



VOLUNTEER
ADMINISTRATION

Volume X
Number 1
Spring 1977

MAY 20 1977

VOLUNTEER ACTION COUNCIL, INC.
SEVEN B NORTON FRANKLIN PARKWAY
10
PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19103



VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION is published quarterly by the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS), the Association for the Administration of Volunteer Services (AAVS), and the Association of Volunteer Bureaus (AVB).

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION was established in the spring of 1967, founded by Marvin S. Arffa and originally published by the Center for Continuing Education, Northeastern University. It was later published privately by Marvin S. Arffa and then became a publication of AVAS. In the Spring of 1977, two other professional associations, AAVS and AVB, joined AVAS as publishers of the Journal.

The present editorial policy of **VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION** is to publish articles dealing with practical concerns, philosophical issues, and significant applicable research. The Journal encourages administrators of volunteer programs and the volunteers themselves to write from their experience, knowledge and study of the work in which they are engaged. **VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION** is a forum for the exchange of ideas and the sharing of knowledge and information among those in the voluntary sector: administrators, board members, volunteers in social service and social action, citizen participants in the public sector, and members of voluntary organizations.

Information on procedures for submitting articles may be obtained from the Editor-in-Chief, Mrs. Marlene Wilson, 279 South Cedar Brook Road, Boulder, CO 80302.

Additional information about the publishing associations may be obtained from:

Association of Voluntary Action Scholars
Box G-55, Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

Association for Administration of Volunteer Services
Suite 615, Colorado Building
Boulder, CO 80302

Association of Volunteer Bureaus, Inc.
801 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Inquiries relating to subscriptions should be directed to the business office:

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
Box G-55, Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167

All rights reserved. No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Editor. Copyright 1977 by the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars.

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Volume X

Spring
1977

Number 1

CELEBRATING OUR NEW COLLABORATION 1

Ronald Lippitt

IN SEARCH OF THE MISSING LINK:
VOLUNTARISM'S TWO CULTURES..... 2

Sarah Jane Rehnberg

THE GREAT UNORGANIZED TERRITORY
OF VOLUNTEERISM..... 8

Roberta Cummings

TRAINING A PROFESSIONAL STAFF TO
WORK WITH THE PROGRAM VOLUNTEER..... 10

Florence S. Schwartz

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN THE PREVENTION
AND TREATMENT OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT..... 15

Adrienne Ahlgren Haeuser

A COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER PROGRAM
IN CORRECTIONS 22

Joseph M. Long
Sitansu S. Mitra
George L. Newberry

President's Comments:

CELEBRATING OUR NEW COLLABORATION

It is with much appreciation and anticipation that I celebrate the actions of AAVS and AVB in joining AVAS in sharing Volunteer Administration. This gives us a collective forum for exchange and interdisciplinary dialogue to develop the perspectives, programs, and quality of volunteerism. It is important that the members of all three of our associations perceive and use the journal as a tool of professional sharing.

I hope Volunteer Administration can become a case study and a model of collaboration which is becoming an objective and challenge for all three of us -- interdisciplinary collaboration in development of good research, inter-organization collaboration in the development and coordination of community volunteerism, and public-private sector collaboration in the national development of our contribution to a vigorous democracy.

So I hope the editors will receive an active flow of paper from all three memberships, and will be able to stimulate some interesting co-authorships.

AVAS is looking forward to the challenge and responsibility of communicating clearly to our practice-committed colleagues about meaningful research and theorizing. And in turn, reading of the research questions to be pursued.

So with much anticipation of a productive association I celebrate this start-up of our new relationship through Volunteer Administration.

Ronald Lippitt

President
Association of Voluntary Action Scholars

In Search of the Missing Link:

VOLUNTARISM'S TWO CULTURES

By Sarah Jane Rehnberg

This article marks the initiation of a "Forum for Research Translation", a new section in the journal of Volunteer Administration. Research translation is a term awesome enough to stimulate the interest of the scholar and sufficiently intellectual to discourage the practitioner from venturing any further. And yet it is precisely such a mixed reaction that this Forum hopes to captivate and channel toward a unified outcome. Research translation involves the condensation of the essential and meaningful elements of a scholarly pursuit into language that is straightforward, nontechnical and applicable to the daily functioning of the practitioner. The hope of such an undertaking lies in the desire to open lines of communication between the two equally dedicated but essentially alien worlds; the "ivory tower" world of the scholar, and the "real world" of the practitioner.

In assuming the editorial responsibility of this new section of Volunteer Administration, I am reminded of the classic lecture of the Two Cultures delivered in 1959 by C. P. Snow, eminent British scientist and literary critic. Lord Snow, an extremely talented man with one foot in the world of science and the other in the world of language arts, became acutely aware of the extreme polarization of the two groups. Each of the two worlds assumed a common set of attitudes, assumptions, patterns of behavior,

common approaches and standards that identified them as members of one group and separate them from members of the other group. The similarities of the persons within one group extended beyond their professional role and impinged on their social and emotional lives. The attitudes, religious beliefs, social class and personal lives of scientists were more like other scientists than they were like non-scientists. Without even thinking about it, those who are members of one group respond like other members of the same group. That according to C. P. Snow, "is what a culture means".¹ The dissimilarity between groups is matched only by the extent of similarity within groups. Consequently, the scientists and non-scientists tend not only not to understand members of the opposite culture, but tend to view the other with skepticism, suspicion and a large dose of mistrust. The practical consequences of this dilemma are staggering.

There seems to be no place where the cultures meet. I am not going to waste time saying that this is a pity. It is much worse than that. Soon I shall come to some practical consequences. But at the heart of thought and creation we are letting some of our best chances go by default. The clashing point of two subjects, two disciplines, two cultures - of two galaxies so far as that goes - out to produce creative chances. In the history of mental activity that has been where some of the break-throughs came. The chances are there now. But they are there, as it were, in a vacuum, because those in² the two cultures can't talk to each other.

Sarah Jane Rehnberg, CVC, is Assistant Director of Community Services, Community College of Allegheny County-Center North; also Research Chairperson, AAVS

Certainly the gulf between the non-scientist (the practitioner), and the scientist (the scholar) is not unique to the field of voluntarism. And while misery has been known to love company, the solace provided does not bring us to the cutting edge of creative interchange between two earnest, dedicated groups.

The division in the field of voluntary action is not without reason, nor is it without hope. In "Research and Community Needs in Voluntary Action", David Horton Smith delineated some of the reasons why voluntary action research has not been relevant to the practitioner. Voluntary action scholars have given inadequate attention to the problems most crucial to the practicing administrator of volunteer services. Dr. Smith notes that on one side of the equation, the scholars have been quick to pursue their own academic concerns with little, if any, regard to the practical relevance (or more frequently, practical irrelevance) of their pursuit. The practitioner balances the equation by quickly dismissing the work of the scholar, while neglecting to pressure the scholar for more meaningful research.³ How often I have personally heard practitioners comment to one another in walking away from a scholarly presentation, "I could have saved you the time and told you that, had you only asked" or "Obviously so and so has never been a volunteer" or "Boy, are you off the track." And yet these disparaging comments are never communicated to the scholar directly and the gulf between the groups widens.

Until the establishment of this "Forum for Research Translation" (an idea conceived and brought to fruition by David Horton Smith), formalized opportunities for exchange were limited to periodic conferences and sporadic publications available to limited audiences. With the adoption of this concept and the joint sponsorship of Volunteer Administration by AVB and AAVS representing the practitioner organizations and AVAS representing the scholar contingent, a significant step has been taken to bridge the "cultural" gap. I strongly urge an active letter writing campaign to the editorial board of Volunteer Administration in response to articles published in this section. Such interchange of ideas should sharpen the focus and help to channel the undertakings of the scholars, to become more responsive to the needs of the practitioner.

In return, the practitioner should make every effort to learn to understand the "language" of the scholar if lines of communication are to remain open and viable. I am

fully aware of the value of knowledge gained at the experiential level, and I can also empathize with the seasoned practitioner who combines creativity with ingenuity and concludes that "In my heart, I know what I am doing is right." In fact such observations gleaned from years of experience often become the sum and substance of creative research endeavors and form the basic premises of future theoretical discussions. But we should be wary lest we overrate the merit of such practice. It is a service to ourselves and to our profession to carefully phrase our "tried and true" assumptions and put them to the test of rigorous study and evaluation lest we propagate half-truths that stagnate our emerging profession. History tends to judge ineptness and failure harshly. As practitioners, we do not want to perpetuate damaging myths that slow our growth. Dr. Smith offers an analogy that helps to clarify this point.

Voluntary action has been getting along pretty well for a long time without any significant inputs from voluntary action research. In doing so, most leaders and staff of voluntary organizations and programs have largely been "flying by the seat of their pants"- depending on intuition, accumulated personal experience, trial-and-error, knowledgeable colleagues, and others to do the best they can. What we are suggesting here is that some kinds of "radar" and other navigational instruments have been discovered, figuratively speaking, that can improve still further the effectiveness of voluntary action. This being the case, the wise "pilot" or voluntary action leader/staff person will at least investigate how accumulated scientific knowledge can be of help in his operations. This knowledge will not be a cure-all, but it may help the careful pilot avoid some of the more troublesome "mountains" (problems) he or she would otherwise have difficulty avoiding or dealing with.⁴

A large and truly exciting task lies before all of us as the progression of voluntarism reaches toward puberty. Volunteer administrators are gradually coming to view themselves as managers of human services; researchers are pioneering through largely uncharted territory; volunteers are gaining a sense of the immense contribution they provide annually and are demanding just treatment and respect. As a profession, we are experiencing the developmental needs that change through the stages of maturation as our body of knowledge and practice accumulates. Malcolm S. Knowles delineated the "six ages of a field of social practice" and identifies the sequential research needs in evolving fields of social practice.⁵

These phases should be viewed as relative markers and not absolute directions as we define and pursue the body of knowledge that belongs uniquely to the voluntary sector.

Phase I: Definition of the Field - *The awareness of a new kind of social practice - voluntarism - that is doing something different from other established fields. Members gain a sense of identification with one another and attempt to define the terminology used to describe themselves and others.*

Descriptive research such as surveys, census studies, and case reports characterize this phase.

Phase II: Differentiation of the Field - *The field gains security in its self-identity and seeks to define and clarify how it differs from other fields of social practice. Concern is directed to establishing the unique needs and special resources it offers.*

Comparative studies exploring boundaries and establishing unique approaches occur at this time.

Phase III: Standard-Setting - *Problems of control become important as the field becomes more clearly defined and differentiated from other fields. Standards of practice, evaluative criteria, certification of practitioners, and training institutions become relevant concerns.*

At this phase there is a need for normative - descriptive research focusing on standards, evaluative research and improved tools and methods of measurement.

