
THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Fall 1986

- 1 Volunteers and the Ethics of
Advocacy
Margery Naylor van Inwagen
- 9 Harriet Naylor on Helping to Preserve
Democracy: The Role of
Volunteer Administration
Anne S. Honer
- 13 Some Reflections on: Who Are We?
Joseph F. Bass, Jr.
- 16 A Brazilian Volunteer Connection
Melanie Ghio
- 19 Volunteers Training Volunteers:
A Model for Human Service
Organizations
Kathiravelu K. Navaratnam
- 26 Cumulative Index to
Volumes III and IV
- 29 Call for Presentations at the
1987 National Conference on
Volunteerism

V: I

AVA ASSOCIATION FOR VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

The Association for Volunteer Administration (AVA) is the professional association for those working in the field of volunteer management who want to shape the future of volunteerism, develop their professional skills, and further their careers. Members include volunteer program administrators in a wide variety of settings, agency executives, association officers, educators, researchers, consultants, students—anyone who shares a commitment to the effective utilization of volunteers. AVA is open to both salaried and nonsalaried professionals.

AVA also has a special membership category that enables organizations with mutually-compatible goals to AVA to become Affiliate Members. Affiliates range from local associations of directors of volunteers, to statewide volunteerism groups, to national organizations. Affiliates, each with its own membership base, broaden the networking possibilities open to all AVA members.

AVA is an association run by its members. Active national committees include: Public Information; Professional Development; Resource Development; and Public Policy. Members also plan the annual "National Conference on Volunteerism," a major event held each year in a different city in the United States or Canada. This Conference provides participants the opportunity to share common concerns and to focus on national issues of importance to volunteerism.

AVA is divided into twelve geographic regions, each of which develops a variety of programs to serve its members. These can include annual regional conferences, periodic local workshops, newsletters, and informal "cluster group" meetings.

Two major services that AVA performs, both for its members and for the field at large, are Certification and Educational Endorsement. Through the Certification process, which recognizes leaders of volunteer programs who demonstrate professional performance standards, AVA furthers respect for and appreciation of the profession of volunteer administration. Similarly, AVA Educational Endorsement is given to those workshops, courses, conferences and training events that provide opportunities for professional growth in volunteerism.

Finally, AVA produces publications, including several informational newsletters and booklets, and THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION.

For further information about the ASSOCIATION FOR VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION, contact AVA, P.O. Box 4584, Boulder, CO 80306.

THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION is published quarterly. Subscriptions are a benefit of membership in the Association for Volunteer Administration (AVA). Non-AVA members may subscribe to THE JOURNAL at a cost of \$20 per year or \$50 for three years. Subscribers outside the United States should add \$3.00 per year for additional postage and handling costs. Checks or money orders (payable through a US bank or in \$US) should be made payable to: Association for Volunteer Administration.

Inquiries relating to subscriptions or to submission of manuscripts should be directed to the business office: THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION c/o AVA, P. O. Box 4584, Boulder, CO 80306.

ISSN 0733-6535
Copyright 1986. Association for Volunteer Administration.
All rights reserved. No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Editor.

Volunteers and the Ethics of Advocacy

Margery Naylor van Inwagen

This is lovingly dedicated to the memory of my mother, Harriet H. Naylor. She was a remarkable woman—wise, compassionate, determined, hard-working, creative, farsighted, and totally committed to volunteers. As their advocate, she lived by the principles that I describe here.

Lying in a hospital bed, for the moment physically but not mentally incapacitated, I thought about elderly people in a nursing home. Some of these people are physically handicapped in ways that cut them off from many of the educational and cultural resources of the community, yet their minds are as good as ever. They want, and need, to continue to learn. There must be a way to meet this need! But how?

Then I thought about community colleges. They serve students of all ages, including students with physical disabilities. But how can community colleges serve elderly persons who can't get to the community college to take courses?

Simple!

Have the teacher go to the nursing home. Hold classes in a comfortable room, with a table where people in wheelchairs can sit. Use audio-visual aids to help people see and hear as much as they can. Make the classes short enough not to tire people out. Take two semesters to teach a one-semester course.

And so was born the idea of the Older, Wiser Learners (OWL) program.

Later that day, my mother called me at the hospital. "Mom, I've got an idea!" "But how are you?" she asked. "Oh, I'm fine! Listen, Mom, I've got an idea." She did listen. She liked it. A lot.

Encouraged, I resolved then and there to try to put this idea into practice, as an unpaid and unaffiliated volunteer—simply as a member of the community in

Syracuse, New York, not employed by the community college or a nursing home.

The first step was to describe the idea of OWL courses to people in Syracuse. The response was wonderful! A newspaper reporter, Louise Laughton, sketched the idea in the *Herald-Journal* and covered the OWL story as it unfolded. Her newspaper published an editorial supporting the program.

At Onondaga Community College, Professor Maren Brown's reaction was, "that's exactly what we should be doing!" She relayed the idea to some of her colleagues. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, John Blasi, supported the OWL program from the start and enlisted widespread support for it at the college and in the community at large. The adviser to handicapped students, Gary Falco, worked on adapting a college course for physically disabled people in a nursing home. Professor Jerome Berrigan of the English Department volunteered to teach an OWL course and planned one that would challenge and delight older students.

The Central New York Community Foundation funded the first OWL course, paying for books and tuition.

At Loretto Geriatric Center, a large nursing home providing outstanding care, the Director of Social Services, Nancy Bolton, worked tirelessly with volunteers, staff, and residents to put the idea into practice. Drawing on her expert knowledge of gerontology, she helped the rest of us

Margery Naylor van Inwagen is the oldest of Harriet H. Naylor's three children. An adjunct member of the faculty of Syracuse University, she publishes articles about philosophy under her maiden name, Margery Bedford Naylor. She was graduated in 1963 from Smith College and earned a Ph.D. in philosophy at the University of Rochester. As a volunteer, she designed and founded the Older Wiser Learners program in Syracuse in 1978.

understand the needs and concerns of the residents. She knew each resident personally and helped us all to get to know one another quickly. She recruited the residents for the first OWL course, arranged for a room with a blackboard, made sure that the residents got to class and back to their rooms afterwards, and she even baked goodies for the break half-way through the classes.

People in the community, like my mother's great friend, Ruth Sherwood, a founder of RSVP, gave incredibly generously of their time and advice.

Once we knew that the community college was able and willing to offer an OWL course at Loretto if the residents wanted one, that Loretto could have a class there, and that an OWL course would cost \$1,200 for books and tuition, we presented the idea of an OWL course to the Residents Council at Loretto. These were leaders among the residents.

This was the "acid test." If the members of the Residents Council had rejected the OWL program, then it would have been one of those ideas that sound good to everybody but the people it is designed to help!

Happily, though, they were fascinated and pleased with the idea, although they did have a couple of reservations about it. For one thing, a college-level course scared them. We assured them that their years of experience were all the preparation that they would need to take an OWL course, even if they had never been to college. Their other reservation was about taking a seminar-size course. Reacting just like college students a half-century younger, they were worried about whether they would have to participate in class discussion. We assured them that they would be able to talk in class if they wanted to, but that they would not have to talk, if they didn't.

Relieved on these counts, they enthusiastically approved the idea. They helped set up the first OWL course, contributing all sorts of ideas. They got other residents interested. In fact, almost immediately, the residents themselves became the best advocates of all for OWL courses.

After a little less than a year, in September, 1978, the first OWL course began,

with a dozen Loretto residents, the oldest of whom was ninety-four. It was a course in literature taught by Jerome Berrigan.

It was a rousing success!

The residents were delighted with it. They read and discussed all sorts of contemporary literature, and they wrote poetry. And they loved Jerry Berrigan.

At the end of this first course, in June of 1979, I saw a young teenager, a granddaughter of a resident for whom she had been named, Margaret Leak, pushing her grandmother's wheelchair into the room where the residents were about to receive certificates for the three college credits that they had earned. The grandmother was a very frail woman, who turned out to be a talented poet, with a marvelous flair for language and imagery. The granddaughter, her face aglow, said, "Grandma! I didn't know you could write!"

The OWL program has continued, an idea put into practice by the effort of many people, and sustained by them.

My mother believed absolutely in the importance of lifelong learning, and in the importance of older people's being perceived—especially by themselves—as lifelong learners. Without her support and advice, I'm sure that it would not have been possible to get this program started. As you well know, she believed that there is no limit to what volunteers can accomplish, and that confidence saw us all through months of hard work.

She and I talked every Sunday on the phone (long distance, running up horrendous bills). She asked me questions that helped clarify my own thinking, and gave me the benefit of her great wisdom all along the way.

In one conversation, she described what I was doing as "advocacy." Well, I hadn't thought of it in those terms. All I knew was that I was trying to put an idea into practice. But her remark got me thinking about volunteers as advocates, and I'd like to share with you some thoughts about the ethical dimensions of advocacy.

THE ADVOCATE ROLE

Let's start by looking at what advocates are.

In the broadest sense, advocates are people who plead a cause—i.e., who speak out in favor of it. They are neither

neutral nor silent. They are *for* it, and they *say* so, and they *say why* they are for it.

They do this to persuade others that some end (or goal) is worth trying to achieve, when that goal can't be achieved unless others work to achieve it.

As an advocate for the OWL program, I was trying to persuade others that the goal of offering college courses through community colleges in nursing homes was worth trying to achieve.

Enriching the intellectual opportunities for residents of nursing homes was something that almost everybody agreed was good. But I defined a more specific goal: OWL courses. I needed to persuade others to support this goal, because it would take others who believed in it, each making a special contribution, to achieve this more specific goal. One person, all alone, couldn't achieve it.

Persuading the community college and nursing homes to support this more specific goal turned out to be a matter of showing them that offering OWL courses would be a good way to meet goals of *theirs*. By offering OWL courses, a community college could satisfy its obligation to serve the educational needs even of physically disabled elderly residents of nursing homes in the community, and nursing homes could promote the welfare of their residents, through intellectual stimulation in a group setting.

Appealing to commitments that people had already made was not enough, however, because people at community colleges and nursing homes were already overburdened, trying to serve students and residents in countless other important ways. I also needed to convince them that OWL courses could be taught without making it impossible for them to serve people in these other ways.

This involved showing that offering OWL courses would require simple adaptations of what they were already doing—e.g., teaching in a nursing home, instead of at the college, and holding a class, instead of a meeting of a small group of residents for some other purpose, in a meeting room at the nursing home.

What I learned was that what advocating a cause requires is showing, not just that an end is *worth* achieving, but also

that it *can* be achieved and *how* it can be achieved.

SOME ETHICAL QUESTIONS

Advocates are people who plead a cause, whether or not they are paid to plead it. But unpaid volunteer advocates have a credibility that paid advocates don't have. Paid advocates (like press agents, advertising copy writers, sales representatives, and diplomats, for example) can be very effective, but their sincerity is open to doubt. Are they pleading a cause because they really believe in it, or only because they are being paid to argue for it? Unpaid volunteer advocates, on the other hand, can never be accused of advocating a cause just for the money!

