VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Volume XI
Number 3
Fall 1978

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

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

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

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

Additional information about the publishing associations may be obtained from:

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

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

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

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

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

there were consequently heady, optimistic feelings in large sectors of the population in general and the union movement in particular that people in difficulties would no longer have to depend on volunteer and voluntary philanthropy. It was hoped that through the National Insurance scheme the nation's health and welfare requirements would be available as a right of an egalitarian basis to all people regardless of means. Further it was hoped that these health and welfare services would be provided, not through a handful of well meaning volunteers and voluntary organizations, but through paid skilled and professional workers employed by government services.

The feeling that volunteers were an irrelevancy, and an inheritance from the past, was not only shared by the labour movement but also probably the majority of professional workers in the health and welfare services. Even the voluntary movement itself had severe doubts about its role. However, the voluntary movement in response to the welfare state, successfully developed its role as a pioneer to meet new needs and services as yet not identified or taken on by the welfare state services. But it should be noted that these voluntary efforts were not seen as an alternative form of provision but rather the piloting of new provision subsequently to be taken over by the welfare state and run by paid workers.

By the time the 1970s had been reached, the situation was a very different one. The voluntary sector was no longer just a hesitant pioneer - it had also become a vigorous critic on behalf of various disadvantaged groups such as the homeless, the elderly, the mentally ill, etc. But the role of the voluntary movement as major and lasting independent provider of services was still not widely appreciated or accepted. Insofar as it is possible to generalize, the union movement still regarded state welfare services manned by paid workers as the only significant means of meeting social need. In the late 60's and early 70's there were major budgetary expansions in the state health and welfare services and this gave new enthusiasm to those many people who felt that state services manned by paid workers would be able to cope with all problems of human need, given sufficient time and manpower.

However, despite general union suspicion and dislike of voluntary health and welfare services, they had up until 1970 done little to actively oppose the volunteer contribution.

But it was in this period of financial growth of state services that the labour unions with memberships in the government health and welfare services began to become more openly critical of what appeared to them to be the anachronism of volunteer helpers. In 1970 the national conference of one of the more active unions in the field - the Confederation of Health Service Employees - passed a resolution condemning the use of volunteers in hospitals and expressing its suspicion of the political motives behind official encouragement given to setting up voluntary help schemes. Union criticism began to grow partly because of the feeling that there was enough money around to pay for more paid workers and paradoxically because of fears that a change of government from a Labour (Socialist) administration to a Conservative administration would lead to a cut back in this growth. Union fears of financial cutbacks were proven correct. Successive Conservative and Labour administrations have cut back drastically on the rate of growth of government health and welfare services to the point now where we are virtually in a position of nil growth.

If my description of the attitudes of unions in the government services ascribes to them a certain sense of paranoia, I should point out that over the late 60's and early 70's there was an unprecedented growth in the appointment of Directors of Volunteer Services or what we call Voluntary Service Coordinators. For example, in the National Health Service in 1967 there were

only 14 Voluntary Service Coordinators. Yet by 1973 this figure had reached 225 and now there were 330. In the personal social services, a major government report in 1970 recommended significant increases in Voluntary Service Coordinators in that sector also. It had already become government policy in the probation service for official recognition and encouragement to be given to volunteering.

Therefore, in the early 1970's we had a tense situation developing. Successive governments were encouraging greater volunteer activity in government health and welfare services, while at the same time there was growing aggression from the organized labour movement towards the involvement of volunteers in government services. This situation was exacerbated by some enthusiastic volunteer action during strikes in the health services in 1973.

Having described the growing union opposition to volunteers, it is important to look at the reasons for union objection. Understandably the main concern was the perceived threat that volunteers posed to paid workers. Volunteers were not only seen as threatening the overall number of paid jobs but also the type and status of paid employment. Further there was sufficient evidence of the involvement of volunteers affecting levels of earnings that this also became an issue. There were widely held assumptions behind the growth of welfare states services that they should be manned almost entirely by paid workers. There was also a genuinely felt fear that volunteers would lower the standard of services for clients and patients.

Another fear, which was not featured in many public situations but was certainly acknowledged in private, was the concern that outsiders unaccountable to these services in any legal way would become self appointed inspectors of welfare state services. Further, they might contribute to a minor if growing chaos through being outside a direct control of the services themselves. It would be wrong to associate this concern simply with unions representing unskilled and semi-skilled workers. Staff associations and professional bodies also worked on the assumption that paid workers were best and that volunteers could only provide service on the cheap, masking the need for more paid workers. Further it was felt that the growing volunteer involvement was encouraging unskilled and untrained people to do more than they were in reality able to accomplish.

In this description so far I have described some of the developments associated with the anti-volunteer lobby among labour unions and professional associations. That description should be qualified strongly by the assessment that only a minority of individuals, unions and professional associations were overtly antagonistic although I suspect that the majority were quietly anti-pathetic.

It should be acknowledged that a minority of union leaders and people active in professional associations were extremely positive in their attitudes towards volunteer involvement. If this had not been the case it would have been inconceivable that welfare state policy on paper would have shifted so positively towards volunteer involvement. This lobby's sophisticated analysis and promotion of volunteer involvement did a lot to lay the foundations of the more healthy relationships that now exist between the volunteer movement and professional and union bodies.

Nevertheless, back in the early 70's the situation was beginning to worry several of the more sensitive observers. Indeed it was partly their intervention which led to the setting up of The British Volunteer Centre with its purpose of encouraging more and more effective community involvement through concentrating on information exchange, research, training and development.

The Volunteer Centre was founded in late 1973 just at the time that the negative debate on paid workers versus volunteers was reaching the boil. *One of its first acts was to meet informally with several influential union leaders to see if there was any willingness to take some of the heat off the situation and to explore some of the difficult issues out of the eye of the public debate. The response was positive and in 1974 The Volunteer Centre set up a working group comprising one third trade union representatives, one third representatives of voluntary organizations and one third representatives of welfare state services which were involving volunteers. Perhaps one of the most significant contributions to the later successful deliberations of this group was the invitation and acceptance into membership of the deputy leader of the Confederation of Health Service Employees, the very union that three years ago had passed a resolution condemning the use of volunteers in the National Health Service. However, the significant union representation on the working group guaranteed that the discussions would be difficult and result in no whitewash of volunteerism.*

In the end the careful gathering and analysis of evidence, the skillful chairing by a major union leader, and the many long hours of discussion led to an agreement of guidelines for the relationships between volunteers and paid unskilled workers.

Guidelines were produced on relationships with unskilled workers because this was seen as the main flashpoint area. The more workers felt skilled or professionalized, the less threatened they felt by volunteers.

The guidelines developed by the group are by no means a manifesto on behalf of volunteerism. Indeed, I measure their success by the fact that they have been criticized by some volunteers for being too discouraging of volunteering yet also criticized by some more militant union members for being too positive toward volunteerism. What these guidelines represent is a middle ground that is acceptable to the vast majority of volunteers and union members.

Since their publication in 1975, over fifty thousand copies of the guidelines have been requested and there is a great deal of qualitative evidence that they have had a significant impact on maintaining and improving good relationships at local level. I should point out that they are a voluntary agreement and are in no way legally binding.

Another significant outcome of the working group had nothing to do with the guidelines themselves, but to do with the regular meetings of senior labour union officials, voluntary organization leaders and government service managers. I now feel confident that should any national crisis blow up on the issue of volunteers and paid workers there is sufficient personal contact and trust between these three groupings that The Volunteer Centre could quickly and easily call them together again with beneficial results. Indeed a little under a year ago we convened two further meetings of the group to review the guidelines and as a result they were strengthened, no mean gain in the British situation of economic cutback and rising unemployment.

THE GUIDELINES

The first guideline specified that any change in the level of voluntary service should be preceded by full consultation with interested parties. This <u>local</u> consultation is always necessary because in our country as I suspect in the United States of America, local situations vary enormously. So it is important that management, staff organizations, representatives of volunteers

and where feasible, representatives of those receiving the service, should get together to sort out the implications of any volunteer proposals at the earliest stage.

I know that there are many attractions in not getting into extensive consultations. Firstly, they slow down the implementation of proposals and the consultations themselves often throw up other problems which need solving. Also, it can be argued that if proposals are not brought formally to the attention of local union leaders they will often turn a blind eye to things to which in a more formal situation they might object. There is also a more militant view in the volunteer world, which is certainly not mine, which says that it is none of the business of union leaders what volunteer services are introduced. I would argue with this view, but in a sense it is irrelevant whether one feels that union leaders do have a right to comment or not. In the event of their being dissatisfied, they have such a potential veto that it makes sense to gain their agreement. Put more positively, if one can gain union backing, many problems that would otherwise be there just simply disappear.

