THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Summer 1987

V:4

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.

Forming a Partnership with Education: Corporate Volunteers and the Volunteer Center

Kimerly Miller

BACKGROUND

According to the authors of A *New Competitive Edge: Volunteers from the Workplace*,[1] American companies rank education as their primary volunteer involvement. The Conference Board, in a 1985 report, cites education as the second most pressing issue of concern (following local economic development) of the business community. In the Northeast, the region in which the project described here was conducted, concern for elementary and secondary education is actually ranked first. It is not surprising then that corporate community affairs representatives should have succeeded in teaming up with a local Board of Education and a Voluntary Action Center to obtain federal money in support of a business-education partnership project.[2]

The Corporate Volunteers of New York (CVNY), in consultation with the Mayor's Voluntary Action Center (MCAV) initiated the concept of the project and created the partnership by recruiting the participation of the New York City Board of Education. Motivation to begin the project stemmed from the experiences of individuals within CVNY member companies who had found that high school interns and job applicants had an unrealistic view of the world of work and were ill-prepared to participate successfully. There was some indication that students' misconceptions were attributable to their teachers' misinformation. A proposal was submitted to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that outlined four project objectives:

1. to provide a training experience for teachers and guidance counselors in the current world of work, especially in areas which offer entry-level employment for high school graduates;
2. to offer corporations and corporate volunteers an opportunity to become directly and personally involved in preparing teachers and their students for the modern work environment;
3. to utilize the resources of the Mayor's Voluntary Action Center, the Corporate Volunteer network and the New York City Board of Education to reach out to high schools in target areas in all five New York City boroughs;
4. to acquaint participating youth with volunteer opportunities that would help them develop employment-related skills.

The proposal was accepted and a grant of $79,963 was awarded to the partnership to conduct a one-year demonstration project. A project director and secretary were hired as full-time employees of the project.

From April through November, 1986, the project succeeded in training nearly 100 high school faculty from seventeen public high schools. The "Orientation to Entry-Level Jobs in Business Settings" was conducted ten times during that period at seven corporate worksites and two New York City government agencies (one company repeated the workshop). During each workshop corporate personnel recruiters spoke to high school faculty about current hiring procedures, managers discussed their departments' employment needs (specific skills and appropriate work attitudes, dress, and

Kimerly Miller is currently the Director of the Corporate Volunteer Involvement Project. Prior to working with the City of New York, she worked in the volunteer field in Minnesota recruiting corporate participation in education and employment for Southeast Asian refugees. She also trained volunteer tutors for English as a Second Language tutoring programs.

speech), and entry-level employees were observed working with the latest in office technology.

PARTNERSHIP COMPONENTS

The project was conceived as a joint activity of the thirty-four-member CVNY in collaboration with the New York City Board of Education and the Mayor's Voluntary Action Center. This provided the project director with two ready-made constituencies from which to recruit participants—a network of corporations to host teacher workshops and an urban school system composed of 111 high schools. Inherent in such a collaboration was the assumption that both constituencies had agreed to devote themselves to the successful implementation of the project within the one-year timeframe, but it was an assumption that had to be clarified and reinforced as the project proceeded.

The school system, and specifically the Office of Career and Occupational Education, was anxious to expand its network of linkages with business and industry as part of its responsibilities to provide career orientation and preparation to New York City high school students. The Office was also charged with the provision of staff development opportunities especially in those areas related to innovative career and occupational practices. Since New York is a city with a fast-growing service industry (New York Times, 12/4/86), and with an equally fast-growing mismatch of entry-level jobs to high school graduate job candidates, the Office of Career and Occupational Education seized upon any opportunity to contribute to the closing of the gap.

Early on in the project, the Office identified ten high schools in target areas that it felt could benefit from exposure to the business world. The office notified the principals of each of the schools that they had been selected to participate in the project and requested that eight faculty be chosen from pre-determined subject areas to be released for an on-site corporate visit. Most principals endorsed the project and moved immediately to appoint faculty representatives.

The corporations, on the other hand, were not able to act in such a united fashion primarily because, as independent businesses, each had its own community affairs agenda. Some ranked education as an issue of primary concern, especially if they were closely linked to the local community as in the case of banks or the telephone company. Others did not consider local educational concerns to be of great importance. Consequently, although CVNY served as the "corporate" body which was co-sponsoring the project, it could not function in the role of centralized power of authority and responsibility in the same way the Board of Education's Office of Career and Occupational Education could. The CVNY executive committee could recommend and encourage corporate involvement in the project but had no prerogative to mandate participation.

The role of the Voluntary Action Center was to house the project director and any other project staff, serve as a conduit for the federal funds, provide back-up support (both human and technical), and assure the inclusion of a component on student volunteerism in the project plan.

INITIAL STEPS

Within the first month of the project the Board of Education identified the participating schools which in turn selected appropriate faculty for worksite visits and Advisory Council representation. However, another two months passed before commitments were received from any of the CVNY's member companies. During that time, the project director made presentations at CVNY's monthly meetings, sent mailings to all CVNY members, and followed the mailings with phone calls.

Several companies expressed interest in the goals of the project, but were still reluctant to step forward. This reluctance may have stemmed from a lack of understanding concerning the roles and responsibilities of the corporate hosts. Although the goals of the project were clear—to provide a training experience for educators, to offer corporations a chance to have an impact on career preparation, and to acquaint students with volunteer opportunities—by what means the goals were to be achieved was still undecided. Questions concerning specifics remained unanswered: how long would the teachers' visit be, how many

would come, which school(s) would they come from, what would be the topics of discussion, who would speak to the teachers?

In order to help corporate hosts visualize their roles and responsibilities, the project director drafted Guidelines for Hosting (see Appendix) which identified the workshop audience, outlined its objectives, described the setting, and suggested a schedule for the day. The guidelines also recommended various resources that were available to the corporate host including films and videos, in-house human resources, and speakers from MVAC.

At the same time the guidelines were distributed, a letter was also sent to solicit commitments. The letter included a series of deadlines that were meant to assist corporations in planning their workshop. The first deadline was to obtain approval from a supervisor to proceed with the project. Subsequent deadlines instructed corporate hosts to identify employees who could participate in the workshop, schedule a date for the workshop, make logistical arrangements, finalize activities, conduct the workshop, and participate in follow-up and evaluation.

Once the specifics were laid out and corporate hosts had an outline they could follow and adapt to their particular situation, it became easier for them to visualize its implementation. By the end of February (four months after the project was begun), three of the CVNY members had agreed to hold a workshop. They each set a date for late April which gave them enough time to plan but which did not consign the workshop to the final busy weeks of the school term. The project director oversaw the development of each workshop can plan exercising a kind of "quality control" to make sure that each included the essentials that had been identified by corporate and school personnel.

The three companies conducted their workshops in the spring and were prepared by early summer to share their experiences with their colleagues. During a June meeting, they presented their planning and implementation strategies to other CVNY members and several invited guests. That same day six companies and two city agencies agreed to hold fall workshops. Ultimately five companies executed their plans. One company was subject to a strike and was unable to implement a workshop.

DEPARTURE FROM ORIGINAL PROPOSAL

At this point, it is important to note that all corporate interest focussed on workshops for high school faculty even though the proposal had made provision for visits by students. The CVNY/MVAC team that had written the proposal had envisioned a one-to-one career shadowing experience for selected students. Each of the eight teachers invited to the workshops would choose up to five students who would be paired with corporate mentors. In other words, the corporations would have to find 400 employees who could take the better part of a day to show a young student around the company.

The corporations objected to the student visits because the number of young people who would need to be accommodated for a day, possibly as many as forty per corporate worksite, was potentially disruptive to the work environment. They were quite sure, in some cases, they they could not garner support for such an activity.

It was, thus, agreed that the project would concentrate on providing a professional development experience for teachers and guidance counselors. This focus was never a result of a clear-cut decision to choose teacher visits over student visits. Rather, it seemed to develop as a result of concerns voiced by the corporations about the student visits and their subsequent embrace of the teacher visits as the component they could execute successfully. In reality, two corporations did follow up teacher visits by inviting back several teachers with a handful of students. The student visit then took on the shape of the original teacher visit rather than the individual career shadowing originally proposed.

Although it appeared as though the student component had been practically eliminated from the project, it had, in reality, only been altered. Students did not go in great numbers to company worksites

but over 500 of them heard about career preparation as a result of their teachers' participation.

Each workshop included a half-hour presentation by MVAC's Coordinator of Recruitment and Training whose special assignment is student volunteerism. Her presentation centered on the benefits of volunteering, most notably: career exploration, skill development, acquaintance with potential job references, and entrance into a network of possible job opportunities. Many teachers and guidance counselors felt their students, coming from economically depressed areas of the city, had to have paying jobs which would limit their interest in and acceptance of volunteer work. Nevertheless, a few saw the importance of a volunteer assignment and invited the MVAC Coordinator to speak to their classes.

One very enthusiastic business education teacher enlisted the support of her assistant principal who in turn went to the Parents' Association to inform parents of this opportunity for their children to get work experience. Another arranged for her class to be interviewed for volunteer jobs in a city agency which gave them all the interview experience. MVAC has reported an increase in requests and job placements from students from the high schools the coordinator visited.

Once the first three corporations had decided to conduct a teacher workshop, work began on the logistics. Each of the three, McGraw-Hill, Honeywell, and IBM, agreed to host teachers from one or several of the schools that had been selected by the Board of Education, but each was also interested in involving teachers from schools with which they already had a working relationship. McGraw-Hill and IBM had adopted schools that were not on the Board of Education list and invited teachers from those schools. Honeywell had a well-developed job training program for students and wanted to include several teachers of the students with whom they were working.

Initially, including teachers from schools other than those selected by the Board of Education posed a budgetary problem for the project director. The grant had allocated approximately 15% of its budget to reimburse the schools for substitutes who would be hired to cover the classes of those teachers released to attend the corporate workshops. Without knowing how extensively this reimbursement money would be requested by the schools, the director was reluctant to overcommit the funds by including schools that were not part of the Board of Education selection. In this initial phase, the corporations agreed to cover the expenses of the schools they invited.

As it turned out, the demand for reimbursement was not heavy. When guidance counselors, assistant principals, or program coordinators were included in the group that made the corporate visit, requests for substitute reimbursements were minimal. Guidance counselors have no classes to be covered and other personnel may have only one or two classes. In addition, some schools simply did not take advantage of the reimbursement offer, for reasons unknown at this time to the project director. Later in the project, the director was able to offer reimbursement to any schools invited to participate.

The schools themselves had some problems with the project as originally conceived. Eight educators were to be selected from each of ten schools (two from guidance, two from special education, etc.) and invited to attend a corporate workshop. In only one instance was a principal able to release eight faculty members on one day. One principal, in fact, did not want to release anyone on a school day. He preferred that faculty participate in any outside staff development activity on their own time which would have restricted the workshops to holiday periods. Following consultation with the Office of Career and Occupational Education, he agreed to release teachers on school days provided only two were released at a time.

Most schools agreed to between two and four faculty to be released on any given day. This meant that the original plan to match one school with one corporation had to be revised (except in the case of the Equitable Life Assurance Company which had adopted a school in Queens; the principal there agreed to release all eight participants on the same day). The director made every effort to match corporations with schools in which

they had an interest and then added faculty from additional schools. This resulted in a mix of from two to five schools represented at each corporate workshop. Ultimately, this mixture worked to the advantage of the project since faculty from different schools were able to share experiences across the boroughs.

PLANNING THE WORKSHOPS

As mentioned earlier, momentum for the project accelerated once the first three corporations had successfully conducted their teacher workshops in April, 1986. Their experiences provided proof that the workshop could be planned and implemented with very little effort. The work involved recruiting presenters from other departments or divisions since the coordinators of the workshops found that they needed people from personnel to explain application, interviewing, and hiring procedures; trainers to share techniques they used in training entry-level employees; or line managers to discuss their specific departmental needs.

Coordinators also found that it was beneficial for faculty to speak with high school work-study students, employees who were recently hired out of high school, or employees who had started in entry-level positions and had been promoted several times. All of this required some investigatory work on the part of the coordinators and in some cases asking favors of people outside their own departments. However, most agreed that it was not as much work as they had anticipated and frequently resulted in more open communication between departments and in unexpected discoveries, such as the realization that the personnel department regularly conducted on-site tours and was prepared with a great deal of information and answers to questions.

Assisting the second group of workshop hosts, five corporations and two New York City government agencies, to plan their day's activities was subsequently a much easier task. The experience of the first three companies served to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the corporate host coordinators and the project director, to verify the usefulness (with a few alterations) of the workshop guidelines,

and to obtain preliminary feed-back from faculty participants.

EVALUATION

Plans for a final evaluation of the project took shape early in the fall of 1986 as the second round of workshops commenced. A formal evaluation was seen as important primarily for purposes of refunding, and so an outside evaluation team, the Academy for Educational Development, was hired to design and implement an evaluation plan. Funds for an evaluation had not been initially included in the budget proposal, but were available under the line which had been allocated for substitute teacher reimbursement. It was decided that hiring an experienced reputable evaluation team was a legitimate use of some of the remaining funds.

As it turned out, the decision to use an external evaluation team proved sound. Following participation in one of the fall workshops, the team developed two questionnaires which were distributed among corporate hosts and school participants, respectively. The questionnaires elicited information about the usefulness of the workshops to all involved, the potential for further business/school cooperation, the transferability of learning from worksite to classroom, and the attitude changes that may have occurred as a result of the interaction between business people and educators. Responses to the questionnaires were collected by representatives in each corporation and school and discussed at a day-long evaluation session attended by the representatives and conducted by the evaluation team.

The result was a report submitted by the evaluation team at the end of the project which summarized the discussions at the evaluation session, synthesized discussion summaries with information collected from the questionnaires, and made recommendations for continuing the project. As hoped, the evaluation report was an impartial assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project as it had been piloted. Fortunately, its recommendations coincided with many of the unsubstantiated beliefs that the par-

ticipants had developed over the months about the validity of this type of staff development activity. The report could thus be used to promote the project's continuance in specific ways that the participants themselves deemed necessary, beneficial, and workable.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REPLICATION

The experiences of the participants during the demonstration phase of the Corporate Volunteer Involvement Project suggest several features which may contribute to successful replication of the model:

1. Enlist participation of both corporate hosts and visiting teachers with the aid of a model plan, preferably in writing. The plan should include as many specifics as possible so that participants know from the start what they are expected to do and what they can expect to gain from participation.

2. Appoint contact people in both company and school who will serve as liaisons to superiors (department directors, principals), take on the responsibility of seeing that peers are prepared for the workshop, and be available following the workshop for evaluation activities and other follow-up that develops.

3. Budget for reimbursement of substitutes realizing that some schools will not need full reimbursement. Funds may later be directed to follow-up activities that stretch the life of the program.

4. Enlist the support of a good external evaluation team which can objectively assess workshop outcomes and lend credibility to your claims of success.