Advocating a cause, like anything else we do, raises ethical questions—i.e., questions about the goodness of the end that we are trying to achieve, and about the rightness of the means by which we try to achieve that end.

Advocating a bad cause (such as racial discrimination) would be wrong, no matter how effectively it was done. So advocating a given cause is right only if the cause itself is good, before we advocate it.

Not all causes are good, of course, and we have a responsibility to find out whether a cause itself is good.

But what if we promised to advocate a bad cause? Then we would be in a dilemma, in which nothing that we did would be right. It would be wrong to advocate a bad cause; but it would also be wrong *not* to advocate it, because it would be wrong not to keep our promise. This is why it is so important to make sure that a cause is good, before we promise to advocate it.

It is almost always up to us which causes we advocate. Even paid advocates have the option, no matter how unattractive it might be, of quitting their paying jobs to avoid defending a bad cause. But it is much easier for unpaid volunteers to avoid defending a bad one.

Even if the cause is a good one, however, there are ethical limits on the *means* that we may use to plead it. It would be wrong to violate someone's right in pleading it, for example. So, even when the end is good and the means are effective, we

must make sure that the means are *right*, before we use them.

But how can we tell whether a cause is good, or some way of pleading it is right?

All I can say is that we *can* tell the difference between good and bad ends, and right and wrong means, by using our conscience. The hardest part is remembering to ask ethical questions in the first place.

TYPES OF CAUSES

Different causes raise specific ethical issues of their own. There are so many different causes that we can look at them here only in terms of broad categories and the kinds of issues that causes that fit into those categories characteristically raise.

One way of classifying causes is according to whether they directly benefit people or not, and if so, which people they benefit.

Some very important causes would not benefit people directly—e.g., the humane treatment of pets, the protection of endangered species of plants and animals, and the preservation of historic buildings and documents. However, many of these causes would benefit people *indirectly*, by benefitting animals, plants, or things, valued for their own sake.

Two of the specific ethical questions that such causes raise are about the extent to which the interests of people may be sacrificed for the sake of animals or plants or inanimate things, and whether it is better to benefit people directly or to benefit them indirectly as a "trickle down effect" of benefitting something else.

Other important causes *would* directly benefit people—e.g., immunization and literacy programs, Meals on Wheels, scouting, etc. Each particular cause can raise its own ethical issues, usually about the means employed to reach what are clearly worthy ends.

Among causes that would benefit people *directly*, there are two different kinds: those that would benefit *other* people, and those that would benefit only the advocate himself or herself.

Suppose, for example, that Sam Smith, who lives alone, wants to add a room to his tiny house, and so he pleads for per-

mission from the zoning board to do this. This is an example of *self-advocacy*.

If adding a room to his house would help him and would not harm anyone else, then there would be nothing wrong with his pleading his own cause before the zoning board. Besides, who else would plead it?

There is nothing wrong with self-advocacy as such, although it could be used wrongly—e.g., to promote one person's self-interest at the expense of other people's, or, even worse, by violating their rights.

Now let's consider causes that would benefit people *other* than the advocate—not causes that just happen to benefit them, as an unexpected windfall, but ones that are advocated *because* they would benefit them. We'll call advocating such causes *altruistic* advocacy (as opposed to self-advocacy).

Altruistic advocacy can be for a "class-action" cause, on behalf of all of the members of a group that is defined by a common interest, like all of the owners of a certain model car that has a defect. These people all face the same danger, just because they own the same model car.

It is important to be sure that the cause *would* benefit those people. But, if it wouldn't (e.g., if nobody owned these cars, or the cars weren't defective), it would not be *wrong* to advocate it—unless, of course, advocating it actually harmed the members of that class. It would just be a waste of the advocate's time.

Altruistic advocacy can also be for a cause that would benefit only one person, or just a few people, without benefitting all of the people who have the same interest. For example, parents of a retarded child who urge school officials to give that child a better opportunity to learn at school are advocates for that cause in order to help *that* child, but not necessarily in order to help other retarded children.

All altruistic advocacy is ultimately advocacy on behalf of individual people, though, because the members of the class advocated for are all individual people.

Because altruistic advocacy is advocacy on behalf of individual people, it is subject to the following ethical limit. In ad-

vocating a cause for the sake of other people, it would be wrong to violate their rights.

Advocacy for the OWL program, as it affected a Loretto resident we'll call Wilma Lerner, illustrates what I am talking about. (Although she is an imaginary person, she is a composite based on real residents, and the events and attitudes are all actual.)

Mrs. Lerner is eighty-five years old, a feisty woman, with a lively sense of humor and strong opinions. Physically, she faces severe limitations, unfortunately, because of a stroke that weakened her left side. Her hearing isn't too bad, but she can't see very well at all.

In advocating the OWL program, I was trying to persuade others that offering OWL courses was an end worth trying to achieve, because it would benefit people like Mrs. Lerner.

This is altruistic advocacy, since I advocated this cause because it would benefit such people. It is also a class-action cause, since it would benefit the members of a group defined by a common interest: physically disabled residents of nursing homes, who would welcome an opportunity to take a college course.

This group is, of course, made up of particular people, of whom Mrs. Lerner was one. Her rights (among other factors) set ethical limits on what I could do as a means to the end of getting the OWL program started.

SPEAKING FOR OTHERS

As you know, my mother believed that volunteers make some of their most significant contributions by speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves and for whom nobody else might otherwise speak.

This is advocacy as speaking for a *cause*, and it is altruistic, since the cause is one that is advocated because it would benefit *other* people. But it is not just speaking for such a cause. It is also speaking for *those people*.

This is advocacy in the narrow sense, in which advocates plead other people's causes for them. "Speaking for other people" is the defining characteristic of this kind of advocacy.

Parents who talk with school officials

on behalf of their retarded child are advocates in this sense. They plead a cause that would benefit that child for that child, speaking, not just in favor of that cause, but *for that child*.

In spite of its effectiveness, we recognize that this sort of advocacy is only a last resort.

Why?

For one thing, if other people *can* speak for themselves, then they *should*—if only to free someone who would speak for them to speak for people who really *need* someone to speak for them.

For another thing, it does not help people in the long run to speak for them, when they can speak for themselves, because the more that people can do for themselves, the better off they'll be. This is illustrated by a situation that is familiar to parents.

Susie, who is four years old, comes home wailing, "Pete hit me!" If her parents step in and read Pete the riot act, you can bet that the next time there's trouble between Susie and Pete, she would want them to do the same thing. Although she might become very good at getting other people to fight her battles for her, she would never learn to settle her own disputes herself. For her, the rewards would come from stirring up trouble, not from settling it. So she would be better off if her parents made her deal with Pete herself, helping her learn how to do this, instead of speaking for her themselves.

To the extent that people *can* speak for themselves, their advocate should therefore *let* them, speaking for them only when absolutely necessary. The best strategy is to help them plead their own cause, speaking for them as little as possible, not as much as possible. The goal should be to enable them to be effective self-advocates.

WRONG ADVOCACY

There is also an ethical reason for not speaking for people who can speak for themselves: it would be *wrong* to speak for people who can speak for themselves and who want to.

This ethical principle is illustrated by the following situation.

Suppose that you are in a restaurant, with a menu open in front of you, trying

to decide what to order. Then, without even consulting you, your companion tells the waiter to bring you a steak, baked potato, and salad with house dressing.

Wouldn't you be indignant?

Even if this is exactly what you would have ordered anyway, it would still be presumptuous of your companion to decide for you what you would have and then order it, when you were able to make your own decision and speak for yourself.

What your companion did was not just irritating, it was *wrong*, because it is wrong to speak for people who are able to speak for themselves, and who want to.

Why?

I believe that the answer lies in the very nature of *persons*, as opposed to inanimate things.

Inanimate things can only be acted upon. They cannot decide what to do and then do it. What makes people different from them is that it is up to people to decide for themselves what to do.

But, if it is up to persons to decide for themselves what to do, then they must be *entitled* to this. This is why persons have the right to *self-determination*, which is the right to decide for themselves what to do.

This right has a price. Having it entails being responsible (i.e., *accountable*) for what they decide to do. The price of being entitled to choose is being accountable for the decision.

The right to decide for themselves what to do also entails the right to speak for themselves, if they can and want to. An advocate for other persons must therefore speak for them without violating their right to speak for themselves, and also without violating their more fundamental right to decide for themselves what to do.

What makes it hard to avoid violating other people's right to speak for themselves, is that they can be able to speak for themselves in some ways, even if they can't in others. People who are incapable of arguing their own cases in court, for example, might still be able to indicate what they want or need, and therefore what they think is best for themselves. Even people who are severely incapacitated in some ways can do this much, at least sometimes.

Here is an example.

There was only one area in which Mrs.

Lerner could not speak for herself. She couldn't get around well enough to plead the cause of OWL courses by going all over the place to meet with people, or get things photocopied, weighed at the post office and mailed, etc. Even so, she wanted (and got) a wheelchair van ride to the community college, so she could "go straight to the top" and "tell them that old people have just as much right to learn as anybody else does."

She was, of course, perfectly capable of deciding for herself whether a course in literature would interest her. She was also perfectly capable of expressing a strong preference that they not read books with bad language, of saying that she wanted "her volunteer" at Loretto to read to her whenever possible, and of speaking eloquently on behalf of causes to benefit people in nursing homes, among others.

There were times when she entrusted people such as her volunteer, or Nancy Bolton, or me, with messages to relay for her. Then we spoke for her, but *with her permission*. We couldn't speak for her without it, though.

In advocating the cause of OWL courses, I was speaking on behalf of Mrs. Lerner, but it would have been wrong for me to speak *for her*, when she could speak for herself, and she wanted to.

To the extent that people *can* indicate what they want or need, however, then they *can* speak for themselves, and it would be wrong not to let them.

This gives advocates an ethical obligation not to take it upon themselves to decide what is best for those for whom they speak, when these people can make, and express, this decision for themselves. This is part of letting them speak for themselves whenever possible.

PERMISSION TO ADVOCATE

This does not mean that there is anything wrong with consulting "the experts" about what is best for the beneficiaries of advocacy. Nor does it mean that there is anything wrong with advocates using their own eyes and conscience to form an opinion about what is best for these people. What it does mean, however, is that it would be wrong for advocates to do these things *instead* of consulting the

beneficiaries themselves. Advocacy on behalf of other people requires *listening* to them, as well as speaking for them.

One way that an advocate can avoid violating other peoples' right to speak for themselves is to speak for them only with their permission, because speaking for them *with* their permission would not violate their right to speak for themselves.

Suppose, for example, that you and a friend like to order Chinese food to take out. Your friend must place an order now, so that it will be ready by the time you plan to pick it up, but your friend can't reach you to find out what you want. You have said, however, that it would be fine to order for you.

