VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Volume XIV
Number 1
Spring 1981

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION is published quarterly by the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS), the Association for Volunteer Administration (AVA), 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, AVA 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 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.

Cost is $8 per year. Check or money order payable to VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION should accompany order. If billing is requested, one dollar will be added for service.

Subscribers outside the U.S. should add $2.80 for the extra cost of postage to Canada or Mexico or $3.00 for all other countries. Only international money orders or checks payable through a U.S. bank can be accepted as payment.

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

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, CO 80306

Information on procedures for submitting articles may be obtained from;

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, CO 80306

Additional information about the publishing associations may be obtained from;

Association for Volunteer Administration
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, CO 80306

Association of Voluntary Action Scholars
S-211 Henderson Human Development Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

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

Volunteer Administration

Volume XIV Spring 1981 Number 1

The Imitation of Volunteers: Towards an Appropriate Technology of Voluntary Action 1

Ivan H. Scheier, Ph.D.

The Value of an Internship in Volunteer Administration 7

Michael A. Cianfrocco, with Norma A. Greco, Ph.D.

The Management of Community Resources 9

Marilyn Taylor

Using Process Consultation Techniques to Improve Board Training 13

Marc B. Goldstein, Ph.D. and Carolyn M. Wysocki

When Partnership Fails: The Student as Victim 16

Michele A. Whitham

The Developing Organization 20

Rick Miller

Leadership Abstracts in Volunteer Administration 24

1981 National Conference on Volunteerism

October 14 - 17

SHERATON HOTEL
17th & JFK Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA

Co-Sponsored By
AVA/AVB/AVAS

WHO? directors of volunteers in agencies, institutions, and other settings ● association officers ● executive directors ● board officers ● clergy ● and lay leaders ● VAC staff and officers ● heads of community groups ● educators ● consultants ● corporate volunteer program coordinators ● students ● service-learning program coordinators ● community organizers ● trainers ● self-help group leaders ● fire chiefs ● civic and club officers ● political campaign managers ● heads of fraternal organizations ● leaders of cooperatives ● colleagues from the international community

ALL LEADERS OF VOLUNTEERS: salaried & unsalaried; full-time & part-time; formal & informal organizations; public & private sectors; local, state & national levels.

WHY?
No matter what your setting — of view — This is **the** meetingplace to explore what we all have in common. This conference will give you time to:

- build skills
- exchange experiences
- identify resources
- increase collaboration
- address issues affecting volunteerism

COSTS?
Conference Registration: Approximately $75 for members of the sponsoring organizations
Approximately $100 for non-members
Daily fees will be available
Sample Hotel Rates: $59 plus tax for a double room at the Sheraton Hotel

DETAILED INFORMATION AND REGISTRATION BROCHURE WILL BE SENT UPON REQUEST

PROGRAM

An estimated 1,000 participants will be offered a full agenda of **practical workshops, local study tours, special interest caucuses, research paper readings, regional meetings,** and **presentations by national resource people.** Both newcomers and veteran volunteer leaders will find topics of interest: programmatic, professional and personal, practical and theoretical. **"Challenge Sessions"** will deal with the implications of today's issues for program management. Extended time is scheduled on Thursday afternoon for a **unique "Strategy Exchange"** — a structured general session allowing conferees to collaborate on specific questions and concerns. This "Strategy Exchange" will insure that people who should meet each other, do.

The **Annual Meetings** of each of the sponsoring organizations will be held during the conference, allowing members to participate in national association business and voting.

Because a conference should not be all work and no play, the 1981 National conference on Volunteerism will have a variety of **free-time options** available to registrants, maximizing the blend of colonial and cosmopolitan atmosphere of Philadelphia. **Tours, dinner parties,** and other **special events** will allow conferees to interact informally.

EXHIBIT space will be available for commercial and non-profit organization exhibits at minimal fee based on space required. Plan your display now and reserve space by calling Carol Harlan, 302-478-7435.

For **GENERAL INFORMATION** about any aspect of this exciting event, contact Christine Franklin, Conference Chair, P.O. Box 2152, Duxbury, MA 02332 (617-934-6951), or conference office: P.O. Box 4584, Boulder, Colo. 80306 (303-497-0238).

The Imitation of Volunteers: Towards an Appropriate Technology of Voluntary Action

By Ivan H. Scheier, Ph.D.

Legacy and Challenge

Who's responsible for what happens to volunteerism? If you're reading these lines, you are, because in one role or another--board, staff, community leader, coordinator, consultant, trainer, or any variety of career -- what you think and do influences our field.

Among readers of this journal, there are no innocent bystanders.

But what shapes us who then shape volunteerism? From whence come the tactics, strategies, principles, skills, attitudes, and world view which leaders of volunteers then transmit to rank and file via training, consulting, guidelines, standards, model projects, and in the very language we use to describe who we are and what we do?

I believe the answer is quite clear. Our knowledge base and the very core of our self-image as leaders are eclectic derivatives of management; business and public administration; leadership theory; organizational development; psychology (especially personnel psychology and the theory of motivation); sociology; social work; communications; public relationship; education and training; and fundraising--with occasional sorties into philosophy, theology, community organization, and a few other fields.

Quite a list of conceptual creditors! What's more, our sense of belonging to them is real; for example, we often call ourselves "managers" and "administrators." To be sure, translations and adaptations from established fields help assure a healthy childhood in any profession. Early psychology, for example, leaned heavily on philosophy and even physics. For our field of volunteerism, we can say with pride that we have been humble enough to learn from many sources, and creative enough to adapt and integrate them for our own uses.

This has been a rich legacy of learning from our complex parenthood and one hopes for its continuation. But I believe there comes a time in the life of any field when we must ask if there is anything we can call especially our own. We must either be able to answer yes or implicitly acknowledge second-rate status. The challenge is to concentrate on identifying what, if anything, is different and special about the volunteer experience, and from this derive premise, principle, strategy, tactics and methods which are uniquely appropriate for us.

The "Different" About Us

In any search for ourselves, one pitfall is familiar to any reader of who-dunnits: the best place to hide something is in plain sight. What has been somewhat "hidden in plain sight" all these years is the raw beauty of our quintessential situation: people participating caringly without pay; people doing more than they have to because they want to, the basis being principally a motivational paycheck. We deal with a neglected species of work which is at once voluntary and help-intending, and which, more than most any other kind of work, can be shaped to individual people (vs. shaping people to work).

None of the disciplines we emulate can make all these statements or even most of them about their knowledge and value base. Overlap there may be, but this is a far cry from substantial identity.

Ivan Scheier is a consultant, learning facilitator, and publisher of the futures journal "On Background." He is also Resource Development Chair for the Association for Volunteer Administration.

For helpful review comments on this manuscript, the author is grateful to Sue Dryovage.

There is even "evidence" of a kind that our difference does make a difference. In the past eight years, some of us have begun the attempt to determine what volunteer leadership methods would look like if more directly and explicitly based on the special characteristics and conditions of the prototype volunteer situation. [Barber, 1979; Lewis, 1979; On Background, Vol. I, No.s 3 and 4, 1980; Scheier, 1980b, 1981.] This approach yields principles which at least seem more like our own, and different from those of other fields, e.g., "make the minimum difference in what a person wants to do, and can do, which has the maximum positive impact on other people." From this and related principles, methods emerged which seem to differ from standard management procedures. I believe one main reason for this was that these "people approach" strategies were deliberately designed to capitalize on the special advantages of the volunteer situation, while acknowledging its special restrictions. The names, at least, sounded different: Minimax, Need Overlap Analysis, the Bridge, the Neighborhood Enabler, The Task Enrichment System, etc.

Except for the names, the "evidence" described above is simply a claim registered with references for your consideration and conclusions.

Towards An Appropriate Technology: Two Parts

I happen to believe there is something there, and I suppose what we are groping towards might be called an "appropriate technology" of voluntary action --"appropriate" because in modeling primarily on "the volunteer situation" it asks neither too much nor too little of volunteers and their leadership.

An appropriate technology for voluntary action would have two parts. One part, just alluded to, bases methodology on the prototypical volunteer experience. Another thrust parallels this effort for values in volunteerism. The technical sector is coming into place, I believe; little more is said about it here. The second more ethical part is scarcely begun. Its key proposition is an essential homily; any person or organization claiming to lead and/or represent volunteers, must be able clearly to perceive and articulate the values volunteers stand for; more, she/he should live and work by those values.

"Volunteer Values" as Leadership Behavior Guides

Earlier work enables us to identify five important inter-related values expressed by the act of volunteering [AAVS, 1978; Barber and Scheier, 1979; Scheier, 1978; Wilson, 1980]. These are the values of participation in a free society; respect for the dignity and worth of every individual; pride in work; caution concerning the excesses of extreme materialism; and the ethic of practicing what we preach about ethics.

Each of these "volunteer values" will be examined in the light of what it implies for the behavior of leadership individuals and organizations in our field. Our approach builds on the pioneer achievement of the AVA Code of Professional Ethics (AAVS, 1978), and attempts to extend it in two ways. Value-consistent vs. value-inconsistent behaviors are described and their implications drawn: 1) for volunteer leadership individuals in general, not just directors/coordinators of volunteer services; and 2) for the behavior of organizations as well as individuals in the volunteer leadership field.

I'm serious about holding our feet to the fire on this one, in terms of what we do as leaders, not just what we say. Any dissonance or contradictions between the values volunteers represent and the values exhibited by the behavior of their leadership/spokespersons, forbodes a disabling alienation between volunteers and their leadership and a consequent ineffectiveness in that leadership.

Moreover, as volunteer leadership more perfectly lives the values represented by its "constituency" it will be healthier in the sense of practicing what it preaches, and more visible to the nation at large as something special.

This is not a saints and sinners scenario. Thus, the preceding sermonette is superfluous for most volunteer leadership people, except perhaps to raise their awareness of the significance of the decency already natural to them, and to refine their expectations vis-a-vis volunteer leadership organizations which seek their affiliation and support. The intention is certainly not to preach absolute perfection in emulating volunteer ideals. Here any pointing fingers, my own included, are likely to be generously curved.

Nor are volunteers proposed as candidates for canonization. To be sure, they are admired as good people, whose behavior preserves some endangered species of everyday ethics. But (thankfully) our approach need not require that volunteers be perfect people, flawlessly embodying every ethical ideal.

A. The Value of Participation In a Free Society

Volunteers choose to participate, without the powerful inducement of money. In this and other ways, they personify the virtues of involvement.

For starters, leadership people should themselves be doing some volunteering, perferably of the type they teach and talk about. Thus, useful as it is, volunteering on a policy board, especially a prestigious state or national board, does not ordinarily equip us to understand the hopes and frustrations of front-line local volunteers.

We should be doing volunteer work ourselves because we want to, because it is value-consistent, and because our effectiveness as leaders needs a constantly refreshed direct understanding of what it's like to be whom we seek to lead. This is why a history of having been a volunteer some time ago is very risky as a current data base; memory of the experience fades and filters readily.

Concurrent front-line volunteer experience should impact positively on a leader's level of sensitivity and relevance. However, the leader's choice to seek such involvement is mainly a matter of private conscience and commitment. It is not ordinarily a matter for public proclamation or examination as a credential.

Another kind of value-consistent behavior <u>should</u> be public, and is in fact glaringly obvious in the breach as well as the observance. We cannot credibly urge other people to involve volunteers, when we fail fully to do so ourselves, as leadership individuals and organizations.