5. If a whole school system is involved rather than one single high school, see that a project director is hired to coordinate workshop schedules, recruit business participation, work with the evaluation team, assist with program development, and work on

promotion of the project within the community.

_____
FOOTNOTES
[1]Vissa, C., K. Allen, and S. Keller. A *New Competitive Edge: Volunteers From The Workplace*. Arlington, VA: Volunteer: The National Center, 1986, p. 186.
[2]The project described in this article is the recipient of a 1987 President's Volunteer Action Award Citation.

Appendix
Guidelines for Hosting

Orientation to Entry-Level Jobs in Business Settings

AUDIENCE

High school faculty—guidance counselors, teachers of business subjects, coordinators of bilingual, special education, and cooperative work programs—10-15 in a group.

OBJECTIVES

1) to expose high school faculty to current business practices especially related to the entry-level jobs their students will be seeking;

2) to initiate a dialogue between the corporate sector and high school personnel;

3) to introduce high school personnel to volunteer opportunities for students that will enable them to explore career choices and develop job skills.

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

One day-long session.

SETTING

Business worksite—conference room for presentations and discussions, whole site available for observation.

Suggested Plan

9:00   Welcome and introductions.

9:20   Presentation by personnel recruiter of qualifications required for entry-level positions; application and interview procedures; current salaries and fringe benefits; opportunities for promotion; most common problems with poorly prepared applicants; and trends affecting future entry-level positions (computerization, sex equity).

10:20   Break.

10:30   Office skills trainer shares methods of training office personnel or panel of managers from different departments discusses specific entry-level employment needs.

11:30   Discussion of student volunteerism. Invite speaker from the Mayor's Voluntary Action Center.

12:00   Screening of films/videos produced for youth employment training (see Resources).

12:30   Lunch with management.

1:30   Tour of facility concentrating on areas where entry-level positions may be clustered. Discuss company policy regarding tardiness and absenteeism. Note standards of dress, manner, and speech at various stations. Introduce teachers to equipment the entry-level positions may use (word processors, duplicators, etc.). If possible, ask 2 or 3 people at various stations to discuss own background from high school graduation to present position.

2:30   Open discussion: evaluation of day's program, optional second session at corporate site or at school, application to classroom, follow-up contact between school and corporation, etc.

3:30   End.

RESOURCES

In-house: personnel department, trainers, training films, volunteers, entry-level employees with good presentation skills.

Mayor's Voluntary Action Center, (212) 566-5956
Project Director, Kimerly Miller, will assist with design of program and speak about volunteer experience as work experience.
Coordinator of Recruitment and Training, Elyse Weisberg, will speak about student volunteer experience as work experience.

The Black Filmmaker Distribution Service, P.O. Box 315, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417, (201) 891-8240, Get A Job film or video.

Metropolitan Life, Bruce Lentini, (212) 578-3737, or Time, Inc., Taiga Ermansons, (212) 484-1453 for a copy of the Working video.

Creative Arts Team, Lynda Zimmerman, Executive Director, (212) 598-2360, for Youth Employment Video Series.

Local Human Service Development: Institutional Utilization of Volunteers to Solve Community Problems

Cate Riley Wineburg and

Robert J. Wineburg

INTRODUCTION

Human service development in the United States is in the midst of dramatic changes. Communities nationwide are becoming more responsible for solving pressing problems. They have to do this with less money in part because spending cutbacks in federal domestic programs have reached the $30 billion mark during the past several years. Communities are witnessing widespread hunger, homelessness, deinstitutionalization of patients from mental hospitals, increasing rates of single parents, high unemployment among minority youth, overcrowded jails, and high rates of single head-of-household women in poverty. Just when communities seem to require wisdom, guidance, and money from government to handle these problems, dominant political thought says that such guidance can be found at local churches, civic organizations, schools, businesses and human service agencies.

The scope and closeness of the problems will compel community members to design programs that enable them to use resources efficiently, effectively, and differently. Beyond money, there is little question that volunteers can be the most important resource used to solve, manage, cope with, and prevent the host of social problems facing communities.

The central question to be answered by those responsible for human service development in their communities is: how can they design systems that will be resilient, enterprising, and capable of meeting future challenges successfully? There have been no major studies to date that answer that question completely. There is, however, a small but growing amount of literature. For example, Wineburg, et.al. (1983), Wineburg (1984, 1985), and Wineburg (1986) show how Greensboro, North Carolina's human service system has managed different aspects of local service development. Demone and Gibelman (1984) talked about how agencies in a number of communities were managing cutbacks. Salamon and Tietelbaum (1984), Doll (1984), and McDonald (1984) looked at new roles churches were playing in local human service development nationally and in specific cities like Cleveland and Denver. Emery and Mamerow (1986) pointed to Dayton's progress in arranging cooperative service planning among public and private agencies.

It was noted explicitly in many articles and implied in others that volunteers were the mainstays of emerging programs, and that a spirit of voluntary cooperation was the rule rather than the exception. It appears that there is some movement nationwide in the direction of increased use of volunteers to manage social problems at the community level. The major question for researchers and

Cate Riley Wineburg is director of Project Independence of Greensboro Urban Ministry. She has volunteered in many social programs at both the administrative and direct service level, including serving on the Youth Council Board in Greensboro. Robert J. Wineburg teaches Social Welfare Policy in the Social Work Department at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. He has been an active volunteer who most recently has worked to develop a community organization called the Human Services Institute, designed to stimulate voluntary cooperation and coordination among human service agency executives. The Wineburgs contributed equally to this work.

human service planners alike is in what ways will volunteers be used to insure the building of resilient, enterprising, and effective human service systems?

In the Winter 1985-86 edition of *The Journal of Volunteer Administration*, in an article titled "Localization of Human Services: Using Volunteers to Fight Feminization of Poverty," we presented a case study of Project Independence of Greensboro, North Carolina's Urban Ministry. We noted that the strength of the program was in its almost exclusive use of local church volunteers to help women and their families get off and stay off welfare. It was emphasized that volunteers helped prevent further dependency by providing women with concrete resources such as funds for day care, job leads, or help with transportation. We also reported how volunteers provided a source of encouragement and hope when all other support systems were exhausted.

The idea of collaborative relationships between paid professional staff and volunteers was examined. We noted that this was uncharted territory and felt then, as now, that volunteers will do more and more direct service work and will be guided by professional staff. In the previous article, it was noted that churches in Greensboro made commitments to use volunteers from their congregations to help in the project. That was seen as an institutional commitment to volunteer use. We claimed in that piece that Project Independence, while only a model program, had elements of new and creative approaches to involving volunteers. And finally, we claimed that pairing of professional human service workers and church volunteers will set the tone for other volunteer programs with similar objectives.

In this article, we will:
1. give an update of Project Independence;
2. examine the difficulties and highlight the successes of volunteer involvement in solving a community social problem;
3. offer specific training guidelines for incorporating volunteers into direct service and advocacy capacities; and
4. make some broad recommendations, based on what we are learning

from our model program, about the role of volunteers in shaping local human service systems development.

PROJECT INDEPENDENCE UPDATE

Two years ago, Project Independence had twenty-five volunteers from ten churches helping ten families. Project Independence has placed six of those ten women in new jobs. Two have gone back to school or into a training program, and two have not progressed. The project now has fourteen families and a total of sixty volunteers from local churches and from the Junior League of Greensboro.

The Junior League still funds the day care component. A stipulation of that grant is that League members must be able to volunteer in the program. As such, Junior League members have enthusiastically helped publicize and evaluate the program. A couple of League members have been helpful in encouraging their churches to participate in the project.

Project Independence, at the last writing, was still an experimental project of Greensboro Urban Ministry. It is now an official agency program. The paid program director is now on par administratively with the five other paid program directors of Emergency Services, Food Bank, Night Shelter, Temporary Housing, and Volunteers. On a deeper level, however, it means that Urban Ministry, which could not help the needy without volunteer support, has made a commitment to *prevent* dependency. Thus, Greensboro Urban Ministry has committed itself to leading the community in the institutional involvement of volunteers to prevent dependency. While only a small step, it must be seen in the context of the use of all community resources to prevent the growth of social problems locally.

FUNDING

Since the last writing, the program has received three substantial grants. The first was a grant from the National Office of United Methodist Women which allowed the program director to employ an assistant director on a half-time basis. The second grant, from a regional Campaign for Human Development, set up a revolving loan fund to help clients out of a

pinch on a short-term basis. The third grant, as cited earlier, was from the Junior League of Greensboro for day care funds to provide scholarships for children of the clients. Quite often, women cannot return to work because the cost of day care is prohibitive.

Each grant is essential in and of itself. The first has allowed the program to expand without overloading its capacity to work with volunteers effectively. The second provides short-term cash assistance to help the client in a pinch, get car insurance or a new outfit for an interview. And the third grant eliminates the frustration of having to go back on welfare because day care costs are prohibitive.

Description of the Volunteers

Eighty percent of the volunteers are women, most of whom are in their mid-thirities. Many are employed. There are ten churches in the program, six of which have mainly white congregations while one congregation is integrated. Three congregations have primarily black members. There are two Catholic parishes and eight Protestant churches participating. Members of nine of the ten churches are what might be termed "middle class" while members of one black church are what might be called "working class."

The program is evaluated yearly by the Junior League and by the program director of Project Independence. Program participants and program volunteers are asked to fill out evaluation forms. The program participants are also interviewed to determine their level of satisfaction with the program. The following information has been attained from program evaluation forms and personal interviews. By far, the majority of the volunteers reported on their evaluation forms that their major reasons for being involved was to live out their beliefs of helping their neighbor. They also felt that helping the less fortunate was a way to express gratitude for their own good fortune. The program seemed to meet the spiritual needs of those volunteers questioned.

DIFFICULTIES AND BRIGHT SPOTS
Volunteers' Views

A good number of the volunteers found it difficult initially to communicate and build trusting mutual relationships with their clients, who were often from a different racial background and, more often than not, from a lower class background. Consequently, volunteers initially felt discouraged that their honest intentions were not received with the same enthusiasm as they were put forth.

Another problem expressed by the volunteers was an inability to clarify the difference in goals between their clients and themselves. One might envision a white college-educated volunteer entering the home of a black single parent who may or may not have completed high school. The white volunteer, armed with several prescriptions on how to change this woman's circumstances, proceeds to outline the quick way out. The client's concerns, on the other hand, might be a new place to live or permanent transportation to a job, and not satisfying the volunteer's need to help his or her neighbor. Thus, differing expectations between client and volunteer formed another source of difficulty.

The volunteers also reported that another weakness on their part was the tendency to be too judgmental about the lifestyles of their clients. They began to realize that imposing their values and ways of doing things on people who see the world differently from them was not a workable way to help those in need. By becoming aware of this, they began to lose the romanticism about helping the poor and began to see poverty lifestyles as complicated and difficult to manage.

In this vein, the program has helped volunteers "see" the poverty in Greensboro realistically. When faced with the grim realities that face their clients, volunteers separate fiction from truth. Such truths lie in the facts that women want to work but are mired in complicated circumstances, each of which must be dealt with before they can obtain and keep a job. Volunteers see that the will to work relates to adequate housing, affordable day care, appropriate training, and dependable transportation. The exposure to the realities of poverty enables them to create a new awareness in their churches. And, of course, this awareness multiplies throughout the community as the churches become involved. As such,

a new truth and new ways to solve problems get rooted in community institutions and form the basis for new ways of doing things.

Clients' Views

The single most important aspect of the program reported by the clients was the positive relationship developed with the church volunteer. While initially there might have been some mistrust, those sentiments grew into positve feelings about the church contact person. Clients reported difficulties in obtaining concrete resources like housing or transportation, but they also noted that volunteers were helpful gaining resources. As a result of the volunteer support, clients were able to become more confident and independent in their pursuits. The personal contact is the central part of the program. And, what makes it so effective, according to clients, is that there is support after 5:00 p.m. and on weekends as well, something usually not offered by larger bureaucratic operations. For the clients, it is the personal touch, that *human* quality of the program, that is seen as important.

Director's Views

From the view of the professional human service worker, the difficulty in solving the dependency problem of poor women via volunteers has been finding and keeping a balance between the volunteers' tremendous desire and enthusiasm to help and the tedious, time consuming, and frustrating problems of helping a poor family negotiate the local community social service system. For example, a client who may live in deplorable housing would like to live in public housing. A volunteer moves quickly to assist, only to find a three year waiting list to get into public housing. If the family that a church sponsors gets a food stamp reduction, either because of a worker's oversight or client reporting error, volunteers get frustrated at hearing "nothing can be done until next month."

Volunteers also get frustrated because they do not understand why the "welfare bureaucracy is like it is." They get angry with themselves because they cannot fulfill successfully their need to help, and they become leery of their client who has

long ago lost the vigor to fight three year waiting lists and repetitious "nothing 'til next month" excuses.

They come to realize that the world of the poor resembles the world one envisions in communist countries—people waiting in long lines for commodities that a bumbling bureaucracy fails to deliver efficiently. Only in this case, the wait is three years for a decent house or a month for some food. This country delivers goods very efficiently to those who can afford to pay. For those who cannot pay, life is grim. Helping them becomes a game of help them maintain an inadequate living standard for fear that slippage will drive them down further.

Thus, much of the volunteers' work involves maintenance. Moving someone out of poverty is not easy unless there is an abundance of money—which there never is. Sponsorship is for eighteen months and the volunteer moves with the client very slowly from the constraining stages to independence. For the director, this means constant assurance to volunteers that things will progress. It means helping volunteers learn how to do short-term crisis counseling. It requires teaching volunteers how to work the welfare system on behalf of their client. It requires that the director teach the church volunteers that success in helping one's neighbor requires both the desire to help and the patience to wait for change. Accomplishing these objectives with an increasing number of volunteers has been difficult. The director often feels burned-out from overseeing a sizeable number of clients and volunteers.

TRAINING NEEDS

Training of volunteers for programs like Project Independence is essential. It would be wise for professional service organizations to see volunteer involvement in an institutional capacity as a trend which will grow. Training needs will also grow and therefore emphasis should be placed on developing self-perpetuating volunteer training programs. In the case of Project Independence, this means that eventually participating congregations will have people in their own ranks able to train new volunteers. This approach is efficient, economical, and frees profes-

sional staff for other necessary work.

Volunteers need to learn about poverty and the complicated welfare system with which poor people deal regularly. In essence, professional social agencies will have to develop ongoing volunteer training sessions. Such sessions might include lectures, small group discussions, reading lists and fact sheets about the demographics of poverty in the community, so that volunteers can put their work with their clients into a broader context. Institutions like churches should build library collections on the topics related to poverty.

Informational training should be balanced with a different kind of skill development. Regardless of the issue on which a community group works, volunteers will need both interviewing skills and short-term crisis counseling ability. Volunteers who advocate for the poor, mentally ill, homeless or others will need skill training in mobilizing community resources. This means that they will have to know about the different agencies and their services. It also means knowing how to work with the different cultures, values, and statutes to which community agencies adhere.