Phase IV: Technological Refinement - *As a result of research, areas of weakness in the field surface and unsatisfactory practices are uncovered.*

Experimental research measuring the case studies, and action research all assist with increasing the understanding of the effects of the practices in the field.

Phase V: Respectability and Justification - *A need for status and esteem develops as the field gains stability and insures its survival from the gains made in the earlier phases of development.*

Historical research, and field-evaluative studies demonstrate the fields effectiveness and accumulated knowledge. Biographical studies highlight the achievement of the noted pioneers in the field.

Phase VI: Understanding of the Dynamics of the Field - *The field has become established, is recognized, and held in esteem. Emphasis is placed on the need to understand the internal and external forces affecting its development.*

Institutional studies focus on the functional elements of the field; designs for more effective organization; factors contributing to resistance to change; significant social environmental issues; and new directions for growth characterize the research needs.⁶

As Knowles outlined these phases he cautioned the observer not to expect orderly linear movement. The developmental process is a spiral growth pattern. A field may move through all six phases rather quickly and superficially and then return to repeat the process more methodically.

The Six Phases represent a research theory which I hope will shed light on the process ahead of us as the field of voluntarism develops and will demonstrate the value to be gained from a carefully delineated theory. Knowles speculated on the Six Phases after carefully reviewing his previous intuition, experience and logic gained in the emerging fields of social practice of recreation, social work, and adult education. His theory was outlined so that it may be examined by others, tested empirically and analytically as other new fields of social practice develop.

Voluntarism represents an emerging field of study and of service whose development can be measured along the theoretical lines described by Malcolm Knowles. Perhaps the creative utilization of this research theory will answer those who exclaim that academia, theory and philoso-

phy do not belong in the field of voluntarism because they aren't "reality". I maintain that voluntarism is frequently misunderstood, and its contributions overlooked, in part, due to the insufficient attention given to the thoughtful analysis of the daily practice encountered in the field. We pride ourselves as being practical persons who strive to "get results". We are impatient with theory, with open ended discussions with no immediate concrete applications. Alan Watts explains:

This is why the behavior of Western civilization might be described, in general, as "Much Ado About Nothing". The proper meaning of 'theory' is not idle speculation but vision, and it is rightly said that 'where there is no vision the people perish'.

*But vision in this sense does not mean dreams and ideals for the future. It means understanding of life as it is, of what we are, and what we are doing.*⁷

Our research and our theory must develop concurrently. Theory can point to areas where research might prove to be illuminating and provide a basis for explanation and prediction. Research, on the other hand, can test theory, clarify concepts, suggest new formations or validate and extend old ones. Without this essential link our research will be sterile and meaningless, our theory will be hollow.⁸ Theory has been linked to a net where knots represent terms or concepts and the threads connecting the knots are the definitions and hypotheses of the field.⁹ As practitioners, we must actively identify the relevant knots, suggest the possible connection and offer our findings openly to the scholars. The scholar sincerely interested in the field will need to abandon less relevant pursuits and analyze the more practical hypotheses. The research findings must then be translated to the practitioner and the relevant findings adopted.

Although the task before us is not an easy one, it is of very direct pragmatic importance. David Horton Smith analyzes the problem from the standpoint of competition and evolution:

*...a given voluntary organization or program that does not make the best possible use of available scientific knowledge is likely in the long run to fall by the wayside as competing groups grow and prosper as a result of their increased effectiveness.*¹⁰

As I examine the rapid growth and current strength of the women's movement, I have to wonder if "traditional" voluntarism contributed inadvertently to its own loss of woman-power. Did our own poor management techniques, inept assignments and well intentioned, but misdirected recognition efforts encourage some volunteers to seek positions where reliable attendance and meaningful work are measured by a monthly pay check? Had voluntarism analyzed earlier the factors that motivate persons to participate in activities and applied this knowledge along with sound management practice, in a systematic fashion, it is not altogether unlikely that more of our competent women would still be with us. Marlene Wilson's book, The Effective Management of Volunteer Programs, exemplifies a classic in our effort to apply the best techniques of management to volunteer administration.

We talk about growth through volunteerism and the importance of voluntary activity in helping young persons identify career goals through voluntary activity, and yet with the exception of Virgil Peterson, little has been done to confirm the impact of this assertion on actual student volunteer participation.¹¹ We look with pride and admiration on civic organizations that adopt humanitarian causes as the central focus of the voluntary action of their collective membership, but have we ever stopped to delineate the exact impact of such concerted effort on the cause in question? David Jeffreys examined the work of one service club and found the volunteer ideals did not translate to the client as completely or as efficiently as desired.¹²

We are all inspired when leaders in the field of volunteer services assert "that beyond the practical achievements of each volunteer there seems to be a spiritual growth that transforms competitive individuals into a unifying brotherhood that may well have tremendous importance for the ultimate destiny of mankind."¹³ Our field has too long been characterized by statements such as these that are reinforced by a committed constituency and directorate. The energy of the practitioner and academic investigator should now be challenged to document the existence of "spiritual growth" and operationalize it in such a manner that the strictly chance occurrence of such an outcome is minimized. It might then be possible to apply such a growth process to persons most in need of this opportunity: the mentally ill; the convicted criminal; the adolescent in search of identity. And what of the person

over-extended in the sphere of volunteer involvement? Have we considered the detrimental effects of active membership on too many philanthropic boards and altruistic foundations? It is time we begin the process of careful scrutiny and begin directing the energy of a potentially effective mechanism for social and institutional change. Our growth must incorporate the advances made in other fields of endeavor. Voluntarism has much to gain from the fields of adult education, psychology, management, and sociology to name but a few.

Is voluntarism a nonordinary reality, a term popularized by Carlos Castaneda, as he discussed "the path with heart" or is it actually an undefined reality lost in the mystical trapping of goodness and altruism? I would like to propose that we begin accumulating the data already present and carefully review our findings, and that we disseminate the information currently available and search for new links in the theoretical net. I believe that voluntarism is actually an undefined reality desperately in need of communication between the persons with the expertise to investigate the phenomenon observed by the practitioner, and practitioner. The practitioner must assume the responsibility of critical questioning and careful evaluation if we are to contribute to the development and professionalization of our position. Perhaps the path we are discussing is "the path with heart", but such claims should not be exercised without validation.

As we embark on a problem-oriented approach to translate research and to establish a theory in the field of voluntarism, I would like to present a final note of caution. I believe we would be well advised to heed George Kelly and deal only in "half-truths". I hope that we have the courage to preface any eventual theory with his comments when he says:

*This paper, throughout, deals with half-truths only. Nothing that it contains is, or is intended to be wholly true. The theoretical statements propounded are no more than partially accurate constructions of events which, in turn, are no more than partially perceived. Moreover, what we propose, even in its truer aspects, will eventually be overthrown and displaced by something with more truth in it. Indeed, our theory is frankly designed to contribute effectively to its own eventual overthrow and displacement.*¹⁴

Man's nature and consequently anything that he creates is in constant action. Change and movement are essential aspects of his being. Any theory proposed to explain a function of this constantly changing creature must be broad enough, inclusive enough and strong enough to face and adapt to change. If voluntarism is able to establish a theory capable of guiding it as a field and yet flexible enough to meet a changing social order, we will surface as leaders in the field of social practice. I believe this goal is within our reach, if we as practitioners and scholars reach for it together.

FOOTNOTES

- 1) C. P. Snow, The Two Cultures and A Second Look, p. 10.
- 2) Ibid., p. 16
- 3) David Horton Smith, "Research and Community Needs In Voluntary Action", pp. 4, 5.
- 4) Ibid, p. 6
- 5) Malcolm S. Knowles, "Sequential Research Needs in Evolving Disciplines of Social Practice", Adult Education, 23:4, p. 209.
- 6) Ibid., pp. 299-301
- 7) Alan W. Watts, The Wisdom of Insecurity, p. 105
- 8) C. Selltitz, et. al., Research Methods in Social Relations, pp. 498, 499
- 9) Ibid., p. 485.
- 10) Smith, op. cit., p. 6
- 11) Virgil Peterson, "Volunteering and Student Value Development". Synergist, 3:3, pp 44-51.
- 12) David Jeffreys, "Volunteer Power -Idea to Reality", presented at the AAVS/ AVAS Conference, Boston, Mass., Oct. 7, 1976
- 13) Eleanor Wasson, "Developing the New Spirit of Volunteerism", Volunteer Service Administration, 1:1, p. 1
- 14) George A. Kelly, "Man's Construction of His Alternatives", Assessment of Human Motives, p. 33.

Suggested Readings

Jeffreys, David, "Volunteer Power -- Idea to Reality", presented at the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Association for Administration of Volunteer Services and the Third Annual Conference of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, Boston, Mass. Oct. 7, 1976.

Kelly, George A., "Man's Construction of His Alternatives", In G. Lindsey (eds.) Assessment of Human Motives, New York: Rinehart and Co., 1958

Knowles, Malcolm S., "Sequential Research Needs in Evolving Disciplines of Social Practice", Adult Education, Summer 1973, 23:4, pp. 298 - 303.

Peterson, Virgil, "Volunteering and Student Value Development", Synergist, Winter 1975, 3:3, pp. 44 - 51

Selltiz, C., Johoda, M., Deutsch, M., and Cook, S.: Research Methods in Social Relations, New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962, pp. 480 - 499.

Smith, David Horton, "Research and Communication Needs in Voluntary Action", Washington D. C., Center for a Voluntary Society, 1972, pp. 3 - 7.

Snow, C. P., The Two Cultures and A Second Look, Cambridge, The University Press, 1969, pp. 1 - 26.

Wasson, Eleanor, "Developing the New Spirit of Volunteerism", Volunteer Service Administration October 1974, 1:1.

Watts, Alan W., The Wisdom of Insecurity, New York: Vintage Books, 1951, p. 105.

THE GREAT UNORGANIZED TERRITORY OF VOLUNTEERISM

By Roberta Cummings

Dedicated to all the people who are doing for others in every community, often without seeking recognition or even considering themselves - or being considered - "volunteers."

A few years ago, in my small town, a dairy farmer was sick, and couldn't get his hay in. Then the "neighbors" came with their tractors and balers, the garages gave free gas, and the haying got done

When a teenager died suddenly and tragically, and the path to the cemetery plot, which had not been expected to be used for many years, was found to be clogged and overgrown, the "neighbors" cleared the way, so the boy could be buried.

When a farmhouse and barn burned down the "neighbors" promptly rallied round with offerings of food, clothing, money, shelter, furnishings.