Consultation is not simply in favour of the union side either. In England we have had several examples where union proposals for withdrawal of volunteer services were accepted by management without any consultation with the volunteers and voluntary organizations. This guideline insists on tri-lateral negotiations and should prevent a bi-lateral agreement between management and unions which by-pass volunteer representatives.

I would go further than the formal limits of this guideline which calls for formal consultation and say that it is a good tip to keep in regular contact with local union leaders on an informal basis. I know many local relationships in Britain which have started out being very tense, but through sensitive nurturing have changed radically. Union members at all levels were invited to social gatherings and meetings of volunteers. The volunteer service director was careful to identify and relate the voluntary work that union representatives undertook in other aspects of their lives to the volunteer work going on in the work situation.

The second guideline is simply that the agreement of additional voluntary activity needs to be made widely known among the interested parties. This sounds too obvious to be a guideline but in our experience it is a great temptation, once an agreement has been hammered out, often with difficulty, to feel that the main job is then over. As you well know, this is not so. If all the nurses, orderlies, social work aids, porters and cleaners do not know that agreement has been reached with the union, difficulties will follow. If they are not informed of the type of work that will be undertaken then things can go badly in the day-to-day situation. Volunteers may be rebuffed and perhaps consequently respond aggressively, thus starting a vicious spiral of antagonisms.

The third guideline is that voluntary work should complement the work of paid staff and not substitute for it. This is one of the most difficult guidelines to interpret. Essentially it is trying to encapsulate the notion that volunteer work is at its most effective when it is providing a service or a resource in a way that a paid worker, by definition, could not provide. A useful check question is, "if we had all the money and staff we needed, should we still prefer to use a volunteer for this task?"

The most obvious examples of volunteering in this area are befriending an isolated person voluntarily, an activity which is very different from that of the regular visiting by a paid social worker. Another example might be of the provision of advice of welfare rights being more acceptable in certain instances from a volunteer not

associated with authority than when this advice comes from a paid worker who is seen to be part of the authority system. A more general example might be the volunteer being a guide in a hospital, where the fact that a guide is a volunteer and not paid makes him or her seem to the patient and relatives to be just that little bit more like one of them and thus help to overcome their sense of discomfiture.

This guideline is also saying that in a situation where there are say five identical jobs being undertaken by paid workers, it is unacceptable to bring in a sixth person to do an identical job when that person is a volunteer.

In other words certain jobs are for paid workers and not for volunteers. It seems likely that types of jobs that are seen to be inappropriate for volunteers will vary as time passes. For example in the past in hospitals in Britain volunteers were frequently used for clerical duties, especially in medical records. Because, I suspect, of the changing patterns in volunteering with fewer married women to do volunteer work virtually full time, it has been increasingly the case that paid workers have been appointed to these jobs. The scarce pool of volunteers have been increasingly allocated to work that depends on their unique contribution as volunteers. Thus, now it is generally accepted that clerical work in hospitals should be undertaken by paid workers and not by volunteers. Such demarcations will, I am sure, vary over time and differ between one country and another.

The fourth guideline states that the action of volunteers should not threaten the livelihood of paid staff. In Britain there have been occasions in the past, where without proper consultation, voluntary activity has been implemented which has had repercussions on earning levels and has sometimes even threatened the jobs of paid staff. Such action, however well meaning or intended, can only lead to a deterioration in the level of industrial relations and result in a poorer service. Examples of volunteer activity affecting earnings levels quite frequently occur in our health services. A fair number of unskilled workers have financial bonuses attached to specific aspects of their work. For example the amount of crockery they wash up or the number of chairs that have to be moved. It is very easy, unless there is proper prior consultation, for volunteers to become involved in washing up or chair moving which inadvertently affects these financial incentives. As we all know such a problem only has to occur once for rumor to fly.

Although that example is fairly straightforward, it is often difficult to draw what seems to be the right conclusion in the situation of severe staff shortage in a particular area. However, the guideline is quite clear and in the majority of cases it is followed in that volunteers should not be used in situations brought about simply by staff shortages because of the risk that such activity will mask these shortages and result in them never being rectified. It is straightforward in theory but in practice it is difficult to interpret.

For example in one situation a hospital had been short of filing clerks in the medical records department for several months. Because there had been these staff shortages for so long, huge backlogs of work had built up and inefficiency was occurring. When new workers were recruited there appeared to be no time to train them and they were not only faced with work which they could not do, they were being criticized for the backlog and inefficiency. As a consequence the new workers regularly seemed to leave almost as soon as they arrived. The head of the medical records department was quite convinced that if only he could clear the backlog and train incoming workers that there would be no problem. He approached the local Volunteer Service Director to ask

for volunteers to help him achieve this. In the end the Volunteer Service Director for the hospital agreed to place volunteers in these jobs which were reserved for paid workers on the understanding that firstly, the department would train the volunteers; that secondly, the labour union leaders' agreement should be sought and obtained; and thirdly, that there would be a strict time limit set for the volunteer involvement. However, even with these provisos, the Volunteer Service Director was not entirely happy because she knew how difficult it would be to apprise everybody in the hospital of the particular circumstances of the job and she also knew how easily rumors get around to the effect that volunteers are taking over paid workers' jobs.

I am sure that these rather rigid rulings are leading you to feel that changes in the British system must be difficult to bring about. This should not be the case. The only provision that is laid down is that the action of volunteers should not threaten the livelihood of paid staff. Let us take an example in which research shows that volunteer involvement can be beneficial in an area which was previously undertaken by paid workers. This can still be negotiated under this guideline, provided the livelihood of the paid workers is not put in jeopardy. For example in England there is a major service provision which we call Meals-On-Wheels, where meals are delivered to the houses of mainly elderly people who are finding it difficult to cook their own hot meals. This is largely run by paid workers. However, experiments are taking place in several areas whereby instead of meals being prepared and delivered by paid workers, neighbors are being given expenses to prepare an extra meal and take it to the neighbor. Preparation and delivery of meals by neighbors (i.e., volunteers), is being encouraged partly for reasons of cost and partly because it is hoped that such neighborly contact will have other spin-offs such as reducing isolation. Clearly the implementation of such a scheme on a wide basis would be seen as threatening the livelihood of the cooks and drivers associated with the official Meals-On-Wheels service. However, we have an acute shortage of drivers and cooks in many welfare services, and so provided these two groups of people can be deployed to other work which is acceptable to them, then this new form of meals delivery involving neighborhood volunteers is not threatening workers' livelihoods and can be implemented.

The fifth guideline is that voluntary workers should not normally receive financial reward.

Oddly enough, it is the more hard-line volunteers and hard-line labour union members who agree with this guideline and the more middle-of-the-road people who are worried about it. Indeed the working group could not really reach agreement under this guideline. In Great Britain it is commonly accepted that volunteers should receive expenses that they incur when they are doing their voluntary work. However, as in the United States we have become increasingly worried about disproportionately few poorer people who are involved in volunteer programs. One method which has been developed to overcome this is to provide small payments to these volunteers, not as a financial incentive, but simply to make it possible for them to participate. The payment does not make these people employees because they do not have contracts. But they are not really volunteers either, because they could get a lot more money elsewhere and undertaking the work represents a real sacrifice. As you can imagine, union opposition to this is quite explicit. They feel that these people are being exploited because they are not being paid the rate for the job and are also undermining wage levels of paid workers.

So there is no good news under this guideline and what in practice is happening is that a number of programs of 'paid

volunteers' are receiving a significant degree of union opposition.

Perhaps the most emotionally charged area that the guidelines address themselves to is what volunteers should do in cases of union/management conflict. *The sixth guideline says that volunteers in a situation of industrial conflict, which might for example be a strike or go slow, should undertake no more voluntary work than they would do in the normal situation. However, it goes on to say that additional volunteer work can be undertaken provided this is agreed to by the management and those staff organizations involved in the dispute.* The reason for this fairly strict guideline is clear to see. Strike breaking is an emotive word and this is how enthusiastic volunteer activity has been seen in the situation of some strikes. Inevitably what happens is that such action, while it may have a helpful effect on the people being disadvantaged by the strike, has a much greater effect on the intransigence of the strikers. In several situations where volunteers have undertaken the jobs of striking workers it has apparently led to the whole dispute taking far longer to resolve. If that is the short term disadvantage one of the longer term disadvantages is that the relationships when normal work is resumed become difficult if not impossible and result in real setbacks for the volunteer work.