Training should also allow for networking. In other words, volunteers from one church or organization should meet with other volunteers to compare notes.

Agencies that develop training for volunteers working to prevent further dependency in their communities, as in the case of Project Independence, must train cautiously. Volunteers are energetic, enthusiastic, and eager to solve the problems facing their clients. It is essential that training channels that energy into knowledge and skills that can lead to helping the client succeed. All too often energetic idealism is replaced by unhealthy cynicism all because a volunteer does not know the system or does not know how to work with a client in crisis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As problems facing communities continue to grow, community members will examine new ways of attacking those difficulties. It has been noted that volunteers will be recruited increasingly to solve, manage, and prevent problems.

Volunteers ought to be put to work in ways that use their talents best. If communities move toward increased involvement of volunteers to provide direct, advocacy, and support services in ways similar to Project Independence, planners would be wise to create an infrastructure of financial and supervisory support to avoid inefficient efforts by volunteers.

To date, Project Independence has grown considerably and has been successful in helping families off welfare through the work of church volunteers. The program has gained needed financial and community support for its efforts. One thing learned from Project Independence is that recruiting volunteers on behalf of their churches is an effective and efficient volunteer program model. We envision churches, businesses, schools, and civic organizations making commitments to solve community problems, via their members or employees.

Organizations should accept such commitments only when they have planned and trained for the effective involvement of such volunteers. In this vein, we see professional human service employees moving away from direct service. We see them training volunteers for such direct service roles as crisis counselors, advocates, or friendly visitors. In effect, human service workers will spend more time planning programs around volunteer training, fund raising, recruitment, public education, and supervision.

It should be noted that there may be some danger assigning volunteers to the role of human service "assistant" because, as found in our experience, many come from the middle class ranks and may very well be highly educated and skilled in their own fields. Given the enthusiasm witnessed among the volunteers in Project Independence, it would be troublesome if it were diminished by pulling the spiritual plug and labeling their efforts as human service "assistance."

Nevertheless, the knowledge and skills for such roles, as noted previously, are essential for successful work in solving community problems. Therefore, we recommend that planning for volunteer training be the first item on an agency's planning grid. Most importantly, we believe that agency personnel should

develop ongoing ways to receive program suggestions from volunteers. This does not mean that all suggestions should be implemented. It means that volunteers can have a say in the way they solve community problems.

In Greensboro, churches have supported this idea enthusiastically and have increased their financial support for Project Independence. Church influence has been effective in moving the Greensboro Human Relations Commission to look into poverty as a city human relations issue. Two Commission members are ministers who have been affiliated with Project Independence. We expect more community effort at solving other related problems because citizens are broadening their involvement in community service by the way of the churches.

CONCLUSION

Project Independence of Greensboro, North Carolina's Urban Ministry is a program that involves volunteers in a way that more and more communities nationwide will follow. Volunteers are involved as part of an organizational (church) effort to solve and prevent social problems locally. Our findings indicate that more people will volunteer on behalf of their church or civic organization in solving problems locally if the program is managed carefully.

We see changing roles for both volunteers and professional human service workers. It is felt that the volunteers will become more skilled as crisis counselors, advocates, and friends of the poor. There is a good chance that the human service worker will become a social planner and volunteer supervisor. The ripple effect of middle class exposure to the poor and the poverty situation will have a positive influence on the funding of social programs such as day care, transportation, and housing. Once the complexity of poverty is understood, people will influence the design of programs to attack the complex difficulties faced by the poor.

We recognize that programs like Project Independence cannot replace large scale national entitlement programs. But we do believe that if the spirit of federal domestic spending cutbacks prevails, volunteer programs like Project Independence will be one source of back-up and support to allow a community to pick up where the federal government leaves off. Much work needs to be done to bring together the church and other organizational volunteers, the poor and welfare workers. That work will need to be done if communities expect to solve and prevent problems efficiently, effectively and with wisdom.

REFERENCES

Demone, D. and M. Gibelman. "Reaganomics: Its Impact on the Voluntary Not-For-Profit Sector." *Social Work*, 1984, 5, 421-427.

Doll, W. "Cooperation in Cleveland." *Foundation News*, 1984, 5, 66-70.

Emery, K. and D. Mamerow. "Making Services Integration Work at the Local Level: The Partnership in Dayton, Ohio." *New England Journal of Human Services*, VI 2, 1986, 12-14.

McDonald, J. "Survey Finds Religious Groups Strongly Favor More Collaboration." *Foundation News*, 1984, 5, 20-24.

Salamon, L. and F. Tietelbaum. "Religious Congregations as Social Service Agencies: How Extensive Are They?" *Foundation News*, 1984, 5, B2-G4.

Wineburg, R., P. Spakes, and J. Finn. "Budget Cuts and Human Services: One Community's Experience." *Social Casework*, 1983, 64, 8, 489-96.

Wineburg, R. "The Future of Human Services: Pulling Together or Tearing Apart." *Public Welfare*, 1984, 3, 26-31.

Wineburg, R. "Pulling Together." *Public Welfare*, 1985, 43, 4, 37-40.

Wineburg, R. and C. Wineburg. "Localization of Human Services: Using Church Volunteers to Fight the Feminization of Poverty." *Journal of Volunteer Administration*, IV, 3, 1986.

Lay Leader Participation in Extension Work in the Philippines

Blanda R. Sumayao and Edward W. Gassie

As in any developing nation, agricultural Extension in the Philippines is constrained by a number of factors, among them the unfavorable Extension agent-client ratio. This situation makes difficult frequent personal contact between Extension agents and their clientele. Concern for Filipino farmers' low Extension exposure exists because of its imminent consequences on the rural farm population. As observed in most of the developing countries, the rural farm population is not benefiting much from the technology that scientists have at their disposal (Admed and Coombs, 1975).

However, one strategy has been employed whereby small farmers, especially the most disadvantaged ones, could be reached by and reap the benefits from the Extension Service. What is referred to is the use of volunteer local lay leaders (LLs) as responsible representatives of the Service. It has long been strongly felt that in using LLs, the Extension Agency could be certain that there are known and respected persons in every community who serve as its ambassadors vouching for the unfamiliar and perhaps threatening teachings of the Extension agent (Brunner and Yang, 1949). By trying new techniques for themselves, the local leaders can thus demonstrate the validity of the techniques under local conditions. They can, therefore, multiply many-fold the efforts of the professional worker. Moreover, developing the leadership potential of people leads to more self-reliant and independent communities in which people can solve their own problems.

In the Philippines, very little is known about the participatory nature of lay leaders in Extension work. Questions such as how are the lay leaders involved in the development efforts of the country, what is their participation, and how much participation do they have, are given little focus, if any at all. Therefore, a study was conducted in two selected provinces in the Island of Luzan, the Philippines, in an attempt to answer some of the questions raised. Among the objectives of the study were the following:

1. To determine the LLs' perceptions of the nature and level of LL participation in planning, implementation, and evaluation of local Extension projects and activities.

2. To determine the appropriateness of LL participation in planning, implementation, and evaluation of local Extension projects and activities.

This article will draw some of the findings of the study.

PROCEDURE

The broader framework formulated by Uphoff, Cohen, and Goldsmith (1979) provided a useful basis for developing the model for systematically examining lay leader participation in Extension work in the Philippines. According to them, a development participation framework should distinguish between dimensions and contexts of participation.

The dimensions of participation on which they focus answer the questions *what*, *who*, and *how* of participation. The

Blanda R. Sumayao is Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education at the University of the Philippines at Los Banos. She specializes in Extension Education. At the time of this study, Ms. Sumayao was on study leave, working on an Ed.D. in the Department of Extension Education at Louisiana State University. *Edward W. Gassie* is Professor of Extension Education at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, and has been involved in graduate education since 1964, directing theses and dissertation research in areas of leadership and leadership development.

TABLE I

**LLs' Participation in Planning Activities and Appropriateness
of LL Participation in These Activities as Perceived by the LLs**

Activities	Percent Participated[a] (N = 107)	Percent Responding Appropriate[b] (N = 107)
Identifying needs and problems of the barangay	46	97
Formulating objectives for the project/activity planned	44	86
Studying and analyzing the barangay situation	33	81
Holding community forums to solicit clientele approval of and cooperation in implementation of activity planned	27	88
Furnishing information about the barangay	27	96
Holding of community consultations and dialogues to formulate a comprehensive plan for the barangay	25	89
Getting priorities among project/activity objectives	23	89
Assessing community resources required by each project/activity objective	21	70

[a]Percentages not reported are for those with no participation.
[b]Percentages not reported are for those who viewed participation in the activities as not appropriate or were undecided.

TABLE II

LLs by Planning Participation Index Scores

	PPIS*	Percent (N = 107)	PPIS*	Percent (N = 107)		PPIS*	Percent (N = 107)
Lo	0	39.3	8	4.7		15	1.9
			9	0.9		17	0.9
	1	1.9	10	2.8		18	0.9
	2	4.7	11	3.7		20	0.9
	3	2.8	12	1.9	Hi	21	11.0
	4	6.5	13	0.9			
	5	3.7	14	1.9		Mean =	6.12
	6	1.9				S.D. =	7.17
	7	6.5					

*Planning Participation Index Score

what dimension has four major concerns: participation in decision making, implementation, benefits, and evaluation. To answer the *who* question, Uphoff and Associates suggest distinguishing between four types of participants in the entire rural community whose characteristics warranted specific attention. These are the local residents, local leaders, government personnel, and foreign personnel. The *how* dimension generates insights into such questions as to why participation takes place, continues, declines, or has the particular pattern it does.

The focus of the study being reported was on the *what* dimension of participation, i.e., participation in planning, implementation, and evaluation. Subjects for the study were the LLs working for the Extension Service in two selected provinces in the Island of Luzon, Philippines.

These LLs, who totalled 107, provided the basic information for this study. They were selected following nonprobabilistic sampling procedures. This was because of the difficulty in defining the population and the seeming reluctance of some Extension agents to identify their leaders.

Data were collected through personal interviews with the 107 LLs. The interviews were done with the help of two research assistants. LLs were questioned concerning their participation in various activities related to planning, implementation, and evaluation of Extension programs. In addition, they were asked to indicate their perceptions of the appropriateness of their participation in each of the activities. Level of participation was determined from an activity complexity gradient developed for the study. Activities in planning, implementation, and evaluation of Extension projects were identified and submitted to two groups of Extension agents to be rated for their complexity.

Both groups were asked: "If local leaders were to be involved in the following activities, which do you perceive as very simple (VS), simple (S), difficult (D), or very difficult (VD)?" The ranking of the activities as perceived by the two groups was determined by obtaining equivalent scores for each activity using a weighting system of four points for "VD," three for "D," two for "S," and one for "VS" rating.

The total of all equivalent scores for an activity was the one used in the ranking. The correlation of the rankings made by the two groups was established using the Spearman Rank Correlation Method. The analysis showed a correlation of r's equal to 0.82 and N equals 8 at 0.05 probability for the planning phase. R's equal 0.825 and N equals 16 at the 0.05 probability for the implementation phase. No correlation was done for the evaluation activities because of a small N.

Participation index scores of the LLs were obtained by computing the total weighted score by the number of activities participated in. The weights—1, 2, 3, and 4—were still assigned to "VS," "S," "D," and "VD" categories, respectively. Levels of participation were categorized into high, moderate, and low/nominal.

FINDINGS

Participation in Planning

About two-thirds of the LLs reported participation in planning activities although the proportions reporting participation in each planning activity ranged from 21 percent to 46 percent only (Table I, Col. 1). What may be of interest, because of their importance in the design of programs, is that the two activities in which there was the most participation were "identification of problems and needs of the 'barangay'" and "formulation of project/activity objectives." These activities were participated in by 46 percent and 44 percent of the LLs, respectively.

Of the remaining six planning tasks, "assessment of community resources" had the lowest number of LLs involved (21 percent) next only to "setting priorities in project/activity objectives," which was participated in by 23 percent. This low proportion of LLs involved is quite disturbing if the interest is to design programs and projects appropriate to the needs of the barangay.

Using the complexity gradient, each individual's planning participation index score was taken (Table II). This was used to determine the level of participation in planning (LOP_p). About four out of ten (39 percent) of the LLs scored at the lowest level, and fully one out of ten (11 percent)

TABLE III

LLs' Participation in Implementation Activities and Appropriateness of LL Participation in These Activities as Perceived by the LLs

Activities	Percent Participated (N = 107)	Percent Reporting Appropriate (N = 107)
Giving technical assistance	86	82
Attending to visitors to project	79	90
Communicating notices and directives to other farmers/homemakers	77	79
Establishing dynamic working relationships with other government/private agencies	70	78
Campaigning or soliciting support for the project/activity	65	75
Calling and presiding over meetings	64	94
Disciplining delinquent members of the association	58	80
Occasionally serving as the technician's representative	56	76
Mobilizing community people for community projects	55	79
Keeping records of activities of the group	53	78
Orienting officers and members of association to their duties and responsibilities	45	72
Organizing field trips, field days, exhibits, fairs, etc.	39	78
Promotion and organization of farmers/homemakers association	37	72
Testing of new technology	36	73
Training and development of farmers/homemakers/youth	33	72
Registering, association with the Securities and Exchange Commission	23	63

scored at the highest level. The mean planning participation score was 6.12.

Dividing the index scores into three groups for purposes of a descriptive classification of the LLs' LOP_p, 1 to 7 points was classified as low/nominal LOP_p, 8 to 14 points, moderate LOP_p, and 15 to 21 points, high LOP_p. Using this classification, 26 percent of the LLs had nominal LOP_p, 17 percent were with moderate LOP_p, and a much smaller proportion, 16 percent, was observed to have high LOP_p. The 39 percent with zero scores still remain in the no participation category.

Appropriateness of Participation in Planning

Asked whether or not it is appropriate for LLs to participate in these planning activities, the great majority of LLs, with percentages ranging from 70 percent to 97 percent, responded "yes" to all of the eight planning activities (Table I, Col. 2). Two exceptionally favored activities for leader participation were "identification of community needs and problems" and "furnishing information about the barangay" with 97 percent and 96 percent of the LLs reporting, respectively. Quite unpopular with LLs was the task, "assuming community resources required by each project/activity objective." Participation in this activity was favored by only 70 percent of the LLs.

Participation in Implementation

The number of LLs participating in tasks related to the implementation and maintenance of projects was evidently higher than that observed for planning. The proportions participating in each of the 16 implementation tasks ranged from 23 percent to 86 percent with the majority of the LLs having participated in 10 of the 16 tasks (Table III, Col. 1). The most popular implementation task for LL participation was "giving technical assistance." Eighty-six percent of the LLs claimed they have been in various ways involved in the giving of technical assistance to some people in their barangay. The activity in which there was least participation was "registering association with the Securities and Exchange Commission."