Under these conditions, there would be nothing wrong with your friend's deciding what you would have and ordering it for you, because your friend would do this with your permission—and therefore not be speaking for you when you wanted to, and could, speak for yourself.

It would be very simple to avoid violating people's right to speak for themselves, if we could speak for them only when we have their permission. Unfortunately, however, it is not always possible to get permission from them. How can an advocate get permission from a comatose patient or an infant, or even just someone who can't be reached in time by telephone?

At first, it might seem that an advocate can go ahead and speak for people like these, without their permission, because they *can't* speak for themselves. So, speaking for them would not violate their right to speak for themselves.

But here there is an important ethical complication.

Not just *anyone* is entitled to speak for the comatose patient. If the patient's next-of-kin can speak for the patient, then they are entitled to. Anyone else who wanted to speak for that patient would need the permission of those relatives or that person would violate their right to speak for that patient. A similar thing is true of the infant, whose parent or legal guardian is entitled to speak for that child.

Even in an office, if Mary Johnson is out sick, not just anyone can speak for her in her absence. There is someone who is authorized, and therefore entitled, to

speak for her, when she is unavailable. Anyone else who wanted to speak for her would need permission from that person.

Sometimes volunteers are advocates for people for whom they are authorized to speak anyway—like the parents of the retarded child, for example. In which case, of course, there would be nothing wrong with their speaking for them.

Sometimes, however, volunteers perceive the need for *someone* to speak for people who can't speak for themselves, when those who are authorized to speak for them are unwilling, or unable, to speak for them, but are perfectly willing to let volunteer advocates speak for them. In which case, again, there would be nothing wrong with speaking for them.

What *would* be wrong in most circumstances, though, would be for an advocate to speak for people who can't speak for themselves, when those who are authorized to speak for them *don't want* that advocate to speak for those people. If, for example, an advocate spoke for the retarded child, when the parents didn't want that advocate to speak for their child, then the advocate would violate the parents' right to speak for their child.

A dilemma is presented, however, if the authorized spokesperson takes a position that is not in the best interest of the person unable to speak for him or herself. Then the advocate must carefully determine how to best represent the interests of the beneficiary.

But there are some people, who have nobody who is authorized to speak for them, and who are unable to get the help that they need, because they are unable to speak for themselves. It would not be wrong for an advocate to speak for them, even without any authorization, because it would be ethically intolerable not to help other people, when they need help and can't help themselves, and nobody else is responsible for their welfare. In fact, it would be wrong *not* to speak for them.

CONCLUSION ... AND SPECIAL ASSETS OF VOLUNTEER ADVOCACY

What may we conclude about volunteers and the ethics of advocacy?

Advocacy of a given cause (whether the advocate is paid or not) is ethically right

only if the cause is good and the means used in pleading it are right. The means used in pleading it are right only if they do not violate the right of those, on behalf of whom the advocate speaks, to speak for themselves whenever they can and want to. This right and, more fundamentally, the right to self-determination, which all persons have, are absolute ethical limits on what advocates may do in pleading a cause.

Advocates, like anyone else, have the right to self-determination, which means that all advocacy is voluntary, in the sense that it is up to advocates themselves to decide which causes to plead. If they find themselves unwilling to plead a cause that someone wants them to plead, then it is up to them to refuse to plead it. If they do decide to plead a certain cause, however, then they are personally responsible for which cause they plead and the means by which they plead it. That volunteer advocates are *unpaid* does not add any ethical complications that I can see.

There is one respect in which advocacy is *not* voluntary, however. Once we have promised to advocate a certain cause, then we are no longer free not to advocate it. We have an ethical obligation to do what we have promised to do, and so it would be wrong not to advocate that cause. This is true, even if we are not being paid to advocate it.

All advocates, paid or unpaid, face the ethical limit of the rights of those on whose behalf they speak, but unpaid advocates have some important advantages over paid ones.

Being unpaid makes it easier to stay within the ethical boundaries of advocacy. For example, it simplifies the decision about whether to advocate a certain cause, because the question of whether to advocate a bad cause to keep a needed paying job does not come up.

Being unpaid also makes it easier to be *effective*. We noted that unpaid advocates have a credibility that comes from being perceived as believing sincerely in a cause. There are lots of other advantages, like not having a stake in defending the *status quo*, that I haven't gotten into here.

Unpaid volunteer advocates *are* effec-

tive. They speak with creativity, intelligence, and sensitivity, in favor of an incredibly rich variety of important causes that make the world a better place for everyone. They speak on behalf of people for whom nobody is paid to speak, meeting needs that would otherwise not be met, and helping those who would not otherwise get help.

My mother devoted her life to the cause of volunteers and the value of what they do. It was a life well spent.

I am grateful to Ivan Scheier, Susan Ellis, Anne Honer, Betsy van Inwagen, Robert Winne, and Nancy Bolton Calhoun for valuable comments and suggestions.

Harriet Naylor on Helping to Preserve Democracy: The Role of Volunteer Administration

Anne S. Honer

PREFACE

Since her death in 1985, it has been a year of remembering Harriet Naylor, a designer of the principles upon which the field of volunteer administration has grown. Not only a pioneer, Harriet Naylor continued to lead and challenge throughout her more than 40 years in the field. When her second book, *Leadership for Volunteering* (Dryden, NY: Dryden Associates), was written in 1976, editors noted that Ms. Naylor had already had 30 years experience in international volunteer work. Her professional training in social work and adult education provided the foundation for her work as Director of Volunteer Services, New York State Department of Mental Hygiene; consultant to the Office of Volunteer Development for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and Director of Education and Training for the National Center for Voluntary Action. In recent years, she had toured the country as a consultant and speaker on "volunteerism," a term she sometimes regretted coining because of the unanticipated attention it received. In 1983, she was made an honorary lifetime member of the Association for Volunteer Administration.

In my correspondence with this leader in the year before she died, Harriet revealed some of her thoughts for a new book, thoughts which included her views on centralized decision-making ("it denigrates many able people with a lot to contribute"); training ("rote training is less than helpful because it gives false confidence!"); and the need for philosophers and theologians to "help us understand what builds faith, positive expectations,

etc. in a world which ridicules, puts people down"¹

Harriet Naylor's final presentation, however, was not in print but in person on May 1, 1985 at a Girl Scouts of the USA conference on volunteers at the Edith Macy Conference Center, Briarcliff Manor, New York. She had spent much time there many years ago as a volunteer, researching organizational management. A transcript of excerpts from that conference shows that Naylor's belief in the necessity of nurturing and developing volunteers in order to preserve democracy was her constant theme even to the last.

Harriet Naylor was one of those rare people who was able to help you "lift yourself high enough to see beyond horizons."² Her many years of actual experience working with volunteers and in agencies did not hold her feet in the sand; instead, they released her creativity and enabled her to inspire others to seek and assume leadership in their own spheres of influence.

Will we continue to hear her voice? Harriet Naylor's visions of volunteerism were those of power and influence and leadership, ingredients essential to the preservation of democracy. She saw volunteer administrators as developing volunteer power and leadership within organizations' programs and instilling their vision in new professionals.

ROLE OF VOLUNTEERISM IN A DEMOCRACY

Basic to a democracy is freedom of choice. Citizens choose their leaders by voting; show their lifestyle preferences in selecting their neighborhoods; choose

Anne S. Honer is Assistant Executive Director of Rhode Island's Volunteers in Action (VIA), this country's only statewide voluntary action center. She directs VIA's Community Skillsbank and provides the major staff support for the VAC's training and agency relations activities. She has served the Association for Volunteer Administration as National Membership Chair and reviewing editor of *The Journal of Volunteer Administration*.

their religious beliefs; and, hopefully, choose their vocations by seeking training related to their interests and aptitudes. Their understanding of the world around them is shaped by their choice of information sources—by the news programs they hear and the publications they read. To Harriet Naylor, what was even more important was that, by volunteering, citizens influence what values are to be preserved and which human services are to be made available.

As volunteers in the systems providing human services, citizens provide checks and balances to program implementation, ensuring that programs truly meet the needs of clients and other constituents. In *Leadership for Volunteering*, Naylor points out that because volunteers are free to choose to what they commit their time, skills, and energies, they can be advocates for effective programs. They talk to their friends and to decision-makers about well-run programs; further, they may have more credibility than paid staff because they do not personally benefit by taking a stand. Programs with volunteer involvement are strengthened by that participation and the issues volunteers raise.

Naylor recognized that government increasingly has removed Americans' choices by prescribing which human services will be provided through its support—and withdrawal of support—for such programs. Most Americans see or perhaps personally feel the impact of this influence as well-run and effective local programs are cut because of changing national or state priorities. For many Americans, even the right to choice itself has been threatened. For example, public transportation in rural areas is rarely "cost effective," yet is the only link for many rural poor or older people to health services, other programs, and companionship. As rural public transportation systems were de-funded by government, people's choices as to how their needs—even which needs—would be met were also "cut."

The housing choices of the elderly may be determined not by their own neighborhood and housing type preferences, but by their age, income, health, and participation in specific programs serving the

elderly. Closer to home for volunteerism, a low income person not yet 60 years of age may be prevented from choosing to volunteer because he or she does not meet the age requirements of a specific Federal volunteer program. Without the insurance coverage and transportation between home and workplace, volunteering might be impossible for that person.

In addition to increased government involvement in policy making within service-providing organizations, Naylor witnessed an era in which the trend was towards an increase in salaried staff. Individuals trained and accredited to provide human services took on much of the planning and priority-setting functions previously delegated in large part to volunteer leadership. As a result, volunteers at all levels had fewer choices for volunteering. Both communities and organizations suffered because they lost the participation of volunteers in the planning and implementation process.

Naylor felt that doing *for* others, as salaried staff were increasingly doing, was not to anyone's advantage. We should do *with* people . . . and that's part of the process which preserves and strengthens democracy:

So voluntarism is learning that slowly, for a long time, we [professionals] did things for people and we had very patronizing attitudes about it, and it was greatly resented. But we have found that by planning with and working with people, our programs will work because they are everybody's plan.³

ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR IN VOLUNTEER DEVELOPMENT

Naylor realized that there must be a system within which volunteers can work in order to maximize their potential. This system she called a "volunteer development system." This perspective emphasizes that the volunteer administrator is primarily responsible to volunteers for their development within a program. Keeping in mind that volunteer activities should contribute to achieving organizational goals, volunteer administrators themselves would stimulate individual growth, deepen volunteer commitment to the organization, and at the same time

work to keep volunteer spontaneity and responsiveness.