Incidents like these are part of the unofficial annals of every town. So, too, are the less dramatic day in and day out, week in and week out voluntary efforts and services of every community, fraternal, church-affiliated, and quasi-governmental group. From the women who arrange the flowers on church altars, to the voluntary

clerks, typists and telephone answerers; to the bakers and cooks and clean-up crews of every cake and food and rummage sale and church supper; from the volunteer fire-fighters to all those individual "committee" members - there is literally a cast of thousands.

For most people, the choice of how to serve seems natural and common-sensical - an outgrowth of their own daily lives, their own interests and concerns. Perhaps that is why we take so much for granted the hours of voluntary labor of parents with growing children in 4-H or "scouts" or school-related projects; or the efforts of so many for repair of the firehouse or a new church steeple.

The impulse to reach out into the larger community; to work for the public good; or to help others back into the mainstream of human society, finds expression, for most, within the framework of organized "charitable" activities and local service programs. Whether it's "Christmas toys" or "hot meals" or visits to nursing homes, or rides to the doctor, or errands for shut-ins, or small scholarship funds, or helping youth, or supporting fledgling drug, rape, alcohol or suicide counseling centers.

No less, the contribution of local planning board and conservation commission members; selectmen, and school board members; and all the other lay and citizen advisory board members - all individuals giving time and effort for the good of their communities. Serious work that may or may not be appreciated, but must be done.

Reprinted from Maine Volunteer Newsletter, October 1976. Ms. Cummings is a free-lance writer, formerly an editor for Parents Magazine.

More fun, perhaps for the community at large, and a chance for it to participate, are the **eating** and semi-social events, the auctions and bazaars, put on as fund-raisers. For example, "Public Fish Chowder Supper-One piece of home-baked pie with all the beverage and chowder you can eat"; an effort of one local Masonic Lodge. I attended one of these-their 53rd chowder-the other night; the latest in four-and-a-half years of continuous monthly chowders. The men of the lodge prepare and cook and serve the chowder and coffee. Their wives bake the pies (with real whipped cream). And the men wash the dishes-sometimes for as many as 300 people. Proceeds have gone for repair of the lodge building and to benefit other groups' projects; purchase of a new ambulance; creation of two public tennis courts; and support for crippled children's hospitals.

One cannot point to one or another effort and say "that is more worthwhile than the rest." But sometimes we can see more clearly within an individual, isolated act of kindness (the "volunteer" who bakes a birthday cake for an 11-year old child who has never had a birthday party, for example) the spirit that is present in every ever-so-ordinary volunteer act.

Still more can we be touched by those people who, usually through their faith, have overcome the timidity and uncertainties that hold the rest of us back; people who are capable of feeling and showing that special brand of qualities usually not spoken of much except from the pulpit or the podium.

I was privileged to meet such a person recently, and I'd like to tell you a little about her and the "volunteers" she works with; and the work they do, which gives hundreds of others in their community a channel and an outlet for their own feelings of compassion and good will.

Picture a large community, with many churches, and ethnically diverse; a "mill" town, with all the usual service agencies and government programs available to help out. And then picture a few good people who on their own began to respond to the small, but often desperate, needs of the people around them. Needs that for one or another reason were not being reached or met by more official organizations.

Picture the ripple effect, as slowly word gets around, and reports of people in need and offers to help filter in. Slowly a whole network is built up of over a hundred people who can be called upon to help. Slowly the "sharing post" (as I'll call it)

becomes known as a place to turn to for help. It becomes a clearing house and distribution system for other groups, as well (the Thanksgiving and Christmas baskets kids at school decide to make up, for example). But the "sharing post" itself stays small, personal, and by design, almost anonymous; manned for the most part, by the same original few who started it.

I attended a "sharing post" meeting early one morning. And I was struck again by the paradox in our modern, complicated world of expensive programs, just how effective the "simple" response can be - when it's real.

The meeting was short, only 30 minutes or so. An update, and reports of people who needed help. This time, the needs were for things: a crib; young children's-size clothes; a bed; a stove. (Visible symbols that in some way all was not well?)

From here, the call would go out; the things would be found. The donors would not know to whom the items had gone; or would the recipients know from whom the items had come.

Along with the needed object, would come the "sharing post's" human contact-non-judgmental, and sensitive; no lecturing, or even conversation, unless it was asked for; only the message conveyed by their presence-people care. Which may account for the "sharing post's" success.

Their ideas are not new; their services are not unique. To a greater or lesser extent all over the nation individuals are making their own worth felt as they reach out and contribute in positive ways to the lives of others. In this, we all have a share in the "sharing post's" prayer:

*Lord
help me to hear
the cry of the anguished
the whisper of the hopeless
the plea of the forgotten.*

*Lord
help me to recognise the trials of poverty
the odor of illness
the air of loneliness.*

*Lord
help me to realize
why some people have no taste for life
no palate for living*

*Lord
help me to reach out and touch
these my brothers and sisters.
Amen.*

TRAINING A PROFESSIONAL STAFF TO WORK WITH THE PROGRAM VOLUNTEER

By Florence S. Schwartz

A key obstacle to the greater development of volunteer programs in social service agencies has been the resistance of the professional paid staff, covert and overt, conscious and unconscious.

This resistance, sometimes almost hostility, has been clearly evidenced in my work with social agencies, in my teaching experience, and in the research study I did with the Associated Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations of Greater New York¹ (an organization of 13 community centers, 10 nursery schools, 9 senior citizen centers, and camps in a variety of socio-economic neighborhoods of the New York Metropolitan Area). The data demonstrated the variety of ways that staff limited the role of volunteers: by the assignments they made available; by their treatment of volunteers; their recognition of volunteers or the lack of it; by their contradictory responses to questions about reliability, etc. Another clear pattern was their practice of using older adults and teenage volunteers, but omitting the middle adult group.

For instance, when professionals were asked where they thought volunteers were most useful, the leading response was "clerical work". When asked where they thought volunteers were least useful, the leading

response was "group leadership," followed by "professional functions", "program activities," and "intensive service" (defined as complex tasks that involve responsibilities similar to those of the professional staff). When asked what demands should be made of volunteers, the professionals emphasized routine and limited assignments such as "clean up, chauffeuring, and assisting professionals," and indicated that their expectations of volunteers involved mainly such routine things as punctuality and regularity. When asked about evaluation of volunteers, only half of the professionals indicated that volunteers were evaluated, and of these the great majority (about 85 per cent) indicated the evaluations were done informally, verbally, and not frequently. When asked to compare volunteers with paid but untrained workers, the majority of the professionals stated that the paid though untrained worker was preferable, primarily because of the factors of regularity and consistency.²

This study was later replicated by a group of my students in a variety of social agency settings - including settlement houses, a child care agency, a psychiatric hospital, a Y.M.H.A., and the Brooklyn region of Catholic Charities. Certainly, my experience in the classroom has confirmed this data about professional resistance to use of volunteers, so that I am convinced that this is not idiosyncratic but intensive and pervasive.

There is a long and complicated relationship between social work professionals and social work volunteers and their

Florence S. Schwartz, Ed.D. is an Associate Professor, Hunter College School of Social Work, City University of New York.

respective roles in social work agencies. Social work actually derives from the work of the volunteer - the name we now view perjoratively was "Lady Bountiful". "Lady Bountiful" was the benevolent, kindly, well-intentioned upper class "charity lady" who brought food baskets to the poor. She was succeeded by the "friendly visitor" who added the function of improving the condition of the poor, through various programmed institutions which developed into social work agencies and which became increasingly professionalized.³

The volunteer no longer delivered direct service, but became an administrative volunteer: Board member, fund raiser, policy maker, community liaison. However, in the more recent period, volunteers have been returning to the function of delivery of service. They are more and more frequently being used for program purposes in a variety of social work settings. At the same time, their administrative volunteer functions have also expanded. *Despite the increase in the importance of volunteers, social work education is doing very little about preparing students to work with volunteers, so that we still produce inadequately trained social workers.*

During the 60's, the social work profession accepted the concept of the paraprofessional in the human relations field in a way they had never accepted the volunteer (though many of the motivations and needs of the paraprofessional and the volunteer are often the same). Since they were paid, the paraprofessionals became part of the bureaucratic hierarchy and therefore could be fitted in, whereas the volunteer does not fit in so clearly, and may even be considered a threat.

There are some positive signs, however. These include the whole national climate toward the encouragement and development of the use of volunteers. The increasing thrust of utilizing older adults as volunteers through projects like RSVP and the fine work of the Voluntary Action Centers are all contributing to greater receptivity to the volunteer by the social work profession.

Nevertheless, resistance still exists. As a consultant to the Associated Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations of Greater New York I developed a course for supervisory and program staff who work directly with volunteers in an attempt to deal with this resistance. The content of the course was developed with a committee of executive staff members and the two Board members who were responsible for the agency's interest in volunteers. The Executive Vice

President of the agency participated, demonstrating the sanction, interest and support of the head of the organization.

The limited objectives for this short course were organized on:

A. A Conceptual Level

1. *To understand the changing role of the volunteer in a changing society.*
2. *To define the differential responsibilities of staff and volunteers.*

B. An Administrative or Operational Level

1. *To create a more hospitable climate for the development of volunteer programs and to develop a cadre of staff who are knowledgeable in working with volunteers.*
2. *To develop new assignments for volunteers which would enable centers to provide services in time of fiscal limitations.*
3. *To develop competent administration of volunteer programs.*
4. *To broaden the volunteer constituency in centers.*

The training course was held at the Hunter College School of Social Work, rather than in the agency for two reasons:

1. *The staff would recognize that this was considered continuing education at a professional level.*
2. *The volunteer program would gain visibility in the school, as a cooperative agency-school activity.*

Announcements went to the executive of each center from the Association's Executive Director, giving an outline of the course and inviting the executive to attend or to enroll another member of their professional staff. There were 16 participants, including several center directors who attended regularly. The majority (11) of the participants were M.S.W. social workers; the others were B. A. level staff members. The course consisted of six sessions, the last of which was an all-day-conference. The program for each of the sessions was as follows:

SESSION 1

The History of Voluntarism

Material covered started with the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor (1943) which enlisted the aid of 400 prominent men to provide help (mainly moral) to the immigrant Irish and poor, teaching them about thrift, sobriety, and hard work. Reference was made to the social reform movements of the mid-nineteenth century, the Charity Organization Society movement of the mid-nineteenth century (which utilized both women volunteers and paid staff workers), the social settlements and municipal reform movements of the 1890's, and the modern social work agencies of the twentieth century.

The agency's own history of voluntarism was described and explained by long-time active participants in its program.