It should be noted that in England threats to life and limbs as a result of disputes in government services are regarded ultimately as the responsibility of the government. Their traditional approach in extreme circumstances has been to call in the armed forces to man critical services. However, the key issue for local negotiation in this guideline has to do with union agreement for extra work. In the situation of a strike, it is often the case that the striking workers are quite pleased that volunteers undertake certain emergency duties. In this way the union can then feel that it is being militant and pushing its sanctions to the limit but the humanitarian instincts of union members can be satisfied with the knowledge that their action will not bring about undue suffering. More pragmatically it will not result in a loss in public sympathy for the strike action because of extreme difficulties experienced by clients.

The seventh guideline recognizes the central role of the Volunteer Services Director. In England this person is seen as having a key promotional role in relation to volunteering and is also expected to take account of all points of view. Therefore, the seventh guideline recommends that when any party (e.g., the volunteer or a paid worker) feels that the spirit of the guidelines is being broken, he or she should immediately talk with the Volunteer Service Director to see if the matter can be sorted out. If it cannot the matter is then referred to full arbitration between the union, management and volunteer representative.

So, this article has attempted to describe the background factors in Great Britain which led to a worsening situation in relationships between volunteers and paid workers and The Volunteer Centre's attempts to bring together the interested parties to draw up guidelines for effective practice. They are complicated and sometimes difficult to interpret. Never-the-less, in local situations, agreement can be reached and good relationships maintained and improved. The evidence appears to be that this has had a major impact on creating positive cooperation between the labour unions and the voluntary movement in Great Britain.

ON THE EVOLUTION OF A COLLABORATION:
A Case Study

By Ivan H. Scheier

I. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

This year, you may have received even more catalogs than usual. One or two of them might have come from a national distribution center for volunteer leadership publications called "Volunteer Readership". This distribution center is intended to provide one place where you can find a large collection of such publications, however scattered their origins. It is an integrated operation of two distinct national organizations: the National Center for Voluntary Action (NCVA) and the National Information Center on Volunteerism (NICOV).

Hopefully, this article will not come across as a commercial for the distribution center. You will be receiving your catalog under separate cover--five or six of them if the computer misfires again. *Here, I simply want to describe the history, planning and implementation of this operation, as a reasonably successful instance of collaboration between two national organizations. From this description, I will then draw inferences about how and why it worked. I hope these guideline hypotheses will be useful for others exploring national collaboration. I believe they also have local applications.*

The strength of this is in sticking fairly close to the real-life evolution of a collaboration. A weakness may be over-reliance on this one instance. Here I can only suggest that NICOV and I have wider experience of collaborative successes and failures. The successes include several years of joint project operations with the Florida Office of Volunteerism. They also include cosponsorship of conferences with AAVS, AVAS, the Junior League, several state offices of volunteerism, and local Voluntary Action Centers. (Collaboration can and should cut across local, state and national lines.)

Dr. Scheier is President and founder of the National Information Center on Volunteerism and a national consultant on volunteerism.

In fact, NCVA/NICOV collaborative experiments did begin as early as this time period. Many of them were relatively short-term, with pullback options. For example, joint proposal development on Alliance Task Forces and elsewhere; a member of one organization serving on the Board of the other; NICOV participation with NCVA in Voluntary Action Leadership; increasingly regular cooperation between our two information systems, etc. Between 1974 and 1978, I can list 17 instances of this sort. Some of them required more than casual, temporary commitment to one another. An example was the 1974-75 project to plan a national information system for volunteerism. Funded by ACTION, it was staffed jointly by NCVA and NICOV. The report tended to polarize response and became quite controversial. Many of the comments and criticisms were positive and helpful. But the total complexion of the controversy left some scars. Thus our first intensive joint venture was weighted towards disappointment. There was much in the experience that could have prompted a "never again together" response. Actually, I think it had the opposite effect. As we believed in what we had produced, bonds were cemented in common defense of the work rather than severed in recrimination.

I am not necessarily recommending shared suffering as a deliberate collaborative principle. (For one thing, it's hard to facilitate self-consciously.) But I do think it can be a factor, if not too overwhelming, for organizations which share a substantial body of common experience. They must also be willing openly to share their hurts and problems with one another, or at least resist projecting false-positive images at each other. This may be more exhortation than deliberate principle. In any event, I think it has diagnostic validity; there's a chance you're going to make it when you can say openly to each other: "Hey, we've got problems; there's some things we can't do, without your help". I'm inclined to believe openly conceded "can't do's" facilitate a collaboration as much as the "can do's". Probably a good mix is best, well-seasoned with objectivity on both sides.

In any case, I think the joint information planning controversy inadvertently helped NICOV and NCVA over the "shiny image" problem. Once over that hurdle, we have had ample opportunity openly to share common problems over recent years because we have been in a somewhat similar position as national organizations. So much for the common complaint factor, otherwise known as the paranoia principle. Organizations that cry together can work together provided thay are crying about the same sorts of things, and not crying all the time.

NCVA/NICOV interaction was not all peaches and cream in the early overlap years. In some instances, NCVA people may have perceived NICOV as aggressing into areas of work and constituency traditionally handled by NCVA. NICOV did not see it that way, but I came to appreciate the restraint and dignity of the NCVA response. There were sometimes hurt feelings too, as individual staff members of one organization began interacting with staff of the other. "They don't understand or appreciate us" is not easy to work out at the 2,000 mile range. In one case I know of, we bid against each other on a significant contract. Nowadays we usually bid jointly on these kinds of contracts and were just awarded our first one.

Today, I'm able to take a Pollyanna view on this part of our history. We had just enough conflict and competitive experience to realize the misery of it all. And where we didn't cooperate, we at least tried to stay out of each other's yard. This was easy enough; volunteer leadership is a very big yard.

A very significant event occurred during 1976, when two able young Executive Directors assumed the reins of leadership. Kenn Allen at NCVA; Dorothy Denny at NICOV. They carried forward from their Associate Director days, and perfected further an admirably candid, task-oriented, continuous dialogue on the concerns of the two organizations in relation to the people we serve. Gradually, they extended this dialogue to others on staff and board.

As an outside admirer, I also know something about AAVS/AVAS/AVB's joint sponsorship of a national conference and their joint publication of Volunteer Administration.

Such instances are secondary background here, to this extent: I happen to know of nothing in them which seriously violates the conclusions drawn from the NCVA/NICOV case study examined here. I do believe all the instances described share several general characteristics with the NCVA/NICOV distribution center example: a relatively small set of participants, with common interest in a project difficult for any one of them to accomplish effectively (or as effectively) alone; and usually some prior "test experience" working together.

Hopefully this article will stimulate dialogue on these examples, other examples, and counter-examples. I chose the distribution center simply because I happen to know it well, but not too well. As a NICOV staff person, I was regularly consulted on developments, but I was never one of the primary decision-makers in the process. I hope this, and my admiration for similar examples not involving NICOV or NCVA, suggests some modicum of objectivity on my part. Further to reinforce that view, I do not claim the NICOV/NCVA example is one of serene perfection. It was hammered out; it was difficult and it is still incomplete in some respects. NCVA and NICOV remain strugglers and learners in this collaboration thing, and I hope that sense comes through here. The danger is making it all seem too elegant and logical, when trying to summarize the complexities of a real-life collaboration. If it turns out that way, don't blame anyone else. I take total personal responsibility for what's written here. It's not official from NICOV, NCVA, or anyone else.

II. HISTORY OF A COLLABORATION

I doubt if good collaboration grows out of thin air, or hot air either. Some prehistory in which the organizations reality-test each other is desirable, maybe necessary. During this testing, trust builds. Conflict or the threat of conflict may also build to the point where it is unendurable and must be resolved. Both these things can happen concurrently. But I do think the mutually interactive history of organizations is relevant in analyzing their potential for collaboration. The NCVA/NICOV distribution center collaboration began to mature in early 1977. Much had happened before.

1967-1973

The two organizations are relatively old as things go in the volunteer resource field. They are each approximately 10 years old.