Where <u>is</u> the volunteer leadership organization or volunteer program that, as it solicits your dollars, endorsement, support, or participation makes sure its own operation involves clear and vigorous model non-token, intelligent delegation to volunteers, in a rich variety of responsible as well as routine roles, in service as well as policy-setting? Are these involvements geographically accessible to the widest possible range of people? Does the organization's treatment of its volunteers mirror (highly polished) the exemplary standards it exhorts others to observe in volunteer-staff relations, recognition, supervision, evaluation, minority involvement, etc.?

It should not be necessary to mention such matters. Yet, incredibly, the bias that it is easier/better to get more money and hire people for the work, than to suffer the "inconvenience of volunteers" is not unknown among volunteer leadership organizations and programs. Classic ironies here include failure to tap the full potential of service volunteers to assist the work of: 1) salaried volunteer coordinators and 2) volunteer leadership organizations.

Volunteering is one behavioral endorsement of the value of participation. Another value-consistent set of behaviors has to do with the encouragement and use of input from volunteers, members, consumers of services, and all who have a stake in our work.

Where does your leadership person stand on this one? Does she/he have plenty of time for open questions and interaction, for careful and concerned listening? What sort of priority does the leadership organization place on regular, accessible channels for input and feedback from its members, consumers, publics, and non-members, too? Are these communication mechanisms well-used, with sensitive listeners at the other end, ready and able to try to do something about what they hear? Indeed, genuinely broad and deep participation is as much a matter of attitude as of structure - the attitude of being gladly open vs. narrowly defensive in actively seeking and considering suggestions on vital subjects. Seeking input only on the relatively trivial or absolutely pre-decided topic is merely to play participatory games. So is the irritable assumption that people are "apathetic" or "poor sports" when they don't choose to participate within the quite possibly arbitrary frameworks we have established.

B. Respect for the Dignity and Worth of Every Individual

Volunteers put flesh on this ideal in at least two ways:

1) They witness a faith that individuals can still make a difference in an otherwise impersonal age of big government, big business, big labor, big philanthropy, and perhaps big volunteerism too.

2) Volunteers are often willing and able to give individualized attention to weak and vulnerable people, when paid staff are too busy to do so. What this attention says to clients loud and clear is that "you matter" and "we believe in your potential."

One important way in which volunteers show respect for clients is by finding them worthy of listening to. Once again, the effective imitation of volunteers requires a truly listening leadership. Thus, at workshops, conferences, and consultations, value-consistent leadership style is readily recognized: the person is <u>with</u> the people served--frequently, easily, eagerly and even enjoyably--rather than clustered or cloistered with her/his "own kind." The latter behavior reveals the backside of this value--the class-conscious notion that some individuals are more worthy than others simply because they are officers, staff, educated, experienced, professional, certified, etc. Thus, while perfection of a certification process is a high priority for AVA, it is also the place where we are most in danger of violating our own code of ethics on the dignity and worth of every individual. The minimum protection is to stop well short of ratifying automatically any kind of inherent privilege: educational, chronological, or financial. AVA's new certification plan is on the safe side here, because it is competency-based.

Commitment to the dignity and worth of every individual is also reflected in organizational style. For example, the effective imitation of volunteers should have leadership individuals and organizations listening with concern to the powerless and poor as much as to the powerful and rich; to the non-member and the non-contributor as carefully as to the member and money-giver; and to the non-conformist along with the "team player." When realistic organizational or individual needs for control are not held in reasonable check, it is easy to confuse unity with unanimity, and to question the motivational integrity of dissent. But this is to fail the ultimate test of respect for the dignity and worth of an individual--when she/he is in the out-voted minority, or simply resolute in disagreement. Generically, we are really talking about the politico-social value of pluralism, which volunteerism is said to represent and reinforce in a society (Black, 1979). Indeed as we become more aware of policy and advocacy as integral parts of the volunteer family, we are going to have to learn to respect volunteers holding a wide range of diverse opinion and convictions on any given topic; including opinions with which we as leaders may strongly differ. The parallel practice in our organizations would carefully avoid the suffocation or subversion of dissent.

More generally, the balance struck between individual and organizational needs reflects our commitment to individual worth and dignity. Beyond a certain point an organization is clearly counter-modeling volunteer values when it sacrifices individuals on the altar of organizational priorities, rather than viewing the organization mainly as a way of encouraging and supporting growth and development in individuals.

Finally, our commitment to the dignity and worth of every individual is tested in practice by the kinds of recommendations emphasized in our training, technical assistance, consultation, and publications. Thus, one value-consistent position would be a strong endorsement of significant volunteer and client input into volunteer programs, with practical suggestions on how to make that happen more--even when agency/staff resistance makes this a tactless tactic.

A related value-consistent approach would be explicitly skeptical and, if necessary, courageously confrontative in regard to any organizational arrangement which emphasizes subordinate service roles for volunteers and/or token advisory or policy roles.

Finally, a volunteer-imitating leadership would vigorously support in word and deed, the proposition that everybody has something to give as volunteers. This includes clients, transitional and other "non-traditional" volunteers; the very young all the way to the very old, in a vast range of acceptable types and styles of contribution [ENERGIZE, 1981; Scheier, 1980a]. Note particularly, here, the readiness to accept support and encourage self-help and mutual help/ network models, as at least close relatives to volunteerism. Indeed, look for anything like this which finally and forever exorcises patronizing stereotypes of helping.

C. The Dignity and Value of Work In and Of Itself

Eliminate money as a primary incentive, and you've gone a along way towards saying work must have substantial value <u>for its own sake</u>. This is why volunteers testify eloquently to a pride-in-work principle, a rare proclamation indeed in a society where money is the main measure of the value of work (and people?).

Value-consistent leadership behaviors include:

1) Accuracy and honesty in packaging roles for volunteers (vs., for example, allowing a person to believe their volunteer policy participation is real, then ignoring or cicumventing their input);

2) Skilled, sensitive, resolute efforts to maximize responsibility and growth opportunity in all volunteer work roles, plus strong advocacy for respectful attention to this volunteer work on resumes.

In the matter of volunteer job design my own belief is that value-consistency particularly welcomes the enrichment of <u>intrinsic</u> attractiveness of work for volunteers, as distinct from an emphasis on <u>extrinsic</u> incentives, additions not in the work itself, and perhaps closer to substitutes for money (Scheier, 1980a).

D. A Remedy Against Extreme Materialism

Leadership people and organizations usually need some money to achieve their purposes. At the same time, the volunteer example proclaims certain basic qualities of caring as not for sale, having no price tag, and scarcely even discussable in dollar terms.

This bubble in the consciousness of modern volunteerism has been around since approximately Day One. I claim both numerous and distinguished company in not having thought my way completely through the apparent anomaly. This is why the following sounds like an invitation to suffer along with Hamlet--in hopes of converting anguished monologue to productive dialogue.

Sometimes it seems like volunteer leadership individuals and organizations never heard of the not-for-money alternative. No one scrambles harder for dollars then we do, or places higher prioity on teaching others to do the same. Money-raising techniques are a prominent, popular feature of our workshops, textbooks, and technical assistance. But sometimes, when our hair is down, some of us will concede peril to our souls in compromising what we see as needed in favor of what there's money for; in over-representing the rich and powerful in our councils; or simply because money-worry takes too much time and effort away from thinking about what we're supposed to be doing, and whom it's for. Somewhere, there may be a soul-searching threshold at which our staff or board spends too much time talking about money, and needs to start talking about <u>why</u> we're talking so much about money (is it <u>25%</u> of our time? 75%? 98%?).

Overbalancing towards dollar-based decisions is possible even when the primary purpose of the volunteer effort is to raise money. Here, one sometimes sees leadership which seems to want volunteer focus on fund-raising activities so much that it doesn't seriously offer fund-raising volunteers opportunities for direct personal involvement in the problem-situations they are raising money to deal with. (This is probably short-sighted policy in any case.)

Finally, even what we call major <u>issues</u> in volunteerism--gas mileage allotments, tax deductions or credits, enabling funds, insurance protection--are essentially dollar-and-cents oriented. Important as these matters are, they seem to redefine the benefits and protections of voluntary work principally in materialistic terms.

Sometimes the irony is overpowering: we who claim leadership of people not primarily motived by money, seem motivated by nothing else.

The foregoing may only feed the guilt pangs about money that many of us have now and then. But in the first place, most of our fund-raising efforts are dedicated to helping others, rather than for selfish gain. Even when there's also something for us in it, as volunteer leaders we can be comfortable. For, as I've argued elsewhere (Scheier, 1980a, Chap. 15), nothing in the volunteer philosophy need imply disdain for the importance of money, and we are fools if we do so, for among other things we then <u>deserve</u> the counterpart bias: disrespect for anything which is <u>unpaid</u>, including volunteer work (Scheier, <u>1980a</u>, Chap. 15). Moreover, even implying that money is unimportant or "dirty," is arrogantly insensitive to the sufferings of poor people.

Only consider: many people are enabled to volunteer mainly or only because hard work and/or good fortune assures them money enough for decent living. To say that this money does not come from their volunteering is to miss the point: they <u>have</u> the money, and that <u>allows</u> them to <u>volunteer</u>. Indeed, the clear <u>majority</u> of volunteers today are doing so in their "spare time" from salaried employment, or else using volunteering as a stepping-stone to paid work. Those people personify an intimate complementary relation between paid and unpaid work, not a conflict.

Therefore, what we really seem to be saying is not that it's "bad" to accept money in return for work. Rather, we are saying that once one has enough money or its material equivalent for basic life support and a few creature comforts, it is good to do a little extra work of one's choice not for pay.

Such a version of the volunteer value system can with complete consistency advocate decent pay for volunteer coordinators and other staff related to volunteer programs. Nor is there anything here that hates money so much it will give politicians an alibi for saving it by bludgeoning human service budgets. Indeed, another volunteer value--respect for the dignity and worth of every individual--will support surgical removal of fat from such budgets, but object vigorously when the weak and vulnerable are damaged, or when volunteers are exploited as "cheap labor."

Trueness to a less materialistic "volunteer alternative" does appear to suggest certain guidelines for leadership and behavior. Certainly, we should fully respect people and organizations who are not paid for their services as leaders, e.g., the volunteer volunteer coordinator, the consultant-volunteer, etc. In ours, of all professions, these people cannot be seen as second-raters in any sense.

Now, a word to the remunerated among us. Elsewhere I've argued for the reality of a volunteer component in all work, salaried or unsalaried (Scheier, 1980a, Chap. 15). Thus even when "doing it for money," some of our best employees are also "doing it for <u>more</u> than money," working harder than they <u>have to</u> because they want to. This volunteer attitude towards work can occur at any pay grade from zero to a million dollars a year. In fact, the volunteer approach to work probably occurs more frequently at higher salary levels because this "extra mile" approach tends to attract merit advancements, in any reasonably fair and open employment situation.

Therefore, salaried leadership of volunteers should take special care to model the volunteer attitude in their own work. (The vast majority of us are already dedicated extra milers; we might only articulate better to ourselves and others what this means.) This volunteer attitude for salaried leadership is not only consistent with our values; it is also consistent with any salary level, and particularly the higher ones. I claim only that this is worth a try, and may help assuage any lingering guilt feelings about deserving decent pay for our work (this usually means, higher pay than today). But I'm well aware that exhibiting the volunteer attitude in one's work also invites exploitation from the wrong kind of boss or sponsor. Here, we must simply market our present skills better to employers, and perhaps add other marketable skills based on the uniqueness of volunteering--which bring us full circle to this article's introduction.