SESSION 2

Developing Volunteer Opportunities

Topics covered were: Identification of tasks that volunteers can handle; mobilization of volunteer program activities utilizing volunteers from their own constituencies; understanding the motivations for volunteering; exploration of the process of reaching out for volunteers by professional staff; development of a volunteer skills bank; identification of differential expectations for volunteers and paid workers.

SESSION 3

Developing the Volunteer Program: Recruiting, Interviewing, Orienting and Training.

Two role playing sessions were utilized. The participants were divided into groups of three, assuming roles that reflected key issues. Each group contained two "players" and one observer; the roles were then switched for the others to try new approaches.

Role Play I The Professional Worker

You are the Assistant Director of a center and some members have complained to you about Mrs. Phillips. Mrs.

Phillips has been a clerical volunteer for three years. She is a reliable person who has been working quite successfully in her center task. The complaining members are saying that Mrs. Phillips has been talking to people in the neighborhood about the fact that some people have been given scholarships. They are upset about this breach of confidentiality.

The Volunteer Worker

You are Mrs. Phillips, a clerical volunteer who has been working for a center for three years. You know you have been doing a fine job. You are proud of the fact that you are permitted to look at records that not everyone may see. Lately you have gotten the feeling that your work is not really considered very important.

Role Play II The Professional Worker

You are a professional on the staff of a community center, and someone has told you that Mrs. Lawrence just registered her three year old son in the nursery school.

Mrs. Lawrence was formerly on the staff of Jewish Family Service as a case worker, and it is possible she may be interested in doing some volunteer work, according to your informant.

Mrs. Lawrence is on scholarship and it was suggested that she see you.

The Volunteer Worker

You are Mrs. Lawrence, a former case worker with Jewish Family Service who has been at home since your three year old son was born.

You have just registered the boy in the center nursery school and would like to do something useful with your time. You are not very comfortable with the thought of being a center volunteer.

SESSION 4

Making the Volunteer an Effective Part of the Service Team

Using Force Field Analysis, the group worked on the above stated objective of the session. The Force Field Analysis approach to problem solving is based on the work of Kurt Lewin.

It involves (1) *stating the objective*; (2) *identifying the driving forces*, those forces that support the objective; (3) *identifying the blocking forces*, the obstacles to the achievement of the goal; and (4) *using a "brain-storming" technique*, encouraging the group to let creative ideas flow without any critical discussion. Later, the group deals with the operational aspects of the analyses and the solutions that have been generated.

Among the driving forces that emerged were: new programs can be achieved; staff and workers can learn new skills; and intergenerational and heterogenous experiences can be provided. Also mentioned were: opportunity to strengthen supervisory skills, public relations, recruitment, financial savings, lighten staff load, new profile and outreach activities. Among the blocking forces that emerged were egocentric volunteers; unreal expectations of volunteers; unavailability; staff resistance; interpersonal conflict; lack of skill and knowledge to train volunteers; threat to staff; more staff work; staff dependency; and lower quality of work.

SESSION 5

Problem Lab

Each participant had been asked to bring in problems encountered in their work with volunteers. These were dealt with in small groups, and then brought to the total group. A sampling of the problems that were presented:

- 1) The wife of a board member pictures herself as an "artist." She has been taking courses and doing work at home since her children went away to college. She now "volunteers" to teach the oil painting course in the senior citizen program of the center. As director of the senior program, however, I am very reluctant to have her fill the position because I have observed that she talks down to, and infantilizes, the seniors in her dealing with them at the center. Also, she has said that she will teach beginners by encouraging them to copy from attractive pictures. She is not interested in volunteering in any other capacity.
- 2) Some volunteers in the older adult program feel that they are entitled

to extra privileges or compensation such as:

1. Free trips.
 2. Extra food.
 3. Better seats in bus or theatre.
 4. Free admission to special functions and events.
- 3) Certain jobs among the older adult group are considered more prestigious than others. How to deal with assignments, rotation, and qualifying procedures?
 - 4) Some volunteers become over-invested in their work, resulting in frustration sometimes or in hostility and aggressiveness at other times. How to "depersonalize" contacts among volunteers?

SESSION 6 (All-Day Conference)

The Creative Use of the Volunteer in the Community Center

An all-day institute planned by the committee of executives and board members of the Associated Y's, and developed with the workshop participants. Fifty members of the agency professional staff attended. Professor Eugene Litwak of Columbia University made the keynote address, Agency Linkages to the Community, based on his paper, "Community Participation in Bureaucratic Organizations: Principles and Strategies," (Interchange: Vol. 1, No 4, 1970).

Dr Litwak's paper contrasted natural support systems, such as are found in primary groups such as family, friends and neighbors, with rationalistic structures such as business, government, or social agency organizations. The latter maximize specialization, technical knowledge and economics of large scale; the former maximize interpersonal relationships, the sense of individual obligation, and the emphasis on general function as against specialized function. Dr. Litwak explored the two types of organizations from the points of view of motivation, cooperation, organizational structure, rewards, training, professionalism and effectiveness.

In discussing the role of the volunteer, Dr. Litwak called for a variety of linkages between staff, community and volunteers that most utilizes characteristics of both types of structures in new and innovative forms.

His presentation was followed by four workshops led by the planning committee and participants of the previous sessions.

WORKSHOP SUBJECTS

- I. *The Retired Professional Volunteer.*
- II. *Mutual Expectation of Staff and Volunteers.*
- III. *Organization of Volunteer Program - Issues and Dilemmas of Board Member Volunteers.*
- IV. *The Volunteer Drop-Out, a Psycho-Social Dilemma: The Role of Supervision As A Supportive Tool.*

A summary session provided an opportunity for all the participants to learn about the highlights of the sessions they were not able to attend.

EVALUATION

Evaluation forms were mailed to the participants several months after the completion of the program.

Participants unanimously proposed that the course be repeated for other staff workers. Seventy percent found the course useful in their own centers. Sixty percent were interested in a continuation of the course.

Among suggestions for future sessions were:

- Training in how to lead sensitivity sessions for volunteers.
- Training in content and methods of group supervision.
- Sessions dealing with young volunteers.
- Sessions with more homogenous participants.

COMMENT

It is my belief that the approach of this program represents a significant shift in emphasis for dealing with staff in relation to volunteers. We deemphasized the "how to deal with volunteers" aspect, and emphasized the program as an educational experience which provided intellectual stimulation through consideration of issues, philosophy, and history. Some of the

sessions dealt with specific operational problems, but the tone of the entire program was to provide a truly professional atmosphere. The material that was offered, and the additional material that came out of the sessions can provide the basis for consideration of what might get into social work education regarding voluntarism.

The technique of opening up the area of professional resistance to the use of volunteers provided opportunities for participants to deal with their own resistance and to interact with one another around the problem.

The variety of topics dealt with enabled the participants to see the various contexts in which voluntarism should be viewed.

Some additional topics that require consideration are: 1) the significance of social class differences between volunteers and professionals; and 2) the strains involved where the consumer of service is also the deliverer of service.

Since the workshop, there appears to have been an increase in the use of volunteers in the agency, and an additional full-time staff member has been added with duties related to the use of volunteers.

FOOTNOTES

1. Florence S. Schwartz, *Volunteer Activity in Community Centers: Its Nature and Satisfactions* (Ann Arbor Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc, 1966).
2. *Ibid* Chapter 7
3. Dorothy G. Becker, *Exit Lady Bountiful: The Volunteer and the Professional Social Worker*, in *The Social Service Review*, March 1964, pp. 57-72.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

By Adrienne Ahlgren Haeuser

Voluntary associations such as the Child Welfare League and the American Humane Association have been engaged in child protection activities for many years, for child abuse and neglect is not a new problem. About ten years ago, however, professionals in a variety of human services, particularly medicine, social work and law, began publishing increasingly on this topic and creating a wave of new interest in the problem.¹ Many also attempted to bring the issue to public attention. In part, their concern was to determine the real extent of the problem underneath the tip of the iceberg of reported cases. To date, projections of actual incidence on a national basis remain inconsistent, with estimates ranging from a half million to four million reportable child abuse and neglect cases annually.² Experts do concur that the problem is much more massive than actual reports, even though some reports are unsubstantiated. For many professionals, concern has also evolved into developing methods for coordinated multidisciplinary impact on identification and treatment and, hopefully, more insight into causes and prevention.³

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act

After lengthy hearings in which many of these professional experts, buttressed by a few self-confessed abusive parents,

Adrienne Haeuser, MSW, is an Assistant Professor in the School of Social Welfare, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

testified that current pressures on the American family warranted increased attention to the problem, Congress passed the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, PL 93-247, in January 1974. The act established the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect which is located in the HEW Office of Child Development (OCD). The act defines child abuse and neglect as "the physical or mental injury, sexual abuse, negligent treatment, or maltreatment of a child under the age of eighteen by a person who is responsible for the child's welfare under circumstances which indicate that the child's health or welfare is harmed or threatened thereby, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary."⁴

The provisions of the act do not reflect resolution of the issue raised in the hearings as to whether child abuse is a problem rooted in society or in individual pathology, although at times the Congressmen present indicated support calling for broad social change. They feared, however, that such a bill would not be signed.⁵ Nonetheless, the background of the act in the hearings, which were titled American Families: Trends and Pressures, is significant because it gave visibility to the position that child abuse and neglect might in fact be ameliorated through social policies and universal social provisions, and highlighted the possibility that management of the problem required participation by a broad range of community resources and the community at large.⁶ Professor Andrew Billingsley's testimony typified some others:

.....the family is a dependent unit of the larger society, highly influenced by the policies and operations of these major segments or systems of that society. These systems have both a direct influence on family functioning and an indirect influence through their interrelatedness with each other. Thus, while family viability can be enhanced by strong economic support--a good job at an adequate income, by adequate, safe and sanitary housing, and by effective education--it is also necessary to recognize that these systems are themselves highly interrelated and interdependent. All are necessary, and neither is sufficient in itself to produce and sustain viable families. The communications media, for example, have both direct and indirect influence on family life in the values they portray, the resources they provide, as well as their teaching potential.In order, then to utilize the resources of all these major segments of our national life, to enhance family functioning, we need a national family policy.⁷

