are directly involved in volunteer program coordination?*

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5-9
- 10 or more

In what ways or areas does your nonprofit partner(s) participate in the co-coordinated volunteer program? (Click on ALL that apply.)*
Co-Coordinated Volunteer Program Components

- Writing policies to govern the co-coordinated volunteer program
- Providing resources for volunteer programs (financial or other)
- Training for paid staff, including a coordinator, to work with volunteers
- Creating job descriptions for volunteers
- Providing liability coverage for volunteers
- Outreach to recruit volunteers
- Orienting volunteers
- Designing or providing basic and ongoing volunteer training
- Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers
- Creating higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers
- Evaluating volunteers
- Recognizing volunteer program staff and volunteers

Is your volunteer partnership moving toward increasing, decreasing, or maintaining the current level of co-coordination of the volunteer program? (Click on one.)*
Trend of Volunteer Program Collaboration

- Increasing your level of participation
- Decreasing your level of participation
- Maintaining the current level of participation

Volunteer Management Practices
From the list below, rate the level of the volunteer management practices that are included in your overall volunteer program collaboration, with 'overall' referring to practices by either or both partners.* Zero (0) represents no activity; five (5) represents very established and significant activity; and N/A represents not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Written policies to govern the volunteer program	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Resources for volunteer programs (financial or other)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Training for paid staff, including a coordinator, to work with volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Job descriptions for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Liability coverage for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Outreach to recruit volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Orientation for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Basic and ongoing volunteer training	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Evaluation of volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Recognition for volunteer program staff and volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Reasons for Formation of the Volunteer Program Collaboration
Please click on ALL the boxes that apply in terms of reasons, pressures, or impetuses that helped lead to the formation of your volunteer program partnership.*
Reasons for Forming the Volunteer Program Collaboration

- Legal or regulatory mandate or requirement
- Encouragement from government
- Third-party brokers who provided pressure to interact or forums for interaction
- A common vision about a need and how to address it
- A crisis that focused potential partners toward a problem
- Leader(s) who inspired or convened the players and provided a vision for action
- Collaboration to secure additional resources or cope with turbulence
- Growing trend toward privatization
- Learned about examples of similar collaborations, and adopted or adapted their practices
- Social or other issue that brought the organizations together to more efficiently shape or address a large social problem that neither could address alone
- It grew/developed organically out of the existing partnership
- Cost savings of having a nonprofit partner manage volunteer programming
- Other:

Collaborative relationship
From the list below, rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements about your volunteer program collaboration.* Zero (0) represents complete

disagreement; five (5) represents complete agreement; and N/A represents not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
It is purposeful/voluntary	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It evolves, based on conditions and the success of the partnership	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It focuses on an area or areas of mutual interest and concern	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each organization to maintain its identity and autonomy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It includes negotiated roles, responsibilities, commitments, and understandings among the partners	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is reciprocal in that each partner both gives and receives	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each partner to obtain resources it would not otherwise have	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each partner to more fully address its goals or needs than it could acting alone	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each partner to respond more successfully to changing, complex, and turbulent conditions	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Stages of Development of Volunteer Program Partnership.

From the list below, check ALL boxes that represents a stage of development of your volunteer program collaboration, to include its current stage. In other words, which of the development stages has the partnership experienced, including the current stage?*

Volunteer Program Partnership Development Stages

1. Problem setting—developing a common definition of a problem or need, identifying and convening stakeholders, committing to collaborate, and identifying resources
2. Direction setting—establishing norms, setting agendas, organizing groups, exploring options, and reaching agreement on how to proceed
3. Implementation—conducting joint action, dealing with clients, building external support, structuring, monitoring the agreement, and ensuring compliance
4. Stabilization—ongoing management and sustaining of the collaboration over time, willingness and ability to address issues as they arise, and regular examination of the alliance

5. Decision—the point at which partners are deciding whether to continue, revise, or end the collaboration based on how it has worked and on changing circumstances

Challenges to Volunteer Program Collaboration.
From the list below, rate the degree to which the following challenges have arisen in the initiation, implementation, or sustaining of your volunteer program collaboration.* Zero (0) means the challenge did not exist; five (5) means the challenge was or is very significant; and N/A means not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Ideological differences between the partners	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Historical differences between the partner organizations	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power disparities between the partners	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Cultural norms and dynamics of either partner (tendencies toward individualism, resistance to share scarce resources, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Different perceptions of risk, resulting in different goals and approaches	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Logistical complexities of collaboration, and different interpretations or rules of how to respond to them	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Institutional or political structures that resist collaboration or change	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Insufficient staff to enact plans	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Budgeted funds for partnership not available in a timely manner	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Describe any other challenges to volunteer program collaboration.