The Proof of Everyday Ethics is in the Doing, Not Just the Saying

In the arena of ethics, volunteers are the original "deeds-not-words" folks. So are most volunteer leadership individuals and organizations most of the time. Perhaps the best criteria are daily ones. Thus, leadership individuals and organizations adequately imitate volunteers just insofar as they regularly treat their own colleagues, employees, constituents, clients, and publics with consideration, caring and concern; with patience where needed; with respect and understanding always.

We're only human here, only strugglers toward the ideal. To an already demanding list of desirable leadership qualities we need not add sainthood. But I am especially worried about some commonly accepted leadership characteristics which could actually conflict with caring--notably, an uncritical penchant for "efficiency" in volunteer program operations. At an early extreme, I suspect efficiency is the deadliest enemy kindness ever had, an ever-ready altar on which opportunities for decency are sacrificed to economy in money or time. Having opened this Pandora's box for much more peering into, I'll rest my opening case with any veteran air traveler. What happened to the quality of caring in the passenger cabin as a result of computer-tight deployment of cabin attendants and flights themselves? I would hope the extra attentions volunteers can provide encourage all of us to risk some inefficiency, whenever it allows more leisure for caring.

On the other hand, I do not think our commitment to imitating the volunteer ethic requires that we remain powerless in an era where we cannot afford to be. Elsewhere I have indicated practical ways in which we can develop value-consistent power (On Background, Volume I, No. 2, 1980a).

The Conclusion as a Beginning

From the vote to the town meeting to the organized policy or advocacy group, volunteers are especially free to speak their minds. I hope many readers will feel prompted to imitate volunteers in this respect, too, for any of the difficult issues raised in this article.

References

Association for Administration of Volunteer Services (AAVS). Professional Ethics in Volunteer Services Administration. AAVS, Boulder, Colorado, 1978.

Barber, P., et al. "MINIMAX: The Exchange Game," Volunteer Readership, Boulder, Colorado, 1979.

Barber, P. and Scheier, I. "Ethics in Volunteerism: A Beginning Dialogue," Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter, 1979, pp. 35-40.

Black, Joyce. Commentary in Voluntary Action Leadership, Summer, 1979, p. 2.

ENERGIZE, Philadephia, Pennsylvania, 1981. Poster of volunteer job titles, based on "Titles of Caring."

Lewis, D. The Neighborhood Notebook: Ten Exercises for Working With Volunteers. IDEA, East Aurora, N.Y., 1979.

ON BACKGROUND, a future journal, Boulder, Colorado:
a) Volume I, No. 2, 1980. "Making People Points for Resource Power"
b) Volume I, No. 3, 1980. "The Neighborhood Enabler"
c) Volume I, No. 4, 1980. "The Bridge"

Scheier, I. "Values in Volunteering: Time to Reconsider," Voluntary Action Leadership. Summer, 1978, pp. 38-39.

Scheier, I. Exploring Volunteer Space: The Recruiting of a Nation. Volunteer Readership, Boulder, Colorado, 1980a.

Scheier, I. "The Task Enrichment System: The First Outline," Volunteer Administration, Vol. XIII, No. 3, Fall, 1980b, pp. 15-26.

Scheier, I. "Recruiting Volunteers in the 1980's: A Perspective on People Approach," NAVCJ Examiner, Volume 2, No. 1, Winter, 1981, pp. 7-8.

Wilson, Ruth D. "The Deeper Meaning of Volunteerism," Voluntary Action Leadership, Winter, 1980, pp. 2, 45.

The Value of an Internship in Volunteer Administration

By Michael A. Cianfracco
with Norma A. Greco, Ph.D.

A hospital's department of volunteer services offers various support systems that invaluably enhance the institutions effectiveness as a health care facility. Not only does the volunteer department provide services for patients and assistance to staff, but it functions also as a main channel of communication between the hospital and the larger community. Because of the increasingly important and diverse roles of volunteers in hospitals and in all areas of the non-profit sector, effective leadership in volunteer administration has become a recognized necessity. Nevertheless, pre-professional programs in the field are as yet few and largely experimental. As director of Volunteer Services at Magee-Womens Hospital in Pittsburgh, I became aware of the lack in western Pennsylvania of any formal training structure for prospective professionals in volunteer management, and in response I have established at Magee a Volunteer Adminstration Internship Program. During the five years of its operation the program has "graduated" sixteen interns trained in various aspects of volunteer administration.

The internship program at Magee has fulfilled the purpose of providing interested individuals with an effective mechanism through which to test and verify experientially the responsibilities involved in volunteer administration and to develop necessary professional skills. It also provides benefits to both the hospital and to the director of volunteer services who implements the program. The hospital receives the services of the talented and conscientious persons serving as interns, while the director is enabled not only to sharpen important managerial techniques, but also to strengthen his or her own understanding of the profession's demands and objectives.

The internship program is on-going throughout the year, and in the past from three to seven interns have participated at any one time. Each intern commits his or her services for a minimum of two days a week for six months. A college degree is a requirement for admission, although interns have offered a variety of educational background and have included those with master's degrees as well as Ph.D. candidates. Interns are carefully selected after candidates have been interviewed to determine whether they have adequate motivation and ability to perform duties required, which are essentially those of an assistant director of volunteer services.

Once selected, an intern is assigned tasks that match his or her specific interests and talents. The assignments performed by the interns are varied, and their contribution to the effectiveness of Magee's health service has been evident. In the past, interns have been responsible for the following projects: the writing of assignment guides, coordinating a CPR program for volunteers, establishing activity programs for patients, coordinating educational programs for volunteers, handling recruitment and supervision of the Junior Volunteer Program, assisting in the writing of a grant proposal for a patient aide program on nursing units, assisting with the presentation to the Governor's office on a convention for volunteerism, assisting with the implementation of a TB tine testing

---

Michael A. Cianfracco is the director of Volunteer Services at Magee-Womens Hospital in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He is an active member of the Association for Volunteer Administration, American Society of Directors of Volunteer Services, Pennsylvania Society of Directors of Volunteer Services and Volunteer Administrators of Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Norma A. Greco is an instructor at the Ellis School in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and is a volunteer at Magee-Womens Hospital.

program for volunteers, writing a volunteer handbook, organizing and writing an administrative manual for the department and assisting with the development of risk management programs.

Through their many valuable services to the hospital, the interns are able to define for themselves the demands and objectives of a volunteer administration position. Because they assume the responsibilities of an assistant director, they gain awareness of necessary skills and receive initial training in the profession. In addition, through participating in a staff structure of three or more interns and a director, with required weekly meetings for reporting and assignments, interns receive valuable managerial experience in interpersonal communication. Further career preparation is provided interns by acquainting them with the professional organizations in which the director participates, including the American Society of Directors of Volunteer Services, the Western Chapter of the Pennsylvania Society of Directors of Volunteer Services, the Volunteer Action Center, the Association for Volunteer Administration. By attending meetings of these organizations, the interns secure a variety of employment contacts and broaden their understanding of volunteerism.

The high proportion of "graduates" who have secured positions in volunteer management of related fields indicates that the program's objectives of providing job verification and pre-professional training have indeed been met. Of the sixteen graduates, all but three have entered the profession directly or continued graduate work in health administration. For example, one intern who enrolled in the program in search of career opportunities in volunteer administration worked diligently at Magee, performing a variety of management services. Following her internship, she received a position as volunteer administrator for a community-based radio station. Other "graduates" have attained such positions as director of student activities in a local college, volunteer coordinator at a public library, and director of volunteers for a female offenders' program.

In addition to meeting the needs of the interns and the hospital, the internship program lastly benefits the Director of Volunteer Services in ways which have more than compensated for the extensive time and effort required in implementing the program. A group of dynamic interns working together in a variety of assignments has offered the department a continual supply of added vitality through which it has grown and expanded at an accelerated pace. The interns also stimulate fresh and original insights into ordinary daily problems, a contribution so valuable to a director in reevaluating the department's day-to-day performance. The loneliness of the position is also lessened greatly when he or she can discuss problems with the individuals who understand and share the department's objectives and can offer solutions. I have found also that the friendship and meaningful professional ties gained in the process constitute a valuable and rewarding bonus.

More important, perhaps, I have discovered that the program has offered me, as Director of Volunteer Services, a clarified perspective on the profession and an opportunity to practice and strengthen necessary skills. By meeting the needs of the interns, the director focuses on professional demands and responsibilities and defines the scope and requirements of the position. In the process of participating with the interns in a staff structure, the director also sharpens managerial techniques so necessary to effective volunteer administration. Based on my experience in coordinating an internship program at Magee, the director becomes involved in an exciting and rewarding personal and professional experience while guiding the interns in their own training.

The results of the Administration Internship Program at Magee are conclusive: the program provided viable training in volunteer administration and benefits the institution served as well as the coordinating director. As yet, the role of such internships in the future of volunteerism remains uncertain. The success of the program at Magee, however, raises a major question for consideration by those concerned about volunteer administration in the non-profit sector. Should an internship system be integrated into the curriculum of a university degree program in volunteer administration? Certainly the lack of defined and tested pre-professional programs in the field demands that every proven training mechanism, such as that operating at Magee, be fully examined for its potential contribution to the goal of effective volunteer adminstration.

The Management of Community Resources

By Marilyn Taylor

The Community Projects Foundation (CPF) is a national community and youth work agency in England which sets up innovative and experimental projects in various parts of the country. As an organization whose role is to develop such methods of work and demonstrate their value, it receives a substantial proportion of its funds from the government. An important part of its work therefore, is to evaluate the experiences of its field projects during their three to five year life in order both to develop further projects and to share the learning with others in the field.

As research officer for this organization, I have been involved in the evaluation of a number of projects. In general, evaluation has been broadscale, covering the full range of the project's work. A number of common themes have emerged during these studies, which need far more extensive evaluation in their own right. One of these, the subject of this paper, is the management of locally-based community work agencies.

In debate about community work and community action in this country, the questions of its management is a long way down the agenda. My interest in it was aroused, on the one hand, by observing the struggles some workers have had operating within management structures which seem inappropriate, irrelevant or simply not very helpful; and on the other hand, from observing the difficulties that local people with a strong commitment to managing their own resources had in finding ways of doing this effectively. I was struck by the differences between community work agencies in their attitudes towards management. At one end of the system, I found workers who saw their management structure as something remote, something they would play along with for the sake of appearances, and use where possible, but which would be kept at arm's length. At the other end, there were workers who were putting a major part of their energy into building up a representative group of local people to manage their own project, who saw the development of effective local control as central to their work and ideology. Where along this spectrum are the most effective and valuable forms of management?

The matter is not of purely academic interest. A lot of enery has been invested in management; whether in developing or obstructing it. In many management groups, individual members are offering a high commitment and time they can scarcely afford, to tackle problems of poverty and disadvantage. The resources at their disposal are scarce, given the scale of the problems. It is important that they have the skills to use both their time and those resources to maximum advantage.

The Role of Research

Research should be able to offer a better understanding of the role of management in a community work agency. First, it can bring out the assumptions and values behind various forms of management in the field and make them explicit. Second, researchers can describe the different models that are around and evaluate their impact. Through this, information can be shared. Third, research can borrow insights and concepts from the study of management elsewhere, and suggest how they might be applied. The pool of knowledge thus created, and the tools of analysis, would provide a foundation for training and support of people in mangement positions and give them a basis for making decisions between different approaches. More knowledge

Marilyn Taylor is a Senior Research Officer for the Community Projects Foundation, a British community work and youth work agency which receives its major funding from the Voluntary Services Unit of the Home Office in the United Kingdom.

of current management practice and its effects would, surely, encourage more realistic expectations from the managers, the managed, and--most important--the funders. And, fourth, the researcher could play a more immediate role as a resource to individual groups, offering feedback, analysis, and thereby direct support.