HEW took a much narrower view and testified against the proposed act with the rationale that child abuse and neglect could be handled adequately without special legislation. The congressmen learned, however, that prior to this time there was no one in HEW working full time on the problem. The hearings did galvanize formation of an HEW Intradepartmental Committee with OCD as the lead agency. In effect, the committee aggregated objectives and eliminated duplication rather than developing an overall strategy. Nonetheless, this opening-up of lines of communication within HEW around the specific problem of child abuse and neglect reinforced the outside experts' testimony supporting multidisciplinary approaches. As a result, PL 93-247 provides funding incentives for multidisciplinary team centers, for multidisciplinary training, and for grants to states which provide multidisciplinary programs. State grants are contingent on other problematic requirements, including reporting of physical neglect and mental injury and appointment of a guardian ad litem in all judicial proceedings, with the result that the states have been slow to qualify, and for those which have qualified, many of the grants are conditional. On the other hand, the National Center has funded a multiplicity of public and private sector resource, demonstration and training projects which are mobilizing toward a new approach to the management of child abuse

and neglect.⁸ A vital aspect of this new look is that the problem is moved out from the confines of the county protective service agency into the larger arena of the total community in what is identified as a "community team approach" to the problem.⁹

The Community Team Approach

Principles undergirding the community team approach represent some rethinking of prior practices and in the author's opinion can be summarized as follows:

1. The victim is the abusive or neglectful parent or caretaker as well as the abused or neglected child, and as such, the parent deserves treatment more than punishment.
2. Since the parent, in most cases, was also abused or neglected as a child, the parent needs parenting to meet his or her own needs for nurturing and to experience a constructive role model.
3. Treatment for the parent, child or family must break a social isolation barrier and includes a variety of supportive community resources such as a day care, parent aides, recreation programs, advocacy counseling, etc., as well as casework or psychotherapy.
4. Program goals should be to maintain children in their own homes or to remove them only very temporarily with the children's protection monitored through frequent family contact.
5. Programs must provide long-term treatment and follow-up as well as identification.
6. Because of the stigma attached to the problem, parents' helplines and self-help groups such as Parents Anonymous should be supported. PL 93-247 requires states, to the extent possible, to give "preferential treatment" to parental organizations combatting child abuse and neglect.¹⁰
7. Public understanding and awareness of the problem is essential for early identification and secondary prevention. Douglas Besharov, Director of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, has said:

*All citizens must recognize the critical need to strengthen the family so that it can better cope with periods of stress. The public must come to understand that in certain circumstances almost any family can have difficulty coping and that, at such times, the family members must be able to seek and find help. Only if this level of understanding is reached can public concern be translated into true community action.*¹¹

8. The acute stress on professionals in child protection and high staff turnover can be alleviated by shared team responsibility and by use of carefully screened, trained and supervised volunteers and paraprofessionals.

In summary, these eight points mean that abuse and neglect cannot be managed by child protection agencies alone nor by one discipline alone. While the traditional public child protection agency has an important and mandated role in identification and diagnosis, long-term treatment and prevention, for which no agency anywhere in the United States is mandated, require a vast array of other private as well as public community resources. The mandated child protection agency worker functions in effect as a case manager responsible not only to the mandated agency but also to the multidisciplinary, multiagency team.

A recent publication from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect defines the community team as a "body of professionals and the representatives of service agencies and groups who work together, using some form of coordination, to insure more effective management of cases of child abuse and neglect."¹² A community is defined as a geographical area of 200,000 - 500,000 residents irrespective of city or county lines. A community team serving a smaller or larger population would be inefficient or ineffective.

Professional Participation in the Community Approach.

The National Center has published Dr. Ray Helfer's model of the community approach as a threefold, interlocking structure, namely specific and discrete but multidisciplinary teams for: 1) Identification and Diagnosis, 2) Long-Term Treatment, and 3) Education, Training and Public Relations.¹³ Each of the teams is responsible to a central and key program coordinator. Persons

interested in details of these team functions should see Vol. 3 The Community Team - An Approach to Case Management and Prevention, in the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect series, The Problem and Its Management. They should also be alert to publication of Dr. Helfer's forthcoming book, Child Abuse and Neglect: The Family and The Community.

For purposes of this article, the critical issue is that many public and private community resources are necessary to impact on the problem of child abuse and neglect. Each of the three teams in an effective community approach will represent several professional disciplines such as social workers, doctors, lawyers, judges, nurses, psychologists, teachers, police officers and any other professional disciplines which can affect the community's family and child caring resources. The exact composition of each team will vary according to function and according to local needs, resources, and professional interests.

Citizen Participation in the Community Approach.

Besides direct professional involvement, citizen participation is critical to advocate and support the community team approach. Broad-based community support is desirable for funding of programs and for breaking through the bureaucratic maze which all too often keeps agencies and programs in their own confined worlds. Influential and committed citizens can often get action while professionals are still studying the problem. Vigorous action may be necessary, not only for financial support of the program coordinator and the various programs in the three components, but also for agency agreement to participate. Voluntary agencies in particular may hesitate to serve child abuse and neglect cases since they are accustomed to voluntary, self-motivated clients. This kind of community participation is probably best accomplished by developing a voluntary association or council of lay and professional persons to whose board of directors the community team program coordinator is responsible. Such organizations, which frequently begin as task forces, have already evolved in various locations, both large and small, from Children's Advocates in Boston to Friends of the Family in Van Nuys, California to the Concerned Citizens League in McHenry County, Illinois.

As a first step in moving toward a community organization, concerned citizens

might complete a detailed child abuse and neglect community assessment guide oriented to a community team approach.¹⁴ This will introduce them to the traditional care providers and will reveal community needs and issues with respect to child abuse and neglect which can then be used as "talking points" for developing the umbrella organization. The assessment, however, should not be allowed to become a vehicle for those who would resist change. It should be time-limited and program development should proceed thereafter regardless of the quality of the information obtained. Further assessment can occur as the community program evolves.

Materials such as the Child Welfare League manual, Finding Federal Money for Children, or the Children's Defense Fund, A Child Advocate's Handbook for Action, can also help professionals and citizens alike find funding sources.¹⁵ However, again the resistance to change posed as lack of funding should not deter development of a community organization. Sufficient funding may never be available, and incremental approaches are consistent with a growing organization.

The second reason for citizen participation is to monitor professional power and agency turf problems and to facilitate communication among the professionals. Professionals in one field are rarely aware of the objectives, conceptual bases, ethics and problems of other disciplines, and the difficulty of cross-disciplinary communication represents a real barrier to the community team approach. Furthermore, Mr. or Ms. John Q. Citizen may not understand any of them! However, our Mr. or Ms. Citizen will likely ask questions and demand straight answers. The citizen associated with the community team has a vital role in building communication and trust between disciplines and between agencies. To help professionals become sensitive to the barriers to communication, the author is developing a child abuse and neglect community task force simulation exercise for use in training or orientation of community teams and/or umbrella community support groups.

Besides facilitating trust and communication, the citizen will ensure that unchecked professional power does not permit passing decisions making responsibility from agency to agency.¹⁶

A third reason for citizen participation in the community team approach is to advocate and facilitate the use of trained

volunteers who can perform important functions such as staffing helplines or "mothering" parents as parent aides or lay therapists, activities for which professionals have neither time nor often skill. The National Center for Voluntary Action issued a June 1976, publication describing 15 programs which show a range of volunteer activities in preventing and treating child abuse and neglect.¹⁷ The Introduction notes that "While there is some professional resistance to volunteers in child abuse and neglect programs, there is growing recognition of the enrichment that carefully selected, well-trained volunteers can add." Our Mr. or Ms. Citizen can advocate reduction of that resistance and identify sources of volunteers. Fortunately, HEW is also facilitating volunteer use through its Office of Volunteer Development, which has recently produced excellent detailed but easy to read materials to help professionals initiate and maintain volunteer programs.¹⁸

A fourth reason for citizen participation is to interpret the community team program to the community and thereby to raise the community's level of awareness and understanding of the problem. Mr. or Ms. Citizen may even go back to his or her club or church group and report that child abuse and neglect is a respectable, treatable problem and that there should be no stigma or resistance which prevents seeking help.

Community understanding will not only facilitate early intervention but it will foster prevention. As more and more people understand that child abuse and neglect crises are so often triggered by inadequacies of housing, education, public assistance, health services or alienation in the workplace, public interest will stimulate ameliorative activity. The Child Welfare League Standards for Child Protective Services notes that "There is such a thing as community neglect of children. The whole community, including schools, churches, civic groups, medical practitioners and health agencies, has a part in doing something about conditions that increase child neglect or abuse."¹⁹

The final, and perhaps most important, reason for citizen participation is an extension of the previous point with respect to public understanding leading to social action in the community. However, more significantly the ultimate benefit of that understanding may be a citizenry sensitive to gaps in both health and social policy and advocates for filling those gaps on a national scale.

Impact on National Policy

To prevent child abuse and neglect, some industrialized countries rely on social policy and universal social provisions.²⁰ One of these countries, Sweden, further relies on legislation which prohibits parents as well as anyone else from physically assaulting a child, thus respecting children's rights over family privacy. Our own capitalistic democracy sanctifies the privacy of the family, but there are growing demands, as indicated earlier in the hearings which eventuated in the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, to develop an explicit family policy. This objective was highlighted by Norman V. Lowrie in his presidential address to the National Conference on Social Welfare in June of 1976 in Washington, D. C. We also need Mr. and Ms. Citizen, informed through association with the community team approach to child abuse and neglect, raising their voices and creating an outcry which elected officials cannot ignore. On the professional side, the Family Impact Seminar, located at George Washington University, and Nicholas Hobb's Center for The Study of Families and Children in Nashville and various other projects, are gathering technical data which should support the public's interest.

Our informed Mr and Ms. Citizen may have some new thoughts about health policy, also. They may not only demand government funded health insurance for all, but they may also support Dr. C. Henry Kempe's position that a national health care program should include provision for home health visitors. These should be trained lay persons who would initiate regular visits to every family shortly after the birth of each baby. The health visitor, used in Scotland and other countries, would assess the parent-child relationship and developmental status and advise on common well-child problems, besides serving as a liaison to health resources. Dr. Kempe describes this method of early intervention for families-at-risk as basic preventive pediatrics and he says, "Just as we have accepted the basic concept of free universal education, so we should accept the concept that society has a right to guarantee the total health of the child ... If the plan of preventive pediatrics is made equalitarian and universal, it would obviate the concern that it is a repressive program for those who are poor or from minority groups."²¹ There are significant numbers of American children living in troubled or neglectful families whom Dr. Kempe's proposal would protect. However, the invasion of privacy, limited though it is, represents a "hot potato" which legislators will not touch without widespread public support.

To achieve this public understanding of health policy needs and the need for an explicit family policy, persons in communities all across the nation should get involved in developing a community team approach to the problem of child abuse and neglect. The Director of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect has said that the challenge we face is not so much to discover what works but to develop cooperative community structures.²² An aroused and knowledgeable community can develop those structures for, as Thomas Jefferson once said, "There is no substitute for the enlightened action of an aroused citizenry."