"Our field is so significant to individual development in a democratic society. . . ."⁴ Naylor believed that everyone needs opportunities to volunteer in order to be "wholly human," for through volunteering people discover skills and abilities they didn't know they had.⁵ And if volunteers are going to preserve our democratic way of life, they must recognize their own skills and abilities and provide leadership wherever needed. When successful, the volunteer administrator trains individuals to take responsibility for those matters which involve their lives and to be able to do something about them. "We could be developing volunteering as a route out of powerlessness."⁶

Unless conscious of this need to develop volunteers, volunteer administrators may tend to "manage programs" and not "lead people," when leadership is the more appropriate strategy. Democracy thrives on leadership, not management. Volunteer administrators who are trained to think primarily in terms of controlling human resources to achieve organizational goals and structure may give a lower priority to the enabling, empowering or liberating of volunteers. Naylor exclaimed, "Let's get management ideas under control so that we can spend time and effort on something else, for a change!"⁷

In the last two decades, the profession of volunteer administration has developed the tools with which to work in a variety of settings. But they are just that—tools. In her last years as she traveled around the country speaking, consulting, and writing, Hat urged volunteer administrators onward. "Leave those techniques to those we supervise," she suggested in her letters. She believed that the important work for volunteer directors is to inspire others to choose volunteerism to preserve those freedoms they value. If people don't volunteer, these freedoms eventually will be lost.

We can't really overcome the impact of inflation and depression but with a volunteer development system we can bring in volunteer caring and concerns to undergird the program systems

*and then free them to turn public policy priorities toward unmet needs.*⁸

Clearly, the message for those in the profession of volunteer administration is to master management and move on from there to strengthen the skills of freeing the potential of each individual who chooses to volunteer.

There are challenges. New populations are being added to the volunteer pool, including the court-ordered community service workers and those in physical or mental rehabilitation programs. Volunteer administrators screen these volunteers by assessing each person's ability to meet an agency's need; if a prospective volunteer's skills do not meet a need, he or she can be referred to another program.

Naylor's perspective was that volunteer administrators should keep alive the voluntary nature of the individual's commitment. They should understand the volunteer's skills as well as motives for wanting to volunteer for an organization, and explore the opportunities to volunteer which do and could exist. Volunteer administrators attempt to *screen people in*, not out. Wherever possible they have a responsibility to push their organizations to the limits of their adaptability and advocate for the right of all individuals to volunteer.

*Volunteering is a fragile, priceless commodity and we above all people should not try to control or regulate it, but encourage adaptability, response to emerging needs and some of the heroic job achievements which will raise the [volunteer's] self-image, confidence and competence by inspiration.*⁹

Many who have experienced the growth in confidence and competence that results from inspired leadership know its importance to individuals.

*Leaders emerge from the crucible of experience—they are not born, but made, and training makes a good many people into leaders with confidence based in the new competencies they learned as volunteers.*¹⁰

For example, in her speeches at the conference in May of 1985, Naylor told of a

shy, young Girl Scout who was elected troop president by her peers. Surprised by the choice, Naylor had faith that the democratic process was wiser than her personal perceptions of the girl. With her guidance, the young Scout became a very effective leader.

ROLE OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROFESSION

Besides program management and leadership development those in the field of volunteer administration have the additional responsibility to share and teach "a vision of the values we hold dear, [and] not just informational, but self-help supportive relationships in our networks."¹¹ We must lead and develop not only volunteers, but also others in the field of volunteer administration.

In a publication released last year, Naylor suggested that the real challenge for the profession of volunteer administration was "to identify its role in society, its values and perimeters in the wide amorphous field of practice."¹² There are far-reaching implications for our society in how professionals see themselves. The task-oriented manager asks: "How do I do x, y, and z?" The value-seeking leader asks: "How do changes in society affect my profession—and how does, or can, my profession change society?" In other words, what unique knowledge, skills, attitudes, and visions do volunteer administrators as professionals have in common that will shape society's future?

Since many professions share common management skills, professional volunteer administrators must look to their visions for their uniqueness: who, where, what will they be in the future? What will be their professional relationships to their organizations? What assumptions will guide professional research and practice?

Volunteer administrators believe in the right of individuals to contribute their time, money and skills to causes, organizations and movements of their choice. And, partly because of Naylor's influence, today's volunteer administrators recognize their responsibility to create an effective partnership of volunteers and causes, organizations and movements.

Creating such opportunities will provide direction and focus as members of a democratic society are led to fulfill their choices. Harriet Naylor said in her last publication, *Beyond Managing Volunteers*: "I believe that democracy can survive if volunteering does!" And if volunteering survives, it will be in large measure because leaders such as Harriet Naylor were with us in our formative years.

FOOTNOTES

¹Harriet H. Naylor, letter to author, August 11, 1984.

²Richard Bach, *Illusions: The Adventure of a Reluctant Messiah* (Delacorte Press, 1977) p. 91.

³Unpublished excerpts from Harriet Naylor's speeches, May 1, 1985. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the Girl Scouts of the USA in making these excerpts available for writing this article.

⁴Naylor, letter to author, February 4, 1984.

⁵_____, *Leadership for Volunteering*, (Dryden, NY: Dryden Associates, 1976) p. 26.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 150.

⁷Naylor, February 4, 1984 letter.

⁸_____, *Leadership for Volunteering*, p. 211.

⁹_____, February 4, 1984 letter.

¹⁰_____, *Leadership for Volunteering*, p. 208.

¹¹_____, February 4, 1984 letter.

¹²_____, *Beyond Managing Volunteers* (Boulder: Yellowfire Miniseries #17, February, 1985) p. 1.

The author thanks Susan Ellis and Ivan Scheier for their assistance in the preparation of this article.

Some Reflections On: Who Are We?

Joseph F. Bass, Jr.

I have had the pleasure of hearing many speakers talk about what volunteer program administrators do. Most say it is hard to describe, and I agree, but that is mostly when you are talking to people outside the field of volunteerism. Insiders seem to talk the same language, or at least they are more polite, and smile knowingly and grunt in understanding occasionally. At least, their eyes do not glaze over when we tell them what we do.

So, let me tell you what I do. I *administer* several grant *programs*, or *supervise personnel* who do. I *hire* some *staff* and *establish performance plans*, and *evaluate* their performance. I *prepare* organizational *goals and budgets*. I *chair* working groups and *task forces*. I *conduct workshops*, *network* with folks like you, *refer* folks like you to other folks like you, *give technical assistance*. . . .

A simple example of technical assistance: I was talking on the phone to a volunteer administrator friend of mine who said she was having some problems with a mailing. She was having trouble getting her envelope stuffers motivated and they were just about on strike. It seems she had neglected to bake anything the night before, and they were used to having something to munch on as they did their volunteer work.

In a moment of blinding insightfulness I understood not only the crumbs in the envelopes I had been getting from her agency, but also the volunteers' grievance: that she had deprived them of a basic benefit . . . her prize coffeecake! I made a recommendation: "If you've got to get the mailing out today and don't have cake, give them I.O.U.'s, to be redeemed at some near future date. That way they'll work in anticipation of that

reward, which is almost as good as having it now, and certainly makes for a less crumby job."

The volunteers loved their I.O.U.'s, which is why I can claim some of Solomon's wisdom for that day's advice and another satisfied customer . . . and yes, I have stuffed envelopes too, so I understand the need for appreciation for doing that task.

At the 1985 AVA National Conference on Volunteerism in Seattle I heard Steve McCurley talk about the many jobs that volunteer administrators do. We are *planners*, *budgeters*, *personnel directors*, *supervisors*, *facilitators*, *conveners* . . . we are everything to everybody . . . and as he spoke about all we do I began to identify a feeling, that I had felt before, at the VOLUNTEER conference in Los Angeles in June, and again since I had arrived in Seattle. Going to the registration area, seeing all those people, hundreds of them, I was overcome with a feeling that I was among very special people, who have a lot of knowledge about a lot of things. I was reminded of those wonderfully creative people of the Renaissance, who were skilled in all the arts and sciences. We are skilled in all the arts and sciences also, the arts and sciences of volunteer administration, and WE ARE RENAISSANCE PEOPLE.

On that first day of the Seattle conference, I had just left a training session with Tom Peters, the author of *In Search of Excellence* and *A Passion for Excellence*. The former has sold 5 million copies, in its 15 translations, to become the second fastest-selling non-fiction title in history. In it he lists phenomena observed in successful U.S. corporations, which he calls the four key sources of "sustainable strategic ad-

Joe Bass is Director, Technical Assistance Division at ACTION, the National Volunteer Agency. He has 23 years of federal, state and local government experience with volunteer programs, and has conducted workshops and presented at a number of conferences, including those run by AVA and VOLUNTEER. This article is taken from a speech he delivered to close the South Carolina AVA Fall Conference in November 1985.

vantage" for organizations. They are: 1)superior customer or client service; 2)constant innovation; 3)reliance on the ability and creative potential of all the members of the organization; and, 4)exceptional, in-touch leadership.

In Seattle, I realized that the characteristics Peters had described are possessed by volunteer program administrators. Our success depends on each of his four key sources, applied every day in our volunteer programs. We believe in superior service to our clients, and we give it through recruiting, training and placing the right volunteers in the right jobs. We must be constantly innovative in order to survive, and we adapt our programs and our marketing strategies in order to be competitive with other organizations. We rely heavily on the abilities and creative potential of our staffs and our volunteers, because we know the value of what we can do together. And we stay in touch with the latest techniques for management and marketing that workshops, self-study and networking can bring us. We stay in touch with what is happening in our field and we strive to give good leadership. WE ARE RENAISSANCE PEOPLE, IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE.

My research for the workshop I did on the future, "Trends in Volunteerism," led me to a book by Arnold Mitchell called *The Nine American Lifestyles*. In his book Mitchell describes who Americans are and where we are going. He categorizes each of us into four basic groups: a)need-driven; b)outer-directed; c)inner-directed; and, d)combined outer/inner-directed. The nine lifestyles are subsets of these groups, as follows:

A. Need-driven

1. Survivors: Old, intensely poor, far removed from the cultural mainstream, 4% of the U.S. adult population.

2. Sustainers: Angry, resentful, street-wise, living on the edge of poverty, involved in the underground economy, 7% of the U.S. adult population.

B. Outer-directed

3. Belongers: Aging, conventional, content, intensely patriotic, traditional Middle Americans, 35% of the

U.S. adult population.

4. Emulators: Young, ambitious, flashy, trying to break into the system, 9% of the U.S. adult population.

5. Achievers: Middle-aged, prosperous, self-assured, the leaders and builders of the American Dream, 22% of the U.S. adult population.

C. Inner-directed

6. I-am-me: Very young, narcissistic, impulsive, exhibitionist, a transitional state to inner-direction, 5% of the U.S. adult population.

7. Experiential: Youthful, seeking direct experience, artistic, intensely oriented toward inner growth, 7% of the U.S. adult population.

8. Socially conscious: Mission-oriented, mature, successful, out to change the world, 8% of the U.S. adult population.

D. Combined outer/inner-directed

9. Integrated: Psychologically mature, tolerant, understanding, flexible, able to see "the big picture," 2% of the U.S. adult population.