The Questions that Need to Be Asked

As a foundation to research of this kind, the remaining section of this paper will suggest areas where examination is currently needed.

The reseacher needs to start his or her investigation right at the beginning, by charting the decisions that lie behind the setting up of a management structure. How much thought actually goes into finding the suitable management structure for each project? All sorts of assumptions and values lie behind the final structure. They need to be made explicit and tested. In particular, it would be interesting to explore the constraints that funders put on management and the expectations they have. What are the unwritten rules or codes of practice that people automatically adopt when thinking about the management of a new project or resource?

Who Manages?

In my experience there are three basic models of management, reflecting very different views about community intervention. Stated simply, they are:

A. Direct Management

In some cases, the sponsoring body manages the agency directly, without the intervention of a management group. Probably the most common examples of this in Britain are found in local authority community work. The actual structure adopted varies from bureaucratic control through a local authority department hierarchy, to defacto worker management, where the sponsor, by default, leaves the responsibility for the project almost entirely in the workers' hands.

Sometimes, where a variety of sponsors are involved, representatives from each may come together in a management committee.

B. Professional Management Committee

In this case, although the sponsors retain ultimate responsibility, management is effectively delegated to a group of people of some kind of professional experience or official status in the locality. They might be selected by the sponsors themselves, by the workers, or by whoever had the idea for the project and built it up. Members are selected for a variety of reasons: for particular skills (a lawyer, an accountant, or a professional community worker from another agency); as representatives of relevant local agencies, or indeed of local authority departments; as delegates of trade unions; or simply for their personal status in the local community.

If well-chosen, with an eye to experience in the community work field, such a group may be very competent indeed. But often relevant experience is hard to define. The desire to get all possible vested interests together can be counterproductive and produce a forum in which local professinal and political battles are fought. Or, so many potentially useful people may be assembled that they are incapable of giving any direction to the work.

C. Local Control and User Management

In this case, the members are brought together in the belief that community resources should be in control of the users of those resources. They are chosen as representatives of the groups with and for whom the project is working. This model is closest to the principles of self determination and redistribution of power that underlie much community work.

Which of these is chosen will depend on the values behind the work, although people who favor local control in the long run will often opt in the short-term for a more "professional" model because "a local person's time is valuable and should be used in action, not management," or because they believe local people exercise their own informal control ("they've got to like us to talk to us"). The danger is that such a group becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, preventing local activists from taking any real part in running their own resources or determining their direction. An efficient professional group often does not allow others the space to come into the group and learn to manage for themselves. As one local tenant that I spoke to commented: "It's more important to have experienced people on. They are more important that the tenants. We don't know what's going on, but these people do." The competence of professional managers on such a group can be a mixed blessing.

There are of course many variations in this simple classification. Sponsors, local professionals and local group members often all find themselves in the same group. But such a group may find itself trying to be all things to all people, with its members expecting very different things of management from each other--a situation which soon leads to frustration. The combination of those who know about community action but not project management, and those who know about management but not community action can be explosive.

Or a two tier system might be introduced, with a small group meeting regularly as an executive committee with responsbilities to a more general meeting; with a sponsor carrying some functions and delegating others to a management committee locally; or with a management committee delegating some of its tasks to sub-groups. While a wider involvement can be achieved in this way, there is some evidence that friction between the tiers follows. Such a system is open to confusion--or people work out where they feel the real power lies, and argue that their more peripheral involvement is just window dressing and, as such, a waste of their time.

What Does Management Do?

It is impossible to pursue the question of who manages, without exploring the content of management. Observation suggests that the following tasks are covered:

- legal and financial accountability, i.e. policing the boundaries of the work, and ensuring that the intended program is carried out.
- policy formulation
- administration
- hiring and firing
- fundraising
- policital protection--giving the workers' space.
- coordination and public relations with other local agencies.
- work supervision, support and advice
- evaluation

More often than not, one group will be set up to undertake all of these or more, and it is hardly surprising that many find it extremely difficult. Equally, there are hidden agendas of tasks that are not strictly management, such as: inviting people onto management because they need to be educated about community work or kept "sweet;" or setting up a group to act as a buffer between the workers (who actually make the decisions) and the sponsors, especially when they are a local authority department.

More research is needed to establish to what extent all these various tasks are compatible and, if not, how they can be distributed. Many members of management groups find that the skills for which they are appointed do not suit them for many of the things expected of them. For example, fundraising may be beyond the competence of community people brought on to give support and advice on services.

It would be useful to have a range of information about the ways in which different projects organize the different tasks, whether within management or outside, so that the abilities of management groups members can be used more effectively. How do two-tier structures work? How do they spread the functions, while keeping the system integrated and the two parts committed? Several projects have found advisory groups valuable, despite their lack of ultimate power. Good advice is far preferable to bad management and should carry far more weight. Some workers find that with such a group, they are freed from the negative position of trying to "get things through," and put in the more positive one of sharing ideas and practical problems with people who have a genuine interest in the work.

The Relationship Between Workers and Management

The range of tasks above, even if research can establish better ways of allocating them, is a lot to expect of a group which meets usually once a month and whose members are hard pressed elsewhere. How can their actions be anything less than a formality? A lot clearly depends on the quality of information from the workers in the agency. In some cases, workers are actually on the management group, but in other cases, management will argue that this allows the workers too dominating a role, and blurs the distinction. Some people I have spoken to argue that the ideal relationship between workers and management should be that which is supposed to obtain between a trade union branch and its divisional officer. But, all too often, the balance is very different, and community workers find themselves in the position of training their management group to manage--which is confusing, to say the least. It would be valuable if some kind of support or training could be offered to managers outside this dependency relationship. Again, this is an area which cries out for some kind of systematic study.

The "Natural History" of Management

All these questions need exploring against the understanding both of the different environments in which projects work, and the way management develops over time. Different stages of intervention may call for different styles of management, just as different projects do. For some projects, for example, user management would be meaningless in the opening stages, because the users aren't there, aren't organized, don't have the time and skills, and so on. Elsewhere, to exclude local groups from management would be suicide, because of the suspicions it would arouse. If we were to conclude, however, that some transition was necessary over time, we would need to explore the problems inherent in transition, and the likely vested interests. I would refer the reader back to my comments on local control.

In pursuing these questions, researchers will need to avoid the creation of a "management mystique," a science of community management which is the province for a few. Nor would I expect any study to produce the right model. We need to avoid the wasteful process which one of my collegues has described as people all over the country all inventing the wheel at the same time--where everyone who ever goes onto a management group starts again from scratch, and where people go on making the same mistakes. At the same time, it is essential that we preserve flexibility and encourage creativity. What is important is to pull together different people's experience. It is important to put into the open different assumptions about management and the values behind them, and to expose some of the myths. It is important that people are conscious of the sorts of management structures they are imposing on their projects and why. Then we can move towards helping people realize their aims through effective management rather than meeting up with frustration, elitism and stagnation.

Appendix: A Case Study

The range of problems just outlined can well be illustrated by a recent case study which I undertook of a local management group in a CPF project. The idea of this project attracted a great deal of interest from local groups who, while CPF was developing its formal proposal for an agency, formed themselves into a large, open advisory group, with subgroups to deal with questions such as premises and job descriptions. This group negotiated with CPF to gain as much control as possible when it opened in July 1975. At this point, when the Advisory Group turned into a local management group, attendance was regularly as much as forty people. There was strong commitment to developing a constitution which allowed open access to community groups in the area and ensured their dominance in the group over local professionals. Meetings went into the early hours of the morning while this was hammered out. CPF of course had representation on the group and ultimate control.

However, after these intial stages, once the agency was going and the constitution established, attendance gradually fell (except when the agency was hiring new workers, when a high attendance was guaranteed). Some two years later attendance, apart from the agency workers who had two representatives on the group, amounted to some half a dozen people, predominantly local professionals. The group by then was forced to consider changing the constitution.

Various factors contributed. Some people suggested that, while things were running smoothly, most groups, especially new ones, saw little need to become involved in management. Further, people who were likely to be involved in management were also likely to have many commitments in their neighborhood which came first (the agency in question was city wide); and early images of a tough, conflictual management group where local battles had been fought out had put newcomers off. Others argued that after the initial excitement of setting the thing up, meetings had become boring; that after setting up the center and appointing workers members of the group had been unsure what their role should be vis-a-vis those workers.

In the concern for ensuring open access and avoiding elitism, the principle had, some people felt, been taken too far. A loose, leaderless structure had resulted. The workers, too, had been inhibited from taking a lead in the group too obviously, although in the absence of a strong lead from other members, they inevitably made the important decisions outside the group. Administration had gradually taken over, and squeezed policy and work discussions out of the agenda. Newcomers were soon bored, and despite all attempts to the contrary, found the group had established a language and traditions they did not understand.

This is a short, and therefore limited, picture. Individual people involved in the management group have learned a great deal from their involvement, and there is no doubt that the whole concept of local control has been put on the map in the area. It would be difficult to ignore it in the future. The agency in question is now independent of CPF and has a newer tighter constitution which tries to combine openness with clear and continuous responsbility. It is hoped that these intervening years have provided valuable lessons and that the commitment to local control will now pay off.

Using Process Consultation Techniques to Improve Board Training

By Marc B. Goldstein, Ph.D.
and Carolyn M. Wysocki

Over the past several decades, we have observed a dramatic change in the role played by voluntary boards to human service agencies. The seats of such boards were at one time filled primarily with prominent members of the community to give agencies an aura of respectibility. Such boards were minimally involved in the actual operation of the agency and usually served as a "rubber stamp" for policies set by the agency executives.

But beginning in the 1960's and continuing to the present, a host of factors contributed to a change in expectations: increased government social service programs, consumerism, etc. Accordingly, boards were expected to show more leadership in establishing agency policy and to reflect the constituency being serviced. The consequences of poor board leadership were stiffened: court rulings (Stern v. Lucy, et al.) decreed that board members were collectively and individually responsible for their actions and could be sued.

This shift in accountability and responsibility has produced certain problems. Mandating new roles does not, per se, lead to dramatic changes in board performance. Indeed, for the new board member, the challenges are many: he/she is expected to enter a new organizational setting with individuals of widely varying background and values and to deal effectively with a wide range of complex functions such as policy formation, financial planning, and personnel selection. Without any formal socialization process, the new board member typically experiences considerable stress and confusion in this transition.

Given these issues, there has been increased interest in training for voluntary board members. Several packaged training programs exist. However these may not meet the needs of new board members who need to develop an understanding of the unique features of their particular agency and the populations being served. This article describes the development and implementation of a specialized training program for Board and Advisory Council members of the Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) throughout Connecticut. More importantly, it illustrates how a process consultation perspective can be useful in developing training programs for any type of agency.

We were approached by the director of a Title XX program at a local community college to provide board training to several AAA groups. Although experienced in volunteer services and human relations training, we were not familiar with the particular agency seeking assistance. The issue thus became how best to tailor our training to the specific needs of the board members and the agency.

Accessing Training Needs

As mentioned above, we have found a process consultation perspective valuable in diagnosing agency needs and developing appropriate training interventions. Process consultation (Schein, 1969) is an approach to organizational development in which the consultant attends principally to the interpersonal

Marc B. Goldstein is a professor of community/clinical psychology at Central Connecticut State College and directs the M.A. Program in Community Pscyhology. He has served as a consultant to both public and private sector organizations.