The "how to" of establishing a community team approach to the prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect, including both professional and citizen participation, is beyond the scope of this article. However, to assist a prime mover, whether professional or lay person, the appendix lists Ten Rules for Community Organizers, rules as applicable to this as any other community organizing effort.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, Monrad Paulsen, "The Legal Framework for Child Protection," Columbia Law Review, 66 1966, pp. 679-717; C. Henry Kempe, M.D., Ray Helfer, M.D., The Battered Child, 1st ed., 1968; David Gil and John Nobel, "Public Knowledge, Attitudes and Opinions about Child Abuse in the U. S.," Child Welfare, 48 No. 7, 1969, pp. 395-401; David Gil, Violence Against Children: Physical Child Abuse in the United States, 1970; Vincent Fontana, "Factors Needed for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect," Pediatrics 46, N. 2, 1970, pp. 318-319.
2. Saad Z. Nagi, "Child Abuse and Neglect Programs: A National Overview," Children Today, 4, No. 3, May-June 1975; U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare The Problem and Its Management, Vol. 1, An Overview of the Problem, DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 75-30073, pp. 9-11.
3. See, for example, Paul A. D'Agostino. "Dysfunctioning Families and Child Abuse: The Need for an Interagency Effort," Public Welfare, Fall, 1972; C. Henry Kempe and Ray Helfer, eds/. The Battered Child and His Family, 1972.
4. Public Law 93-247, 93rd Congress, S.1191, January 31, 1974, Sec. 3

5. Raymond H. Milkman, etc al. The Case of Child Abuse: Public Program Management, Lazar Institute, National Technical Information Service, U. S. Dept. of Commerce, December, 1974, p. 18.
6. U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, American Families: Trends and Pressures, 1973 Hearings before Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U. S. Senate, 93rd Congress, 1st session, September 24-26, 1973, Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office, 1974.
7. Ibid, p. 308
8. U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Report to the President and Congress of the United States on the Implementation of Public Law 93-247, The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, August, 1975.
9. U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, The Community Team, An Approach to Case Management and Prevention, DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 75-30075.
10. P. L. 93-247, op cit., Sec. 4, (b) (2) (J).
11. Douglas Besharov, "Building A Community Response to Child Abuse and Maltreatment," National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, Caring, 2, No. 2, Mar-Apr. 1976, p. 4.
12. DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 75-30075, op cit., p. 2.
13. Ibid.
14. A Community Assessment Guide on Child Abuse and Neglect, developed by the New York State Resource Center at Cornell U., is available from the Midwest Parent-Child Welfare Resource Center, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Social Welfare, Milwaukee, WI, 53201.
15. Child Welfare League, Hecht Institute for State Child Welfare Planning, Finding Federal Money for Children, 1975; Children's Defense Fund, Title XX: Social Services in Your State, A Child's Advocate's Handbook for Action, April, 1976.
16. See Hon. Justine Wise Polier, "Professional Abuse of Children: Responsibility for the Delivery of Services," Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry 45 (3), April, 1975.
17. Volunteers in Child Abuse Prevention Programs, The National Center for Voluntary Action, Technical Services Division, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036
18. See, especially, A Volunteer Development System, Division of Responsibility in Overall Development Cycle. DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-10006.
19. Child Welfare League of America, Standards for Child Protective Services, Part 6, "Protective Service and the Community," 1973, p. 70.
20. Sheila B. Kammeran, "Cross-National Perspectives on Child Abuse and Neglect," Children Today, 4, No. 3, May-June, 1975.
21. C. Henry Kempe, N.D. "The Right of All Children," National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, Caring 2, No. 3, May-June 1976, p. 2.
22. Douglas J. Besharov, op. cit., p. 3.

Ten Rules for Community Organizers

William Koch, Director, University of Wisconsin-Extension Center for Social Service, included the following Ten Rules for Community Organizers in his workshop presentation, "Basic Skills for Interdisciplinary and Interagency Goals," at a regional conference, A BICENTENNIAL CHALLENGE: THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, May 4, 1976. The Rules are appended with permission.

1. *In community organization, don't play the game alone.*
2. *Know who the players are and what position they are maximizing.*
3. *Since information is power, get access to information. Establish networks of communication to get information.*
4. *Strive to create a positive audience atmosphere. Describe program aims positively. Get public endorsement from authorities, i.e., key people, governors, state and local representatives and, if possible, consumers of service.*
5. *If the organization has clout, use it as a pressure point in the system where decisions are made.*
6. *Without clout, get the public's attention and support of the issue.*
7. *Establish a constituency. Get friends, churches, other organizations and agencies to support you.*
8. *Form coalitions to accomplish time-limited specific objectives, but at the same time maintain your own constituency and its goals.*
9. *When presenting your proposals, "psych-out" and get supporters in the audience. "Get your ducks in a row."*
10. *Since timing is important, know when money is available for funding and when to introduce proposals for change. Be able to act with head and heart. Be an "informed heart".*

A COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER PROGRAM IN CORRECTIONS:

A Pilot Study Using the NICOV Basic Feedback System

-- Joseph M. Long,
Board of Probation and Parole
-- Sitansu S. Mittra
Bureau of Correction
-- George L. Newberry
Equitable Life Assurance

Background:

How does one proceed through the Criminal Justice System? Police, courts, institutions, parole plans - different number, different personnel, separate conflicting disciplines are all to be survived by a designated criminal. The issue is as much keeping above the tide of requirements as it is responsibility for one's wrongdoing.

In Pennsylvania the Bureau of Correction and the Board of Probation and Parole are separate agencies, although their clients are the same. Recognizing this, the Commissioner of the Bureau, the Chairman of the Board, and their respective staffs, met regularly to discuss ways to improve the services to their clients. One attempt to bridge the disjointedness of the system, was the development of the Community Volunteer Program. The primary objective of the program was to test the validity of providing a continuum of volunteer services to inmates/clients of the two agencies. Volunteers in this program were to be used in a supportive role to the inmate/client on a one-to-one basis, particularly during the period when the individual moves from incarceration to parole.

It is generally believed that the ultimate goal of correctional programs is to produce a released inmate who commits no more crimes. Due to lack of success with institutionalization, many correctional systems are now looking for innovations. Studies of innovations in organizations show that the more radical an innovation, the greater the repercussions throughout the organization. Innovations are diversely

classified as, ([2], pp. 130-131):

- (a) variations versus reorientations;
- (b) structural versus human innovations;
- (c) external versus internal innovations.

The Community Volunteer Program attempts to integrate all of these techniques into one program. Reorientations draw on outside resources so that the Community Volunteer Program is a reorientation and a human innovation. It is internal inasmuch as it concerns sources of new structural arrangements within the organization. Such innovations are more difficult to implement. Moreover, the character of a correctional institution is not conducive to the flexibility needed for an innovation to take place. Keeping all these facts in mind, the Community Volunteer Program at the State Correctional Institution in Camp Hill appears to be now moderately successful.

The Development of the Program:

In the development of the program, questions that needed answers surfaced quickly. *How could the severe contrast between street and institutional life be modified? What parts of the organizational structure were willing to cooperate to effect support? Who were the most likely candidates for this type of program? How much should the citizen volunteer be informed about the intricacies of the system? What benefits could actually be offered to*

the inmates who participated?

The State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill was selected to be the site for the development of the program. Only adult offenders would be allowed to participate. Inmates would have no detainer, would be from the surrounding nine-county area, and have no more than one year or less than four months to serve in the institution.

Realizing that security is of paramount concern to the institutional staff, it was understood that the introduction of volunteers into the institution could become a threat to the existing structures. In order to overcome this, staff, inmates and volunteers had to have a common orientation about the program. An orientation session was held for all institutional staff who were in any way related to the inmates. Included in this orientation were correctional officers, work officers, education staff, counselors, etc. Unfortunately, as revealed in the evaluation, only a representative group of institutional staff was present at the officially called meeting. The team of program planners gave a full explanation of the program and were willing to answer all questions as thoroughly as possible.

A similar orientation was conducted for inmates who fit into the predetermined categories as listed above. Emphasis was placed on what could and what could not be expected from the program. Opportunity was given for questions. It was made clear that there would be no guarantees of early release or employment for participants. At the end of the orientation, each inmate was interviewed individually to determine if he wished to participate in the program. Everyone elected to participate. The inmates were then asked to suggest names (other than relatives) who they would like to serve as their volunteers from the community, with the understanding that the program planners would make the final decision. Many were able to submit names of persons who ultimately became volunteers.

Those persons who were suggested as potential volunteers by inmates were interviewed by the parole staff to determine their suitability and willingness to serve. For those inmates who were unable to suggest a potential volunteer the parole staff recruited persons from the community from their resources. Two orientation sessions were held at the institution for the volunteers. Time was spent in meeting officials from every level of the institution, touring the facility, and role playing possible problem situations. Opportunity was also provided for volunteers and

inmates to meet, some of them for the first time.

Following this orientation, each inmate and each volunteer was given the opportunity to decide if he wished to participate further in the program. Everyone elected to continue.

A Case Study.

What happened? A case study of one inmate and his volunteer helps to reveal how the different parts of our system reacted to the new relationship established by the program. The case is an actual case and not a composite. It was selected, not because it indicates great strides in the rehabilitation of criminals, but because of the interaction revealed. In fact, on the surface, the case is a failure. However, an in-depth study of this case reveals the potential resource of volunteer participation which is available to the criminal justice system.

Now let us take a close look at the case of Dick (volunteer) and Slim (client).

Dick, 24, was a white, college graduate, employed in the transportation industry. Single and with an 8 to 5 job, Dick had a great deal of free time. Volunteering to work with an inmate at a nearby correctional institution seemed to be an ideal way to use his time constructively. In April 1975, Dick participated in the volunteer orientation sessions held at the institution and he was introduced to Slim.

Slim, 21, white, single, high school graduate, was a first time offender. He was convicted of theft, which was precipitated by his costly drug habit. Sentenced in March 1974, to serve up to five years, Slim's institutional record was average, with an occasional write-up for some minor infractions. After the completion of the volunteer orientation, Dick began visiting Slim at the institution on a regular basis. He encountered some of the usual institutional resistance to volunteers, such as needing to wait over two hours in order to see Slim. Conversations during these visits centered primarily on "getting out", plans for the future, and current events in the community. During this time, Dick also made contact with Slim's family who lived in a nearby community. They discussed mutual concerns and together began to explore employment opportunities for Slim upon his release from the institution. In conversation with Slim's institutional counselor, Dick suggested the granting of a furlough so that Slim could solidify the employment plans. Three days of freedom for Slim enabled him to secure employment

as an apprentice mechanic, socialize with Dick and his family, and reestablish contact with his female acquaintances.