Strategies to Address Collaboration Challenges.
From the list below, rate the degree to which you and your nonprofit partner(s) have used the following strategies to address challenges in initiating, implementing, or sustaining the volunteer program collaboration.* Zero (0) means not at all; five (5) means the strategy was used to a very significant degree; and N/A means not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Frequent communication at multiple levels	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Democracy and equality in the partnership	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Formal agreement, contracts, or memoranda of agreement on the roles, responsibilities, and scope of the collaboration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Proactively addressing disagreement or conflict	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integration of the partnership into the governance structures of the organizations	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Use of compromise to settle disputes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Empowerment of an interorganizational group with authority to address disagreements	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Determination and commitment toward the collaboration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inclusion of key stakeholders in the collaboration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Describe any other strategies that you and your nonprofit partner(s) have used to address challenges in initiating, implementing, or sustaining the volunteer program collaboration.

Impacts of Volunteer Program Collaboration.

From the list below, rate the degree to which the volunteer program collaboration has resulted in the following broad impacts.* Zero (0) represents no impact; five (5) represents significant positive impact; and N/A represents not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Problem resolution or goal achievement—to what degree has the collaboration positively addressed the issues for which it was formed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Are strategic partnership objectives being achieved?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Generation or formation of social capital—how well has the collaboration built social resources around the issue (e.g., relationships, trust, norms, or networks)?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Creation of shared meaning among the stakeholders—how well has the collaboration developed a common interpretation about the issue and how to address it?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Changes in network structure—how well has the collaboration expanded a network structure among the stakeholders?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Shifts in power distribution—to what extent has the collaboration created a more equal distribution of power among stakeholders?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Communication—to what degree have the amount and level of communication improved between partners?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Joint program planning—to what extent have the amount and level of joint planning improved, including strategic planning?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Conflict management plans—has the collaboration led to developing conflict management strategies by the partners?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Conflict reduction—has the collaboration led to reduced incidences or levels of conflict among the partners?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More training for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Higher-quality training for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More volunteer hours	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More or larger volunteer projects completed	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Greater volunteer retention	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater volunteer satisfaction	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater staff satisfaction with volunteer programs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Improved national park unit visitor experiences	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More resources (grants, appropriations, etc.) for NPS programs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More staff working on volunteer programs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater satisfaction with the NPS-nonprofit partnership	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Describe any other impacts of volunteer program collaboration.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please click submit to record your answers.

Appendix 2: Nonprofit Site Selection Questionnaire

Dear XX:
Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire, and for contributing to this study, which will focus on understanding volunteer program partnerships supporting national park sites. The questions seek basic information about the design, structure, and scope of volunteer program partnerships and will be used to help select cases for the study. Please click on the appropriate response or enter the requested information.

The estimated time needed to complete the questionnaire is 15-20 minutes. When finished, click on the "SUBMIT" button. **Please respond by [date]**. If you have questions, contact me at xxxxxxx@gwu.edu or XXX-XXX-XXXX.

NPS Volunteer Program Partnerships Questionnaire
Nonprofit Partner Questions

* = Required response

Respondent Information

Name of Trust/Conservancy/Foundation*	Title*
Name of Respondent*	E-mail*
	Phone*

Volunteer Program Partnership Information
You partner with one or more NPS units to co-coordinate, co-manage, or otherwise share roles for volunteer programs at an NPS site. How many years has co-coordination of the volunteer program been in place?*

What percent of your volunteer coordinator's time is dedicated to volunteer programming or coordination?*

- Less than 25%
- 25%-49%
- 50%-74%
- 75%-100%

How many other (paid or unpaid) staff are directly involved in volunteer program coordination?*

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5-9
- 10 or more

In what ways or areas does your organization participate in the co-coordinated volunteer program? (Click on ALL that apply.)*
Co-Coordinated Volunteer Program Components

- Writing policies to govern the co-coordinated volunteer program

- Providing resources for volunteer programs (financial or other)
- Training for paid staff, including a coordinator, to work with volunteers
- Creating job descriptions for volunteers
- Providing liability coverage for volunteers
- Outreach to recruit volunteers
- Orienting volunteers
- Designing or providing basic and ongoing volunteer training
- Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers
- Creating higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers
- Evaluating volunteers
- Recognizing volunteer program staff and volunteers