The need-driven groups in my opinion do not represent who we, as volunteer administrators, are, but they are our clients. They may also represent to us who we, or our ancestors, once were, but most of us are beyond their state of deprivation and need. I believe that we are various combinations of outer and inner-directed, and many of us live integrated lifestyles.

Who are we? WE ARE RENAISSANCE PEOPLE, IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE, LIVING A COMBINATION OF OUTER/INNER-DIRECTED LIFESTYLES.

My research on the future also led me to books by Kenneth Naisbitt, *Megatrends*; Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock*, *The Third Wave*; and Edward Cornish, founder of the World Future Society, *The Study of the Future*. Interestingly, each of them says independently, each in his own way, that there is hope for the future because there are quiet revolutionaries at work in this country and in the world. They say that these revolutionaries will profoundly affect our future in positive ways.

Marilyn Ferguson, in *The Aquarian Conspi-*

racy, brings us further into the age of Aquarius, writing about a network powerful enough to bring about radical change in our culture. The network, she says, contains those who are experiencing a growing capacity for change in themselves and know that it is possible for others. The network is working to create a society based on a vastly enlarged concept of the human potential.

I believe we, who see every day the human potential through our volunteers, and their (and therefore our) capacity to change conditions, are part of that network. We are those revolutionaries.

Who are we? WE ARE RENAISSANCE PEOPLE, IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE, A COMBINATION OF OUTER/INNER-DIRECTED, REVOLUTIONARIES, and we are . . .

FRIENDS.

Several years ago, I was extremely fortunate to be working with several people who were dreamers, poets, musicians, entrepreneurs, and we were friends. We used to get together, about once a week, usually on Thursday, to talk and to share, and we did it with a spirit of playfulness and good fun. We had some good experiences together and we grew, and although we are walking different paths now, we are still friends . . . friends for life.

My friends gave so much to me, meant so much to me, that I put my thoughts and feelings in a song, which I will present to you now as a poem.

*Friends
Thursday afternoon
Helping me get by
Teaching me to fly
Higher than I've ever been
Before.*

*Friends
They know how to set me free
Wanting me to be
All that I can be
Things that I can't see
In me.*

*I'm bound in chains
Of my own making
And friends can help me break those chains.
Their love can take me to the mountain*

*And bring me sunshine
When it rains.*

*It's
So easy when you realize
Any day is Thursday
Any place, a mountain
When you're with the ones you call
Your
Friends.*

It seems to me that this group of special people to which we belong does help and support its members, in the loving way that friends do. Of course, we can come together and meet, but we can also connect with one another between our convenings. When we are overcome by a world with too many problems, and by too little money and time to solve them we have only to "reach out and touch someone," another special person, to see the mountains and the sunshine. We can help each other fly because of WHO WE ARE.

It will be easy when we realize we are OUTER/INNER-DIRECTED RENAISSANCE REVOLUTIONARIES IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE, and FRIENDS.

A Brazilian Volunteer Connection

Melanie Ghio

In the fall of 1985, I received a call from a gentleman whose heavy accent made telephone communication particularly difficult, but also intriguing. Mr. Goncalves, as I was slowly able to decipher, was studying at Tulane University on a Hubert Humphrey Fellowship and was interested in the systematic practice of volunteer management. Would I be available for an interview as part of his investigation into this profession and its functions?

Absolutely, was my response. First, I was flattered on behalf of the Associated Catholic Charities of New Orleans that someone from another country would want to learn about our extensive volunteer program. Second, as a confirmed and frequent traveler, I welcome every opportunity to meet people from abroad. My husband and I have hosted young people from Scotland and Germany and have been guests of a French family whom we met on previous visits to Europe. The dauntless tourist in me quickly elevated this interview from an interesting but fairly common event in the life of a volunteer manager to the realm of fascinating interaction with a representative of an unknown and foreign culture.

Jose E. M. Goncalves is a psychologist and the director of mental health services in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, the southernmost state in the country of Brazil. He is also an amazingly bright person who had learned English upon his arrival in the United States only two months earlier. His secret weapon in the battle with irregular verbs and dangling participles was television. Hours of T.V. watching had given him excellent pronunciation and complete grasp of current usage, even slang. It had also helped to acculturate him in a very short time.

During his initial visit to my office, we discussed the philosophy of volunteerism and its place in American society. I shared with him the systematic approach to management of volunteer programs which I have learned and practiced over several years. Mr. Goncalves was deeply interested in everything that I had to say and informed me that the investigation of volunteer management was a major goal of his Fellowship year. I made certain he was aware of the various authors in our field who have written about the profession of volunteer management.

A productive two hours was spent as Mr. Goncalves learned many of the basics of volunteer management and I gleaned insights into the world of Brazil, particularly its social problems and opportunities for volunteer activity. I was interested to find that he "consider(s) volunteerism as a unique American institution, not in the fact of its existence because it exists elsewhere, but in its extraordinary richness and variety and because volunteerism is managed in a serious and systematic way." How frequently are your fondest beliefs confirmed so completely?!

A few weeks later, Mr. Goncalves called again, and again requested an interview. This time he was seeking a professional affiliation with our agency which would allow him the opportunity to view, firsthand, volunteer management in practice. I was happy to provide this affiliation, but expressed some concern that as a social service agency, not a purely mental health agency, we might not relate very well to the hospital/clinic set-up that he operates in Brazil. Also, I knew from our first meeting that he had a particular interest in utilizing volunteers to deliver

Melanie Ghio is the Director of Volunteers for Associated Catholic Charities of New Orleans, an agency which sponsors over 60 programs and institutions in southeast Louisiana. She is a trainer with six years of experience in multi-site volunteer program management. Ms. Ghio completed the volunteer management certification program of the University of Colorado, Boulder and is a member of AVA.

mental health services in rural areas of his home state. Rural south Louisiana, while exotic and remote by mainline American standards, is far removed from the rural realities of a developing country like Brazil.

With our limitations and Mr. Goncalves' interests clearly understood and agreed upon, we developed a plan of action which we hoped would provide the needed experience and exposure. His affiliation period was to be February 18 through March 21, 1986, approximately one month.

First, I explained to him that we would be doing several, but not all, of the management functions during his affiliation period, and that those would be out of sequence because of the variety of volunteer programs that our agency operates. We would be doing a great deal of interviewing, screening, and placement of volunteers who had come to us during our January/February recruitment efforts, but the general recruitment campaign itself would be over. We do most of our recruitment in early fall, January/February, and early summer, as do so many volunteer programs.

We would be doing some training with both board members and volunteer coordinators from our many sites. I was also involved in a consulting/supervisory position with one coordinator whose program had experienced tremendous difficulties in volunteer supervision and retention. Our annual recognition event would take place during February, as well.

We addressed the need for exposure to some rural volunteer activity by calling on the staff of our social ministry program. This program has been organizing Catholics and members of other denominations into social action groups that respond to the needs of the communities in which they live. Several of these social ministries are functioning in the outlying areas of our Archdiocese, locations that are rural by comparison to the metropolitan area in which most of us live and work. The staff person who had been working in those "upriver" areas was happy to have Mr. Goncalves accompany him on several visits to the country.

The affiliation was certainly a success for Mr. Goncalves. He was easily able to

transfer the learning that he did in our programs to the situations that were waiting for him back in Brazil. He involved himself in the interview process and in the supervisory relationship most intently. In the paper which he wrote to summarize the affiliation experience, he showed his grasp of some "home truths" of volunteer management. "Policy formulation must involve those who will be affected by it," he wrote in the section on planning and staffing. How many managers are forgetting this basic tenet in their own programs?

Mr. Goncalves' estimable experience as a manager and psychologist was apparent in many situations. In another section of his paper, he observed, "actually, selection and placement is the natural outcome of a well implemented interviewing process." The simplicity of the thing boggles the imagination!

The rural experience that we are able to provide was perhaps the most valuable, after all. It gave him real insight into community organizing of non-professionals to meet the needs of socially-isolated people. The community organizer with whom he worked, Jeff Conner, did an excellent job of training volunteers to interview clients requesting emergency assistance. Mr. Goncalves referred to the experience in his paper and is seeking ways to transfer these skills to the remote Indian villages of Brazil.

I benefitted as much—no, more—by the affiliation as did Mr. Goncalves. (Isn't that often the case in our relationships with volunteers and visitors alike?) He never asked a pointless or irrelevant question, but some of my answers were fraught with bureaucratic irrelevancies. My rethinking about a few "that's the way we do things" responses helped eliminate several needless procedures and forgotten policies. Some functions that had long ago lost my interest were again revealed as stimulating and deserving of attention. And some of my successes, as well as my failures, were dusted off and examined for what we both could learn. It was a valuable self-examination.

This week I received a letter and a questionnaire from the director of the Hubert Humphrey Fellowship Program asking me to evaluate the affiliation ex-

perience. I answered all the questions very positively and emphasized the mutually beneficial results of the affiliation. In his paper's introduction, Mr. Goncalves quotes former California Governor Jerry Brown: "I see voluntarism not as an opportunity but as a necessity of a civilized society." Those words serve to link the so-called developing countries, like Brazil, and our own country on common ground for the common good through voluntary service.

I like to think that someday, when my husband and I are living our dream of visiting all the fascinating countries in the world, we might meet a Brazilian volunteer, part of a volunteer mental health service delivery system: my Brazilian volunteer connection.

Editor's Note: THE JOURNAL has contacted Mr. Goncalves in Brazil and has asked him to share his perceptions directly with our readers. We are awaiting his reply and hope to publish a follow-up article in later issue.

Volunteers Training Volunteers: A Model For Human Service Organizations

Kathiravelu K. Navaratnam

Human service organizations are supposed to train their volunteers. Some provide this training and do it well, while others provide little or no training. A major reason for this is that in recent years the number of volunteers has increased faster than the training capabilities of staff and facilities.¹ Volunteers do not and will not come "ready made." They need appropriate training before they begin their volunteer work, a fact this author learned quite well from past association with many human service organizations. I also learned that education, experience, employment background, and a high level of motivation are not sufficient. Volunteer programs are, however, successful only if volunteers are trained to carry out assigned activities, have a clear understanding of the agency's expectations and also have confidence in accomplishing the entrusted duties. Managers of many human service organizations have come to recognize that they can fulfill training needs of potential volunteers only if they involve seasoned volunteers in training them. The purpose of this paper is to present a model for doing this. The model is an outgrowth of my personal training and work experience at RAFT, a nonprofit crisis intervention center in Blacksburg, Virginia, in which trained volunteers help people in the community resolve their problems and crises through hotlines and walk-in shelter services. These services are available to all people, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. RAFT handles approximately 4000 calls and 200 walk-ins per year.