Early on, there was virtually no significant overlap between them - in origin, mission, or function. NCVA, conceptualized at the highest levels of government, progressively worked its way towards grass roots responsiveness. NICOV began as a local volunteer program and worked its way towards generalizing of volunteer program principles and models. NCVA was always generic. NICOV began with $500, a post office box, and a lot of nerve. NCVA had a far more heroic problem. Out of principle, it voluntarily sought to decrease its dependence on substantial federal funding. This was a painful and courageous epic, the significance of which will grow with the years. But in those early years there was little potential for either conflict or cooperation between two quite different organizations.

1973-1977

By 1973-1974, NCVA and NICOV had begun to overlap significantly in mission and services, (though there were always some discrete functions in each organization, and still are). I like to think this overlap occurred because we were both trying to be responsive to volunteer leadership needs, essentially the same everywhere. In any case, the potential for conflict vs. cooperation was there; it was getting difficult to pretend the other did not exist.

Another bit of history may be relevant. For the past four years or so, the two organizations have been approximately comparable in size. Also recently, in time for distribution center planning, the two organizations have achieved relatively healthy and stable states. Both NICOV and NCVA have had their ups and downs over the years. NCVA suffered epic agonies breaking away from its early dependence on federal dollars. At one time in the late 1960's, NICOV had sixteen staff members; dropped way below that in the early seventies, and never reached that size again until the mid-seventies. We also understand financial crisis.

By 1977, however, each organization had strengthened and stabilized to the extent that they could look ahead a reasonable length of time. As a consequence, they did not approach collaborative negotiations in desperation with judgment clouded by urgent organizational hungers.

Thus far I can discern the following background factors favorable for the distribution center collaboration:

1. *Similarity of organizational characteristics.*

   a. A significant degree of organizational similarity in mission, functions, and constituency, so that the two organizations tended to help and hurt in similar ways. This doesn't mean identity; a reasonable proportion of different but complementary functions may also have helped.

   b. Other things being equal, at least approximate comparability in size is probably a favorable factor. A larger organization might be tempted to lean on much smaller ones rather than negotiate objectively.

   c. The organizations are in a reasonably healthy state, undistracted by sheer survival concerns. Please note: this does not mean a rich and euphoric state either. That is unrealistic and could be complacently counter-productive to collaboration.

2. *Test experience together.*

   a. Enough real-life testing experience with one another, so the organizations have seen each other close up, warts and all - and some beauty marks, too. It's good when people stop kidding each other about what their organization really can or cannot do. I have always believed collaborations have much more change of success when based on open-eyed evaluated capability of the participating organizations. This can come from experiences working together, from development and sharing of organizational effectiveness data, or, better, both of these. It doesn't come from poetic capability statements.

   b. It is probably also helpful, or at least not harmful, if the participating organizations have experienced some conflict or competition or the clear threat of same, as long as this does not overwhelm more promising feedback in their experience together.

   c. Similarly, a reasonable amount of shared pain and struggle, can be a good thing. Thoroughgoing collective masochism is not recommended.

3. *At least one open, honest and regular communication channel between top management in each organization.*

4. *It takes two to collaborate.* I'm not sure it takes ten. I believe the small size of the collaborating set was a favorable factor in NICOV/NCVA cooperative ventures. One-to-one collaboration can get complicated enough. When three, four, five or more try to get it together, there are advantages to be sure. Among them are breadth of input and wider scope of constituency and capability possible for productive combination. But the level of complexity can quickly become insupportable. So can the level of attenuation. I remember an extreme example, consulting with a group of 200 agencies in a community, all serving a generally similar kind

of client. The worthy goal was collaboration; the practical common denominator on which they could simultaneously agree for purposes of common action was little more than the time of day. *I say get it together for a small set first; then build as appropriate.*

Other favorable factors are identified as the description proceeds. In no case is it claimed that all factors must be present for a successful collaboration, that any single one of them is essential, or that other factors cannot be effective in other collaborative models.

III. A NATIONAL DISTRIBUTION CENTER: EARLY 1977

From initiation to implementation, Dorothy Denny of NICOV and Kenn Allen of NCVA were the leading communicators and negotiators. In both organizations, there was some pre-existing "wouldn't it be nice" feeling about a national publications distribution center for volunteer leadership books and pamphlets. The general concept was: would such a distribution center benefit the field? NCVA had strong field experience represented on its board and a highly credible track record in the publications and information field. NICOV drew from an annual survey of its clients, plus several years' previous experience with a prototype operation including publications authored by NICOV and others.

This relatively organized body of information and experience tended to confirm field's need for the service. Beyond that, there was a less organized, yet powerful impressionistic basis. It just seemed to be one of those gaps we were confronted with daily by phone, letter, at workshops, etc., much like the need for further penetration of the educational system with volunteer leadership skill-building and concerns, or the old one about staff support of volunteers.

Therefore, on the field benefit questions, the decision was yes. We did not feel further special needs assessment, feasibility studies, or research was necessary to support that practical judgment. There are significant advantages to special assessment studies backgrounding collaborative enterprises. Among them are better documentation of need or the surprise of discovering your impressionistic needs assessment was seriously in error. The main disadvantages include the additional time and expense taken up on special feasibility and evaluative studies. On balance, we thought the field better served in this case by reliance on practical judgment, relevant experience and precedent, and prompt response.

Concurrent with the field benefit question was the capability question: could and should NCVA/NICOV do the job? There are a transitional set of assumptions between the more ethically-conditioned field benefit question and the more expedient capability one. They go something like this:

> *National organizations, and any coalition of national organizations, are justified only as they serve their publics; in this case, the volunteer leadership and volunteer public.*
>
> *Improved collaboration and cooperative action is a major way in which national volunteer organizations can serve their publics better. This includes avoidance of duplication and alertness to any facet of functioning which is more effectively served in combination rather than in competition.*

The second statement begins to synthesize the capability and field benefit issues, and practicality with pure ethics. I do not believe resource organizations are obliged to commit suicide attempting to meet field needs, real as these needs may be. It is healthy and realistic for them to ask: can we indeed meet this particular need effectively and still survive? If the answer is no, they should try to persuade capable others to undertake the task.

The capability question for NICOV/ NCVA broke out in two parts: Could the two of us do it effectively by ourselves (and survive). If the answer to that was "yes", should we still involve other organizations for other reasons?

Our answer to the first question was "yes", based on our judgment of the prototype experience and capability of each organization, as previously indicated in this paper. Beyond that, the decision was that both of us together could do the job far better than either of us alone: a vital factor in the decision to collaborate. NICOV had been conducting a prototype national distribution center operation for several years. We simply never had the muscle to make it work by ourselves, at a satisfactory level of volume, range of publications offered, etc. NCVA later had a chance to try solo with greater resources than NICOV had. To my profound admiration, they opted to negotiate collaboration with NICOV instead. The practical part of that decision for NCVA might have been tapping into NICOV's experience in the catalog process, though NCVA also had plenty of this.

There were factors on the other side, too. For example, loss of solo identity and glory for each of us alone. But this was more than offset by the good vibes we anticipated as a team, through providing an immediately needed field service. For both of us, there were also added attractions in an operation which promised to be largely self-sufficient financially, with side benefits in wider dissemination of our own materials and services along with those of others.

Throughout, practical factors strongly influenced our decision on whether we could effectively respond to the more ethically-conditioned appreciation of field needs. I emphasize the integration of the practical and the pious in such matters. I tend to be suspicious of collaborative plans presented as if they are purely altruistic and self-sacrificing.

But the decision--we could do it together--was far from purely self-advantageous. Our planning correctly anticipated serious risk factors. For example, many thousands of scarce dollars and person hours had to be invested front-end before the first book was sold, and serious operating deficits were realistically expected long after. Both NCVA and NICOV had many other places to put those person-hours and dollars. And if the venture failed, they would suffer this loss, not anyone else. I want to emphasize this: scraping together the necessary dollars and time was a tough and somewhat dangerous proposition; what we decided to risk were our own resources of time, expertise and money.

At the time, I was pretty uneasy about this. Looking back, I'm happier, and would even elevate it to the status of principle, namely, the "grunt and groan" principle of collaboration. Other things being equal, it is healthier for participants significantly to risk their own, rather than the gifted resources of anyone else. The reason: you have to be very serious about trusting your judgment, and in testing commitment to each other and to the project. I believe the same principle might apply to any risk of resources, of whatever size, provided it is a significant one relative to the total available resources of the collaborators. To paraphrase Dr. Johnson: "Nothing clears an organization's head so wonderfully as the knowledge that it might be hanged in the morning".