Everything looked good for Slim's future. He had a home with his parents, a constructive job and an interested and supportive volunteer. Dick attended Slim's parole interview and the Parole Board members were impressed with Slim's potential for the future. Parole was granted, and in July 1975, Dick met Slim at the institution and they traveled together to Slim's home, and to Slim's new employer. Later that evening, Dick and Slim made plans to intensify their relationship now that Slim had his freedom. It appeared that Dick was filling a previous void in Slim's life. Slim now had a real friend.

But some of Slim's needs could not be met by Dick, particularly his need for female companionship. Almost unnoticed, Slim began shifting his time priorities toward some of his previous female friends. Dick understood this need, and was not discouraged at first. Then things began to change. Slim left his parental home, and began staying with one of his girl friends, and then another, so that it became increasingly difficult for Dick or anyone else to make contact with Slim. In view of this development, Dick began shifting his contacts to Slim's place of employment and began seeing him immediately after work. Soon Slim began missing work, rarely notifying his employer. Dick and Slim's parole agent maintained regular contact during this time, each attempting to exert a positive influence on Slim. Then Slim became a "no show" at work, moved again, and became almost impossible to locate.

Then it happened -- less than two months since release on parole, Slim was arrested for the burglary of his parent's home, and imprisoned in the county jail. Dick immediately visited Slim trying to understand what went wrong. Charges were subsequently dropped by Slim's parents, but the Parole Board had lodged a detainer because of technical parole violations. The decision of the revocation hearing was to revoke Slim's parole, and in October 1975, he was transferred to a state correctional institution some distance away. Feelings of failure surrounded Dick as he tried to examine again and again where he could have been more helpful. Slim had so much going for him, but some deep-seated emotional needs were apparently not being met. Dick wrote a long letter to the Parole Board, not criticizing their decision,

but sharing with them some of his feelings about Slim's potential and urging the Board to insure that Slim would receive psychological help during his stay in prison. In spite of what seemed like failure, Dick began visiting Slim in the institution to try to break down the new barriers which Slim had erected.

The future of Slim is unknown, but if the support of an interested volunteer has any influence, Slim has a good chance to make it the next time on the street.

Data Collection

To evaluate the program, Dr. Mittra used the Basic Feedback System (BFS) designed and distributed by the National Information Center on Volunteerism (NICOV), in Boulder, Colorado, (see [1]). The BFS provides an ongoing estimate of performance, satisfaction, and commitment of the program personnel components. It is divided into five components of the program personnel, which include: (1) Coordinator; (2) Line Staff; (3) Volunteer; (4) Client; and (5) Management. Although not a technical evaluation, the BFS uses self-reports of persons in each of the above components of the program. It gives a composite or overall average score for each area, providing a relative indicator on how the program has been operating.

Because of the length of the 5-part questionnaire, and the need for adaptation to our program, Dr. Mittra prepared a shorter version of the NICOV/BFS questions for distribution. These are attached as appendix.

During February, 1976, the BFS questionnaires were distributed to members of each program personnel component. Return rates were indicated as follows: (1) Coordinators (100% return); (2) Line Staff (16%); (3) Volunteer (70%); (4) Client (25%); (5) Management (67%). Unfortunately, the return rate was low for the line staff, and clients (i.e., inmates of SCIC). This was due to the pilot nature of the project and the lack of coordination in the initial stages of circulation of the questionnaires.

Data Evaluation

The maximum score for each program component was set at 100 points. Part I of the questionnaire was tested against national norms established by NICOV, while the norms for Parts 2 - 5 are still being developed. Results for each program component on the

Table 1: Scores of the Program Components of the BFS
with comparison of NICOV norms for effectiveness.

Program Component	Overall Average Scores for Program	BFS Norms for Effectiveness (% effective)
I - Coordinator	75	88
II - Line Staff	47	21
III - Volunteer	66	66
IV - Client	45	50
V - Management	51	28

BFS are as follows:

(a) Part I (Coordinator): The average overall score is 75/100, which according to BFS norm, indicates that the program is more than 88% successful in its operation as perceived by the coordinators.

(b) Part II (Line Staff): Here the average raw score is 47/100. On the basis of a norm established from youth service volunteer programs, this indicates that the present program is operating at an efficiency of more than 21%, as viewed by the line staff. One reason for this low profile from the line staff standpoint is a lack of communication between the line staff and the organizing management. Moreover, corrections officers at SCIC viewed the program as a threat to the security of the institution.

(c) Part III (Volunteer): Here the average raw score is 66/100. On the basis of a norm established from volunteers working in hospital auxiliary, Red Cross, YMCA, RSVP, student and youth services, this means that the program has an operating efficiency of more than 66%, as viewed by the volunteers. The score includes elements of volunteer satisfaction versus frustration, dependability-perseverance, and the volunteer's perception of the adequacy of program leadership. However, NICOV found that it is almost impossible to get a volunteer feedback score of less than 20-25. These are virtually free points.

(d) Part IV (Client): Here the average raw score is 45/100. On the basis of an experimental norm this indicates that the program is operating at an efficiency of higher than 50%, as viewed by the clients.

(e) Part V (Management): Here the average raw score is 51/100. On the basis of a norm established from directors, executive

directors, etc., of youth service volunteer programs in the southeastern part of the United States, this score indicates an efficiency rate of more than 28%. There are two possible explanations for such a low profile - first, the management staff receiving the questionnaires are institutional managers instead of volunteer program directors exclusively; secondly, the geographic location of Pennsylvania is not the southeastern part of the U.S.A., but the norms were established on the basis of a sample from that geographical area.

Data Interpretation:

The use of volunteers in reintegrating offenders into the society has increased dramatically since 1955. Several studies were made in the past assessing the effect of such volunteer programs, ([2] , pp. 25-27). The results seem to indicate that volunteers can contribute significantly to the correctional system. However, since volunteers are used in conjunction with changes in procedures, it is difficult to say how much of the positive result is due to the volunteer participation in the overall program.

The Community Volunteer Program at SCIC is no exception to the above general comments. Moreover, being a pilot test, the project was not in formal operation long enough to obtain any reliable data on its effect on recidivism. Accordingly the foregoing evaluation has been aimed at the assessment of the program by the various levels of the involved staff using the norms established by NICOV, ([1]).

The main thought running in the volunteer's minds is the personal satisfaction derived from helping inmates towards getting back to the normal life in the society. The volunteers view the project favorably because of its potential impact on the criminal justice system.

The volunteers can also be used as future social contacts by the inmate upon their release. As such, the program directs one of society's most vital resources - the energy and talents of the volunteers - to deal with one of society's greatest challenges - reintegration of criminal offenders.

The inmate's viewpoint is also compatible with the above situation. He wants the help of a volunteer and expresses a desire to become a volunteer in the future as soon as his own life is straightened out. Moreover, he recommends this service to other inmates as well.

Unfortunately, the line staff has a predominantly negative reaction. The first cause for this is perhaps their limited involvement in the initial planning of the project. In addition, some of the line staff perceive the program as a security problem. However, they should recognize the positive possibilities of greater communication between them and the volunteers and should be moved in the direction of opening these lines of communication. Since the questionnaire is designed to keep anonymity, there is no way to tell whether the security line staff felt anyway different from the treatment line staff.

This program is closely analogous to the Community Sponsor Project undertaken at the State Correctional Institution at Rockview aimed at recruiting and matching community sponsors with inmates there. Both programs stem from the same general feeling: community must share in the responsibility of reintegrating inmates back to society. The present paper has used the evaluation report of the Community Sponsor Project done by Lewis, et. al (1975),
[2]

The Community Volunteer Program has already derived some benefits from the present evaluation. There is a proposal to expand this program to the State Correctional Institution at Graterford. The organizing management is now involving the line staff more into the initial planning stage. Hopefully, the program will fill a long-existing gap in the criminal justice system by providing the volunteer as the unifying agent in the total process of reintegration of the offender to the society.

1. Ivan Scheier and Robert M. Cooper - Basic Feedback Systems for Volunteer Programs, NICOV, Colorado, July 1975
2. M. V. Lewis, D. E. McKee, L. I. Goodstein and A. D. Beamsderfer - Community Sponsors and Support Teams in Corrections, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., November 1975.
3. The five sections of the paper were written as follows: Mr. Newberry wrote the first section, Mr. Long wrote the second section, and Dr. Mitra wrote the last three sections.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAM EVALUATION

Part I: To be completed by the Coordinator

- (xx) Place two checks if it's true for you.
(x) Place one check if it's partly true or you are uncertain.
Leave the line blank if it is not true.

1. Spent enough time planning our program, before it started, carefully consulting all relevant people..... _____
2. We have written volunteer job descriptions, giving enough details of the type of work..... _____
3. At least half of our volunteers are personally and consistently involved working directly with clients..... _____
4. Before accepting volunteers we use and study a volunteer background registration form..... _____
5. Each volunteer is interviewed at least once before acceptance..... _____
6. We have in-service training meetings monthly or more often..... _____
7. Each new volunteer receives and keeps a written orientation manual..... _____
8. Systematic effort to orient staff to working with volunteers..... _____
9. We deliberately seek maximum compatibility of volunteer and client by asking and assessing both volunteer and client..... _____
10. In addition to intuition, we employ specific compatibility criteria such as home location, interests, sex, age, etc... _____
11. Volunteers sign or explicitly assent to a work contract of specific time commitment over a maximum period of at least eight months..... _____
12. We have a regular position of Volunteer Coordinator or Director..... _____
13. He or she feels he has enough time to do the job adequately..... _____
14. Our Volunteer Coordinator has an office near other staff and is regularly invited to attend staff meetings at the supervisory level..... _____
15. Each volunteer has an I.D. card or lapel pin or other suitable agency identification..... _____
16. Volunteers have a desk or other designated place to roost at agency..... _____

17. Provision for good experienced volunteers to move up in responsibility and status as volunteers, e.g. head volunteer, volunteer advisory board, etc..... _____
18. At least a third of our new volunteers are brought in by present volunteers..... _____
19. Within five minutes, we can tell you (a) exactly how many volunteers we have, and also (b) for any individual volunteer, current address, job and assigned client, if any..... _____
20. Volunteers are required to report at least once a month by phone or by report form and we enforce this..... _____
21. Generally, volunteers are actively involved (e.g. advisory board) in decisions regarding their own volunteer program..... _____
22. We have a regular statistical-evaluative component supervised by a professional in the area..... _____
23. The agency prepares a regular, carefully considered budget including the volunteer program..... _____
24. At least one-half of our volunteer program funding is incorporated in regular state or local agency budget..... _____
25. Agencies or organizations in similar service areas have expressed approval of our volunteer program..... _____