Carolyn Wysocki is currently a consultant and trainer in volunteer management. Formerly she served as the executive director of the Voluntary Action Center for the Capitol Region and manager of volunteer services at New Britain General Hospital, both in Connecticut.

processes that occur among individuals and/or groups. Issues of leadership style, communication patterns, and decision-making processes become the focus. For example, the consultant may examine how a particular group reaches a decision, rather than what (content) was decided.

By taking such a perspective, we were able to assess more accurately the training needs of the agency during our initial data collection phase. After our initial meeting with AAA Executive Directors, we agreed to provide training contingent upon the agency's providing us certain documents as well as the chance to observe agency meetings and solicit input from members. In total, data was collected from each agency through: a) discussions with the Executive Director; b) inspection of agency documents such as by-laws and job descriptions; c) observations of committee meetings; and d) a questionnaire on training needs given to board members.

Three key training issues emerged from these data. Significantly, the content needs, that is, what was specifically asked for, often differed from the process needs, that is, what we observed as needs. The specific issues were:

(1) Lack of role clarity. From the low return of our questionnaire asking about training needs, as well as the lack of specificity of the responses, we sensed that there was either a lack of interest or a lack of clarity about the speicific roles of Board and Advisory Council members. The clarity hypothesis was supported from our discussions with Executive Directors. Their chief concern in working with Board and Council members stemmed from Board/Council members' attempts to usurp decision-making roles clearly falling in the Director's domain. None of the questionnaires, however, specifically mentioned role clarity as an issue.

(2) Lack of interpersonal skills among agency/board members. Again, comments from the Executive Directors as well as our observations of group meetings suggested that a minority of members lacked certain interpersonal skills, e.g., listening skills and self-disclosure, that inhibited effective group process. Comments regarding certain "disruptive" members were usually coupled with requests for techniques to control these individuals. Such individuals were seen as having negative personalities rather than lacking interpersonal skills.

(3) Poor group decision-making skills. In addition to the lack of interpersonal skills by certain individuals, our observations indicated that many of the individuals had no clear model of how a group arrives at an effective decision. Much of the group discussion was often off the topic and decisions were commonly made using minority or autocratic processes. Again, group process issues were rarely mentioned as training needs.

The trainers chose to focus the training on three issues: 1) sharpening role clarity among the Executive Director, Board and Advisory Council members regarding domains of operation; 2) increasing awareness of interpersonal skills and deficiencies; and 3) improving group decision-making skills.

Developing the Training Experience

In developing the training experience, two considerations were kept in mind: first, Board/Advisory Council members, as volunteers, usually did not have large blocks of time to devote to training activities; and second, there was considerable variability in both the interpersonal and cognitive skills and the backgrounds of the board members. Consequently it was our goal to keep the training short and concrete. (We have found that many training exercises in human relations tend to be placed in unusual and unrealistic contexts, such as the "man on the moon exercise," which can detract from the learning of group participants. See Goldstein, 1978.) Thus, a one day training program was developed that focused on the three goals listed above. The specific training experiences developed are described below.

Sharpening Role Clarity

One of the barriers to effective board functioning was the lack of clarity regarding the specific roles ascribed to Board members, Advisory Council personnel and the Executive Director. A review of agency documents indicated that there was, in fact, some overlap in the stated role/responsibilities of each group, but there were also distinct domains. To help members explore these issues, a list of statements was developed that summarized the specific responsibilities of each of the three groups as well as some common areas.[1] These statements were scrambled and presented to the group. Members individually identified to which group(s) each stated role belonged. Following the individual assignment, each statement was read by the facilitator and the group was asked to identify to which group that statement belonged. This process generated considerable discussion among the membership and helped clarify areas of confusion. When some consensus was reached, the statement was listed on a sheet of newsprint under the appropriate group heading.

Assessing Individual Interpersonal Skills and Weaknesses

Following a short lecture on interpersonal skills, members were presented with a list of

48 interpersonal skills. Members assessed themselves on each skill by one of three categories: "doing all right," "need to do it more," and "need to do it less." After making their ratings, individuals paired up and shared with a partner two skills which they felt they did well and two skill areas which they felt needed improvement. This task also produced considerable group discussion.

Group Decision-Making/ Problem-Solving Skills

A short didactic presentation on group decision-making and problem-solving skills (based on Schein, 1969) was presented. Following that, the attending members were divided into an even number of groups of four to six members. Half the groups were given a simulated real-world problem to solve (dealing with neighborhood resistance to a proposed senior center) and each group interacted for 30 minutes trying to resolve the problem. The remaining groups served as process observers. Following the problem-solving session, those group members were given both written and verbal feedback on the dynamics involved in their problem-solving effort. Following a discussion, the groups switched roles, a new group problem was introduced, and the process was repeated. Board members seemed uniformly pleased with the training experience and written feedback at the end of the workshop was generally positive.

Conclusions

The above case study illustrates how process consultation methods may be used in the development of training programs that are specifically matched to the needs of the recipients. Such an approach to training places an additional demand on trainers to do more that present their "bag of tricks" but to engage in a diagnostic process in which the needs of the group are identified from multiple sources of data.

Footnotes

[1] Copies of all training materials are available from author Marc Goldstein, Department of Psychology, Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, CT, 06050.

References

Goldstein, Marc B. "A Simulation Exercise for Teaching Management Skills." Exchange: The Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal, Fall 1978, Vol. 3, pp. 40-41.

Schein, Edgar H. Process Consultation: Its Role in Organizational Development. Addison-Wesky: Reading, Ma., 1969.

Stern v. Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries, et al., 381 F. Supp 1003 (D.D.C. 1974).

When Partnership Fails: The Student as Victim

By Michele A. Whitham

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Ms. Whitham at the 1980 Annual Conference of the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, held in San Francisco during October 1980. Though aimed at faculty who are advisors to students participating in field work programs, the remarks also have significance to those in agencies who supervise student volunteers and are participants in the "partnership" discussed here.

The program that I am currently coordinating in the Field Study Office of the NYS College of Human Ecology at Ithaca, New York, places students as "special projects staff" in both private and public sector organizations throughout the predominantly rural regions of upstate New York. Rather than working as "interns" or "staff members in training" in established organizational roles, these students are given major problem-solving responsibility for a specific aspect of their placement organization's overall work. Participating students are, in effect, on special assignment, working on contract to produce a major product of perceived value to their sponsor. Theoretically, then, this program is designed to maximize the potentially positive effects of field study on all the partners to such an experience--on the community at large, the specific organization, its constituents, participating students, even the university as a whole. The program defines a theoretically meaningful role for students as "problem solvers;" it assumes that field study students can make tangible contributions of real value to real people. It holds out the promise--to both participating students and to community sponsors--of overcoming the university's peculiar allergic reaction to "doing," which is always miraculously seen as being somehow distinct from "thinking" or "learning."

Yet, at the end of this past semester when I thought to ask my then current crop of "problem solvers" (17 in all) for whom they had seen themselves working for the past 12 weeks, a full three-fourths of them responded without hesitation or qualification: "MYSELF!" Ah, so much for theory. In studying these students' final evaluation forms at the end of the semester, I find confirmation of the fact that, for virtually all of them, the principle, self-reported outcomes of the experience were personal ones. These young people, who had raised funds for neighborhood centers, founded consumer protection agencies and built whole parks, saw the entire experience primarily in terms of career development, skill development, and personal growth. Little emphasis was placed on the value of their efforts to people outside themselves, be it their immediate supervisor in their placement, the staff of the setting in which they worked, or the future users of their products.

Now, in reporting this event, I in no way intend to brand these people as being self-centered or selfish in the context of field study, although existentially this may be the case. Rather, I seek to draw attention to the fact that the most significant outcome of many of our programs, at least insofar as our students are able to immediately articulate these outcomes to themselves and others, is a kind of personality reality therapy, an overwhelming "eureka experience." Surely those of us who consider ourselves to be reasonably sophisticated and conscientious educators, who are genuinely concerned with the broader implications of our programs for everyone

---

Michele A. Whitham is on the faculty of the New York State College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York and Coordinator of the Upstate Field Study Programs. She has worked with student placements at both secondary and college levels for ten years.

whom they affect, must ask ourselves in all sincerity: "Where is the partnership in that??"

All too often, the unfortunate answer to that query is that true partnerships, in the traditional sense of mutual participation in a shared undertaking, do not exist in experiential education programs, that our students are both unable to be partners in the field experience and, more shockingly, are not permitted to be so. In making this assertion I hasten to add that the field of experiential education has always been a "progressive" one in the Deweyan sense of the word; a field which employs such self-actualizing concepts as "learning to learn," "self-directed learning," and "active thinking" in describing its goals for students.

Indeed the temptation is great to see ourselves relatively, to congratulate ourselves on the improvements we seem to have made in the role and place of students in our programs, and to dismiss as overly harsh criticisms of our efforts that label us as part of the the problem. I would argue in turn, however, that experiential educators tend to underestimate the complexity of establishing working partnerships between students, faculty, and placement staff, between the interests of the university, the community, and the learner/worker/service provider. Rather, we content ourselves with new educational forms that perpetuate familiar, disempowering relationships between ourselves and our students, and between our students and the world. Thus we arrive at the early adolescence of the experiential education movement having perfected an essentially academic technology, replete with evaluation techniques, grading criteria, packaged curricula, and research designs, that is oddly lacking in partnership for the student. What, then, is the essence of this failure of partnership? How is it that students are unable to act as partners in the field experience and who blocks their participation?

At this point it is tempting to simply "blame the victim," and certainly our students have their little faults. They often lack prerequisite interpersonal and technical skills which, if not mandatory, certainly reduce their effectiveness on the job or make them very costly to train. Their time frame is for the birds, keyed as it is to a semester schedule: they either try to cram all of their "participation" into study week or they expect to have a revolutionary impact on the community in a semester, in the same way that they "mastered" Marx or 19th century English literature in fourteen weeks. And who among us has not wrestled with an eager, self-important young student's unrealistic expectations of herself or her placement? Certainly our students have an internal reality (personal issues, if you will) to struggle within the context of their field experiences. Small wonder, then, given the pressing personal urgency of such concerns, that they come to see field study primarily in terms of the SELF and that their "partners" in the experience view their successes and failures on the job in individualistic terms. Thus it is not uncommon to see internship programs structured around at best a dialogue, at worst an argument, between the faculty and community partner, with the student as the object of discussion.

Such paternalistic tunnel vision, however, which focuses unduly on the personal "needs" of students--their "need" for supervision, their "need" to learn to integrate theory with practice, even their "need" for correction--belies the "partnership's" basic disregard for the student as an equal partner in the relationship. For in point of fact, the experience of power, of co-equal struggle with faculty and agency personnel about the realities of the placement (as opposed to the personal) experience encourages systematic thinking, while the experience of powerlessness, of being the object of discussion and evaluation, begets individualistic thinking. Thus our students seeming self-centeredness is in reality a symptom of the more fundamental problem, a clue to their powerlessness in the apparent partnership. For we human beings cannot name what we do not know. We are incapable of developing a language to describe realities that we have never experienced. Consequently, since they are forced by the social construction of field study to focus on themselves--on their personal learning objectives, their responsibilities to their sponsor, their academic obligations to their credit-granting institution--students come to speak more and more of themselves, not of the value of their experience to somebody else. No, our students are not selfish. Rather they are disempowered, disenfranchised from true decision-making status in the "partnership." Since their personal concerns are not seen as a valid piece of a larger struggle, but rather become the object of the field study itself, the experience is quickly reduced to a self-centered one. "Whom have you seen yourself working for? MYSELF!"