The remaining question was: should others also be involved, or involved instead of us? We considered and discarded the idea of approaching a commercial publishing house. There were certainly advantages, but we felt they were outweighed by the advantages of our inside knowledge of volunteer leadership and our willingness to take more risks on behalf of our field.

We might still have approached other non-profit organizations within the field. We did not do so individually, for the reasons previously described: the advantages of a trim small set with prototype

experience, already tested experience working intensively together, etc. Nevertheless, some discussions were held with the Alliance for Volunteerism, at that time a coalition of some 15 volunteer resource and volunteer-using organizations, including NCVA and NICOV. The Alliance did contribute a small amount of planning money, in accordance with its mission of facilitating collaboration in the field.

A larger Alliance investment would probably have run athwart the issue of whether the Alliance should itself operate programs, as well as facilitating collaboration among others who operated programs. As I recall, this issue was not fully resolved in the Alliance at that time.

The decision, then, was to do it ourselves. The remaining question was: how soon? We saw no reason to delay, since our judgment was that the field needed the service now, and had needed it for some time. As noted previously, we decided not to invest further time and money in additional needs assessment or feasibility studies. As also noted previously, with only two organizations involved, the complexity of collaborative planning and gearing up was much reduced. The first catalog was prepared and mailed, and the first publications moved out of the joint distribution center less than six months after the first serious collaborative discussions began.

Continuing the earlier numbering series, the principal additional conclusions I draw from this section, are that the following factors are advantageous to collaboration:

5. *There should be clear benefit to the field, consistent with the realistically assessed ability of the collaborating organizations to provide these services without suicide.*

6. *A realistic appreciation that the collaborating organizations can do it better together than alone, or cannot do it effectively at all solo.* These positive factors must distinctly outweigh negative factors such as loss of individual organizational identity.

7. *The organizations are willing seriously to risk their own resources in the collaborative venture.* More generally, they show a readiness to take responsibility for the consequences of their own decisions.

Once again, this section illustrated the trimness of decision-making and movement made possible by a relatively small set of collaborating organizations (principle #4).

IV. A "HISTORY" OF THE FUTURE

As this is written, the joint distribution center had just passed its first birthday. Volume of sales confirms our initial judgment that the service was needed. So do comments from the field. We have also recovered a significant fraction of our original investment, and the ongoing operation is nearly paying for itself.

I suppose a final guideline conclusion might be:

8. *One good collaboration deserves another: at the very least, it should not prevent others.*

The cautionary part of this is that NICOV/NCVA's positive experience with each other should not deter their pursuit of collaborative enterprises with other organizations and people. Both organizations continue to do so, though we keep in touch with one another about these. That kind of enhanced communication is one example of the momentum carrying forward from the joint distribution center experience.

Further, our two Executive Directors are currently applying similar collaborative principles to the consolidation of our leadership development and training activities. Our first major joint training effort is scheduled for autumn, 1978. Also, in autumn, NCVA will make a substantial contribution of documents to NICOV's archival library, in return for ready information access to that library. And I will be spending a month at NCVA, hopefully helping to establish a staff exchange pattern.

Beginning in 1977, our ongoing practical experience in collaboration began to be explicitly identified, ratified and extended by both our boards. This is vitally important and may be another principle in itself.

9. *Positive collaborative experiences should be clearly identified, analyzed, ratified, encouraged, and incorporated in the policy direction of the participating organizations.*

The NCVA and NICOV boards have certainly made their contribution to collaborative momentum in this way.

In December, 1977, the NCVA Executive Committee, on recommendation of its Committee on the Future, unanimously adopted the following resolution which was then communicated formally to NICOV:

> *Recognizing the history of cooperation between NCVA and the National Information Center on Volunteerism and further, the potential for future collaboration, NCVA extends to NICOV an invitation to undertake exploratory discussion concerning the nature of this potential collaboration, to seek closer formal ties between the two organizations and to develop a clear statement of our compatability.*

In January, 1978, the NICOV Board of Directors reviewed the NCVA resolution and unanimously passed its own resolution:

> *The National Information Center on Volunteerism wishes to thank the National Center for Voluntary Action for its invitation to undertake exploratory discussions concerning potential future collaboration. The Board endorses establishment of a Board-Staff committee at NICOV which will have responsibility for discussions and exchange of idea papers, etc., with NCVA.*

The explorations encouraged by both Boards produced, within six months, significant further collaborative plans for review by the respective boards. Consequent to this, during the week beginning July 17, 1978, the NCVA Executive Committee and the NICOV Board unanimously passed identical resolutions which said, in part:

> *Organizations committed to fulfillment of the goals of service and leadership must set aside historic barriers and territorial considerations and mutually seek new ways to share capabilities and resources.*
>
> *NCVA and NICOV have a unique opportunity to join together common commitment, compatible programs and complementary capabilities to strengthen their leadership in the volunteer community and to ensure their continued vitality.*
>
> *It is, therefore, the mutual intent of the National Information Center on Volunteerism and the National Center for Voluntary Action to promptly and seriously plan to merge into a single organization.*

Research Translation
Edited by: Florence S. Schwartz

VOLUNTEER WORK AND ITS REWARDS

By Dr. Benjamin Gidron

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a growing trend to involve volunteer workers on a sustained basis in welfare and social service agencies. These volunteers are generally assigned to assist paid professionals in providing direct care to patients or clients of the agency. Thus, volunteers are teachers' aides in schools and day-care centers, assistant group leaders in youth clubs, nurses' aides in hospitals, and are helping in various ways within agencies that serve the aged, the handicapped, etc. This involvement of volunteer workers is seen as a factor in the improvement of the quality of social services. Volunteer bureaus and volunteer units within agencies have been formed to recruit volunteers and to assign them to jobs within the social service system.[1]

Dr. Benjamin Gidron, is presently with the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

From experience gained so far, it becomes clear that one of the central problems hindering the effective involvement of volunteers in social services is the problem of lack of retention, which results in a high turnover rate among volunteers.[2] *In addition to the organizational difficulties caused by this problem, substantive difficulties are also caused since, within the social service framework, continuity is an important element in the relationship between providers and recipients of service. Volunteer work which is not regular and sustained may cause more harm than good to the service recipient. If there is an intention to involve volunteers in a meaningful and effective way within organizations based on paid work, it becomes important to develop knowledge about the motivations of volunteers to work on a sustained basis.*

Past research on this subject has been mostly descriptive and has not been anchored within a theoretical framework. The most important work on the subject is Sills' classical study on volunteers.[3] In his study, Sills shows that, contrary to common beliefs which relate volunteer work solely to altruistic motives, people

have both other and self-oriented motives for volunteering. Other researchers following Sills[4] also found that volunteers have personal motives other than altruism, but none of these researchers tried to develop this concept or to use it in a systematic way in the analysis of sustained volunteer work.

In this research, an attempt is made to develop Sills' concept of self-oriented motives for volunteer work through the use of theoretical knowledge from occupational psychology and the sociology of work. Specifically, knowledge developed on the phenomena of turnover and absenteeism among paid workers is applied to the area of volunteer work.

Using Blau's "exchange theory"[5] as a conceptual framework, some researchers have developed the "expectancy model" or "expectancy theory"[6] to explain turnover and absenteeism among paid workers. According to this model, in its simplest form, the explanation of why a paid worker leaves his job or is absent from it can be found in the discrepancy between expectations for rewards and between the actual rewards that the worker receives in light of other possible alternatives. Thus, in order to keep workers, it is necessary to make the level and nature of rewards fit their expectations (or vice-versa).

These researchers describe, in a general way, three additional factors in the relationship between expectations, rewards and work.

1. *For paid workers, expectations of rewards from work are not restricted to economic rewards. Workers also expect to receive from their work such rewards as: interest, social relationships, challenge, opportunity for advancement, variety, etc.*

2. *There are similarities in expectations among workers of the same age,[7] with the same educational background,[8] or from the same ethnic group.[9]*

3. *Expectations for rewards from work are not static. They change with time and in the light of the individual's ongoing evaluation of the situation. Among workers who remain on the job, there is a process of fitting their expectations to the rewards that are found within the organization.[10]*

This study uses the expectancy model as a general framework to analyze sustained volunteer work. Descriptive studies dealing indirectly with the issue of rewards from volunteer work show that these can be social (inter-personal relationships),[11] personal (opportunity for self-fulfillment),[12] or indirectly economic (gaining work experience for the future or forming business connections).[13]

For purposes of this study, a volunteer is defined as "a person who works in a particular institution on a regular basis, of his own free will and without receiving direct economic rewards for his work".[14]

From this definition, it is understood that volunteer work is not a one-sided activity in which the volunteer only gives (as has often been thought) but rather an activity that includes rewards for the volunteer. These rewards can be seen as corresponding to the self-oriented motives described by Sills.