Table IV shows the array of implementation participation index scores (LOP_i). Turning to extremes, no major differences

could be seen between the extreme low and the extreme high. What is surprising, although it may not be statistically significant, is the zero implementation participation score for two LLs.

Dividing the scores into three score ranges for a discrete categorization of the LLs LOP_i, 0 to 12 form one category and is labelled low LOP_i, 13 to 27 is the second category and is called moderate LOP_i, and 28 to 40 is for high LOP_i. With these categories, the distribution of LLs by LOP_i is almost normal. About a quarter (24 percent) exhibited high LOP_i. The other quarter falls under the opposite extreme, the low LOP_i. The remaining 50 percent of the LLs are in the middle or moderate LOP_i.

Appropriateness of Participation in Implementation

The great majority of the LLs perceived LL participation in all of the 16 implementation activities to be appropriate, especially "calling and presiding over meetings" and "attending to visitors to project" (Table III, Col. 2). Their primary reason for the perceived appropriateness of participation in implementation is their feeling that it is their duty to be involved. The task that seemed to be least favored by the LLs was "registering association with the Securities and Exchange Commission," the same task in which there was the least participation by the LLs.

Participation in Evaluation

Evaluation as a process was something a great number of the LLs did not know about. The majority of them also were not aware or simply did not know of projects in their areas that had been evaluated.

The few who were aware had some participation in evaluation activities. Of the four evaluation tasks considered, the most commonly participated in was "monitoring project activities" as reported by 17 percent of the LLs (Table V, col. 1).

Table VI presents the evaluation participation index scores (LOP_e) of the LLs. An examination of the extremes points to a great variation in the low and high scores. More than three-fourths (78 percent) of the LLs made the lowest score while less than ten percent made the highest score. This makes for a negatively

TABLE IV

LLs by Implementation Participation Index Scores

	IPIS*	Percent (N = 107)	IPIS*	Percent (N = 107)		IPIS*	Percent (N = 107)
Lo	0	1.9	13	0.9		28	1.9
	1	0.9	14	3.7		30	1.9
	3	1.9	15	0.9		31	1.9
	4	2.8	16	3.7		32	1.9
	5	0.9	17	1.9		33	3.7
	8	0.9	18	2.8		34	0.9
	9	2.8	19	1.9		36	2.8
	10	4.7	20	4.7		37	1.9
	11	5.6	21	3.7		38	1.9
	12	2.8	23	3.7		39	0.9
			24	3.7	Hi	40	4.7
			25	7.5			
			26	3.7	Mean =	21.20	
			27	2.8	S.D. =	10.55	

*Implementation Participation Index Score

TABLE V

LLs' Participation in Evaluation Activities and Appropriateness of LL Participation in the Activities as Perceived by the LLs

Activities	Percent Participated (N = 107)	Percent Responding Appropriate (N = 107)
Monitoring project activities	17	96
Making decisions regarding evaluation to be done	14	63
Final judging of worth of project	12	64
Formal collection of data needed for evaluation	9	57

TABLE VI

LLs By Evaluation Participation Index Scores

	EPIS*	Percent (N = 107)	EPIS*	Percent (N = 107)		EPIS*	Percent (N = 107)
Lo	0	77.6	4	1.9		8	0.9
			5	1.9		9	0.9
	1	5.6	7	0.9	Hi	10	7.5
	3	2.8					
						Mean =	1.28
						S.D. =	2.90

*Evaluation Participation Index Score

skewed distribution.

The evaluation scores were also divided into four groups with the zero scores forming a distinct group by itself representing no participation. Scores 1 to 3 were assigned to low LOP_e. This had 8 percent of the LLs. Scores 4 to 7 were for moderate LOP_e and had 5 percent of the LLs. Scores 8 to 10 for high LOP_e had about one-tenth of the LLs.

Appropriateness of Participation in Evaluation

As noted in Table V, column 2, the majority of the LLs considered leader participation in evaluation activities as appropriate although the proportions observed were slightly lower than those for both planning and implementation. "Data collection" had the lowest number of LLs (57 percent) who considered participation as appropriate while "monitoring of project activities" was favored by the highest number (96 percent). Participation of LLs in making decisions regarding the evaluation to be done was appropriate to 63 percent of the LLs.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Observations in the study give empirical evidence to a general conclusion that lay leader participation in local Extension programs and activities in the two Luzon provinces in the Philippines is, in fact, a reality rather than mere rhetoric. All of the activities for planning, implementation, and evaluation had LLs participation. However, this very general conclusion becomes meaningful and functional for policy and decision-making purposes

only when looked at in its several dimensions.

One way to look at this participation by LLs is through the differences in the number of leaders participating in each activity for each program or project phase. They indicate that participation differs according to program phase. If averages for the proportions reporting participation in each activity for each phase were taken, the largest would be for implementation, next would be for planning, and the least would be for evaluation. Thus, while there may be participation by LLs, it is prevailing only in implementation.

A more marked difference in participation by program phase is given by levels of participation as determined by the participation index scores. The highest proportion of "moderate" to "high" participation was for implementation; the highest proportion of "low" participation was for planning; the highest proportion of "no participation" was for evaluation. Hence, not only are fewer leaders involved in planning and evaluation, but whatever involvement they have is very minimal. On the other hand, more leaders participate in implementation, and their implementation is also at a higher level.

Looking through the activities where there is a concentration of leaders participating, one point that is clear is that participation varies according to the difficulty of the tasks (difficulty being based on the complexity gradient developed for this study). Participation in planning was for the "simple" tasks; in implementation it ranged from the "very simple" to the

"very difficult"; participation in evaluation was for the "very simple" tasks.

The observation that lay leaders are participating in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of Extension programs and activities seems welcome among development planners and practitioners, policy makers, and all those interested in development. However, it is no reason yet for rejoicing, for the "participation" that is taking place could carry the potential of bane or blessing. The variations in the extent to which LLs are participating in these three program phases lead to a very basic question: Why is there more participation in. the implementation phase, less in the planning stage, and least in the evaluation stage?

One way to look at the situation is to consider the nature of the Extension programs and projects implemented in the country. Most, if not all, of these projects in which the LLs were involved were "canned" or "packaged" by some high level decision makers and "shipped" to the village for "consumption." It is a case, therefore, of the villagers being planned for and targets set from above. This not only limits people's participation in policy and decision making but denies them this opportunity altogether. The less participation they will have, the less they come to controlling their own life situations. This little participation could also lead to a general feeling of dissatisfaction, passive resistance, and slow-down, especially when plans to execute have no logical relationships to the local situation.

Although use of local lay leaders in rural development is a participatory strategy, its use, per se, may not actually constitute participation unless the LLs gain power to voice their demands and back them up. The Extension agents looking at LLs as their "helpers, assistants, or extensions of their right hands" may lead to a misunderstanding of what participation really is. When considered as helpers or assistants, the LLs may, as noted by Bryant and White (1982), be vulnerable to co-optation. When this happens, they cease to represent the interests of the group.

It may not be farfetched to also refer to the nature of programs/projects implemented to explain the low LL participation in evaluation. Most of the programs/projects in which the LLs were involved are long-range programs with big, formal evaluations usually scheduled towards their termination. Thus, evaluation may not be in the offing for most of them.

To focus on the specific activities in which the LLs have been involved, an encouraging observation is that the two planning activities in which the LLs participated most (as reported by the LLs) were "identifying needs and problems of the barangay" and "formulation of objectives for the project/activity being planned." These activities are crucial as far as designing appropriate programs for the village and their eventual success are concerned. Having the LLs participate in these activities does not only ensure "hitting where it hurts," but could mean a serious effort on the part of the administrators and field workers to listen to the voice of these people who may have long been submerged in what Freire (1968) calls the "culture of silence."

Another dimension to this observation is the empowerment that may result from being listened to. Bryant and White (1982:16) write that this empowerment could serve as a "leverage for the poor." If administrators and field workers listen to what these village people say their problems are and what they think the objectives of development endeavors, designed with them as recipients, should be, then the people would have influence on the development agenda and would, therefore, be in control to make choices for their future.

In implementation, the activity with the most participation by LLs is giving technical assistance. This is an instance whereby the efforts of the Extension agents are multiplied many-fold. To utilize the lay leaders in this capacity illustrates the trickle down or spread effect in Extension. One concern, however, is whether or not the information disseminated is correct. Any unpleasant experiences the Extension clientele may have because of wrong information given will have its toll on the credibility of the LLs in particular and on the Extension Service in general.

Participation by a number of LLs in the evaluation phase was mainly on monitoring project activities. When the project is monitored while it is in process, there is

continual feedback to the project administration about how it is being implemented. With data feedback to them, changes and adjustments could be made where necessary. Probability of success would be great since project flaws are immediately detected and attended to. This, of course, is working on the assumption that the data feedback are made use of in decision making regarding the project and its implementation.

The LLs' high favorability to participation of leaders in all phases of the Extension programs and activities is a healthy sign for the Extension Service's use of LLs in these Philippine provinces. It appears that the motivation to be involved and to take part in influencing their future are already there. With the right motivation bobbing, there is only the need to have this sustained by having the drive for the motivation satisfied. How this could be done would, perhaps, call for a re-thinking of current policies regarding program development.

IMPLICATIONS

A finding that merits some thoughts is the differential participation of LLs in program development—more prevailing in implementation but less in planning and much less in evaluation. Planning and evaluation are no simple tasks. The greater abstraction in planning and the stringent methodological requirements in evaluation would, perhaps, be sufficient reason to deny participation by LLs who are limited by their low educational attainment or for the LLs themselves to decline participation because of this perceived limitation. In Philippine villages, the person who lacks education generally feels embarrassed when among highly educated people.

If the LLs are to have more participation in planning and evaluation, this implies a new role for them. This new role should be defined in the reality of the Extension work environment. Learning of this new role should not be left to chance. Training is imperative. Training programs to be designed specifically for this purpose should zero in on the critical on-the-job behavior for planning and evaluation. The use of the word "critical" refers to problems encountered with participation or the reason participation is not occurring. The design of future training programs for these leaders should consider the critical areas of lay leader participation in planning, implementation, and evaluation of Extension programs.

To identify these critical areas, Tyler's (1957) framework could serve as a guide. Tyler identifies three sources of information for a wise determination of objectives of an educational activity. These sources are the learners, contemporary life, and subject matter leaders. Contemporary life would be the actual life conditions and opportunities, particularly the reality of the Extension work. The subject matter specialists are the professionals in the development scene. These would include not only those in Extension, but also those in the other relevant disciplines.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Manzoor and Philip H. Coombs (eds.). *Education for Rural Development Case Studies for Planners*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Brunner, Edmund de S. and E. Hsin Pao Yang. *Rural America and the Extension Service: A History and Critique of the Cooperative Agricultural and Home Economic Extension Service*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.

Bryant, Coralie and Luise G. White. *Managing Development in the Third World*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. A Continuum Book. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.

Tyler, Ralph W., *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Uphoff, Norman T., John M. Cohen, and Arthur A. Goldsmith. *Feasibility and Application of Rural Development Participation: A State-of-the-Art Paper*. Ithaca, New York: Rural Development Committee, Cornell University, 1979.

The Social Work Profession's Attitude towards Volunteerism

Gay Strickler

In the past ten years, the social work profession has had to face serious challenges in the form of budget cutbacks, soaring caseloads and a political way of thinking that seems to frown on aid to any but the most desperate individuals. Numerous articles in social work periodicals have discussed these obstacles, and many creative solutions have been proposed. Yet rarely in the literature is there any consideration of volunteerism as a possible resource. There is virtually no discussion of whether or how volunteers could be used to extend or supplement services. This seems both surprising and unfortunate. It is surprising because for most of its history social work has been closely allied with volunteerism. It is unfortunate because ignoring the issue of volunteerism today may prove to be a missed opportunity which social work will regret in the future. The intention of this article is to describe what does exist concerning volunteerism in current social work periodicals and to consider why there is so little written on the subject.

DEFINITIONS AND SOURCES

In trying to assess the attitude of the social work profession towards volunteerism in the 1980s, the author used the definition of volunteers from the *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. Volunteers are "persons who contribute their services without remuneration to public or voluntary organizations engaged in all types of social welfare activities."[1] The term "social work profession" is not so easily defined. However, for the purposes of this article, the term will include those activities and individuals sanctioned by the National Association of Social Workers. With these definitions in hand, this researcher turned to a variety of social work periodicals pub-

lished in the years 1980-1985. It was hoped that a survey of periodicals, rather than new books, would offer a more current and wider view of the field. The periodicals examined were: *Administration in Social Work, Clinical Social Work Journal, Encyclopedia of Social Work, Social Casework, Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Journal of Education for Social Work, Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Policy Studies Journal, Smith College Studies in Social Work, Social Service Review* and the *Journal of Social Service Research*.

The 1983-84 Supplement to the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* offers a concise yet comprehensive discussion of volunteerism in social work. The article, by Gordon Manser, looks at volunteers in terms of their numbers, where they work, what they do and why they do what they do. Manser also touches on the self-help phenomenon and the need for networking. Most interesting, however, is his section on "Barriers to Full Utilization" in which he quotes a report by the National Forum on Volunteering: "...the major barrier in effective volunteer involvement lies in the inability or unwillingness of paid, helping professionals to accept volunteers as legitimate partners in the helping process..."[2]

SEEKING MENTION OF VOLUNTEERS

The gauntlet having been thrown down, one might assume there would be some reaction to this line of thinking. Unfortunately a scrutiny of the current periodicals shows virtually nothing at all on the subject. There are many titles which lead one to think volunteerism will receive attention in the form of at least a sentence or two. Examples include: "Declining Public Social Service Resources: A Managerial Problem,"[3] "The Politics of Cutback Management,"[4] "Adapting to Austerity:

Gay Strickler is a Ph.D. candidate at the Bryn Mawr College School of Social Work and Social Research, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. She is an active volunteer in local civic and school organizations.

Human Services after Proposition 13,"[5] "Management Trends in the Human Services in the 1980s,"[6] "Community Empowerment: The Critical Role of Neighborhoods."[7] In none of these or other similarly entitled articles is volunteerism mentioned as a possible resource in meeting the problem of less available funds to employ staff and increased demand for services. Often, as in the article on neighborhoods, volunteerism is simply assumed with no question as to whether neighborhood residents will even want to volunteer the time to empower themselves. Moreover, in none of these articles is there any discussion as to why volunteers should *not* be involved. Although the Reagan administration has continually justified many of its cutbacks by calling on volunteer capabilities, there is nothing in the social work literature showing why this approach won't work.

While there are some articles in which volunteers are mentioned, their roles are often taken for granted, and there is no concern with some of the deeper issues than their mere participation in a project. The issue of volunteerism, if discussed at all, is an indirect consequence of research on other topics. There are only a few articles falling into this category. They are: "Self-Help for Families of the Mentally Ill,"[8] "The Use of Social Networks in Social Welfare,"[9] and "Community-Based Human Service Organizations: Theory and Practice."[10]

The author found only one article devoted specifically to a problem facing the utilization of volunteers in a social service: this was "Volunteer Ombudsman Burnout in Long-Term Care Services: Some Causes and Solutions."[11] While directed toward a very circumscribed group of volunteers, the article is notable for two reasons. First, it considers an important issue involving volunteers and, second, it deals with an area in which there could be tremendous potential for volunteers.