How, then, does this alienation of the student from participation in the partnership and, by extension, from social issues inherent in the field experience, come about? How is it that many of our programs come to reinforce, even result in, student unconsciousness of a larger social reality outside themselves? I would argue strongly that our students are simply mirroring back to us the fundamental contradictions that underlie the work/service/learning programs that many of us are engaged in. For the faculty-university partner, this contradiction is the traditional one between the reflective ideals of the university and the activist demands of a field placement. Although we have tried to bridge the gap between the classroom and the community, we still, as if by rote, persist in perpetuating academic traditions that require students to distance themselves from their placements and to value their experiences only insofar as they result in very individualistic learnings. Thus, for example, we continue to name these young workers/service providers "students," a social class whose essential powerlessness I trust I need not persuade you of. They are not viewed by us as "workers" who are learning from their experiences, or people in service to the community who derive educational benefits from the immediacy of their work, but rather as students working in a particularly relevant laboratory. Such a conceptualization violates not only the student's rights to equality in the partnership--for how can one actively participate in a dialogue in which one is by definition a junior partner--but also demeans the community as well. Credit is given, we remind them, not for the experience itself, for the doing, the sharing, the mutuality of the undertaking, but rather for those things that are learned from the experience, learnings that must be documented in countless, "extra" assignments that are often not derived from the student's work assignments. In its most pedantic forms, this faculty insistence on "learning"--and on maintaining a clearly delineated student status to describe people engaged in field study--perpetuates the alienating dichotomy between doing and thinking that is the fundamental contradiction of the traditional university. In "reflecting" on what they are doing, our students all too often come to distance themselves from their placements in much the same way that the academician's theories eventually become so rarified that they cease to describe reality. Indeed in many cases neither the student nor the faculty truly understands the praxis between reflection and action as a dialogue in and with the world, in this case with the people and events of the field placement. Thus our students "reflect" in papers and journals that are never shared; their "learnings" come in the form of conclusions about the placement organization that are discussed only with faculty; they live a secret life of thought in the midst of their daily routine. Saddled with the student role, not understanding true praxis, these people enter the community for a semester or a year without ever really arriving, instead remaining in the ivory tower in their lifestyle, their time sense, and their ways of reflecting on the world. A "student," by definition, is not a "partner."

An important corollary of this central contradiction between the reflective ideals of the university and the activist demands of a field placement is the unbelievable naivete with which many of us as faculty approach our students' relationship to their community sponsor. Who among us has not blithely struggled with our students to generate a theoretical understanding of organizations or community organizing or human development, all the while ignoring such reality-based experiences as sexual harrassment on the job or the problems of inconvenient bus schedules? How many of us have failed to consistently and conscientiously wrestle with our students and their superviors about every issue that they defined as being central to the experience, choosing instead to sit in judgment on the student's efforts or the agency's way of doing business, sniping at their activities or offering unrealistic, academic solutions? Where is the faculty member who has not plunged, theory-less, into a placement situation so complex in all its ramifications that we failed to understand the nature of the job that our students were being asked to undertake or the implications of that work for other people in the community? To the degree that we personally, inadequately understand, inadequately prepare our students for, and inadequately supervise them in non-academic settings, in all of their myriad positive and negative aspects, are insuring that our students will never be partners in the exchange. A student who is struggling along or unprepared for the overwhelming complexities of community settings will be rendered a silent partner at best.

Consider the impact on the student of the contradiction between the demands of the mentor-supervisor's role and those of the marketplace. It is my suspicion that the student intern is often viewed by the placement agency not as a partner but as a justifiable "business expense," a problem which will only increase in the recession years of the 1980's. Faced with increasingly severe budget cutbacks and generally diminishing resources, the temptation is indeed great to sign on as many of these low or no-cost junior partners as possible, slot them into their level of competence, and work their tails off. In a related vein, I have also experienced organizations that agree to work with students in order to tap into the university's other resources. On the other hand, those placements whose motives are more benign, or are at least less mixed, quickly discover that shortages of resources, an incomplete understanding of the experiential learning process, and a naivete about how to supervise students leads inexorably to a limping, uncomfortable relationship that falls far short of partnership. Both agency personnel and faculty sponsors arrive in a situation where they are awkwardly aware that their investment and interest in field study are markedly different. Thus the educator educates, the employer employs, and the student is left to struggle imperfectly with two separate realities. Surely we must ask ourselves: "Where is the partnership in that??"

Is there, then, a resolution to this dilemma? Can students ever be fully admitted to partnership which currently consists of an uneasy truce between the senior partners? An affirmative answer to this very challenging questions lies, I believe, in our developing a true understanding of praxis, of the much-touted dialogue between reflection and action upon which many of the programs are supposedly based. Until all of the partners to the relationship are committed to engaging each other in a dynamic process which admits a mutual change, there will be no partnership at all. Such a process would accept as valid the separate realities that each of the partners necessarily bring to the relationship, the inexperience of the student, the economic imperatives of the community, the faculty commitment to analysis and intellectual understanding. Indeed true praxis would insist that all of these issues become the subject of the field study, that no one partner be the object of the other's tactical or intellectual manipulations. This dialogue would require the faculty to be genuinely concerned with such traditionally activist concerns as social justice and social responsibility. It would insist that the community partner be willing to be changed by a student's presence, to wrestle honestly with the questions, challenges and criticisms that a newcomer inevitably has of an entrenched system of doing things. It would transform the student's involvement in the community solely from a "learning" experience to a personally-engaging experience from which one is, of course, able to learn.

Gone would be the lame partnerships between faculty and supervisor based upon a minor common interest in providing students with a community experience. Gone the tendency of faculty and their students to mutter in isolation about the imperfections of the field setting. Banished the kind of self-directed learning that results in narcissistic self-absorption on the part of the students. In their place would be a dynamic, mutual exchange which admits all the partners to the relationship to real power, the power to challenge and influence each other. Such power, of course, carries with it the responsibility to be genuinely invested in the concerns of others, and therein lies an end to the alienation of "learning" from "doing" that has plagued education for generations. For the true meaning of partnership lies in a commitment to the interests and conerns of our partners, to a serious dialogue around each other's issues. I believe we have our work cut out for us in the eighties.

The Developing Organization

By Rick Miller

When should a non-profit voluntary orgnization accept government funding?

When should a non-profit voluntary organization move beyond its traditional core services in order to offer non-traditional special services?

When should an organization consider embarking on an endowment program?

The issue of timing is indeed critical for an organization. Knowing "when to" all too often can determine the success or failure of the organization. Yet little attention has been given to the concept of "when" or, better stated, "knowing when" to act. Focusing on the concept of knowing "when" will assist volunteers and salaried professionals alike to understand the integral role that proper timing plays in relationship to the decisions of an organization. It will also prove to be a valuable diagnostic tool externally and internally for policy makers, planners, managers, and allocaters, as it will help guide an organization to its full developmental capacity. It will be of equal value to the large organization as well as the very small agency.

The conceptual framework in which to understand the important of "when" need not be complex. The famous psychologist, Abraham Maslow, published his "Hierarchy of Human Needs" in 1954; the genius of Maslow's Hierarchy was and is its simplicity and practicality. Maslow helped us understand the when, what, and why of human behavior. By adopting his theroretical structure, a better understanding of the when, what, and why of how organizations "behave" will emerge.

Maslow believed that there exists an ordering of human needs which determines the timing of human motivation. Maslow ordered these needs from lower to higher, beginning with physiological needs and followed by safety needs, love needs, esteem needs and, finally, the need for self-actualization. In application it would, therefore, be foolish to try to motivate a child to do well on a spelling test (esteem needs) if that child has not eaten (physiological needs) or if he or she is abused (safety needs). Lower level needs must be satisfied before higher level needs emerge.

Borrowing from Dr. Maslow, it can be proposed that organizations are motivated by various needs which can also be ordered in a hierarchy. As each need level is satisfied, the needs of the next level begin to evolve, requiring different planning and management. This "Hierarchy of Organizational Needs" offers a clear and valuable understanding of how organizations develop and can assist an organization in determining its next steps.

Hierarchy of Organizational Needs (A Description)

Like Maslow's human needs, organizations also have a well-defined hierarchy of needs which can be ordered from lower to higher so that as each need level of the organization is satisfied, the needs of the next level begin to emerge.

A. Mission/Purpose Need

The most basic need of any organization is the need to have a mission--a purpose for existence. The Mission/Purpose is the reason for being--whether it be to find a cure for cancer or to "assure and enhance the quality of life for boys as participating

Rick Miller is Director of Government and United Way Relations for Boys Clubs of America. He is former Executive Director of the Boys Club in Buena Park, California and has presented numerous workshops on organizational development.

members in a richly diverse urban society." The Mission of the organization must be clearly understood by board members, staff and community. The mission of an organization must be unique and relevant. An agency which is organized today to eradicate smallpox in the United States will have a difficult time existing. So, too, will similar organizations such as Boys Clubs and Boy Scouts if they are unable to distinguish their major differences for the general public.

B. Survival Needs

If the Mission/Purpose need is met, there then emerges a new set of needs which may be categorized as Survival Needs. Survival needs are those factors which must exist in order for an organization to develop its plans to provide services. Survival needs include revenue support, a facility in which to operate, equipment and supplies, and a basic organizational structure, i.e. Board of Directors, core staff, etc. Survival needs are the day-to-day needs of the organization. Unless a good staff is in place and the board members' roles and duties well-defined and understood, the organization will be ill advised to concern itself with launching an endowment program (a higher level need). Even a basic recreational organization cannot "throw out a ball" unless it first has the resources to obtain the ball.

It could be argued that, on the Survival Needs level, for an organization to be truly a non-profit private voluntary agency, its revenue needs must be met with private, rather than public, dollars. It is at this level that the two sectors, government and private, are clearly divided. The private sector depends on the voluntary dollar while the public sector does not. It should be recognized that if dependency on government assistance occurs at this level, the organization ceases to be truly voluntary and private. Yet, the Survival Need is the organization's strongest need. Although it may have come into existence as a private voluntary agency, if it experiences difficulty surviving at that level, it will probably seek government maintenance rather than "die."

C. Core Services Needs

If the organization has been successful in finding a purpose for existence which is recognized and accepted by the community and if the organization has ensured its basic survival, then and only then can the next level of needs emerge. These are the Core Services Needs. The Core Services Needs are a union of the original Mission/Purpose for the organization's existence (level one) and the services rendered to accomplish its stated goal. It is unlikely that the Red Cross could succeed with its Blood Mobile program if communities did not understand the purpose of the Red Cross (level one) or if it lost its basic support (level two). Yet, with these two needs satisfied, the Red Cross can now strive with intensity in order to meet the needs of its Core Services (level three).

Although many organizations may seem to be offering similar Core Services, a more objective analysis uncovers actual differences. The full combination of an agency's activities and program determines its Core Services. Thus, the YWCA, Girls Clubs, Girl Scouts and Camp Fire may all offer recreation and counseling. However, one organization may use volunteers and another, salaried professional staff, or one may offer programs on an everyday, building-centered basis while another may be open only on weekends. Additionally, consideration must also be given to membership profiles before concluding that there is a duplication of service.

It is critical that the organization's Core Services be well defined literally and operationally.