This study focuses on the attitudes towards their jobs of a group of 317 volunteers in health and mental health institutions. The rewards most often expected and received by the volunteers are identified. The study then examines the relationship between the age of the volunteers and the kinds of rewards expected and, using the expectancy model, it examines the relationship between tenure on the job and the extent to which expected rewards are received by the volunteers.

Methodology

The research was carried out in four different long-term residential institutions that provide health and mental health services in or around Baltimore, Maryland: two mental hospitals, one institution for the retarded, and one hospital for the chronically ill. Three of the institutions were public and one (one of the mental hospitals) was private. In each of the institutions there was a special unit for the coordination of volunteer activities. Each of the institutions saw volunteers as a force for assisting paid workers. The characteristic jobs of the volunteers were: building a friendship relationship with a patient or group of patients, visits, discussions, games, helping patients in their work in occupational therapy, accompanying patients on trips outside the institution, etc.

Identifying the active volunteers in each institution was a special problem due to the character of the volunteer population. In spite of the fact that, within each volunteer unit, there were lists of volunteers, it became clear that these lists were not up-to-date and that they also included many volunteers who were not active.[15] In order not to include in the study volunteers who had dropped out, an active volunteer was defined as one who comes to work at the institution at least once every other week. Thus, the researcher was present at each institution for a two-week period and asked each individual volunteer who came to work during this period (unless it was the first day of work for the volunteer) to fill out a questionnaire. The entire universe of active volunteers in each institution was included in the study.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. In the first part, the respondent was asked to answer questions that dealt with himself and the nature of his volunteer job at the institution. The second part included two lists of rewards: (1) a list of sixteen extrinsic rewards - that is, rewards that the institution can control; and (2) a list of twenty intrinsic rewards - that is, rewards having to do with the subjective meaning of the job for the volunteer. About each reward, the respondent was asked two questions: (1) Do you expect this reward?, (2) Do you receive it in your work? For each of these questions, the respondent could answer: "yes", "no", or "I don't know". The results were analyzed twice: once in each institution separately; and the second time as an aggregate of the volunteers in the four institutions.

In this article, the results from the four institutions are presented in the aggregate because it was found that age, rather than organizational affiliation, can better explain the variance in expectations.

The total number of respondents in the research was 317.[16] Among these, 84% were women. 52% of the respondents were 55 years old or older; 22% were 24 years old or younger; 26% were between ages 25 and 54. Most of the men belonged to the latter two age groups. Almost all the young volunteers were high school or college students. Also, among the rest of the volunteers, there were only a few that worked at salaried jobs in addition to their voluntary work. 19% of the respondents had worked at the respective institutions for a period of 3 months or less; 13% for 4 to 11 months; 22% from one year to 3 years; and 46% from 4 years and up. As expected, there was a high correlation between age and tenure at volunteer work.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Extrinsic Rewards:

The extrinsic rewards expected by the volunteers fell into five categories (See Table 1 on Page 26): (1) learning and self-development; (2) social interaction with other volunteers; (3) symbols of social recognition; (4) praise; and (5) authority. In a general way, the outstanding fact was that the level of expectations of the respondents for extrinsic rewards was not high. This fact is especially outstanding if one makes a comparison with the level of expectations for intrinsic rewards (See Table 2). All together, there were only three extrinsic rewards that were expected by more than half the respondents. Two

of these (" professional supervision" and "training") pertain to learning and self-development. The expectation of these rewards shows an interest in the type of work that the institution does, and a desire to better understand its nature. The level of expectation was also relatively high for the last two rewards in the category of learning and self-development ("contact with professionals" and "being consulted by staff about a patient").

"Contact with other volunteers" is the third reward that a high percentage of respondents (67%) expected. The expectation here is to work within a group of peers and not alone. Less than a third of the respondents expected the rewards connected with social recognition by means of external symbols, or praise. Many of the respondents told the researcher that "they are not volunteering for a pin". However, all four volunteer coordinators reported that the volunteers consider these rewards very important. It must, therefore, be assumed that there is a "social desirability bias" in these answers.

A small portion of the respondents expected rewards dealing with authority - rewards that are not usually connected with volunteer work. A closer analysis of the respondents who expected the reward of "supervision over other volunteers" revealed that many of them were long-term volunteers (four years or more). This fact indicates that with tenure, volunteers (like paid workers) expect more responsibility and promotion.

Intrinsic Rewards

Intrinsic rewards that were expected by volunteers can be divided into six categories (see Table 2): (1) stressing one's other-orientation; (2) self-development, learning, and variety in life: (3) opportunity for social interaction; (4) fulfilling and obligation; (5) social recognition; and (6) connection with paid work. Almost all the volunteers expected that their work would allow them to stress their other-orientation. This is, no doubt, the basis for volunteer work in human service institutions.

The findings about expectations for rewards related to self-development and to variety and a chance to build social relations, substantiate in further detail the findings in Table 1. The expectation of intrinsic rewards dealing with self-development and variety in life (expected by a sizeable percentage of the respondents) shows that people expect personal development to result from their volunteer work.[17]

It appears that the expectation of development social contacts in the course of volunteer work also indicates that the volunteers have personal needs that are not being met in other frameworks. Among the various rewards dealing with social recognition, there was only one ("opportunity to belong to an important organization in the community") that most of the respondents did not expect. Further investigation showed that most of those who expected this reward worked in two of the four institutions in which the research was carried out. These were considered more prestigious than the other two institutions.

Among a small and specific portion of the respondents, the volunteer job was considered as experience related to possible future employment in the health or mental health fields.

Expectations of Different Age Groups:

A separate analysis, by age group, of volunteers' expectations (see Tables 3 and 4) show clear differences in expectations among the three groups.

Table 3 shows that older volunteers were less likely than younger ones to be interested in rewards dealing with learning and self-development. Older volunteers were more likely to be interested in the rewards dealing with social interaction with other volunteers. Rewards dealing with social recognition were generally expected more often by both the oldest and the youngest groups than by those in the adult age group. Younger volunteers tended to expect "praise from professional staff" more often than older volunteers.

Table 4 shows that expectations for rewards dealing with stressing one's other-orientation tend to increase with age, although a very high percentage of the volunteers in all three age groups expected this reward. In the area of self-development and learning, the major difference appears in the expectation of "opportunity to learn new skills", and expectation which decreases as age increases. Most of the rewards dealing with social interaction and with fulfilling an obligation are expected more often by the older than by the younger volunteers. Expectations for rewards dealing with social recognition increased with age. Rewards emphasizing the connection between volunteer work and paid work (particularly in seeing the volunteer work as an opportunity for career-testing) were expected more often by younger volunteers.

From Tables 3 and 4 it is possible to draw certain conclusions as to how volunteers in the three age groups view their volunteer work and what subjective meanings the work holds for them.

The most outstanding point among young volunteers (mostly high school and college students) was the tendency to view their volunteer work as a learning experience for self-development and self-testing. At this age of planning for the future, the individual sees the volunteer work as a chance to test himself in work that he considers a possible career, to do this without the pressure of a paid job and without definitely committing himself. Rewards such as "training", "professional supervision", and "contact with professionals" are especially important to the younger volunteers because they consider their volunteer work as an initiation into the "mysteries" of the profession that they are interested in as a possible career.

Among older volunteers (55 years and older), a large portion of whom are living by themselves and lonely, volunteer work is seen more as an opportunity to stress their other-orientation and to fulfill an obligation to the community. Volunteers of this age are inclined to see their work as a way to maintain interaction with their surroundings. Their volunteer work serves as an opportunity to prove that they are not only receiving, but also contributing to society. Their expectation for social recognition can be explained by their need to be assured that their contribution is valuable and important. It might be assumed that their volunteer work is very important to them because, for many in this age group, it is the only chance to break out of their loneliness and to be productive.

Among adult volunteers (between ages 25 and 54), most of whom were women, it was hard to find a unifying theme in their expectations from their volunteer work. It appears that, concerning "learning and self-development", their expectations were most similar to the younger volunteers and that, with regard to social interaction and the desire to stress their other-orientation, they were most similar to the older volunteers. A possible explanation for this ambivalence has to do with the questions raised by the feminist movement about the value of volunteer work.[18] The traditional concept of the woman's role as housewife who participates in volunteer activities in order to keep in touch with her social surroundings has changed. Some women view volunteer work as a way of preparing for paid work and an independent career. More than a quarter of the respondents in this age category viewed their volunteer work as a career preparation; a large portion of them, for resuming a career cut short in order to raise their families. Many others in this category, however, still expected the more traditional rewards. The study did not identify specific characteristics common to this age group.