Is your volunteer partnership moving toward increasing, decreasing, or maintaining the current level of co-coordination of the volunteer program? (Click on one.)*
Trend of Volunteer Program Collaboration

- Increasing your level of participation
- Decreasing your level of participation
- Maintaining the current level of participation

Volunteer Management Practices
From the list below, rate the level of the volunteer management practices that are included in your overall volunteer program collaboration, with 'overall' referring to practices by either or both partners.* Zero (0) represents no activity; five (5) represents very established and significant activity; and N/A represents not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Written policies to govern the volunteer program	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Resources for volunteer programs (financial or other)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Training for paid staff, including a coordinator, to work with volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Job descriptions for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Liability coverage for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Outreach to recruit volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Orientation for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Basic and ongoing volunteer training	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Ongoing communication with and management of volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Higher-level service opportunities for experienced volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Evaluation of volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Recognition for volunteer program staff and volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Reasons for Formation of the Volunteer Program Collaboration
Please click on ALL the boxes that apply in terms of reasons, pressures, or impetuses that helped lead to the formation of your volunteer program partnership.*
Reasons for Forming the Volunteer Program Collaboration

- Legal or regulatory mandate or requirement
- Encouragement from government
- Third-party brokers who provided pressure to interact or forums for interaction
- A common vision about a need and how to address it
- A crisis that focused potential partners toward a problem
- Leader(s) who inspired or convened the players and provided a vision for action
- Collaboration to secure additional resources or cope with turbulence
- Growing trend toward privatization
- Learned about examples of similar collaborations, and adopted or adapted their practices
- Social or other issue that brought the organizations together to more efficiently shape or address a large social problem that neither could address alone
- It grew/developed organically out of the existing partnership
- Cost savings of having a nonprofit partner manage volunteer programming
- Other:

Collaborative relationship
From the list below, rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements about your volunteer program collaboration.* Zero (0) represents complete disagreement; five (5) represents complete agreement; and N/A represents not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
It is purposeful/voluntary	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
It evolves, based on conditions and the success of the partnership	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It focuses on an area or areas of mutual interest and concern	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each organization to maintain its identity and autonomy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It includes negotiated roles, responsibilities, commitments, and understandings among the partners	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is reciprocal in that each partner both gives and receives	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each partner to obtain resources it would not otherwise have	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each partner to more fully address its goals or needs than it could acting alone	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows each partner to respond more successfully to changing, complex, and turbulent conditions	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Stages of Development of Volunteer Program Partnership.
From the list below, check ALL boxes that represents a stage of development of your volunteer program collaboration, to include its current stage. In other words, which of the development stages has the partnership experienced, including the current stage?*
Volunteer Program Partnership Development Stages

1. Problem setting—developing a common definition of a problem or need, identifying and convening stakeholders, committing to collaborate, and identifying resources
2. Direction setting—establishing norms, setting agendas, organizing groups, exploring options, and reaching agreement on how to proceed
3. Implementation—conducting joint action, dealing with clients, building external support, structuring, monitoring the agreement, and ensuring compliance
4. Stabilization—ongoing management and sustaining of the collaboration over time, willingness and ability to address issues as they arise, and regular examination of the alliance
5. Decision—the point at which partners are deciding whether to continue, revise, or end the collaboration based on how it has worked and on changing circumstances

Challenges to Volunteer Program Collaboration.
From the list below, rate the degree to which the following challenges have arisen in the initiation, implementation, or sustaining of your volunteer program collaboration.*

Zero (0) means the challenge did not exist; five (5) means the challenge was or is very significant; and N/A means not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Ideological differences between the partners	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Historical differences between the partner organizations	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power disparities between the partners	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Cultural norms and dynamics of either partner (tendencies toward individualism, resistance to share scarce resources, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Different perceptions of risk, resulting in different goals and approaches	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Logistical complexities of collaboration, and different interpretations or rules of how to respond to them	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Institutional or political structures that resist collaboration or change	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Insufficient staff to enact plans	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Budgeted funds for partnership not available in a timely manner	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Describe any other challenges to volunteer program collaboration.

Strategies to Address Collaboration Challenges.