It is not uncommon to witness an agency whose Misson/Purpose is to serve youth, now wanting to reach out to serve senior citizens. However, such a basic program change may be premature if, in fact, that agency's Core Services for youth have not yet been maximized. Another illustration is a struggling job counseling and referral agency, chosing to establish a community dental clinic. Although a dental clinic may be a valuable and needed service, even latently related to job counseling and referral, the fact is that the agency has not yet successfully met its Core Services Needs.

D. Special Services Needs

As in the case with people, organizations have the need to continue to grow and develop. The agency that is able to change with the needs of society is a well-managed institution. But regardless of external factors, internally an agency strives for higher-level achievements. Therefore, once an organization has successfully satisfied its Mission/Purpose, Survival and Core Services Needs, it then is prepared to move to its Special Services Needs. The Special Services Needs level is characterized by the agency doing something beyond its traditional Core Services. It may or may not be directly identified with the original purpose of the organization.

If, for example, the struggling job counseling and referral agency referred to earlier was really a flourishing organization, then the agency might seek to satisfy its Special Service Needs by opening up a community dental clinic. However, taking that extra step before it was ready (satisfying levels one through three), it would have surely faced major complications.

E. Organizational Actualization

Once all need levels are satisfied, an organization may still strive to grow, refuse to stagnate, and continue to experiment and make better that which is already good. Organization Actualization is characterized by the need of the organization to have all its components--program, board, staff, financial development, etc.--in consonance.

Organizational Actualization

Special Services (non-traditional)

Core Services (traditional)

Survival/Management

Purpose/Mission

Hierarchy of Organizational Needs

How to Use the Hierarchy

As discussed earlier, the Hierarchy can help an organization determine where it is, and when and where it must go to fully develop. Therefore, the Hierarchy is a general diagnostic tool. Additionally, the Hierarchy can be seen as a planning tool. For it can help an organization determine if it is ready to seek a government grant or support a non-traditional special service.

First look at the above illustration of the Hierarchy. Beginning from lower to higher, review each level individually, noting its earlier description, and determine whether your agency has met each particular level sucessfully, partially, or not at all.

Now consider your organization's plans. Where do they fit within the Hierarchy? If you find, for example, that your organization is experiencing difficulty within its Core Service areas and you are considering expanding into Special Services, you may need to reconsider.

An organization which is having trouble supporting itself with private dollars may find itself being lured by a government grant which, if accepted, would require the agency to offer Special Services. Unfortunately, what has happened is that the Survival Level was never successfully satisfied and the Core Services level was subsequently ignored. The organization will now experience an identity conflict as it examines the contradictions of its Mission and what it is really doing.

Characteristics and Traits of the Evolving Voluntary Organization

The Hierarchy of Organizational Needs addresses the organization in overall general terms and does not concern itself with the multifaceted individual elements involved in organizational policy, planning and management.

The Characteristics and Traits of the Evolving Voluntary Organization is a companion chart to the Hierarchy. It offers a further gauge to the growth and development of an agency by again demonstrating "when" an organization is capable of moving from one stage to the next. This instrument breaks down the major functions of an organization into the categories of: 1) Staff, 2) Board, 3) Planning, 4) Community Relations/Identity, 5) Clients, 6) Program, and 7) Financial Development. The instrument then traces the growth and development of these functions through the stages of "underdeveloped," "developing," "developed," "advancing," and "actualizing" by defining those characteristics and traits one would find at a particular period of maturation (the definitions are for discussion purposes and can be revised).

For example, an agency which is experiencing regular staff turnover or whose staff lack those qualifications normally found in similar organization would then be characterized as "underdeveloped" in the staff category. In contrast, an agency whose staff is stabilized and qualified would be in the "developed" stage. Similarily, a high turnover of Board members coupled with poor Board performance would be indicative of "underdeveloped," suggesting to the agency that to mature in this area (progress to next stage) a proper orientation program needs to be designed and implemented as well as identifying some Board leadership.

The "Characteristics and Traits of the Evolving Voluntary Organization" helps an organization determine where it is in each key functional area, thus suggesting when it needs to move and where it must go to get there.

To illustrate further, an organization can be "advancing" in the program area, but "developing" in the Board area. So greater attention is needed in the Board area in order to bring the agency into balance. However, growth is progressive and sometimes movement is one area over another is required to bring the agency into balance.

Knowing when and where to direct the energies of the organization are indeed critical factors.

CHARACTERISTICS AND TRAITS OF THE EVOLVING VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION - by Rick Miller

Characteristics	Underdeveloped	Developing	Developed	Advancing	Actualizing
STAFF	High turnover at all levels; little experience	Regular turnover but not high; 1 and one-half to 3 years experience.	Minimum turnover especially in exec. position; 3 years experience exec. position.	Low turnover especially exec. Minimum in program. 7+ yrs. experience, 2+ yrs. program highly aggressive administrator.	Rare turnover expecially exec. 15+ yrs. Special staff highly sophisticated.
BOARD	High turnover; recruitment not organized; poor orientation of members	Regular turnover but not high; leadership begins to emerge; planning initiated;proper orientation designed but sporadic.	Key Board Members stabilized; attention turning to quality; numbers adequate (15-25 regular).	Quality emphasized; more concern given to role of the Board Members; clearly active in org.	Board self motivating; role clearly identified and accepted.
PLANNING	Little or no real planning; high anxiety with ref. to future.	Objectives set; realistic movement begins and can be tracked; anxiety reduced.	Objectives being met, remaining the same from year to year.	New objectives introduced; planning becomes sophisticated.	Planning highly sophisticated.

Characteristics	Underdeveloped	Developing	Developed	Advancing	Actualizing
COMMUNITY RELATIONS/IDENTITY	No real community identity/acceptance.	Acceptance being gained by community and fellow orgs.	Position (role) in comm/org. earned and believed contributing.	Emerging as a leader in the community.	Highly accepted by outside orgs.; assumes leadership & has following
CLIENTS	Poor client attendance.	Attendance shows some stability, with membership growth.	Attendance regular & predictable; membership remains same yr. to yr.	New populations served.	Excellent attendance; good balance of members.
PROGRAM	Programs sporadic.	Strong core programs emerging; beginning to stabilize.	Core program stabilized; good balance in core programs.	Core programs stabilized; excellent balance; special programs introduced.	Core and special programs highly complementary
FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT	Existing day to day; high degree of frustration; high experimentation; high labor investment with little payoff.	Sources of regular revenues begin to be identified through experimentation; multiplicity considerably reduced.	Revenue sources remain constant yr. to yr.; cost of living & inflationary increases only real concerns.	New sources explored; grants/endowments.	Old & new monies completely insure org. future.

Leadership Abstracts in Volunteer Administration (Third Issue)

This section in Volunteer Administration is designed to provide practitioners with summaries of current literature.

VOLUNTEER ABSTRACTERS FOR THIS ISSUE

Valerie A. Ahwee, The Volunteer Centre, Vancouver, British Columbia

Marjorie Burdine, The Volunteer Centre, Vancouver, British Columbia

Shannon Hurtado, Coordinator of Volunteers, The Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Winnipeg, Manitoba

Linda S. Cerajewski, Denver, Colorado Social Services Volunteers, Inc.

Janice Gerdemann, Staff Associate, Voluntary Action Center of Champaign County, Urbana, Illinois

Mary L. Stewart, Coordinator, Volunteer Services, Ontario Hospital Association, Don Mills, Ontario

Ivan H. Scheier, Ph.D., Abstracts Editor

The abstracter's name also appears in parentheses at the end of each abstract.

JOURNALS AND NEWSLETTERS IN THIS ISSUE

Notes: (1) The total set of abstracts over a one-year period should achieve satisfactory balance between subject areas and journals. No single issue is likely to do so.

(2) From some journals peripheral to the field of volunteer administration, e.g., Harvard Business Review, articles are abstracted only when deemed relevant to our field.

BUSINESS QUARTERLY is published by the School of Business Administration, The University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario. Subscription is $16.00 yearly.

HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW is a bi-monthly journal for professional managers. Yearly subscription, $23,00; Subscription Service Department, P.O. Box 8730, Greenwich, Connecticut 06835.

SOCIAL CASEWORK: THE JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL WORK is published monthly except July and August by the Family Service Association of America, 44 East 23rd Street, New York, New York 10010.

TRAINING: THE MAGAZINE OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT, Offices at: 731 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403. Subscription is $18.00 yearly, $27.00 for two years, $36.00 for three years. Canada and Mexico add $3.00 per year.

VOLUNTARY ACTION LEADERSHIP is published quarterly by VOLUNTEER: The National Center for Citizen Involvement. For current availability, write Editor, VAL, c/o VOLUNTEER, 1214 16th St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

VOLUNTARY ACTION NEWS is published quarterly by the Voluntary Action Resource Centre, 1625 W. 8th Avenue, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6J 1T9. Subscription is $3.00 annually.

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION, back issues for 1978-80, $2.00 each

THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

This system remains provisional, awaiting experience and reader suggestions for final development. A more refined classification system will be offered with the fourth issue of Leadership Abstracts. This system will cross-refer to the essentially arbitrary code numbers currently assigned each abstract. This code number begins with the last digit of the current year of publication for Volunteer Administration. Thus, 1/23 indexes the twenty-third abstract in the 1981 year of Volunteer Administration's publication.

The final classification system will recognize that the typical abstract should be referenced under more than one category.

ABSTRACTS: 1981 SERIES

(CATEGORIES ARE PRESENTED ALPHABETICALLY)

Boards

(1/1) Andrews, Kenneth R. "Director's Responsibility for Corporate Strategy," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 58, No. 6 (November-December, 1980), pp. 30, 32, 36, 40, 42.

1) The forces shaping corporate governance, including restlessness among independent directors, are pressing boards toward greater participation in determining the future direction and character of their companies (organizations).

2) Corporate strategy reconciles what a company (organization) might do in terms of opportunity, what it can do in terms of its strengths, what its management wants it to do, and what it thinks is ethical, legal and moral.

3) Andrews states four principal reasons for the board to be concerned with the strategy's content, and outlines the board's role in strategy development especially through a corporate strategy committee.

Fundraising (Corporations)

(1/2) Finn, David. "Public Invisibility of Corporate Leaders," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 58, No. 6 (November-December, 1980), pp. 102-110.

1) A reversal of deeply entrenched ideas about corporate behavior is needed to change the public perception of who business leaders are.

2) Corporate executives need to integrate their community and business lives to speak up publically as business executives when they serve on third sector Boards, and to speak out as culturally and intellectually sensitive individuals when performing their management functions.

3) Six specific suggestions are given to help corporate bodies be seen as they are: human beings with loyalties, passions, pet projects, fears, concerns and aspirations that have no origins in economic analysis or return-on-investment calculations. (M.L. Stewart)

Manager Skills and Characteristics

(1/3) Greenberg, Herbert M. and Jeanne. "Job Matching for Better Sales Performance," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 58, No. 5 (September-October, 1980), pp. 128-133.

1) The findings in this article are based on a study since 1961 of 360,000 individuals in the United States, Canada and Western Europe, and involved 14 industries. Usual criteria of under/over 40, men/women, black/white, experienced/inexperienced, college/high school are shown to be ineffective and invalid in relation to job matching approach.

2) Companies (organizations) should study the day-to-day function of the job to determine what qualities a person must have to perform well and be happy doing the work.

3) Evaluation of the applicant should focus on ego-drive, empathy, ego-strength, forcefulness, decision-making, detail work, openness, communication.