The findings in Tables 1 - 4 clearly show that volunteers expect concrete rewards from their work. Some of these rewards (dealing with stressing one's other-orientation) are expected by almost all the volunteers. The expectations for some of the other rewards are differential and the data show that the age of the

volunteer is connected with the types of rewards he expects - that volunteer work has different meanings for individuals of different ages. However, the findings presented so far do not deal with the relationship between rewards and tenure.

Negative Discrepancies and Tenure:

According to the "expectancy model", in order to retain volunteers, it is necessary to provide individuals with the specific rewards that they expect or to change their expectations so that they better fit the available rewards. In Table 5, negative discrepancies (i.e. rewards expected but not received) are presented by volunteers' tenure. The Table clearly shows that the average number of negative discrepancies per respondent decreases with tenure. It can be seen that the long-term volunteers are those who either were interested from the start in the rewards available at the institution or that they adapted their expectations to the rewards offered at the institution. Based on findings from research on paid workers, it is reasonable to argue that such an adaptation process did actually take place among the long-term volunteers.

Table 5 shows that the first six months at work are especially important in determining whether or not the volunteer will stay on the job on a long-term basis. In terms of average numbers of negative discrepancies, volunteers on the job between 9 and 11 months more closely resemble volunteers with more than 11 years service than they do volunteers with 4 - 6 months tenure on the job. *The volunteer coordinators in all four institutions reported that "dropping out" usually occurs during the first six months of volunteer work and, especially, during the first three months.*

The negative discrepancies found among short-term volunteers concern rewards pertaining to interaction with professional staff. Many short-term volunteers expected but did not receive rewards such as "professional supervision", "training", "consultation about a patient", and "praise from professional staff". In the institutions studied, volunteers expected to be hampered by hesitation on the part of paid workers to accept and encourage such involvement. Failure to provide these "professional" rewards may well explain many cases of dropping out of volunteer jobs in these institutions.

Conclusions

While this study concentrated on health and mental health settings, the findings can be applicable to other settings as well. The assumption that volunteer work is not a purely altruistic activity has received empirical confirmation in this research. The volunteers who participated in the study expected various rewards from their work and the receipt of these rewards is important to their decision to remain in their volunteer jobs over long periods of time. These findings may guide institutions wishing to involve volunteers in their programs. In planning a volunteer program, one cannot take volunteers for granted. It is important to be concerned about giving satisfaction to the workers so that they will continue in their work on a sustained basis.

Since most of the rewards expected by volunteers are connected in one way or another with interpersonal relationships, it is important to build a system which provides volunteers with a framework for such relationships. It is also important to prepare the paid workers before the entrance of volunteers so that they know what to expect and how to help the volunteers receive the rewards they need.

Since volunteer work is a type of personal investment and since expectations of rewards differ from one person to another, research results indicating the existence of similarities of expectations among volunteers of similar age should prove helpful. It is possible to assume that various demographic and personal characteristics as well as characteristics related to the type of work or to the work situation may also influence the expectations for rewards. It is important to continue to research these areas if there is a desire to attract volunteers from specific populations.

References

1. E. Schindler-Rainman and R. Lippitt, The Volunteer Community, Washington The Center for Voluntary Society, 1971

2. G. M. Aves, The Voluntary Worker in the Social Services, London, The Bedford Square Press and George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969

3. D. L. Sills, The Volunteers; Means and Ends in a National Organization, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1957

4. D. Thurz, Volunteer Group Advisors in a National Group Work Agency, Washington, The Catholic University Press, 1960

   E. M. Adams, "A Study of Volunters in Five Community Agencies", Unpublished Dissertation, Columbia University, 1966

   F. S. Schwarts, Volunteer Activity in Community Centers; Its Nature and Satisfactions", Unpublished Dissertation, Columbia University, 1966

   A. L. Trost, "A Survey of Hospital Volunteers: Who Are They and Why Do They Volunteer?", M. A. Thesis, Long Island University, 1973

5. P. M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, John Wiley, 1964

6. E. E. Lawler, Motivation in Work Organizations, Monterey, Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1973

   R. H. Hall, Occupations and the Social Structure, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1975

7. S. D. Saleh and J. L. Otis, "Age and the Level of Job Satisfaction", Personnel Psychology, 17 (Winter 1964), pp. 425-30

8. M. Starcevich, "Job Factor Importance for Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Across Different Occupational Levels", Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (Dec. 1972), pp. 467-71

9. J. W. Slocum and R. H. Strawer, "Racial Differences in Job Attitudes", Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (April 1972), pp. 177-78

10. L. W. Porter and R. M. Steers, "Organizational, Work and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism", Psychological Bulletin, 80 (Aug. 1973), pp. 151-76

11. J. S. Sainer and M. L. Zander, SERVE: Older Volunteers in Community Service, New York, Community Service Society of New York, 1971

12. W. Bailey, "The Volunteer Big Brother in the Helping Role", Child Welfare, 46 (Dec. 1967), pp. 562-68

13. S. Arsenian and A. Blumberg, "Volunteers in the YMCA" in A. W. Glaser and D. L. Sills (eds), The Government of Associations, Totova, N.J., Bedminster Press, 1966, pp. 199-203

References
(Continued)

C. Schmitthausler, "Analysis of Programs Using Non-Professional Teacher Helpers in Public Elementary School Classrooms", Unpublished Dissertation, University of California, 1966

14. H. Loeser, Women, Work and Volunteering, Boston, Beacon Press, 1974

15. The coordinators of the volunteer programs were not especially interested in keeping current lists since larger lists (even if they included inactive volunteers) created a better impression of the activity of their units.

16. The division among institutions was: 100 from the hospital for the chronically ill; 62 from the public mental health hospital; 72 from the private mental health hospital; and 83 from the institution for the retarded.

17. As already described, the great majority of the respondents did not hold paid jobs.

18. National Organization for Women (NOW), "Volunteer- Why Not? Analysis and Answers", Chicago, Task Force on Women and Volunteerism, 1973

TABLE 1

Extrinsic Rewards Expected by Volunteers from their Work

		N	%*
	TOTAL	317	100
A.	Learning and Self-Development		
1.	Training	208	66
2.	Professional Supervision	178	56
3.	Contact with Professionals	136	43
4.	Consultation by Professionals about a Patient	106	33
B.	Social Interaction with Other Volunteers		
5.	Contact with Other Volunteers During Work	213	67
6.	Banquet	63	20
7.	Lounge for Volunteers	51	16
C.	Symbols of Social Recognition		
8.	Letter of Appreciation	98	31
9.	Pin	84	26
10.	Receiving an Award for the Organization (e.g., church)	43	14
11.	Picture in the Newspaper	10	3
D.	Praise		
12.	Praise from Volunteer Coordinator	79	25
13.	Praise from Superintendent of Institution	65	20
14.	Praise from Professional Staff	57	18
E.	Authority		
15.	Supervision of Other Volunteers	61	19
16.	Uniform**	30	9

*The percentage is according to the number of respondents expecting this reward out of the total number of those interviewed.

**In a number of institutions, the volunteers wore a special uniform, different from that worn by the nurses in the institution.

TABLE 2

Intrinsic Rewards Expected by Volunteers from their Work

		N	%*
	TOTAL	317	100
A.	Stressing One's Other-Orientation		
1.	Opportunity to be of Service to People Less Fortunate than Me	284	90
2.	Opportunity to Think Less of Myself and More of Others	274	86
B.	Self-Development, Learning, and Variety in Life		
3.	Opportunity to Do Something Interesting and Unusual Which Adds Variety to My Life	253	80
4.	Opportunity to Learn how to Deal with People	252	79
5.	Taking Responsibilities	243	76
6.	Opportunity to Learn New Skills	178	56
C.	Opportunity for Social Interaction		
7.	Opportunity to Take Part in an Assignment in which Other Volunteers are Participating	245	77
8.	Opportunity to Meet New People	245	77
9.	Opportunity to Share my Ideas, Opinions, and Problems with Other People	197	62
10	Opportunity to Get Out of the House	157	49
D.	Fulfilling An Obligation		
11.	Opportunity to Fulfill an Obligation to the Community	200	63
12.	Opportunity to Do Important Work	182	57
13.	Opportunity to Practice my Religious Beliefs	144	45
E.	Social Recognition		
14.	Opportunity to be a Part of an Important Organization in the Community	175	55
15.	Opportunity to be Appreciated by my Family Members	92	29
16.	Opportunity to be Appreciated by Friends and Neighbors	84	26
F.	Connection with Paid Work		
17.	Opportunity to be Engaged in an Activity which is Similar to Paid Work	108	34

TABLE 2
(continued)

		N	%*
F.	Connection with Paid Work (cont'd)		
18.	Testing Possibility of a Career in the Health Field	77	24
19.	Testing Possibilities of Paid Employment	53	17
20.	Forming Contacts that Might Help My Own or My Spouse's Business or Work	46	14

*The percentage is according to the number of respondents expecting this reward out of the total number of those interviewed.