Aside from the aforementioned article, there is only one other source in which volunteerism is discussed in any depth. *The Journal of Jewish Communal Service* presents a dramatic exception to the dearth of interest in volunteerism. Almost every issue of this periodical in the last five years has contained at least one article on the meatier issues of volunteerism. The Jewish element of the social work profession seems very concerned with numerous aspects of volunteerism, as the following titles indicate: "Working With the New Breed of Volunteer,"[12] "The Changing Role of Jewish Women: Implications for Family, Social Work Agency and Social Work Practice,"[13] and "Recruitment of the Best: A Study of Why Dallas Jewish Women Leaders Volunteer."[14]

This sample of titles, unlike the previous ones in this paper, does not include all the articles written, but is representative of many written in a similar vein for the *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*. Jewish social services obviously consider volunteerism vital to their continued existence and effectiveness. As one author wrote:

> Without our volunteers there will not be a healthy, organized Jewish community to transmit Jewish values, to raise funds for Israel or to supplement agency services. In these times of extreme government cutbacks, the Jewish community must fortify itself with an even more plentiful, sophisticated, trained voluntary network.[15]

One question which arises is why the Jewish component of the social work profession is interested in volunteerism and the issues surrounding it. This author wishes to concentrate on the other side of this question: Why *isn't* the rest of the social work profession interested in volunteerism?

ROOTS OF THE VOLUNTEER/SOCIAL WORKER CONNECTION

This lack of interest was not always the rule. The social work profession grew out of volunteerism and maintained close ties with it through the 1950s. For instance, in the 1930s, the National Committee on Volunteers was an Associate Group of the National Conference on Social Welfare. In the 1940s the National Social Welfare Assembly was one of the founders of the Advisory Committee on Citizen Participation which centered on volunteers in social policy formation and social services.

In 1945 and 1949, the Council on Social Work Education held workshops, the primary focus of which was the responsibility of social work schools to prepare students to work with volunteers. In the decade of

the fifties, the National Council of Social Work and the Association of Volunteer Bureaus held annual workshops. The goal of these workshops was to enhance the capacity of volunteer bureaus to work with agencies on the principles, methods and procedures which would lead to the best match between volunteer and agency.

Articles in social work periodicals during this time reflected the close connection between social work and volunteerism. Beginning with the publication of its second volume in 1933, the *Social Work Yearbook* (predecessor to the *Encyclopedia of Social Work*) annually devoted space to ofttimes glowing reports of volunteerism's contribution to social work. Other periodicals also published articles dealing with volunteerism, the difference between now and then lying not so much in numbers as in the substantive issues discussed.

In the 1940s and 1950s the use of volunteers was considered in areas in which today their participation is regarded by some as taboo. "Predominance of Volunteer and Employed Workers without Professional Education in Direct Service to Groups"[16] and "The Use of Volunteers in Conjunction with Psychotherapy"[17] are two examples. Furthermore, in articles with more general-sounding titles such as "A Three-Dimensional Approach to Health and Welfare Planning"[18] and "Whence and Whither Social Work—A Sociological Perspective,"[19] volunteerism is not only mentioned, but seriously discussed, unlike the current articles previously mentioned.

Even in the 1960s and 1970s, as cooperation between the two spheres became more troubled, articles still reflected concern with the basic issues. Examples include: "Volunteers in Social Welfare: The Challenge of Their Future,"[20] "The Retired Social Worker as a Volunteer,"[21] "Human Services Trends in the mid-1970's,"[22] "Volunteers in a Juvenile Court,"[23] and "Voluntary Agencies in Four Welfare States."[24] During no five-year period since the 1930s has there been such an avoidance of volunteerism in the periodicals, excluding the *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, as in the 1980s.

WHY DID VOLUNTEERS DISAPPEAR?

What is or are the reasons for this sudden hiatus? Is the social work profession simply no longer interested in volunteerism? There are certainly reasons why it might not be. The involvement of volunteers is a mixed blessing. First, the recruitment, training, supervision and organizing of volunteers requires staff time and agency money. In the 1980s, both staff and money are being increasingly diminished. Thus, the cost of volunteers in an agency may prove greater than the benefits.

Secondly, the incorporation of volunteers into social services can be viewed as a ploy to take the government off the hook; if social services can be delivered by volunteers, then government funding is no longer necessary. At a time when the national government is attempting to sweeten the pill of financial cutbacks with a simultaneous emphasis on the glories of volunteerism, it is understandable that the social work profession would be wary of taking a step which permits a further abrogation of government's responsibility for social welfare.

Feminists and unionists of the social work profession offer a third objection to volunteerism. Both view volunteers as depriving their respective constituents of paying jobs. The National Organization of Women criticized volunteerism on the following grounds: 1) unpaid work downgrades the status of women; 2) it exploits women's time and talents; 3) it works against the development of part-time employment and flexible schedules for paying jobs; 4) it exacerbates the problem of inadequate funding for social services; and 5) it emphasizes a band-aid approach instead of getting at the root of social welfare problems.[25] Members of social work unions have complained, in a similar vein, that volunteers take away jobs, thus leading to increased unemployment of social workers.

There are other perhaps less obvious reasons for social work's apparent dismissal of volunteerism. One writer argues that social workers have historically been involved in direct relationships with clients. Increasingly, social workers are doing resource allocation, decision-mak-

ing, evaluation and other jobs which are a step away from face-to-face contact with the client. The volunteer has taken over

...some of the more attractive tasks that have erstwhile been the fantasised segment of social work practice; it is the social worker who must come to terms with the increasingly specialized and target centered nature of his work.[26]

Another suggestion is that articles on volunteerism are being written but are being submitted to periodicals specializing in volunteerism rather than in social work. A variation on this argument is that articles submitted to social work journals are being refused on the premise that they are more appropriate for journals focusing on volunteerism.

This last argument is certainly reflective of the independent status which volunteerism has acquired in the last twenty years. Volunteerism constitutes a field of its own now, with its own periodicals and publications; it is no longer an adjunct of the social work profession. This development seems to have begun during the 1960s. The 1960s saw the overnight flowering of many new kinds of volunteerism, particularly in the political realm. Many volunteer groups sprang forth around the issues of civil rights and the Vietnam War. Self-help groups increased dramatically in numbers and scope of activity. None of these volunteer activities were dependent on social work.

The 1970s continued volunteerism's progress towards independence from the social work profession. Call for Action Bureaus were created, high schools and colleges initiated volunteer activities and businesses did the same. In all these instances, the initiative came from outside the social work profession. Volunteer groups also began to pool resources, forming, for example, the Alliance for Volunteerism. Networking became more prevalent, especially to press for insurance, training institutes, tax benefits and specific legislation. One could say that during this period volunteerism was becoming "professionalized." It was certainly no longer dependent on the social work profession for its credibility.

It is possible that volunteerism's growing independence from the social work profession frightened the latter. In the eye of the social worker, not only were volunteers no longer simply doing what social workers told them to do, they were taking over functions which had once been the social worker's (functions which had, ironically, originally been the volunteer's). Advocacy for social reform is an example of this trend.

Furthermore, the "professionalization" of the volunteer comes at a time when the field of social work is feeling less than secure about its own professional status and is grappling with issues like decertification, educational requirements and licensure. This author suggests that the lack of security about its own "professionalism" may have contributed to social work's reluctance to consider volunteerism as one means of coping with the simultaneous problems of fewer resources and increased demand for service.

REFLECTIONS ON THE SEPARATION

This writer would also like to suggest that this reaction is unnecessary. Volunteerism and social work have much more in common than otherwise. In fact, today more than ever, it is important that these commonalities be acted upon in meeting what are also common challenges. Although social work complains of the decrease in government responsibility for its citizens' social welfare, a greater problem may be the way in which government is taking action unilaterally, without benefit of citizen participation. The threat may not be to our welfare system, but to our democracy.

A major concern of the 1980s is how to maintain the citizens' role in their "democracy" in the face of a huge government apparatus, a highly technological and specialized culture, and a consequent depersonalization of the entire society. Both volunteerism and social work are based on values which are inherently democratic. The goals of democracy are not that different from the goals of the volunteer and the social worker. Both focus on the individual and the right to participate fully in society. Both fields are also crucial to the functioning of a democratic society.

One believer in volunteerism's role in democracy writes:

Active concern for a cause by individuals and groups is an essential ingredient in social

progress in a democracy...The connection of the ordinary citizen with the government and local authorities who are running the country is remote. He can vote for his parliamentary candidate and local councillor according to his views ... If this were the sum total of democratic action the power of the individual would be small indeed, but fortunately this is far from the case. The individual makes up for the minute influence he exerts as a voter by active participation in the working of society by membership of groups and organizations which seek to improve conditions and to change policy, and by humble day-to-day work as a good neighbor. This is democracy in action.[27]

The author of an article in a 1956 issue of Social Work wrote about social work's importance to democracy in terms which the profession would still hopefully echo today:

> *It is dependent on our ability as fellow Americans to cooperate with each other in developing the necessary social organization so that every American citizen will have an equal opportunity to share in the abundance of this fortunate land and an equal opportunity to achieve for himself a personally satisfying and socially useful life.*[28]

Unfortunately, it is sometimes more difficult to tolerate democracy within one's ranks than it is outside it. As volunteers became more assertive about their needs and preferences, social work has seemed less desirous of involving these volunteers. The following was written more than fifteen years ago, but is still a problem today.

> *We have taken great pride in the fact that we are "democratically operated" institutions. We have said that it is the job of the board to establish policy and the job of the staff to execute that policy. How much of that statement is really true? Many of us have used our position to create boards of like-minded people, who think much as we do. More than anything else, our boards have tended to become reflections of ourself. Through skillful manipulation of the nominating process, we insure that people who think like we do get elected to key offices. We have been much inclined to take the docile, well-mannered volunteer who can be "managed" and see that he rises to the top. Trouble makers, once supported, are skillfully eliminated as disruptive influences. The result is a board that is the "mirror image" of the executive. The monthly agenda features a soothing*

recital of service statistics and passage of pre-determined resolutions.[29]

While the same charge can no doubt be levied against volunteer institutions, the point is that neither social work nor the volunteer sector can ignore the dangers to individualism which are evident today. Volunteerism and social work have a common challenge and can only benefit in working together to meet it.

In more concrete terms, there is much that social work can gain from the use of volunteers. It should also be emphasized that there exists such a plethora of tasks to be fulfilled, that it seems unlikely that there would not be some areas where volunteers could operate without competing with social workers. Such areas include: 1) identifying problems requiring social service; 2) policy-making; 3) fundraising; 4) interpreting social service programs to the public; 5) reporting and evaluating community reactions to programs; and 6) acting as advocates. There are, of course many other areas in which volunteers could be of use. The point is that they are an available resource in a time of diminishing resources.

This author is not claiming that the social service profession must involve volunteers, nor that it necessarily accept volunteerism as a positive element of social-welfare. She does, however, want to argue that volunteerism must at least be considered and discussed. Ignoring the issues will neither enhance social work's effectiveness nor shore up its insecurities about its own status. Such stand-offishness as the profession currently exhibits toward volunteerism is akin to burying one's head in the sand. At best, the profession will only have to deal with a missed opportunity; at worst, the refusal to even consider a potential resource may contribute to a weakening of those democratic elements of our society which constitute the very foundations of the social work profession.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Sieder and Kirshbaum, "Volunteers," p. 1583.

[2]Manser, "Volunteers," p. 173.

[3]Finch, "Declining Public Social Service

Resources: A Managerial Problem."

[4]Pawlak, Peter and Fink, "The Politics of Cutback Management."

[5]Terrell, "Adapting to Austerity: Human Services after Proposition 13."

[6]Sorri, "Management Trends in the Human Services in the 1980's."

[7]Naparstek, "Community Empowerment: The Critical Role of Neighborhoods."

[8]Matfield, "Self-Help for Families of the Mentally Ill."

[9]Maguire and Biegel, "The Use of Social Networks in Social Welfare."

[10]Tourigny and Miller, "Community-Based Human Service Organizations: Theory and Practice."

[11]Litwin and Monk, "Volunteer Ombudsman Burnout in Long-Term Care Services: Some Causes and Solutions."

[12]Farber, "Working With the New Breed of Volunteer."

[13]Pressma, "The Changing Role of Jewish Women: Implications for Family, Social Work Agency and Social Work Practice."

[14]Schwamm, "Recruitment of the Best: A Study of Why Dallas Jewish Women Leaders Volunteer."

[15]Pressma, op. cit., p. 74.

[16]Murphy, "Predominance of Volunteer and Employed Workers Without Professional Education in Direct Service to Groups."

[17]May, "The Use of Volunteers in Conjunction with Psychotherapy."

[18]Angell, "A Three Dimensional Approach to Health and Welfare Planning."

[19]Eaton, "Whence and Whither Social Work? A Sociological Perspective."

[20]Levin, "Volunteers in Social Welfare: The Challenge of their Future."

[21]Einstein, "The Retired Social Worker as a Volunteer."

[22]Demone and Shulberg, "Human Services Trends in the Mid-1970's."

[23]Stoebel, Sterne and Sterne, "Volunteers in a Juvenile Court."

[24]Kramer, "Voluntary Agencies in Four Welfare States."

[25]Ellis and Noyes, By the People, p. 224.

[26]Davies, Support Systems in Social Work, p. 71.

[27]Morris, Voluntary Work in the Welfare State, p. 210.

[28]Altmeyer, "The Dynamics of Social Work," p. 10.

[29]Professions Under Pressure, p. 40.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altmeyer, Arthur. "The Dynamics of Social Work." Social Work. Vol. 1, No. 2. pp. 3-11.

Angell, Stephen. "A Three-Dimensional Approach to Health and Welfare Planning." Social Service Review, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (1952), pp. 308-317.

Aves, Geraldine. The Voluntary Worker in the Social Services. London: Bedford Square Press of National Council of Social Services, 1969.

Bellah, Robert, Richard Madsen, William Sullivan, Ann Swidler, Steven Tipton. Habits of the Heart. N. Y.: Harper and Row, 1986.

Brody, Leslie. "New Initiatives for Human Services Programs." Social Work in a Turbulent World, ed. by Miriam Dinerman. Silver Spring, MD: NASW, 1983, pp. 43-56.

Conrad, James H. Reference Sources in Social Work. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1982.

Davies, Martin. Support Systems in Social Work. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

Dinerman, Miriam, ed. Social Work in a Turbulent World. Seventh NASW Professional Symposium on Social Work. Silver Spring, MD: NASW, 1983.

Dabrowski, Irene. "Working Class Women and Civic Action: A Case Study of an Innovative Community Role." Policy Studies Journal, Vol. II, No. 3, pp. 427-435.