From the list below, rate the degree to which you and your nonprofit partner(s) have used the following strategies to address challenges in initiating, implementing, or sustaining the volunteer program collaboration.* Zero (0) means not at all; five (5) means the strategy was used to a very significant degree; and N/A means not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Frequent communication at multiple levels	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Democracy and equality in the partnership	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Formal agreement, contracts, or memoranda of agreement on the roles, responsibilities, and scope of the collaboration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Proactively addressing disagreement or conflict	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Integration of the partnership into the governance structures of the organizations	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Use of compromise to settle disputes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Empowerment of an interorganizational group with authority to address disagreements	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Determination and commitment toward the collaboration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inclusion of key stakeholders in the collaboration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Describe any other strategies that you and your nonprofit partner(s) have used to address challenges in initiating, implementing, or sustaining the volunteer program collaboration.

Impacts of Volunteer Program Collaboration.

From the list below, rate the degree to which the volunteer program collaboration has resulted in the following broad impacts.* Zero (0) represents no impact; five (5) represents significant positive impact; and N/A represents not applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Problem resolution or goal achievement—to what degree has the collaboration positively addressed the issues for which it was formed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Are strategic partnership objectives being achieved?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Generation or formation of social capital—how well has the collaboration built social resources around the issue (e.g., relationships, trust, norms, or networks)?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Creation of shared meaning among the stakeholders—how well has the collaboration developed a common interpretation about the issue and how to address it?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Changes in network structure—how well has the collaboration expanded a network structure among the stakeholders?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Shifts in power distribution—to what extent has the collaboration created a more equal distribution of power among stakeholders?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Communication—to what degree have the amount and level of communication improved between partners?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Joint program planning—to what extent have the amount and level of joint planning improved, including strategic planning?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Conflict management plans—has the collaboration led to developing conflict management strategies by the partners?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Conflict reduction—has the collaboration led to reduced incidences or levels of conflict among the partners?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More training for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Higher-quality training for volunteers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More volunteer hours	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More or larger volunteer projects completed	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater volunteer retention	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater volunteer satisfaction	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater staff satisfaction with volunteer programs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Improved national park unit visitor experiences	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
More resources (grants, appropriations, etc.) for NPS programs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More staff working on volunteer programs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater satisfaction with the NPS-nonprofit partnership	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Describe any other impacts of volunteer program collaboration.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please click submit to record your answers.

Appendix 3: Interview Guide

Interview Guide

Overarching and follow-up questions:

1. **How do you and your partner organization(s) collaborate and share responsibilities in the co-coordinated volunteer program?**
   Follow-up questions:

- For each of the major volunteer program components, what role does each partner play?
- What formal agreements govern the volunteer program partnership, and how were they negotiated?
- What is the balance of independence and interdependence of the partners related to the volunteer program?
- What is the balance of power or equality in the partnership, and has this changed over time?
- Why did the volunteer program move toward co-coordination with a nonprofit partner?
- Why are volunteer program roles and responsibilities apportioned as they are?
- What challenges does the partnership face, and how are they addressed?
- How are components of the collaboration driven by factors that are specific to your location?
- In what ways does the partnership help your organization in terms of resources, expertise, creation of shared meaning, communications, joint planning, conflict management, generating social capital, and program development and implementation?
- Is the volunteer program partnership tending toward increasing, decreasing, or maintaining the current level of co-coordination?
- How does the partnership help your organization address its overall mission and goals?

2. **What is the design of your co-coordinated volunteer program, and how does it function?**
   Follow-up questions:

- Please describe the primary volunteer program components and structures, as well as how are they designed.
- How strong and effective are these components, and how is their effectiveness evaluated or measured?
- How are components of the volunteer program driven by factors that are specific to your location, the type of national park unit, and needs at the park unit?
- At what stage of development is the co-coordinated volunteer program (i.e., discussion, planning, formalizing, implementing, stabilization, reconsideration)?
- How is the effectiveness of the partnership evaluated, and what effect is the partnership having on the co-coordinated volunteer program?
- How satisfied is your organization with the partnership, and how is that satisfaction measured?
- Are there some unique aspects of the co-coordinated volunteer program, and if so how did they arise?

- Is there a gap between how the partnership looks on paper, how it is perceived by the partners, how it actually operates, and how it ought to be?

3. What factors impact the partnership?

- What challenges does the co-coordinated volunteer program face?
- What strategies are employed to address challenges?
- To what degree to you have structures in place to ensure frequent communication among partners, equality in the partnership, sharing power, conflict resolution, leader support, commitment to the collaboration, etc.?
- How well are the partners able to adapt to changing conditions—i.e., what is their adaptive capacity?
- How are differences over program decision making, allocation of resources, policy development and implementation, conflict, cultural differences, power disparities, and budgeting addressed?