THE MODEL

The term "model" is defined here as the simplified, step-by-step procedures

and methods associated with training people for volunteer services, and also to involve them in training other volunteers as well. Accordingly, the model will demonstrate the existence of a systematic relationship between volunteer trainers and the procedures and methods involved in training of new volunteers. The model considers the following five steps implemented by RAFT:

1. Recruitment
2. Orientation
3. Specific knowledge and skill training
4. Placement
5. On-the-job training

In the RAFT organization volunteers are involved at each step of the model.

RECRUITMENT

RAFT has a high turnover rate as one might expect in an agency that depends largely on student volunteers. Blacksburg, the town in which RAFT is located, is a college town and many students join RAFT for various reasons. Chief among the reasons is the three academic credits they gain to satisfy their internship requirements in social sciences. It might be reasonable to say that the organization has a recruitment problem, in that it is not actively recruiting community citizens who might be willing to stay long enough to provide the program continuity that only seasoned volunteers can provide. Only thirty percent of all volunteers can be considered seasoned volunteers, having worked at RAFT more than one year.

I learned about the RAFT volunteer training program through news media. Because I knew little about the organization at the beginning, I contacted the organiza-

Kathiravelu K. Navaratnam earned a doctoral degree in Agricultural Education from Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia. He was a faculty member of the University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka, and also a volunteer leader in a Community Development Center, Kaithady, Sri Lanka. He is presently a volunteer at the Center for Volunteer Development at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia.

tion to get more information. Promptly, a volunteer competently explained about the training programs and the conditions and procedures for pre-registration. In fact, the volunteer emphasized the policy of time commitment, with at least two hours per week of volunteer work at RAFT for a minimum of six months expected. The volunteer also explained about the training fee which helps RAFT recover the costs of the training manual and workbook given to each trainee on the day of orientation. The fee is \$10 for an individual who eventually completes the training session. However, the fee is \$25 for those who register and attend only a portion of the training session. Since I completed the entire training, I became a volunteer at the end of the training process.

Volunteer recruitment often takes a lot of staff time. At RAFT, this time is reduced by involving seasoned volunteers who help prepare a recruitment plan and also implement it. Volunteers make personal contacts, prepare news for both print and electronic media, and even talk to groups (e.g., churches and local civic organizations) about the RAFT organization and its need for more volunteers. Thus the recruitment effort depends on the cooperation of a lot of dedicated people, both volunteers and staff.

ORIENTATION

Orientation begins for those who are committed to volunteer work at RAFT according to a previously planned schedule. The process clarifies the need for volunteers, their job descriptions, rewards, and other benefits. At the orientation, information about the agency and its training programs are handed out to the trainees, and the staff are introduced by the director of the agency. The director's introductory talk to the trainees embraces the history and development of RAFT. The director pays attention to explaining the benefits of volunteering, such as the opportunity to help others, learn new skills, gain a broader understanding of problems faced by individuals in the community, have an up-to-date resume, gain professional development, and share training and skills in program development for volunteering at RAFT. The objectives and goals of training, duties of volunteers,

qualification of volunteers, and time commitment are explained by the staff and provided in information leaflets.

As a part of orientation, staff and volunteer trainers demonstrate telephone listening in crisis situations as well as how to handle a walk-in at RAFT. During the demonstration, the importance of confidentiality in volunteer work at RAFT is emphasized.

The trainees are informed at the start that there will not be any make-up training sessions for those who fail to attend any section of the training program in that quarter. In that event, they have to wait for the training session scheduled for next quarter of the year.

Trained volunteers are effectively involved in the orientation of new volunteers by providing them the opportunity to talk about their activities at RAFT, interests and abilities needed for volunteering, and possible benefits from participation. Volunteers also explain the policies and procedures of the agency as they relate to volunteer activities. Experience has shown that providing an opportunity for veteran volunteers to share their experiences in the process of orientation has a motivating influence on them to get their continued support for the training programs at RAFT. Involvement of volunteers in orientation not only makes the program more meaningful to newcomers, but also alleviates the problem associated with lack of available staff time for training. However, the time spent by the staff in orientation is more than that of the volunteer trainers.

At the end of the orientation, each trainee is expected to sign a volunteer-agency agreement form. By signing this form, s/he agrees to abide by RAFT hotline policies and regulations. Descriptions of the training session and sign-up for special knowledge and skills training are part of orientation. Finally, a manual on policies and procedures and a workbook are given to each trainee, outlining volunteer duties, program policies, record keeping, and resources and referrals related to crisis handling at RAFT.

SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TRAINING

Every volunteer who works in a human

service organization should have training for the specific knowledge and skills required by his or her assigned job, in addition to more general training for other activities s/he might be called on to perform.² Each volunteer must know what is expected of him or her. Development of specific knowledge and skills requires more training time than is needed for a general orientation. It may also require more tutoring time, special instructional materials, and special attention to individuals.

Trained volunteers, directed and guided by staff, train new volunteers and share with them a wide range of experience essential to begin voluntary work at RAFT. Training of trainers (T.O.T.) is an important part of the volunteers-training-volunteers process. Active, knowledgeable, and talented seasoned volunteers are selected from a "volunteer pool" and given an opportunity to participate in a trainer training program. The selection and training of trainers is one of the primary responsibilities of the staff, and they spend a substantial amount of their time and effort to instill the desired knowledge and training skills in volunteer trainers.

Discussion with staff and observation of the trainer training process at RAFT reveal that planning and conducting the T.O.T. sessions need a considerable amount of continuous staff time. This high level of staff involvement in T.O.T. is necessary for two reasons. The first is volunteer turnover. RAFT loses some experienced volunteer trainers from time to time. This volunteer trainers dropout must be replaced by new volunteer trainers.

Second is the career ladder effect. RAFT provides opportunities for volunteers to advance from one job to another within the organization. For example, direct service volunteers may wish to advance their volunteer career by becoming volunteer trainers, and volunteer trainers may advance to management and administration of volunteer activities. So, again, new volunteer trainers are needed.

During the selection of volunteer trainers, staff evaluate each candidate's ability to be a good volunteer trainer. Staff select volunteer trainers who have completed a minimum of 150 hours of volunteer work

at hotline service and who demonstrate interest in training new volunteers. Qualified and interested volunteers will be requested to take part in an eight-hour workshop on training of trainers. As a part of training, special guidelines and instructions will be given to each volunteer trainer on how to conduct empathy training for new volunteers. In fact, the purpose of the guidelines is to maintain uniformity in the training of various empathy groups.

Empathy training is completely entrusted to volunteer trainers at RAFT. The empathy training is an intensive activity which progresses over four, three-hour group sessions. Each empathy group consists of three to four trainees and two volunteer trainers. The goal is to identify the feelings and responses of another person and communicate them to him/her. The basic idea of the empathy training is to develop listening and responding skills, and good communication ability.

There were five empathy training groups during the summer of 1985. During the empathy training, tape-recorded crisis situations were presented by volunteer trainers to increase the understanding and knowledge of using empathy to handle such problems. Each trainee was expected to react to the taped empathy simulations to demonstrate his/her skills in understanding various crisis situations. This was a way of accustoming trainees to the hotline environment.

An interesting and effective part of this special skills and knowledge training is that both trainees and trainers practice empathy with each other. In such a situation, one trainee will present a real, deeply-felt problem to his/her partner while others listen and watch their conversation. Each trainee has an opportunity to be both subject and empathetic listener. At the end of each simulation, the pair in the crisis conversation describe the real feelings of their experiences. This is followed by comments and suggestions from others in the group.

The special skills and knowledge training is conducted very professionally with a pre-planned agenda and concepts outlined on flip charts. Staff evaluate the performance of the volunteer trainers during a session in which potential volunteer

trainees criticize the performances of trainers. When this is done in non-threatening ways, it is a very useful technique to evaluate and select volunteer trainers.

During the first few occasions when a trainer is in a real training session, a staff member is present to lend support, as well as to observe the new trainer's performance. After the session, the staff member usually discusses the performance with the trainer, pointing out the good points as well as areas where improvements could be made.

The use of seasoned volunteers as trainers not only helps the staff, but also provides an opportunity for potential volunteers to acquire necessary knowledge and skills through their peers. It has been estimated that the involvement of volunteer trainers helps in saving 15 person-days for the agency staff.

The completion of a workbook on policies and procedures is an important and integral part of the training process. It covers attending to hotline crisis situations, clients, first aid, arranging the hotlines rooms, available guide books and sources of information, and drug types and vital symptoms. Completion of the workbook is a challenging activity and an excellent learning opportunity. It needs a minimum of 8 to 10 hours of work for successful completion and must be returned to the staff on or before a specified day and time. The workbook is corrected by staff members who make necessary comments on the performance of a trainee on the workbook.

A week after the end of the total training program, successful trainees are notified of their performance in the training as well as their suitability for placement with the hotlines. If any trainee is not qualified to be placed with the hotline immediately, s/he will be asked to go through a make-up empathy training to increase his/her empathy skill. Both the staff and the volunteer trainers evaluate each trainee to determine his/her suitability to be placed with the hotline.

PLACEMENT

The training process at RAFT provides an opportunity for many trainees to become volunteers. Following the empathy

group training, each successful volunteer trainee is expected to complete 50 hours of on-the-job training in hotline service to become a full volunteer at RAFT. Volunteer trainers assist the staff in matching volunteers with available activities by assessing each trainee's capability, interest, and suitability for certain kinds of volunteer work. Such assistance by volunteer trainers helps the staff to place potential volunteers in hotline services.

As a part of the placement procedure, each volunteer trainee must fill out an availability form which is kept in the phone room. This is to indicate the day and time a volunteer is available for duty (in two-hour blocks) to the staff in charge of scheduling. A change of schedule form must be submitted to the scheduler whenever a volunteer wishes to change his or her duty time. It is the responsibility of each volunteer trainee to fulfill his/her scheduled duty, or find another volunteer to fill his/her duty slot.

A no-show policy is in effect at RAFT. A "no-show" is a volunteer trainee who misses his/her duty slot without prior notification to the staff. A verbal warning, then a written warning, then a summons to appear before the volunteer board and, finally, dismissal are the sequence of actions to take in the no-show policy.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

On-the-job training is an integral part of the training program of volunteers. As a matter of fact, it is essential if the agency is to have well-trained volunteers who understand and know their jobs.³ During on-the-job training, experienced volunteers are paired with potential volunteers to help the newcomers gain experience in real situations.

An orientation to the hotline is given to each trainee by a volunteer on duty. While working on the hotline, different types of calls such as an empathy call, an information and referral call, and a business call are recorded in a specified manner in separate write-up books. The recording of an empathy call consists of the identification of the caller/client, nature of the problem, reaction and response, and identification of the volunteer trainee/trainer. All the write-ups by both volunteer trainees and trainers are re-

viewed by the staff and comments are made wherever appropriate.