Eaton, Joseph. "Whence and Whither Social Work– A Sociological Analysis." Social Work, Vol. I, No. 1 (1956), pp. 11-26.

Ellis, Susan J. and Katherine H. Noyes. By the People. Phila.: Energize Books, 1978.

Farber, Ted B. "Working with the New Breed of Volunteers." The Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 208-213.

Finch, William A. "Declining Public Social Service Resources: A Managerial Problem." Administration in Social Work, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 19-28.

Ginsberg, Leon H. The Practice of Social Work in Public Welfare. N. Y.: The Free Press, 1983.

Gurin, Arnold. "The View from the Top: Dynamics of Volunteer Leadership." *Understanding Jewish Philanthropy*, ed. by Marc Lee Raphael. N. Y.: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1979, pp. 7-25.

Hatfield, Agnes B. "Self-Help for Families of the Mentally Ill," *Social Work*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 408-414.

Jones, Hugh R. "Social Policy: We, the People, Must Act." *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1968. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1968, pp. 21-32.

Journal of Social Service Research, 1983-84, 1982-83, 1982, 1981.

Katz, Alfred H. and Eugene Bender. *The Strength in Us*. N. Y.: New Viewpoints, 1976.

Kramer, Ralph M. "Serving the Disabled in the Welfare State." *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1981. Washington, D. C.: National Conference on Social Welfare, 1982, pp. 187-204.

Litwin, Howard and Abraham Monk. "Volunteer Ombudsman Burnout in Long Term Care Services: Some Causes and Solutions." *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 99-110.

Maguire, Lambert and David Biegel. "The Use of Social Networks in Social Welfare." *Social Welfare Forum*, 1981. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 141-157.

Manser, Gordon. "Volunteers." *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, 1983-84 Supplement. Silver Springs, MD.: NASW, 1983, pp. 169-176.

May, Dorothy. "The Use of Volunteers in Conjunction with Psychotherapy." *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, Vol. XX (1949), pp. 173-189.

Murphy, M. "Predominance of Volunteer and Employed Workers Without Professional Education in Direct Service to Groups." *The Social Group Work Method on Social Work Education*, Vol. XI of Project Report of Aviriculum Study, Council on Social Work Education, 1959, pp. 18-20.

Meyer, Robert. "Social Planning as Social Work Practice: Issues and Strategies." *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 6, Nos. 2/3, pp. 49-60.

Mills, James E. "Moving Toward A Tripartite Marketplace in the Human Services." *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1982-83. Washington, D. C.: National Conference on Social Welfare, 1985, pp. 108-116.

Miluski, Barbara A. "Community Empowerment and Self-Help Strategies." *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1981. Washington, D. C.: National Conference on Social Welfare, 1982, pp. 11-23.

Mogulof, Melvin B. "Federal Support for Citizen Participation in Social Action." *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1969. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1969, pp. 86-107.

Morris, Mary. *Voluntary Work in the Welfare State*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Naparstek, Arthur. "Community Empowerment: The Critical Role of Neighborhoods." *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1980. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1981, pp. 53-64.

Pawlak, Edward J., Charles Peter and Richard L. Fink. "The Politics of Cutback Management." *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 1-10.

Policy Studies Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3, *passim*.

Pressma, Donna. "The Changing Role of Jewish Women: Implications for Family, Social Work Agency and Social Work Practice." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, pp. 67-75.

"Profession Under Pressure." National Association of Social Workers, Texas Council Proceedings of Symposium. November 12, 1969.

Raphael, Marc Lee. "Getting In and Getting On: Reward Systems in Federated Jewish Philanthropy." *Understanding Jewish Philanthropy*, ed. by Marc Lee Raphael. N. Y.: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1979, pp. 25-33.

Raphael, Marc Lee, ed. *Understanding Jewish Philanthropy*. N. Y.: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1979.

Reminc, Daniel, Robert Rice and Jenny Ross. *Self-Help Group and Human Service Agencies: How They Work Together*. N. Y.: Family Service America, 1984.

Ripley, Mary. "The Use of Volunteers in Development." *Proceedings of the XVIIth International Conference on Social Welfare*. Nairobi, Kenya: July 14-20, 1974, pp. 178-183.

Rogers, David, Gordon Bultera and Ken Barb. "Voluntary Association Membership and Political Participation: an Exploration of the Mobilization Hypothesis." *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 305-318.

Rothstein, Donna Gold. "Developing a Voluntary Neighborhood Intergenerational Program." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 48-53.

Sorri, Rosemary. "Management Trends in the Human Services in the 1980's" *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 6, Nos. 2/3, pp. 19-32.

Sauber, Richard S. *The Human Services Delivery System*. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Schindler-Rainman, Eva and Ronald Lippett. *The Volunteer Community*. Washington D. C.: Center for a Voluntary Society, 1971.

Schwamm, Jeffrey Becker. "Recruitment of the Best: A Study of Why Dallas Jewish Women Leaders Volunteer." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. 60, No. 3, pp. 214-221.

Sieder, Violet and Doris Kirshbaum, "Volunteers." *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. Washington, D. C.: NASW, 1977, pp. 1582-1591.

Smith, David H. "Voluntary Action and Voluntary Groups." *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 1, 1975, pp. 247-270.

Stenzel, Anne K. and Helen Feeney. *Volunteer Training and Development*. N.Y.: Seabury Press, 1968.

Terrell, Paul. "Adapting to Austerity: Human Services after Proposition 13." *Social Work*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 275-282.

Tourigny, Ann Ward and Joe Miller. "Community-Based Human Service Organizations: Theory and Practice." *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. V, No. 1, pp. 79-86.

Walz, Asbercoth and Lynch. "The New Upside-Down Welfare State." *Social Work in a Turbulent World*, ed. by Miriam Dinerman. Silver Spring, Md.: NASW, 1983, pp. 11-20.

Wolf, Jacquelyn H. "'Professionalizing' Volunteer Work in a Black Neighborhood." *Social Service Review*, September, 1985, pp. 423-434.

Letters

Dear Editor:

Thank you sincerely for your kind permission to reproduce the article "Selected 'Philosophy of Volunteerism' Essays from Colleagues Certified in Volunteer Administration" which appeared in the Winter 1986-87 issue. These reprints are being used by students attending the first workshop in the six-workshop cycle that is being offered by the Norwich Center for Volunteer Administration leading to a Certificate in Management of Volunteer Programs.

The first workshop was presented by Winifred L. Brown, CAVS, Executive Director of the Mayor's Voluntary Action Center of New York City on March 21, 1987 at Vermont College in Montpelier, Vermont. After an in-depth look at the history of volunteerism and an examination of some current issues and trends in the field, the participants were asked to examine their own beliefs, values and opinions which make up their personal philosophy of volunteerism. As an integral part of the certificate curriculum each student has been asked to return his/her articulated thoughts on this subject. These essays will remain sealed in the envelope in which they arrive and will be filed in the appropriate student folder. At the end of the program students will have their philosophies returned. At that time, each student will be encouraged to re-examine this statement of beliefs to re-write same if appropriate, but most certainly to determine if the study of volunteer administration has resulted in changes, growth, new ideas or beliefs. The use of the reprinted article as a springboard for discussion and for the development of personal philosophies was extremely valuable. Thank you Suzanne, Connie, Kathleen, John, Gretchen and Melsie. Thank you, JOVA.

Sincerely,
Carol Todd, Volunteer Director
Norwich University Center
for Volunteer Administration
Montpelier, VT

Dear Editor:

I am delighted that you published "Volunteers and the Ethics of Advocacy" in *The Journal of Volunteer Administration* (Vol. V, No. 1, Fall 1986). I received a copy of that issue, which also had the lovely article by Anne Honer. Wonderful!

I've continued to work on advocacy since I wrote the article you published, partly because of your astute question about what advocates may do when those who are authorized to speak for others are not speaking in their best interest and refuse the advocate permission to speak for them. I thought you might be interested in the enclosed, in which I pursue this problem. I'd certainly welcome your readers' comments on it.

Sincerely,
Margery Naylor van Inwagen

An Afterthought About "Volunteers and the Ethics of Advocacy"

The problem of what an advocate may do when those who are authorized to speak for others are not speaking in their best interest has worried me enough to work out a better answer than the one I gave on page 7 of my article, "Volunteers and the Ethics of Advocacy" (*The Journal of Volunteer Administration*, Vol. V, No. 1, Fall, 1986, pp. 1-8).

I said there that it would be wrong "in most circumstances" for an advocate to speak for others when those who are authorized to speak for them *don't want* that advocate to speak for them. I now realize that this claim is too weak. What I should have said is that it would *always* be wrong for the advocate to speak for them under these conditions—even when those who are authorized to speak are not speaking in the best interest of those for whom they are authorized to speak. The right to speak that those who are authorized to speak for them is an *absolute* ethical limit on what that advocate may do.

It does not follow from this, however, that there is *nothing* that the advocate may

do to help, as the following example shows.

Suppose that you have authorized me to order chow mein for you, and that Mary (who is with me in the restaurant), knowing this, hears me order spicy beef for you instead of chow mein.

It would be wrong for Mary to speak *for you* by ordering chow mein for you, because this would violate my right to speak for you. But it would also be wrong for her to do nothing when she knows that I have violated your right to self-determination by abusing my right to speak for you.

By saying something for you that you had not authorized me to say, I abused *my* right to speak for you, thereby also violating *your* right to self-determination. I decided for you what you would have for dinner instead of letting you do this for yourself. It would be wrong for Mary not to protect your right to self-determination, because we have an obligation to protect the rights of others.

But what is this obligation, and why do we have it?

It is the obligation to do what we can to prevent *anyone's* rights from being violated—not just our own rights, but the rights of others.

This obligation comes from the very nature of rights. If someone has a *right* to some *thing*, or to *do* something, then that person is *entitled* to have it, or to do it. To tolerate that right's being violated is to treat it as if it were permissible to violate it. But it is not. To violate it is to treat the person who is entitled to something, or to do something, as if that person were *not* entitled to it. So it is *not* permissible to violate that right, or even to tolerate its being violated by someone else. Therefore, we are obliged not to tolerate anyone's rights being violated—i.e., we are obliged to protect the rights of others, as well as our own rights.

In view of this, Mary would be not only entitled, but obliged, to object to my violating your right to self-determination. She may say, "I thought you were supposed to order chow mein, not spicy beef." If she did, then she would be speaking in order to benefit you, but she would *not* be speaking *for* you, since she would not be speaking in *your* name. She would only be expressing her own belief that what I said in your name was not what you had authorized me to say—i.e., that I abused my right to speak for you, and thereby violated your right to decide for yourself what you would have for dinner.

If her doing this persuaded me to order chow mein for you, then she would prevent me from deciding for you what you would have for dinner—thereby protecting your right to self-determination. Moreover, she would protect it without violating my right to speak for you.

If I didn't change the order, though, there is something else that she could do to protect your right to self-determination: she could protest to *you* that what I said in your name was not what you had authorized me to say.

In which case, you might deprive me of the right to order for you—a right that I have only because you gave it to me. If you then authorized Mary to order for you, and she did, then she would not violate my right to speak for you, because I would no longer have it. Nor would she violate your right to speak for yourself, because you would have authorized her to speak for you.

But, if protesting to me did no good, and she could not protest to you, there is nothing more that she may do to prevent me from abusing my right to speak for you, thereby protecting your right to self-determination.

She could, of course, simply order chow mein—speaking in *her own name*, and then offer it to you. But, while this would insure that you could have what you had decided to have for dinner, it would not prevent me from abusing my right to order for you. It would only prevent my abusing it from causing you not to have what you had decided to have for dinner. But this would merely counteract the effects of my abusing your right to self-determination, not prevent me from abusing it.

What this shows is that, when those who are authorized to speak for those who can't speak for themselves are not speaking in the best interest of those on whose behalf they are authorized to speak and don't want an advocate to speak for them, then, although it would be wrong for that advocate to speak *for* them, it would also

be wrong for the advocate not to speak *up*. The advocate is not only entitled, but obliged, to protest to those who are abusing the right to speak for them and, if this does not help, to protest, if possible, to whoever authorized them to speak for them. If even this fails, however, then the advocate can do nothing more to prevent or correct that abuse. But, without speaking for them, the advocate may certainly help them in lots of other ways. Besides counteracting the bad effects of the abuse, an advocate may even plead a cause *in order to* benefit them, as long as the advocate does not speak for them in advocating it. So the advocate does not face a dilemma in which every possible action is wrong. It's just that the advocate must act in the best interest of those who can't speak for themselves without speaking *for* them.

My examples are simple, I know. They are designed to isolate a single issue, not to display the complexity of actual situations.

My point about severely retarded people and people in comas is that they are *different* from people such as physically disabled but mentally competent older people who can indicate what they want. Even so, if severely retarded people and people in comas have next-of-kin who can speak for them, then *they* may do so. An advocate may not speak for *them* without their permission. The role of the courts is to authorize people to speak for those who can't speak for themselves. Anyone who wants to can speak *up* (e.g., as a friend of the court) but, without authorization, nobody may speak *for* them.

The difference is between advocating a cause ("I favor..., for such-and-such reasons") and speaking *for* someone ("I am speaking for so-and-so, and he or she favors..."). To distinguish between these, the advocates need to ask themselves whether or not they are speaking *only in their own names* in favor of that cause. If they are, then they are not speaking for anyone else; but, if they aren't, then they are speaking for others.

Margery Naylor van Inwagen

$$\boxed{\textit{Editorial}}$$

Thoughts at Transition

Susan J. Ellis
Editor-in-Chief

In 1981, when I first volunteered to assume the editorship of AVA's journal, Ivan Scheier, Arty Trost and I had an interesting discussion about editorials. The question was whether it was appropriate for the editor of a professional journal to put her or his opinion into print on a regular basis—to be given a forum simply by virtue of the editorial position held. In the end, I decided that I would not introduce this feature in The Journal of Volunteer Administration, though I have occasionally surfaced in some "Ed. Notes" when necessary. However, as I prepare to turn the Editor-in-Chief position over to the capable hands (and mind!) of Anne Honer, I wish to assert my prerogative and submit this "swan song" editorial, largely because after six years there are some things I very much want to say!

Some readers may not be aware that I actually was the last editor-in-chief of The Journal's predecessor, entitled simply Volunteer Administration. I edited the last two issues of Volume XIV (with unsung help from Arty Trost's word processing and Sam Baker's layouts), then coordinated the transition between the old and the new publications. This included developing a work plan and editorial procedures for the new journal, recruiting volunteer manuscript reviewers, revising the subscription process, filing necessary documents—a host of tasks ranging from the exciting to the nitty-gritty. It is never too late to give recognition, and it should be recorded that the rock anchoring the journal in that time was Hilda Palm (AVA's present Update Editor). Hilda was "Managing Editor" and—as a volunteer—maintained all the financial records and subscription data for Volunteer Administration. She was an unbelievable help in the early years and I cannot thank her enough. Because she lives in Boulder and was willing, she provided the training for our first paid Subscription Manager, Patty Baessler. Today, Hilda still helps The Journal by proofing the "blue lines" in the final publishing phase.