Part II: To be completed by the Line Staff

1. How long have you had any sort of contact with the volunteer program? _____
2. How much time during an average week are you in any sort of contact with volunteers? _____ hours
3. What are the main different things volunteers do directly under your supervision? _____

4. In relation to the total number of clients (patients, consumers) served by your agency-organization, what would be the best or highest ratio of volunteer to clients you'd want? (choose the closest to right for you).
 - a. One volunteer to 50 or more clients.
 - b. One volunteer to 20 clients.
 - c. One volunteer to 5 clients.
 - d. One volunteer to 2 clients.
 - e. One or more volunteers for every client.
5. What concerns you more about the volunteer program? (check one in each line)

a. Insurance-liability	or b.	Volunteer training
a. Volunteer turnover rate	or b.	Spending too much time with volunteers.
6. What jobs, if any, could volunteers usefully perform that they don't now? _____

7. What are some of the things you see as particularly helpful in the volunteer program? _____

8. What are the best ways of involving volunteers in your organization or agency? (choose one on each line)
 a. Working directly with clients or b. Administrative duties
 a. Serving as individuals or b. Serving as groups

Part III: To be completed by the Volunteer

1. How long have you been in this volunteer program? _____
2. Please describe briefly your volunteer job(s) in this volunteer program _____

3. Where does your volunteer time go in an average month? (Please fill in all the lines as best you can)
 _____ Hours total per month
 _____ Hours with clients, or otherwise on the job, per month
 _____ Hours consulting with regular staff per month
 _____ Hours in various volunteer meetings per month
 _____ Hours filling out reports, paperwork (not part of the job itself) per month
4. What are the main reasons you joined up as a volunteer? _____

5. What are some of the main satisfactions you're getting from your volunteer work now? _____

6. What are some of the main frustrations? _____

7. What do you see as some of the good things about this volunteer program now? _____

8. Has anyone in the organization ever asked you before what you thought of this volunteer program? (please check the closest to right for you)
 No, never directly _____ Once or twice, maybe _____
 Many times _____
9. When your present term or year of volunteer services is up, do you plan to sign up again or continue for another term? (check one, please)
 Yes, definitely _____ No _____ Undecided at this time _____
10. Have you recommended joining this volunteer program to any of your friends or family?
 Yes, definitely _____ No, not really _____
 General mention, might not have been a strong recommendation _____

11. For this volunteer program, would you please rate each of the things below on a scale of 0 to 5, using the following key:

0 = really doesn't exist
1 = exists but poor
2 = fair
3 = average
4 = good
5 = excellent

Training of volunteers in this program:	0 1 2 3 4 5
Acceptance and support of volunteers by staff:	0 1 2 3 4 5
Recognition given to volunteer:	0 1 2 3 4 5
Volunteers are trusted to do important things:	0 1 2 3 4 5

Part IV: To be completed by the Client

1. What are some of the good things your volunteer does that help you? _____

2. What are some of the things your volunteer does that maybe don't help quite so much? _____

3. How often do you see your volunteer? _____
4. When was the last time your volunteer got in touch with you (by phone or in-person)? _____ days ago.
5. Have you ever told your volunteer any real secrets about yourself, trusting that she or he will keep them secret? _____
6. Has your volunteer ever told you any secrets about himself/herself in the same way? _____
7. If you were offered the chance to be a volunteer in work like the volunteer you have now, what would you do? (Choose the closest to right for you)
_____ I'd do it tomorrow
_____ I'd do it as soon as I got my own life well straightened out.
_____ I might do it sometime in the next ten years
_____ It's not for me; I probably wouldn't do it at all.
8. Do any of your friends want to have a volunteer like you have?
_____ Yes, I'm sure they do.
_____ Maybe, but I'm not really sure.
_____ No, as far as I know.

Part V: To be completed by Management

- (xx) Put two checks if the question is true for you.
(x) Put one check if you are uncertain or the question is partly true.
Leave the line blank if it is not true for you.

- _____ 1. We have a volunteer program now in our agency.
- _____ 2. I prefer to have volunteers incorporated as unpaid workers within the agency, rather than as a semi-independent auxiliary outside it.
- _____ 3. I believe volunteers should be involved in every part of our operations, working with all paid staff. I do not believe volunteers should work primarily and only for the Director-Coordinator-Supervisor of volunteers.
- _____ 4. Volunteers do well enough handling confidential materials. I don't see that as a matter to be particularly concerned about.
- _____ 5. Volunteers can be found to help with professional level tasks, as well as more routine ones.
- _____ 6. The volunteer program coordinator or director has his or her own secretary or support person.
- _____ 7. Volunteers do have a room or desk space to call their own in our agency.

I am willing to spend significant amounts from our regular budget for extra volunteer program expenses such as:

- _____ 8. Mailing of notices.
- _____ 9. Reimbursement of some work-related expenses for volunteers.
- _____ 10. If our organization's budget were doubled next year, I would still have at least as many volunteers as we have now.
- _____ 11. Within three years or less, I think we can use and should have twice our present number of volunteers.

In regard to staff time which must be invested in a quality volunteer program, I am prepared to:

- _____ 12. Allow at least ten hours a month of staff orientation to volunteers in the first six months of the program, even if that necessitates some neglect of their other duties.
- _____ 13. We give appropriate recognition to line staff who agree to work with volunteers, seriously train and adjust their roles for this and successfully work with them. This includes as a minimum, entry into their work records of their supervisory training and experience with volunteers, plus provision for clear and explicit recording in any merit or advancement rating system we have.
- _____ 14. I give careful if not preferential attention to present or ex-volunteers in my agency in the hiring of new paid staff, based on an objective assessment of their work record and experience as volunteers.

_____ 15. I see that volunteers are provided with letters of work recommendation if they request them, or other appropriate work credit, for their use in applying for paid work anywhere else.

I personally am willing to:

_____ 16. Appear at volunteer training sessions and recognition gatherings to welcome volunteers and express appreciation on behalf of our agency. This may be as many as eight-ten appearances a year.

_____ 17. Participate directly on the volunteer program planning and/or advisory board as much as two hours a month.

_____ 18. Our director or coordinator is a paid person.

_____ 19. His/her level in administrative status is supervisory.

_____ 20. He/she regularly attends and participates in staff meetings.

_____ 21. I see the volunteer coordinator-director at least once a week regularly for direct communication on progress and problems in the program.

_____ 22. We have a framework or mechanism for identifying and looking at any suggestions volunteers may have for agency's objectives or operations as a result of their work experience with us.

_____ 23. We plan to have eventually at least one volunteer for every three consumers of our service (clients, patients, proteges).

_____ 24. We plan to have eventually at least five volunteers for every paid staff member in the agency or organization.

_____ 25. Eventually I would definitely like to see some of our clients (consumer, patients) involved as volunteers.



EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Marlene Wilson, *Volunteer Management Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colorado*

MANAGING EDITOR: Carol G. Moore, *Resource Office for Community and Field Experience Programs, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts*

ASSOCIATION EDITORS:

Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS)

Co-editors: John H. Cauley, Jr., Capital Area United Way, Lansing, Michigan
Anne O. Cauley, Writing Consultant, East Lansing, Michigan

Association for Administration of Volunteer Services (AAVS)

Editor: Gideon T. Stanton, III, Community Action Council of Tulane University Students, New Orleans, Louisiana
Associate Editor: Constance C. Blanchard, Council for Greater Boston Campfire Girls, Boston, Massachusetts

Association of Volunteer Bureaus (AVB)

Editor: Shirley Leberte, Voluntary Action Center of Huntsville and Madison County, Huntsville, Alabama

AVAS RESEARCH TRANSLATION SECTION EDITOR: Jane Rehnberg,
Community College of Allegheny, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

CONSULTING EDITORS:

Association of Voluntary Action Scholars

Kenn Allen, *National Center for Voluntary Action, Washington, D.C.*
Marvin Arffa, *Human Services System, Inc., Norwood, Massachusetts*
Putnam Barber, *Office of Voluntary Action, Office of Community Development, Olympia, Washington*
Jeanne Carney, *National Student Volunteer Program, ACTION, Washington, D.C.*
Beth Clark, *Volunteer Resources, Selingsrove State School, Selingsrove, Pennsylvania*
Phil Grote, *School of Social Work, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama*
Corrine Halperin, *COVE: Council on Volunteers of Erie County, Erie, Pennsylvania*
Harvey Hohausser, *Urban Affairs Center, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan*
Margery Parker, *Management Development, National Convenience Stores, Houston, Texas*
Florence S. Schwartz, *School of Social Work, Hunter College, New York, New York*
Sim B. Sitkin, *Education Redesign Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts*
David H. Smith, *Department of Sociology, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts*
Barbara A. Sugarman, *Office of Volunteer Services, Georgia Department of Human Resources, Atlanta, Georgia*
J. Malcolm Walker, *School of Business, San Jose State University, San Jose, California*

Association for Administration of Volunteer Services

Sara Agnew Davis, *Volunteer and Tutorial Programs, Los Angeles United School District, Los Angeles, California*
Saralei M. Farner, *National Center for Voluntary Action, Washington, D.C.*
Miriam Karlins, *Consultant, Minneapolis, Minnesota*
Constance V. Krell, *Boston Voluntary Action Center, United Community Planning Corporation, Boston, Massachusetts*
Stanley Levin, *Social Security Administration, Baltimore, Maryland*
Mary C. Mackin, *Voluntary Services Staff, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.*
Harriet H. Naylor, *Office of Volunteer Development, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.*
Gregory R. Schultz, *Voluntary Action Center of Metropolitan Chicago, Chicago, Illinois*
Karen Wallin, *Echo Glen Children's Center, Snoqualmie, Washington*
Paul A. Weston, *Georgia Department of Corrections, Atlanta, Georgia*

Association of Volunteer Bureaus

Charles B. Spencer, *AVB Region I Chairman, Bronxville, New York*
Fred Meier, *AVB Region II Chairman, Volunteer Action Center of the Greater Philadelphia Area, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*
Marsha B. Riddle, *AVB Region III Chairman, Western Carolina Center, Morganton, North Carolina*
Lois Hickey, *AVB Region IV Chairman, Janesville, Wisconsin*
Ann Shanbert, *AVB Region V Chairman, Kansas City, Missouri*
Martha McCrory, *AVB Region VI Chairman, Voluntary Action Center, Baton Rouge, Louisiana*
Betty J. Hash, *AVB Region VII Chairman, Volunteer Bureau — Voluntary Action Center of Tacoma-Pierce Co., Tacoma, Washington*
Judy Lower, *Representing AVB Region VIII Chairman, Voluntary Action Center, Huntington Beach, California*

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
Box G-55, Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Boston, MA
Permit No. 50312