Every trainee is expected to complete a minimum of 50 hours of hotline volunteer work to become a volunteer at RAFT. At the end of the 50 hours of volunteer work, volunteer trainees are evaluated by the staff. This includes a personal interview. During this interview, the staff will go through the write-ups and personal files of the trainees to determine the type of calls handled and the number of hours worked. Each trainee is expected to handle a minimum of five empathy calls, three calls related to drugs and alcoholism, and three information and referral calls. If any trainee did not get a chance to handle those specified calls, s/he must wait for an evaluation until after s/he handles such calls.

On-the-job training requires an extended period of time. With limited staff and time, it is difficult—if not impossible—for an agency to conduct an effective on-the-job training program. During this training period, volunteer trainers help volunteer trainees to look in-depth at procedures, policies and mandates of the organization. They also help trainees to study the handbooks and forms, and to observe how others do their jobs. Further, they assist the staff in supervising and evaluating the volunteer trainees.

SUMMARY

The RAFT organization conducts four training sessions in a year for new volunteers. Trained volunteers usually undertake the responsibility of training the trainees. These volunteer trainers spend relatively more time in training than the staff members. This is evident from an analysis of a training session in terms of time spent by both staff and volunteers. As an example, a training program was conducted by RAFT during Summer 1985 to teach volunteers to answer the hotline and to assist with walk-in crisis situations. The major goals of this training were: (1) to explore and analyze human crises and accompanying feelings of individuals; (2) to increase awareness of nonverbal and verbal behavior; (3) to understand different types of responses; (4) to understand and apply reflective responses; and (5) to apply different types of responses

under different types of human crisis situations. There were 16 volunteer trainees who participated in this summer training session.

The staff spent approximately two person-days in the orientation, while volunteers spent 0.5 person-days. A total of 100 person-days were spent by volunteer trainers during the period of on-the-job training. On the whole, except for the recruitment process, the staff spent two person-days, as compared to 116 person-days by the volunteers, in training the potential volunteers. This is equivalent to 58 person-days of volunteered time for every person-day spent by the staff. However, the ratio of staff time to volunteer trainers' time varies with the total number of volunteer trainers involved in the training.

PRACTICAL FEASIBILITY OF THE MODEL TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Volunteer training is the process which provides volunteers with the knowledge and skills they need to perform assigned volunteer activities. It may present new information or reinforce knowledge and skills the individuals already have.⁴ A responsible human service agency will have regular, systematic, and organized methods and procedures for training its volunteers. It will recognize its responsibility to develop the basic skills needed by the volunteers before they actually contribute their talents and time in appropriate activities.⁵ Involving volunteers in training programs not only will allow human service organizations to benefit from the knowledge and skills and other experiences of volunteers, but also will help volunteers to have satisfying and rewarding experiences in their volunteer activities.

Training procedures vary from one agency to another, depending on the availability of staff and facilities. A training and development program for new volunteers should involve trained, experienced volunteers. Such a system makes good use of available expertise as well as helps to overcome the limitations in manpower of staff. Without the involvement of trained volunteers, it is difficult for human service voluntary organizations to adopt a continuous training and development

program.⁶ The model presented in this paper may help service organizations to involve volunteers in their training activities.

My personal experience in the orientation phase of RAFT training gave me a mixture of interest, anxiety, and curiosity. During that period I thought that the volunteers were speaking for the RAFT organization but not for themselves. I also thought that it was inappropriate to use volunteers in training sessions. But it did not take even a week to realize the significant part volunteers play in the training model presented in this paper.

The model primarily considers the intensive involvement of trained and experienced volunteers in the training and development of volunteers in any service organization. The training of volunteer trainers by the staff is one of the important determinant factors in providing quality training for potential volunteers. Thus, the model draws attention to staff responsibilities for assuring quality training through adequate and appropriate supervision. This can be accomplished by a combination of methods such as observing training sessions on an unscheduled basis, followed by a staff-trainer conference.

Obviously, some volunteer trainers will need more supervision than others. Those who are adjudged by the supervisors to be unacceptable trainers should quickly be delegated other responsibilities—ones that are appropriate and acceptable to both parties and that make effective use of the volunteer's knowledge and skills.

My observations of frequent training sessions and personal discussion with staff in RAFT convinced me that using volunteers as trainers was rewarding as well as very successful for the RAFT organization year after year. However, the staff claimed that they did not save time by using volunteer trainers in training activities, but gained time to get involved in other administrative and organizational development activities.

In this training model, I found that there is a three-way relationship among staff, volunteer trainers, and potential volunteers which creates a friendly group atmosphere. The model not only allows po-

tential volunteer trainees to get acquainted with a variety of human crises during the training sessions but also provides them an opportunity for learning as they go through every phase of the training model. Volunteer trainees are informed in advance that they will not be left alone in difficult situations which might arise in their volunteer activities at the RAFT organization. Further, the quality of the training not only motivated many potential volunteers to successfully complete the training course but also helped them to become part of the RAFT organization over the following months.

FOOTNOTES

¹Rick Lynch, "Preparing an Effective Recruitment Campaign," *Voluntary Action Leadership* (Winter, 1984), 23-27.

²Eva Schindler-Rainman and Ronald Lippitt, *The Volunteer Community: Creative Use of Human Resources* (San Diego, CA: University Associates, Inc., 1975).

³Sue Vineyard, *Finding Your Way through the Maze of Volunteer Management* (Downers Grove, IL: Heritage Arts Publishers, 1981).

⁴Marlene Wilson, *The Effective Management of Volunteer Programs* (Boulder, CO: Volunteer Management Associates, 1976).

⁵L. Winecoff, and C. Powell, *Organizing a Volunteer Program* (Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company, 1978).

⁶J. M. Stone, *How to Volunteer in Social Service Agencies* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers, 1982).

Dear Editor:

The staff of RAFT is very pleased to learn that *The Journal of Volunteer Administration* is considering publishing the article "Volunteers Training Volunteers: A Model For Human Service Organizations" by Dr. Kathiravelu K. Navaratnam. Dr. Navaratnam completed our training in the Spring of 1985 and has been a dedicated volunteer ever since. He has worked very closely with our training staff in preparing and revising the article which he has submitted to you.

The training model of volunteers training other volunteers is one that has evolved over the last seventeen years

and has been the source of strength in our ever changing program. That is why we are excited that Dr. Navaratnam has been able to document our training model in order to share it with other human service organizations. We are confident that your readership would benefit greatly from the information presented in this article.

I would be happy to answer any questions that your readers may have about our training.

Sincerely,
Tim Rowe
Hotline Assistant Manager
Raft Community Crisis Center
105 Lee Street
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Cumulative Index to The Journal of Volunteer Administration Volumes III and IV

Arnot, Marie, Lee J. Cary, and Mary Jean Houde. "Strategies for Dissent and Advocacy." III, 2 (Winter 1984-85), pp. 13-18.

_____. "Training Design: Paired Weighting." III, 1 (Fall 1984), pp. 20-24.

Beale, Andrew V. "Recruiting Volunteers in Schools: An Inservice Program for School Counselors." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 7-10.

Clarke, Denise W. "Patient Resource Volunteer Program." III, 1 (Fall 1984), pp. 25-33.

Cogan, Elaine and Ben Padrow. "You Cannot Not Communicate." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 33-35.

Cohen, Burton, PhD, and Patricia Patrizi. "Collaborative Networks: Local Foundations Respond to a Changing Environment." III, 2 (Winter 1984-85), pp. 39-42.

Connelly, Tom Jr., EdD. "Physical Fitness for Your Organization: A 'Wellness' Approach to Effectiveness." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 34-38.

Dalsimer, John Paul, CPA, Paul E. Dascher, PhD, and James J. Benjamin, CPA, DBA. "An Aspect of the Accounting Profession's Social Commitment." III, 1 (Fall 1984), pp. 14-19.

Ellis, Susan J. "Daytime Volunteers: An Endangered Species?" III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 30-33.

Franks, Jeanette, MA. "A Program for Sighted, Blind, Low Vision, and Disabled Volunteers." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 45-47.

George, Ida Rush. "Beyond Promises: A Planned Approach for Rural Volunteer Community Development." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 21-29.

Goldman, Marion S. and Dwight Lang. "Volunteer Organizations: The Case of the Daisy Ducks." IV, 1 (Fall 1985), pp. 1-13.

Gora, JoAnn, PhD, and Gloria Nemerowicz, PhD. "Professionalism in a Medical Volunteer Role: Volunteers in Emergency Squad Work." III, 2 (Winter 1984-85), pp. 19-30.

Greer, Jerry D. "Volunteers in Resource Management: A Forest Service Perspective." III, 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 1-10.

Hanson, JoAnn M. and James R. Stone III, PhD. "Community Service Links Corrections to Volunteering." III, 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 11-20.

Harkins, Emily Symington. "Volunteers for LEE'S FRIENDS/ONCOLOGY PATIENTS." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 47-50.

Hellman, Marcia. "Training Design: Becoming a Consultant." III, 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 44-49.

- Henderson, Karla A., PhD. "In Search of Volunteer Management: Ideas for Excellence." IV, 1 (Fall 1985), pp. 38-42.
- Jasso, Gayle. "Behind the Scenes of Security Pacific's Volunteer Programs." IV, 2 (Winter 1985-86), pp. 22-27.
- Jones, Lynn, PhD. "Effective Delegation." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 48-49.
- Kahn, Jeffrey D. "Legal Issues in Volunteerism: Preliminary Survey Results." III, 2 (Winter 1984-85), pp. 31-38.
- _____. "Legal Issues Survey Results." IV, 2 (Winter 1985-86), pp. 28-34.
- Karn, G. Neil. "Addendum to 'Money Talks.'" III, 1 (Fall 1984), pp. 12-13.
- King I, Anthony E. O., PhD, and David F. Gillespie, PhD. "Administrative Lessons from Volunteer Profiles." IV, 1 (Fall 1985), pp. 28-37.
- Lakey, Berit M. "An Exploration of the Fit between Organizations and Leaders/Managers in Times of Transition." IV, 4 (Summer 1986), pp. 27-32.
- Levine, Evelyn and Arlene Grubbs. "Volunteer Recognition: A Generic Skit Workshop." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 23-29.
- Linsley, Ellen, Ruth March, Marion Jeffery, and Richard C. Durkee. "Corporate Community Involvement." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 36-40.
- Marando, Vincent L. "Local Service Delivery: Volunteers and Recreation Councils." IV, 4 (Summer 1986), pp. 16-24.
- McKinney, Wm. Lynn. "Pricing Volunteer Consultants: A Skillsbank Experience." III, 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 23-27.
- Minnesota Office on Volunteer Services. "Equal Access to Volunteer Participation." III, 1 (Fall 1984), pp. 1-6.
- Nesbitt, Barbara M. "Training Design: Leadership Assessment." IV, 2 (Winter 1985-86), p. 35.
- _____. "Training Design: Setting Priorities: A Team Experience." IV, 4 (Summer 1986), pp. 25-26.
- Noyes, Katherine H. "A Proactive Response to Court-Ordered Community Service." IV, 2 (Winter 1985-86), pp. 1-8.
- O'Connell, Brian. "America's Voluntary Spirit." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 16-20.
- Palmer, Darlene and Barbara Nell Stone. "Research in Volunteerism Update." III, 2 (Winter 1984-85) pp. 43-47.
- Peyser, Hedy. "The Resident Action Box: A Record Keeping System for Volunteer Departments." IV, 2 (Winter 1985-86), pp. 18-21.
- Popowski, Karen J. "Youth Views on Volunteering and Service Learning from the Chicago Area Youth Poll." III, 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 34-41.