Anne Hayden, serving on the AVA board as first Public Information Chair, was also greatly involved in shaping The Journal of Volunteer Administration. She and I met for marathon sessions up and down the east coast for several months, mapping out the future of AVA's new publication. Each subsequent Public Information Chair has served on the committee of "Policy Advisors," joining Carol Moore and Sarah Jane Rehnborg who have stood ready to give advice during the last five years of The Journal of Volunteer Administration's history.

Patty Baessler turned over her job to Patty Shearer who then was succeeded by Stephanie Mile. All three Subscription Managers have cared about the development of The Journal and I want to thank each of them publicly for their extra special attention to the business details of this publication. Hats off, too, to Martha Martin for all those years of fetching and carrying Journal-related manuscripts, galleys, boxes, etc.! It is not easy to publish something with the editor thousands of miles away!

One more piece of history should go on record. As you know, The Journal became fully typeset only two years ago. Prior to that time, each issue was word processed and laid out in the editor's office. This meant that four times a year for four years, ENERGIZE was immersed in a paper blizzard—every surface was appropriated for creating the camera-ready mechanical. My thanks go first to Laurence Manou who, after fulfilling his contract to redesign The Journal, then volunteered to teach me how

to wax the pages and create the layout—and who came twice to help and loaned his own waxer for a year. Everyone who worked at ENERGIZE during those years participated at one time or another in the layout sessions (it took from 10 to 16 hours to complete each issue). Thanks to secretaries, student interns, part-time staff, husband/ Vice President John Paul Dalsimer, and mother Ann Ellis!

And a special word about volunteer Ann Ellis. She has proofread 19 of the 22 issues of The Journal that I edited. She did not like all the articles, but she took pride in seeing that the words were spelled right! Thank you, Mom.

Every manuscript submitted to The Journal that passed my initial reading was reviewed by two Editorial Reviewers. Each Reviewer took this assignment seriously and maintained the turn-around schedule so that production could flow smoothly. We have rotated these editorial positions so that seven different people have participated. My appreciation goes to them all. Katherine Noyes has added a major dimension to The Journal with the Volunteerism Citation Index, building on Gordon Manser's efforts on Abstracts (which, in turn, built on Ivan Scheier's Abstracts in Volunteer Administration—the path is long!). Barbara Nesbitt served as our first Training Design Editor.

Anne Honer began as a Reviewer in 1981, served as Senior Editor for this volume year, and is now moving into the Editor-in-Chief slot. Truly an experienced Journal participant, I thank Anne for her constant support and her enthusiasm in assuming the top role.

THE NEED TO WRITE

While I am happy to be turning the Editorship over to Anne, I have committed to remaining active with The Journal in one area: soliciting manuscripts. As many of you know, I believe strongly that volunteer leaders must make the effort to document their successes (and failures) in writing. So I put you all on notice that I will continue to nag, will continue to point a finger and exhort you to "write!"

Volunteerism is still in the midst of self-discovery. There is so much we have left to learn about what volunteers do, how we can most effectively involve them, and what the potential is for the future of the leadership of volunteers.

Of the almost 300 authors who have submitted manuscripts to The Journal in the last six years, almost two-thirds have been academicians. Of those, precious few have ever personally administered a volunteer effort. I hope scholars will continue to study and write about volunteerism, but I also hope the number of practitioner-authors will increase. Those who "do" can—and should—also share their knowledge with their colleagues.

Oral presentations are important, but words spoken out loud dissipate. They are heard only by a limited few and even then are not heard fully. The written word can be disseminated, reviewed, debated, passed on. We in volunteer leadership cannot allow our colleagues to keep reinventing the square wheel because no information was available about someone else's experience. There is too much to do to waste our time repeating all the steps. Articles, books, manuals, etc. are ways to get a head start on action—to move beyond the basics.

Are you doing something with volunteers that is working really well? Tell us. Are you grappling with an unresolved issue and want to alert others to its implications? Tell us. Have you tried something that did not work but from which you learned a great deal? Tell us. But tell us in writing. And send it to The Journal of Volunteer Administration first!

There is also room for more collaboration between scholars and practitioners. Both sides can initiate a meeting in which useful research projects are discussed. Why should volunteer administrators sit and wish for data when a local faculty member might love to do that very research study? And why should graduate students and faculty pick topics out of thin air when the volunteer community might have a wish list of pressing questions worth studying?

"I DON'T HAVE TIME"

No one has time to write. Most articles take many hours to draft and polish. If you

wait until you have a whole day "free" for writing, that time will never come. The only secret of writing is to sit down and *do it.*

Start with twenty minutes to draft an outline. The next time you have twenty minutes, write the opening. Or, better yet, forget the opening and write a few paragraphs "in the middle." You can always do the opening after you see how the article ended up! Twenty minutes every other day will give you an article at the end of the month.

Tell a few people you are writing an article. Fear of embarrassment will then motivate you to do it. Do you really want to explain why you did not "get to it"?

Sign up for an evening school course in writing and tell the instructor your goal is an article for *The Journal.* That way your manuscript is "homework" for the course and you gain a helpful editor via the teacher.

Recruit a volunteer who knows how to write and collaborate! Or let the volunteer write the article alone, after having "interviewed" you.

In the last analysis, producing a manuscript is like anything else. It begins with writing the first word. It is sustained by a commitment to getting it done.

CROSS-FERTILIZATION

The ability to be articulate about one's subject is only part of the responsibility of a writer. It is also necessary to sense the perspective of one's readers. This means taking the time (the words) to translate experiences in a particular setting to more generic terms. For example, if you are writing about a volunteer effort in a state park, provide some ideas for how other volunteer leaders, perhaps those in social service agencies, might apply your information to their programs.

In my years of editing, training, consulting and writing I have found truth in the observation that programs are much more similar than they are different. This fact is as important to *The Journal* readers as to our writers. I take pride in the diversity of settings that have been explored in the last five years in these pages. But I fear that some of our readers have scanned the front cover table of contents and concluded "there is not much here for me."

Cross-fertilization of ideas and techniques is exactly what builds our *profession* of volunteer administration. Either there are generic concepts to share regardless of setting or we do not have a profession, just similar jobs. It is valid to find one article more immediately pertinent than another, but all the articles should add to your basic knowledge base of the scope of volunteerism.

In many ways, that is what the Association for Volunteer Administration is all about. AVA is the place to identify and strengthen our field's commonalities. There are times in which meeting with peers in similar settings is vital. But when it comes to true professional development, settings are largely irrelevant. Our common denominator is *volunteers.* The philosophy, theory and successful techniques of mobilizing citizen involvement are our professional identity. How we apply these may differ, but we are all in this field together.

SOME CLOSING THOUGHTS

If I appear in *The Journal* again, it will be as a regular author and so this is my last chance to editorialize from a purely personal point of view.

While I continue to feel extremely positive about volunteerism's future, I have some concerns about where the profession of volunteer administration may be leading. And I think we all share in the responsibility to keep ourselves on track.

First, we must aim to avoid elitism. Leaders of volunteers are *enablers* of volunteer effort. What is important is the encouragement and effectiveness of volunteers—equal access to the opportunity to participate in our society. We administrators are not important unless the volunteers we lead are strong. As a field, we also need to find ways to collaborate more effectively with *volunteer* volunteer leaders, to link career directors of volunteers with officers of all-volunteer associations, for example.

Because a few of us began writing and speaking earlier than others, a core of "key" people has evolved. But this core is too small. The pool of conference presenters and

written word producers must grow beyond the pioneers. And we must be sure not to set up obstacles in the way of newcomers. *The Journal of Volunteer Administration* is one forum for new voices. Since all submissions are reviewed "blind," articles are published not because of the author's name, but simply because of the value of an article's content. AVA and others must find additional ways to gain further participation from those who are trying to contribute to the field.

Certification is an important step toward professionalism, but it is a two-edged sword. Let's not allow the "CVA" to become an exclusionary badge. Volunteerism is much more than agency-based volunteer "programs." Leaders of volunteers are more numerous than those with the title of "director of volunteers." I doubt that fire chiefs, clergy, political campaign managers, civic club officers, or others will ever seek "CVA" status—but they *are* in our field. Let's be sure we keep reaching out to them.

If we recruit volunteers to help our organizations, then we in turn must be willing to volunteer ourselves for the things in which we believe. Our professional organizations must be run by us, for us. Leaving the work of AVA to its board and staff is *un*professional. But there also need to be clearer ways for members to participate—a greater willingness to open up the inner circle to more people.

The "Letters to the Editor" column in *The Journal* has always had potential. It is with regret that I leave the Editorship without having stimulated readers to *join in* via this forum. Perhaps in the future each of you will write down your reactions to articles, to current events, to AVA activities—to anything affecting volunteerism. Without such feedback, *The Journal* is a tree falling soundlessly.

How many other fields are new enough for each participant to have an impact? Speak up and out—and do it in writing!

Thank you for the opportunity to serve as Editor-in-Chief. The work has been obvious. The fun has been nurturing first-time writers. The payback has been adding to the knowledge of the field to which I am deeply committed.

I pass you the blue pencil, Anne. Have a great time as Editor-in-Chief!

Volunteerism Citation Index

Covering Articles

Appearing during 1986-87

Katherine H. Noyes, Citation Editor

The Volunteerism Citation Index (VCI) is published twice a year by *The Journal* as a service to our readers. It is intended to be a tool for learning what is being written about volunteerism by those in other professions, and as an on-going guide to current trends affecting volunteerism. VCI also assists those who are conducting research, and adds another dimension to the definition and formalization of our field.

VCI includes citations from both popular and scholarly sources generally available in libraries. Articles are selected because they relate directly to volunteerism and volunteers, *as defined by the subject matter*, not the source. Pamphlets, newsletters, dissertations, unpublished papers and most newspaper articles are excluded because they are too "fleeting" in availability and often difficult to track down in their entirety.

COURTS, CORRECTIONS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

"Crime Stoppers Programs Growing Rapidly, NIJ Reports." *Crime Control Digest*: 20(October 13, '86): 2-3.

Hartman, T.L. "Crime Stoppers: An Effective Law Enforcement Tool." *The Police Chief*, 53(July '86): 66-7.

Hutto, T.D. "Corrections' Strength and Vision." *Corrections Today*, 48(October '86): 42-3.

Leibrich, J. "Community Service Sentencing in New Zealand: A Survey of Users." *Federal Probation*, 50(March '86): 55-64.

"Perspective: Enlisting The Public." *The Law Officer's Bulletin*, 11(October 16, '86): 36.

Schwarz, R.J. "Pay Off: Enriching Lives Through Industries." *Corrections Today*, 48(October '86): 18+.

Vass, A.A. "Community Service: Areas of Concern and Suggestions For Change." *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(May '86): 100-11.

"Volunteer Rescue Squad Cited For Efforts To Save Youth." *Enforcement Journal*, 25(April/June '86): 2.

EDUCATION

Boraks, N. and L. McLendon. "Building Support Systems for Volunteer Tutors." *Lifelong Learning*, 10(November '86): 12+.

Brehm, D. "The Volunteer Tutoring Program at Portland Community College: A Service to the Community." *Community & Junior College Libraries*, 3(Fall '84): 25-33.

Gaughan, K.K. "Literacy Projects In Libraries." *Library Trends*, 3(Fall '86): 277+.

Holmes, W.P., Jr. "Here's How Our School Board Is Boosting Black Student Achievement." *American School Board Journal*, 173(October '86): 38-9.

"Finding Your Place In Election '86; When You Vote For Candidates or Volunteer To Work for Their Campaigns, You Help Decide the Nation's Direction." *Scholastic Update*, 1(October 20, '86): 3.

Jones, C.B. "Grandparents Read to Special Preschoolers." *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 19(September '86): 36-7.

Lerch, H.A. and M.M. Byrd. "Out-of-School Learning." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 57(August '86): 40-2.

Leyser, Y., et al. "Direct Intervention to Modify Attitudes Toward the Handicapped by Community Volunteers: The Learning About Handicaps Programme." *Educational Review*, 38(3, '86): 229-36.

"Nine Colleges Get Grants to Start Courses Relating to Philanthropy." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 33(November 12, '86): 38.

"Outreach Education: Reflections on Experience." *Community Development Journal*, 21 (October '86): 246-58.

Powell, B. "Volunteers in the Schools: A Positive Approach to Schooling." *NASSP Bulletin*, 70(December '86): 32-4.

Rothenberg, T. "Five Keys to a Campaign Win." *Scholastic Update*, 1(October 20, '86): 9.

Sang, H.A. "TV, Telephones and Teachers Bring Homework Help to Kids." *Executive Educator*, 8(November '86): 25-6.

"School Volunteers." *Better Homes and Gardens*, 64(November '86): 58.

Seeley, D.S. "Partnership's Time Has Come." *Educational Leadership*, 44(September '86): 82-5.

"Thousands Volunteer for U. Mass Library's Clean-Up." *American Libraries*, 1(November '86): 796.

Toufexis, A. "Silver Bullets For the Needy; Campuses Are Seeing A Renewal of Student Volunteerism." *Time*, 1(March 16, '87): 72+.

Watson, T. "Reading Aloud in Seattle: A Good Idea Getting Better." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 6(February '87): 20+.

HEALTH CARE

Adsit, P.A. and J. Lee "The Use of Art in Stroke Group Therapy." *Rehabilitation Nursing*, 11(November/December '86): 18-9.

Arno, P.S. "The Nonprofit Sector's Response to the AIDS Epidemic: Community-Based Services in San Francisco." *American Journal of Public Health*, 76 (November '86): 1325-30.

Briggs, J.S. "Volunteer Qualities: A Survey of Hospice Volunteers." *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 14(January/February '87): 27-31.

Cahill, B.F. "Training Volunteers as Child Advocates." *Child Welfare*, 65(November/December '86): 545-53.

Carr, G.M. and R. Hampson. "A New Approach to the Psychological Care of Adolescents with Cancer." *Medical Journal of Australia*, 145(December 1-15, '86): 580+

Davis, W.D., Jr. "In Black American Communities, Volunteer Health Cadres." *Hygiene*, 5(September '86): 32-7.

Engel, N.S., M. Kojima, and I.M. Martinson. "A Community Health Center Responds to the Aging of Japan." *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 12(November '86): 12-6.

Fox, C. "The Wasted Resource—Helping Young People With Diabetes to Help Each Other." *Diabetic Medicine*, 3(September/October '86): 475-6.

Frazier, C.A. "On the Training and Licensing of Lay Persons to Administer Epinephrine," *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 47(September '86): 436.

"Genetics Support Groups: Volunteers and Professionals as Partners." *Birth Defects*, 22(2, '86): whole issue.