4) A thorough understanding of the functional requirements of the job will help the manager maximize the data gathered in an interview. To the applicant, the manager should lay out, clearly and honestly, everything he or she knows about what the work actually entails. (M.L. Stewart)

(1/4) Joseflowitz, Natasha. "Management Men and Women: Closed vs. Open Doors," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 58, No. 5 (September-October, 1980), pp. 56-66.

1) In a study of 68 male and 102 female managers, the latter were found to be twice as accessible as their male counterparts on defined criteria for accessibility.

2) Reasons stated followed three major patterns: "I can't say no," "checking to see how things are going," and "keeping my door open."

3) Research shows no difference in how men and women at all managerial levels handle conflict, but the author found a significant difference between a person's position and their readiness to deal with conflict, i.e., the higher the position, the more effective managers become in this regard, irrespective or gender.

4) Summary of positive and negative consequences of accessibility clarifies a number of points. (M.L. Stewart)

(1/5) Benson, Herbert and Allen, Robert L. "How Much Stress is Too Much," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 58, No. 5 (September-October, 1980), pp. 86-92.

1) Article is based on years of medical research on stress and ways of coping with it. However, authors also draw on views of six chief executive officers who have looked at stress from practical business (organizational) standpoint.

2) Medical research finds stress productive up to a point (which, of course, varies with the manager), but beyond that point it can be disastrous. The trouble in corporate (organization) life seems to be that leaders appreciate the first part of the relationship but not the second; consequently both individuals and organization suffer.

3) To balance stress, executives need to understand that fight-or-flight response, the Yerkes-Dodson law, relaxation response, and their relationships are the tools necessary to manage stress productively. An effective concern for stress demands a long-term view of the function of management. (M.L. Stewart)

(1/6) Mikalachki, A. "Managing Human Resources in the 1980's," Business Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Autumn, 1980), pp. 32-37.

1) Those responsible for managing human resources in the 1980's face three crucial problems: absenteeism and turnover, negative attitudes (toward business) and stress.

2) Mitigating these problems will depend largely on managements' ability to increase employee's job satisfaction and organizational identification through improving employee (volunteer) selection procedures, job content, and job context.

3) Although most research studies report that job satisfaction and organizational identification are positively correlated, Mikalachki contends that they measure different phenomena and, for the 1980's, are the key variables to focus on and control.

4) The author states in summary that concern for the physical and mental health of the individual will result in an improvement in the health of the organization. (M.L. Stewart)

Organizational Behavior, Analysis

(1/7) HBR staff interview with Renn Zaphiropoulos. "It's Not Lonely Upstairs," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 58, No. 6 (November-December, 1980), pp. 111-132.

1) The CEO of Versatec Inc., Santa Clara, California, talks about his management philosophy; describes how the organization functions as a series of concentric circles rather than as the conventional pyramid; discusses the value of celebration after achievement, the encouragement of creativity in problem-solving and the emphasis placed on closeness and openness in relationships.

2) The company continues to grow around its original two objectives: to make money because that is a condition for survival; and to arrange a situation in which people look forward to coming to work.

3) Four employees are also interviewed which illustrate how this philosophy works, the atmosphere created for innovation and the ambience of the company. (M.L. Stewart)

(1/8) Ross, Gerald H. and Goodfellow, James L. "A Fitness Approach to Corporate Survival," Business Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Autumn, 1980), pp. 19-25.

1) The recent economic environment has some spectacular examples of traditionally successful companies (organizations) suddenly turning sour--a kind of organizational coronary--largely because of their inability to adapt or be resilient.

2) The question is how to diagnose the problem far enough in advance to allow preventative action to be taken. There are two principles: a) attempt to forecast future disturbances by indulging in traditional long-range planning; or b) recognize future uncertainties and be prepared to respond to a variety of future contingencies.

3) Research findings suggest that operating too long in favorable conditions may actually create the pre-conditions for future organizational failure, should any sudden change in the environment occur.

4) The resiliency (i.e. "fitness") of an organization is the capacity of the system, whether at the individual or the organizational level, to mobilize resources to restore stability after a demand has been placed upon it. (M.L. Stewart)

Program Types

(1/9) Volunteer Leader Interview with Marjorie Guthrie. "Combatting Chronic Disease with Common Sense," Voluntary Action Leadership (Fall, 1980), pp. 37-40.

The founder of the Committee to Combat Huntington's Disease tells how she developed an organization of 22,000 people in the years since her husband, folksinger Woodie Guthrie, died of this often-hidden disease. She has traveled extensively in the U.S., England and Australia, seeking out people interested in helping each other live with and learn about this illness. Now she believes in combining efforts with other health-related organizations for greater effectivness. (J. Gerdemann)

Recognition, Incentive, Motivational Growth

(1/10) Adolph, Val. "Volunteering and the Disabled," Voluntary Action News, No. 25 (December, 1980), pp. 1-2.

1) Volunteer coordinators should emphasize abilities rather than disabilities when placing potential volunteers.

2) Adaptations will need to be made before disabled volunteers will be able to function at their maximum capacity. Such adaptations may be structural, i.e., wheelchair ramps, or they may be mental, i.e., perceiving diasabled volunteers as assets rather than problems.

3) Also discussed are obstacles which impede acceptance of physically as opposed to mentally disabled volunteers.

4) Among many obstacles confronting the disabled is society's reluctance to accept assistance from disabled volunteers, since it conflicts with the widely-held notion that the disabled are receivers rather than givers.

5) Volunteer work may assist the disabled in improving their self-image, and in providing opportunities to utilize their energies. (V.A. Ahwee)

Recruiting, Marketing

(1/11) Tisdall, Charles W. "Communicating in the Doubting '80's," Business Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Autumn, 1980), pp. 82-87.

1) Astute public relations practitioners see the 1980's as a tough decade because they will face a more doubting, more discerning and increasingly hostile audience that is more fragmented in interests, concerns and causes, even within apparently homogeneous communities.

2) Effective "issues management" is another way of saying management should know what is happening in the real world and how the organization can best adapt to that reality. In practice, good issues management eliminates the need for management to extricate the corporation from messy public confrontations.

3) "Constituent clusters" is replacing "key publics." To communicate effectively in the 1980's management must begin the tough task of naming and understanding each cluster of constituents affected by the corporation (organization) or which will affect the corporation (organization).

4) Above all, management will have to listen better, because communication is more than a two-way street. (M.L. Stewart)

Resources, Career Concerns

(1/12) Murray, Jill. "Transitioning with Dr. Eva Schindler-Rainman," Voluntary Action News, No. 23 (June, 1980), p. 1.

1) Eva Schindler-Rainman's definition of "transition" is introduced. Transition is defined as the move from one circumstance or state to another, i.e., changing jobs, re-entering the work force, etc.

2) A summary is given of the May, 1980 workshop on transitioning which was led by Eva Schindler-Rainman in Vancouver, British Columbia. Also included are highlights of the discussion on "macro" and "micro" transits. Macro transits are major life passages, i.e. from young adulthood to middle-age. Micro transits refer to daily personal passages, i.e. from work environment to the home environment. (V.A. Ahwee)

Status, Surveys, the State of the Art, and Futures

(1/13) Gallup, George, Jr. "Volunteerism: America's Best Hope for the Future," Voluntary Action Leadership (Fall, 1980), pp. 24-27.

The willingness of additional Americans to volunteer in various ways is documented by some interesting polls. But there are some dark clouds: more women working, a decline in the work ethic, rise of the "me-ethic," looking down on unpaid jobs, and a mood of cynicism. Suggested remedies: personal contact to recruit people; dealing with problems perceived to be important, using volunteers' ideas; and recognizing and rewarding volunteers. (J. Gerdemann)

(1/14) Van Dam, Andre. "Trend is not Destiny - Is Message of Conference on the Future," Business Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Autumn, 1980), pp. 70-73.

1) The Toronto Future Conference was the battleground of ideas--of positive and negative perceptions of the future. There was consensus, however, that the present period is to be viewed as one of transition and transformation. The author notes that while more and more future-oriented observers paint a somber picture of the transition period, a majority views this inbalance as "the pause that refreshes."

2) Ten highlights of the Toronto meeting are selected at random as capable of affecting directly or indirectly the international (and national) business corporations (organizations).

3) Societies and organizations most successfully adapted to the past are likely to be overtaken by those less committed and less specialized, or more innovative.

4) The author's overwhelming conclusion from the conference is three-fold:

a) That futurists must strike a chord with those who have the power of persuasion and action in private and public sectors if futures research is to pave the way for a desirable future;

b) That in this highly competitive world of ours, some degree of co-operation and a minimum of consultation and participation is sine qua non, in view of the global interdependency which is occuring in many fields of endeavor; and

c) That a judicious husbanding of all resources is of the essence, if private enterprise is to be perceived as in the public interest. (M.L. Stewart)

Student and Other Youth Involvement

(1/15) Mundale, Susan. "Why More C.E.O.'s are Mandating Listening and Writing Training," Training: The Magazine of Human Resources Development (October, 1980).

Growing numbers of companies are developing training programs in the basic skill areas of listening and writing.

The Number One critical skill has been identified as "active listening." Studies show that the average listener retains only half of what is said in a 10-minute oral presentation; within 48 hours that drops off by half again. At best, only 25% of what is heard is understood, properly evaluated, and retained. Ideas commonly get distorted by as much as 80% as they travel through the chain of command.

According to some estimates, more than two-thirds of the letters, memos, and reports written in industry fail, in whole or in part, to meet their objectives. The positive results of some training programs, however, have been startling: length of letters and reports were reduced 45%, readability raised 27%, persuasiveness up 75% and overall effectiveness increased 46%.

Volunteer Administration provides a forum for the exchange of ideas and the sharing of knowledge and information by publishing articles dealing with practical concerns, philosophical issues, and significant applicable research.

It encourages administrators of volunteer programs and the volunteers themselves to write from their experience, knowledge, and study of work in which they are engaged.

The editorial staff is currently seeking administrative articles dealing with the following volunteer programs or topics:

* Hospitals
* Mental Health Centers
* Churches
* Volunteer Action Centers
* Zoos
* Senior Citizens
* Handicappers
* Education (all levels)
* Recreation/Leisure Services
* Rehabilitation
* Courts
* Fine Arts
* State Offices
* Training or education for administrators, i.e., stress management, power, motivation, communication ideas, conflict management, etc.

Guidelines for Submitting Manuscripts to VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

1) Manuscripts should deal with issues or principles related to volunteer administration. Program descriptions are acceptable only when they are conscious demonstrations of an issue or a principle.

2) The author must send three (3) copies of the manuscript to:

   Hilda Palm, Managing Editor
   VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
   P.O. Box 4584
   Boulder, CO 80306

3) Manuscripts should be five to 20 pages in length, with some exceptions. Three manuscript pages approximate one printed page.

4) Footnotes should appear at the end of the manuscript, followed by references listed alphabetically.

5) Manuscripts should be typed, double-spaced on 8½" x 11" paper.

6) Unpublished manuscripts will be returned to the authors with comments and criticism. Published manuscripts will not be returned to the authors.

7) The author should send a cover letter authorizing *Volunteer Administration* to publish the article submitted, if found acceptable.

8) The author <u>should not</u> submit the article to any other publisher during the period when it is under consideration by *Volunteer Administration*.

9) The review process for a submitted article usually takes six weeks to three months. Each article will be reviewed by at least two consulting editors and an association editor.

10) Authors of published articles will receive two complimentary copies of the issue carrying their article.

AVAS Archives
S-203 Human Development Bldg.
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, Colorado 80306

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit No. 236