- Ragatz, Jill L. "Honeywell Corporate Responsibility and Volunteerism." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 41-44.
- Scheier, Ivan H., PhD. "Moving Along: Cases Studies of Career Paths for Volunteer Coordinators." IV, 2 (Winter 1985-86), pp. 9-17.
- _____. "Stop Wasting Training Time! Try the S-t-r-e-t-c-h-e-d Workshop." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 11-14.
- _____. "Volunteers in Neighborhoods." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 2-6.
- Schram, Vicki R., PhD. "Job Skills Developed in Volunteer Work: Transferability to Salaried Employment." III, 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 28-33.
- Schroder, Deborah. "The Care and Feeding of Sprouts . . . Nurturing Your First Job in Volunteer Administration." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 30-32.
- Seguin, Mary M., DSW and Polly F. McConney, MA. "Team Building and Older Volunteers." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 39-46.
- Stringer, Gretchen E., CVAS. "Staff/Volunteer Relationship 'Perceptions.'" III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 7-10.
- Stupak, Ronald J. and Joan L. Warren. "Non-traditional Organizations in the 1980s: The Power and Poverty of Alternative Organizational Systems." IV, 4 (Summer 1986), pp. 1-11.
- Taylor, Kay. "Court-Referred Community Work Volunteers: A Library Case Study." IV, 1 (Fall 1985), pp. 14-27.
- Twinaime-Dungan, Marge and Betty Schnettler. "College Interns: School and Agency Partnership." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 11-22.
- Volunteerism Citation Index.* IV, 1 (Fall 1985), pp. 43-67, and IV, 4 (Summer 1986), pp. 33-37.
- Wilson, Marlene. "Volunteerism in a World Turned Upside Down and Going Round and Round." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 56-62.
- _____. "The Waking of a Giant: Church-Related Volunteerism." III, 1 (Fall 1984), pp. 7-11.
- Wineburg, Robert F., PhD, and Cate Riley Wineburg, MSW. "Localization of Human Services: Using Church Volunteers to Fight the Feminization of Poverty." IV, 3 (Spring 1986), pp. 1-6.
- Wolfe, Lorrie. "Larimer County Senior Citizens Property Tax Workoff Program." III, 2 (Winter 1984-85), pp. 1-12.
- Yarbrough, Elaine, PhD. "Managing Conflict." III, 3 (Spring 1985), pp. 51-55.

The Cumulative Index to Volumes I and II appears in Volume III, Number 1, on pages 37-39.

AVA

CALL FOR PRESENTATIONS

*Ask not what your colleagues can do for you,
but what you can do for your colleagues!*

The AVA Conference Committee is enthusiastically planning and recruiting program ideas for the National Conference on Volunteerism of the Association for Volunteer Administration scheduled for Chicago, October 8-11, 1987. Originality of ideas, vitality of style, "reaching new heights from solid foundations" characterizes the conference goals.

If you feel you have something of value to contribute, we invite you to fill out the session application form and submit it by December 31, 1986.

PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW: All applications will be reviewed by the AVA Conference Committee. Applications must be postmarked by Dec. 31, 1986 (sorry, no extensions). Notification of acceptance will be mailed by March 15, 1987.

CRITERIA: Presentations should be suitable for managers, trainers, educators, researchers, consultants, volunteer administrators, executive directors and leadership volunteers and apply to one of the three tracks: skills, special interests, trends/issues. The review committee is emphasizing *presenter effectiveness*, therefore, references and experience summaries are vital to submit with your application form. A wide range of presentation styles is being sought. Ideas and styles that work, things that have been proven and new perspectives are among the priorities. Please note: Entries must be **typed**.

SUBMIT TO: 1987 NCV
AVA National Office
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, CO 80306

- TRACK 1 SKILLS—REACHING NEW HEIGHTS OF EXCELLENCE**
topics may include: marketing—effective volunteer program administration—communication—supervision/management of volunteers—proposal writing—training the trainers—stress/time management . . .
suggested formats: workshops, role play/participatory, hands-on, lecture, lecture/discussion, case study . . .
- TRACK 2 SPECIAL INTERESTS—A FOCUS ON SPECIAL GROUPS AND SETTINGS**
topics may include: volunteers in: Hospitals/Health Care—Criminal Justice—Youth—Church—Education—VACs—Corporations—Arts—Elderly—Government . . .
suggested formats: symposia, panel, lecture, round tables, model programs, special meetings, workshops . . .
- TRACK 3 TRENDS AND ISSUES—A FRESH LOOK AT ISSUES AND THE CHALLENGES OF VOLUNTEERISM**
topics may include: ethics—partnerships/coalitions—workplace volunteers—professionalism—certification—career paths—women and volunteering—community service—legal and legislative issues—competition . . .
suggested formats: crackerbarrel sessions, lecture with small group debriefings, point/counterpoint, paper presentations, after-session meetings with the presenter . . .

MAKE PLANS NOW TO JOIN AVA IN CHICAGO IN 1987!

AVA National Conference on Volunteerism

OCTOBER 8 thru 11, 1987 Chicago, Illinois

SESSION APPLICATION FORM

***POSTMARK DEADLINE DEC. 31, 1986**

Mail to: 1987 NCV
AVA National Office
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, CO 80306

PLEASE TYPE ALL INFORMATION

applicant name

position/title

organization

()
daytime phone

street address

city, state, zip

ON ATTACHED SHEET:

Please send your biography and list presenter/experience—please include conference name, number in audience, and phone number and name of reference persons.

List other persons involved in presentation with a biography and presenter experience on each.

Fees of \$75 for a single session (1½ hours) and \$150 for a double session (3 hours) will be offered. Are you willing to waive payment of fees? ____Yes ____No

SESSION TITLE: _____

Please check appropriate track:

I SKILLS II SPECIAL INTERESTS III TRENDS AND ISSUES

WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO DO A REPEAT SESSION?

Yes No

FORMAT DESCRIPTION: _____

OBJECTIVES—As a result of this session participants will be better able to:

CONTENT: _____

Level of expertise of audience: Beginning Intermediate
 Advanced

Summary description for program (50 words): _____

What days are you available? Thur. 10/8 Fri. 10/9 Sat. 10/10
 Sun. 10/11

Length of presentation: 1½ hours 3 hours other (specify)

What is the optimum number of participants for this session? _____

What AV equipment or other special needs will this presentation require?

JOIN



Association for
Volunteer
Administration

ANSWERS

- UPDATE—a bi-monthly newsletter
- THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION—a quarterly professional journal
- VOLUNTARY ACTION LEADERSHIP—a quarterly magazine
- NATIONAL ISSUES UPDATE—a quarterly letter

VARIED GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES

- through PARTICIPATION in local and regional cluster groups
- through INTERACTION with other AVA members who are leaders in the field of volunteer administration
- through CONTACT with noted authors, philosophers, trainers, educators, researchers, consultants, volunteer administrators

ACCESS TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

- Annual National Conference on Volunteerism
- Regional Conferences
- Performance-based AVA Certification Program
- AVA Membership Resource Directory

Membership Application

Name _____

Title _____

Organization _____

Address _____

Telephone: Work _____ Home _____

SS# _____

(For I.D. purposes only)

_____ Check enclosed payable to
Association of Volunteer Administration (only
checks payable through U.S. bank accepted)

_____ Charge to my VISA/MASTERCHARGE Card:

VISA Card # _____

MC Card # _____

Interbank # _____

Expiration Date _____

Signature _____

MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES:

_____ **Active**—Dues \$75 Annually
For persons actively involved in the field of
volunteer administration, consultants,
educators and researchers.

_____ **Associate**—Dues \$40 Annually
For retired volunteer administrators and
others interested - but not active - in the
field of volunteer administration.

_____ **Student**—Dues \$40 Annually
For persons preparing for a career in
volunteer administration.

_____ I also want to make a **Tax Deductible
Contribution** to AVA in the amount of \$_____

Complete and Return To:

**The Association for Volunteer Administration
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, Colorado 80306**

Telephone: (303) 497-0238

Membership is not transferable.

Subscription Form

- I would like to join the Association for Volunteer Administration and receive **The Journal** as a benefit of membership. Please send me more information.
- * I would like to subscribe to **The Journal of Volunteer Administration** for one year (four issues) at \$20.
- * I would like to subscribe to **The Journal of Volunteer Administration** for three years (twelve issues) at \$50.

Name _____

Title _____

Organization _____

Address _____

Zip _____

- Check or money order** (payable in \$US) enclosed, made out to: Association for Volunteer Administration. Please note: subscribers outside the United States must add \$3.00 per year for additional postage and handlings costs.
- Charge to my** VISA MasterCard
- Card No. _____
- Expiration Date _____
- Signature _____

Complete and return to: Association for Volunteer Administration
P.O. Box 4584, Boulder, CO 80306 303 497-0238

THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Susan J. Ellis, Energize Associates, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

SENIOR EDITOR

Anne S. Honer, Volunteers in Action, Providence, Rhode Island

SUBSCRIPTION MANAGER

Stephanie Mile, Association for Volunteer Administration, Boulder, Colorado

CITATION EDITOR

Katherine H. Noyes, Virginia Department of Volunteerism, Richmond, Virginia

EDITORIAL REVIEWERS

Cathleen M. Arnoldy, Allen County Public Library, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Judy Burke, Children's Memorial Hospital, Omaha, Nebraska

Wm. Lynn McKinney, The University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island

Laura Otten, Sociology Department, La Salle University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

TRAINING DESIGN EDITOR

Barbara M. Nesbit, Synergy Associates, Lake Wylie, South Carolina

POLICY ADVISORS

Sam H. Baker, Chair, AVA, Public Information Comm., Dept. of Mental Health/Mental Retardation, Austin, Texas

Carol G. Moore, former President, Association for Volunteer Administration, Columbia, South Carolina

Sarah Jane Rehnberg, former President, Association for Volunteer Administration, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania



ASSOCIATION FOR VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Contact the AVA National Office today and join AVA!

Also, mark your calendars in advance for the 1987 National Conference on Volunteerism, October 8-11, 1987 in Chicago. It will be a super event that you won't want to miss.

THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, Colorado 80306

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit No. 236

Susan J. Ellis 1228 C1 10/87
President
ENERGIZE ASSOCIATES
5450 Wissahickon Av. Lobby A
Philadelphia, PA 19144