Gourley, M. "When Those Called Upon Are Also the Victims." *Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 4(6, '86): 483-6.

Hamilton, G. "Health of the Volunteer Overseas: Cause for Concern?" *Journal Review of Social Medicine*, 79(October '86): 563-4.

Heywood, J.I. "Helping Hands: An Equal Place." *Nursing Times* 83(March 18-24, '87): 36-7.

Heywood, I. "Helping Hands: Coping With Physical Change." *Nursing Times*, 83 (February 11-17, '87): 26-8.

Hill, A.S. and S.G. Fuller. "Volunteerism in Pediatric Nursing: A Conceptual Model and Practical Applications." *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 2(April '87): 88-95.

Howie, C. "Helping the Aged." *Nursing Times*, 83(February 4-10, '87): 40-2.

Kennedy, J.D. "A Patient Relations Program: Bridge Between High Technology and Sensitive Patient Care." *Perio. Nursing Quarterly*, 2(September '86): 51-6.

Kreutz, R. "Self-Help Groups as a Teaching Strategy." *Nurse Educator*, 12(January/February, '87): 6.

Kumar, V., O.P. Monga, and I.J. Walia. "Knowledge of Community Health Volunteers Regarding Treatment of Acute Diarrhea in Children." *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics*, 32(October '86): 214-7.

Langford, R. "Time to Play." *Nursing Times*, 83(February 18-24, '87): 40-1.

Larson, D.G. "Developing Effective Hospice Support Groups: Pilot Test of an Innovative Training Program." *Hospice Journal*, 2(Summer '86): 41-55.

Lefebvre, R.C., *et al.* "Theory and Delivery of Health Programming in the Community: The Pawtucket Heart Health Program." *Preventive Medicine*, 16(January '87): 80-95.

Lock, S. "Self Help Groups: The Fourth Estate In Medicine?" *British Medical Journal*, 293(December 20-27, '86): 1596-600.

Mangklasriri, R., V. Pichaipat, and W. Varavithya. "Effectiveness of Diarrheal Diseases Surveillance by Village Health Volunteer." *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*, 69(October '86): 91-3.

May, D., N. McKeganey, and M. Flood. "Extra Hands or Extra Problems?" *Nursing Times*, 82(September 3-9, '86): 35-8.

Nurden, R. and C. Presern. "Voluntary Service Overseas." *Midwifery*, 2(March '86): 11-4.

Parsonnet, L. and L. Weinstein. "A Volunteer Program for Helping Families in a Critical Care Unit." *Health & Social Work*, 12(Winter '87): 21-7.

Pownall, M. "Nursing Aid, In Rural Isolation." *Nursing Times*, 83(February 18-24, '87): 44.

Seibold, D.R. *et al.* "Volunteer Involvement in a Hospice Care Program: An Examination of Motives, Activities." *American Journal of Hospice Care*, 4(March/April '87): 43-55.

Soltys, F.G. "Recruiting Black Volunteers for a Hospice Setting: Understanding the Community and Your Role In It." *American Journal of Hospice Care*, 3(November/December '86): 22-6.

Stone, J. "AIDS Volunteers." *Glamour*, 8(March '87): 288+.

Sues, A.M. and P.A. Wilson. "Developing A Hospital's Volunteer Program." *Health & Social Work*, 12(Winter '87): 13-20.

Tehan, C.B. "Training Volunteers in Home Care for Patients with AIDS." *QRB*, 12(October '86): 359-60.

Wilkinson, H.J. and J.W. Wilkinson. "Evaluation of a Hospice Volunteer Training Program." *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying*, 17(3, '86): 263-75.

Young, C.L., *et al.* "Organizational Volunteers for the Rural Frail Elderly: Outreach, Casefinding, and Service Delivery." *Gerontologist*, 26(August '86): 342-44.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Calabrese, R.L. and H. Schumer. "The Effects of Service Activities on Adolescent Alienation." *Adolescence*, 21(Fall '86): 675-87.

Gesten, E.L. and L.A. Jason. "Social and Community Interventions." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38('87): 427-60.

Klein, J.M. and S.I. Miller. "Three Approaches to the Treatment of Drug Addiction." *Hospital & Community Psychiatry*, 37(November '86): 1083-5.

Leigh, G. and R. Gerrish "Attitudes Toward Alcoholism in Volunteer Therapist Aides: Do They Change? *Drug and Alcohol Dependency*, 17(July '86): 381-90.

Lesser, R. *et al.* "Involving Relatives in Aphasia Therapy." *International Journal of Rehabiliatation Research*, 9(3, '86): 259-67.

Morrow, H.N. and M.N. Ozawa "Helping Network: Seniors to Seniors." *Gerontologist*, 27(February, '87): 17-20.

Rondon, N. "KID-ABILITY: Taking Action against Child Sexual Abuse." *Children Today*, 15(July/August '86): 2-5.

Vaughan, M.L. "Parents Anonymous: Helping Clients to Accept Professional Services." *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 11(1, '87): 156-7.

TRENDS IN VOLUNTEERISM

Bailey, A.L. "Non-Profit Coalition Launches Campaign to Double Charitable Gifts to $160-Billion." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 33(November 5, '86): 29+.

Brodsky, R. "As Much To Gain As Give; Join the Vital World of Today's Volunteers." *Modern Maturity*, 2(April/May '87): 46+.

Burke, L. "Corporate Community Involvement in the San Francisco Bay Area." *California Management Review*, 28(Spring '86): 122-41.

Duncombe, S. "Volunteers in City Government: Getting More Than Your Money's Worth." *National Civic Review*, 75(September/October '86): 291-301.

Longfellow, E.A. "Volunteers and Liability." *Minnesota Cities*, 71(December '86): 6-7.

Khatib, R.B. "Quality for Productivity Through Quality Control Circles." *Skillstech*, 1(October/December '85): 18+.

Moxley, R.L. and T.S. Hannah. "Individual Participation Patterns in Community Social Action." *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 17(2, '86): 1-23.

Newman, S. and Bocian, K. "Connecting the Generations." *Ageing International*, 13(Autumn '86): 13 +.

Plakins, A. "How to Help: A Guide to Volunteering." *New York*, 19(October 13, '86): 54.

Rosellini, L., *et al.* "Giving That Makes A Difference." *U.S. News & World Report*, 1 (December 22, '86): 58 +.

Salamon, L.M. "Government and the Voluntary Sector in an Era of Retrenchment: The American Experience." *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(January/March '86): 1-20.

Stechert, K. "Thanks to These Good People, A Better World for All." *Better Homes & Gardens*, 6(December '86): 37 +.

White, L.G. "Urban Community Organizations and Local Government: Exploring Relationships and Roles." *Public Administration and Development*, 6(July/September '86): 239-53.

MISCELLANEOUS

Belitsky, E.F. "I'm Just a Girl Who Can't Say No (to Volunteering)." MS, 1(February '87): 48 +.

Corbett, M. "The Perfect Working Vacation." *National Parks*, 6(November/December '86): 10 +.

Doyle, S. "The Docent Elite." *Town and Country*, 1(November '86): 267 +.

Hammond, M. "Homes Grown." *Essence Magazine*, 1(May '87): 30.

Hannusch, J. "Volunteerism: It's in the Can." *New Orleans*, 21(October '86): 96.

"Happy Anniversary, Jesuit Volunteer Corps." *America*, 1(February 14, '87): 119.

Hartigan, P. "Boston Computer Society Is Model User Group." *PC Week*, 4(April '87): 69 +.

Jones, A. "Faith: Catholic; Job: Volunteer." *National Catholic Reporter*, 2(March '87): 1 +.

Kahn, S.H. "Incorporating Voluntarism into Rural Development in Bangladesh." *Third World Planning Review*, 8(May '86): 139-152.

Kallen, N. "Hungry Hearts." *Seventeen*, 45(November '86): 130.

Lineback, D.J. "Keep Your Volunteers On-Line." *Currents*, 12(September '86): 58-60.

Ocko, S. "The Business of Selling Adventure," *Technology Review*, 9(February/March '87): 64 +.

Pritchard, P.C. "Volunteers vs. Professionals in the Parks." *National Parks*, 6 (November/December '86): 5.

Rastikis, L. "Kettering Fire Department Breaks with Tradition." *Public Management*, 6(December '86): 26 +.

Sloan, C. "Trail Blazers; The 200-Mile Appalachian Trail Is the Only Park Area Created and Managed by Volunteers." *National Parks*, 6(November/December '86): 24 +.

Stevens, J.E. "Digging into History; The Work Is Hard, Unpaid, and Not Very Glamorous, But That Doesn't Stop Amateurs Around the Country from Volunteering to Help with the Spadework." *Americana*, 1(February '87): 41 +.

Toops, C. "Trash Bashing on the Buffalo." *National Parks*, 6(November/December '86): 31.

Weinschenk, D. "I & R Service from Volunteer Senior Citizens." *Library Journal*, 111(October 15, '86): 50.

Readers are alerted to the recent publication of the following valuable resource:

Daphne Niobe Layton. *Philanthropy and Volunteerism: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: The Foundation Center, 1987.

This comprehensive bibliography lists over 1,600 books and articles that analyze aspects of the philanthropic tradition in the United States and abroad. Almost 250 of the references are extensively annotated. "Volunteering" is one of the categories researched.

The book is available for $18.50 from The Foundation Center, 79 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003.

THE JOURNAL OF
VOLUNTEER
ADMINISTRATION

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

I. CONTENT

A.   THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION provides a forum for the exchange of ideas and the sharing of knowledge about volunteer administration. Articles may address practical concerns in the management of volunteer programs, philosophical issues in volunteerism, and significant applicable research.

B.   Articles may focus on volunteering in *any* type of setting. In fact, THE JOURNAL encourages articles dealing with areas less-visible than the more traditional health, social services, and education settings. Also, manuscripts may cover both formal volunteering and informal volunteering (self-help, community organization, etc.). Models of volunteer programming may come from the voluntary sector, government-related agencies, or the business world.

C.   Please note that this JOURNAL deals with *volunteerism*, not *voluntarism*. This is an important distinction. For clarification, here are some working definitions:

volunteerism: anything related to volunteers or volunteer programs, regardless of setting, funding base, etc. (so includes government-related volunteers)

voluntarism: refers to anything voluntary in our society, including religion; basically refers to *voluntary agencies* (with volunteer boards and private funding)—and voluntary agencies do *not* always utilize volunteers.

Our readership and focus is concerned with anything regarding *volunteers*. A general article about, for example, changes in Federal funding patterns may be of value to executives of *voluntary agencies*, but not to administrators of *volunteer programs* necessarily. If this distinction is still unclear, feel free to inquire further and we will attempt to categorize your manuscript subject for you.

D.   THE JOURNAL is seeking articles with a "timeless" quality. Press releases or articles simply describing a new program are not sufficient. We want to go beyond "show and tell" to deal with substantive questions such as:

—why was the program initiated in the first place? what obstacles had to be overcome?

—what advice would the author give to others attempting a similar program?

—what might the author do differently if given a second chance?

—what might need adaptation if the program were duplicated elsewhere?

Articles must be conscious demonstrations of an issue or a principle.

II. PROCEDURE

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

AVA
P.O. Box 4584
Boulder, CO 80306

B.   Manuscripts may be submitted at any time during the year, but the following are the deadlines for consideration for publication in each issue:

for the *October* issue: manuscripts are due on the 15th *of July*.

for the *January* issue: manuscripts are due on the 15th *of October*.

for the *April* issue: manuscripts are due on the 15th *of January*.

for the *July* issue: manuscripts are due on the 15th *of April*.

C.   With the three copies of the manuscript, authors must send the following:

1. a one-paragraph biography, highlighting the author's background in volunteerism;

2. a cover letter authorizing THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION to publish the submitted article, if found acceptable;

3. mailing address(es) and telephone number(s) for each author credited.

D. Articles will be reviewed by a panel of Reviewing Editors. The author's name will be removed prior to this review to assure full impartiality. The review process takes six weeks to three months.

1. Authors will be notified in advance of publication of acceptance of their articles. THE JOURNAL retains the right to edit all manuscripts for basic writing and consistency control. Any need for extensive editing will be discussed with the author in advance. Published ms. will not be returned.

2. Unpublished manuscripts will be returned to the authors with comments and criticism.

3. If a manuscript is returned with suggestions for revisions and the author subsequently rewrites the article, the second submission will be re-entered into the regular review process as a new article.

E. Authors of published articles will receive two complimentary copies of the issue of THE JOURNAL carrying their article.

F. Copyright for all published articles is retained by the Association for Volunteer Administration.

III. STYLE

A. Manuscripts should be *ten to thirty pages* in length, with some exceptions.

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

C. Manuscripts should be submitted with a title page containing title and author and *which can be removed* for the "blind" review process. Author's name should not appear on the text pages, but the article title may be repeated (or a key word used) at the top of each text page.

D. Footnotes should appear at the end of the manuscripts, followed by references listed alphabetically (please append an accurate, complete bibliography in proper form).

E. Authors are advised to use non-sexist language. Pluralize or use he/she.

F. Contractions should not be used unless in a quotation.

G. First person articles are acceptable, especially if the content of the article draws heavily upon the experiences of the author. This is a matter of personal choice for each author, but the style should be consistent throughout the article.

H. Authors are encouraged to use interior headings to aid the reader in keeping up with a lengthy article. This means breaking up the text at logical intervals with introductory "titles." Refer to issues of THE JOURNAL for sample headings.

I. Illustrations (photographs, artwork) will only be used in rare instances in which the illustrations are integral to the content of the article. Generally such artwork will not be accepted.

J. Figures and charts should be submitted only when absolutely necessary to the text of the manuscript. Because of the difficulty we have in typesetting figures and charts, authors are requested to submit such pieces in *camera-ready* form. Figures and charts will generally be placed at the end of an article.

THE JOURNAL OF VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION welcomes your interest in our publication. We are ready and willing to work collaboratively with authors to produce the best possible article. Please feel free to submit outlines or first drafts to receive initial response from us. If your work is not accepted on the first try, we encourage you to rewrite your manuscript and resubmit.

Further questions may be directed to our administrative offices in Boulder or to Anne Honer, Editor-in-Chief (401) 751-4300.

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

AVA

JOIN YOUR COLLEAGUES AT THE

1987 National Conference on Volunteerism

CHICAGO
Hyatt-Regency O'Hare
October 8-11, 1987

	FEES	
	Advance Prior to	**Regular**
Registration	9-1-87	
Member	$225	$245
Affiliate	250	270
Non Member	275	295
Daily $90		

NATIONAL AFFILIATES:
American Red Cross
Association of Junior Leagues, Inc.
Camp Fire, Inc.
Literacy Volunteers of America
Lutheran Brotherhood
National Council of Jewish Women
Prison Fellowship Ministries

The Salvation Army
United Way of America
VOLUNTEER: The National Center
Young Men's Christian Association

SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS:
AVA-Metro Chicago
Corporate Volunteerism Council of Chicago