TABLE 3

Extrinsic Rewards Expected by Volunteers in Three Age Categories

		24 Years or Less		25 - 54 Years		55 Years or more	
		N	%*	N	%*	N	%*
	TOTALS	68	100	85	100	164	100
A.	Learning and Self-Development						
1.	Training	59	87	61	72	88	54
2.	Professional Supervision	56	82	53	62	69	42
3.	Contact with Professionals	50	74	46	54	40	24
4.	Consultation by Professionals about a Patient	32	47	41	48	33	20
B.	Social Interaction with Other Volunteers						
5.	Contact with Other Volunteers During Work	34	50	58	68	121	74
6.	Banquet	5	7	17	20	41	25
7.	Lounge for Volunteers	4	6	10	12	37	23
C.	Symbols for Social Recognition						
8.	Letter of Appreciation	24	35	15	18	59	36
9.	Pin	22	32	12	14	50	30
10.	Receiving an Award for the Organization(e.g. church)	12	18	8	9	23	14
11.	Picture in the Newspaper	2	3	3	4	5	3
D.	Praise						
12.	Praise from Volunteer Coordinator	9	13	17	20	53	32
13.	Praise from Superintendent of Institution	4	6	11	13	50	30
14.	Praise from Professional Staff	15	22	17	20	25	15
E.	Authority						
15.	Supervision of other Volunteers	5	7	22	32	34	21
16.	"Uniform"	-	-	9	11	21	13

*The percentage is according to expectations for each reward in each age group.

TABLE 4

Intrinsic Rewards Expected by Volunteers in Three Age Categories

	24 Years or Less		25 - 54 Years		55 Years or More	
	N	%*	N	%*	N	%*
TOTALS	68	100	85	100	164	100
A. Stressing One's Other-Orientation						
1. Opportunity to be of Service to People Less Fortunate Than Me	58	85	75	88	151	92
2. Opportunity to Think Less of Myself and More of Others	54	79	73	86	147	90
B. Self-Development, Learning and Variety in Life						
3. Opportunity to Do Something Interesting and Unusual Which Adds Variety to My Life	49	72	71	84	133	81
4. Opportunity to Learn How to Deal with People	57	84	67	79	128	78
5. Taking Responsibilities	55	81	74	87	114	70
6. Opportunity to Learn New Skills	56	82	59	69	63	35
C. Opportunity for Social Interaction						
7. Opportunity to Take Part in An Assignment in Which Other Volunteers are Participating	39	57	65	76	141	86
8. Opportunity to Meet New People	54	79	68	80	123	75
9. Opportunity to Share My Ideas, Opinions, and Problems with Other People	32	47	61	72	104	63
10. Opportunity to Get out of the House	6	9	38	45	113	69
D. Fulfilling an Obligation						
11. Opportunity to Fulfill an Obligation to the Community	31	46	58	68	111	68
12. Opportunity to Do Important Work	30	44	45	53	107	65
13. Opportunity to Practice My Religious Beliefs	28	41	27	32	89	54

TABLE 4
(continued)

	24 Years or less		25 - 54 Years		55 Years or More	
	N	%*	N	%*	N	%*
E. Social Recognition						
14. Opportunity to be a Part of an Important Organization in the Community	24	35	39	46	112	68
15. Opportunity to be Appreciated by my Family Members	6	9	21	25	65	40
16. Opportunity to be Appreciated by Friends and Neighbors	10	15	15	18	59	36
F. Connection to Paid Work						
17. Opportunity to Be Engaged in an Activity Which is Similar to Paid Work	8	12	41	48	59	36
18. Testing Possibility of a Career in the Health Field	50	73	23	27	4	2
19. Testing Possibilities of Paid Employment	29	43	20	24	4	2
20. Forming Contacts that Might Help My Own or My Spouse's Business or Work	28	41	16	19	2	1

*Percentage is according to expectations for each reward in each age group.

TABLE 5

Length of Service by the Negative Discrepancies and Between Expected and Received Extrinsic Rewards

Length of Service	Number of Respondents (a)	Number of Negative Discrepancies (b)	Average No. of Negative Discrepancies/Respondent (c) = b/a
1 - 3 months	59	86	1.46
4 - 6 months	23	27	1.17
7 -11 months	19	14	0.74
1 - 3 years	70	55	0.79
4 -10 years	82	54	0.66
11 years or longer	60	31	0.52
TOTAL	313**	267	0.85

*A negative discrepancy is defined as a case where the respondent answered "yes" to the question of whether he expects a particular reward and "no" to the question of whether he receives it.

**Four respondents did not answer the question about length of time on the job.

CURRICULUM INNOVATION:
Volunteering in the Juvenile Justice System

By Betty Wade Coyle
Old Dominion University
and
Laurie Newman DiPadova
Friends of the Norfolk
Juvenile Court

For the fourth consecutive semester the sociology department of Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia, is offering a three semester-hour course entitled "Volunteering in the Juvenile Justice System". Recent trends in sociology, in higher education, and in the volunteerism movement make clear that this course speaks to the needs of our time. These trends, as well as the mechanics and content of the course, and its effects on participants and the sponsoring volunteer agency will be explored in this paper.

The scientific community is beginning to emphasize the importance of values in our technological society. "The interplay of science and technology on the one hand, and social ethics on the other, is much discussed today." (Sieghart, 1973, 7).

While concern for values is increasing in the scientific community, academic institutions are experiencing a trend which may increase receptiveness to value concerns. The so-called "crisis in higher education" has seen a reduction in the proportion of college-aged people in our society. Institutions of higher learning are experiencing cut-backs in funding accompanied by a basic questioning of the value of higher education. In this atmosphere, many colleges and universities are developing innovative courses which combine a traditional conceptual framework with value concerns relevant to the needs and interests of students. Such courses may be particularly attractive to non-traditional students, thereby providing more contact with the surrounding community.

Old Dominion University, for example, has defined its mission as an urban university which must be responsive to the needs of the larger community of which it is a part. As such, the University utilizes the community as its laboratory, while participating in problem-solving efforts. Thus institutional goals are fully compatible with the humanistic trend in sociology, with its orientation toward efforts which benefit society.

The increased student demand for relevance in academic course work is fostered, undoubtedly, by the ever-tightening job market. Courses which provide exposure to job possibilities and encourage participation in community agencies are often viewed by students as not only relevant to their own lives, but perhaps helpful in future job-hunting, as well.

Many teachers in colleges and universities encourage students to become involved in community activities as an integral part of their learning experience. For example, credit practicum courses are increasingly utilized. Sociology students are given the opportunity to view the discipline as more than just an accumulation of knowledge which must be articulated in proper form for the purpose of testing. Rather, sociology becomes a vehicle for increased awareness of one's social environment. Courses which provide community involvement also promote responsible involved citizenship and intelligent issue-oriented voting.

Coinciding with academia's increasing community involvement is the rapid growth of the volunteer movement. The movement has been precipitated in part by cut-backs in funding and the resultant lack of personnel in community agencies, and has been fueled by the increasing amounts of leisure time found in many segments of our society. In virtually every area of social concern, volunteerism is growing. In the area of courts and corrections, however, the growth is dramatic. In 1965, two volunteer programs existed in the area of courts and corrections in the United States, involving a total of 600 volunteers. By 1975 over 2,500 such programs were in existence, involving the services of more than one-third of a million volunteers (Leenhouts, 1975).

In Norfolk, a major volunteer agency is the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court, Inc.,[1] currently the largest court volunteer organization in the state. Incorporated on March 24, 1970, the first year witnessed the involvement of 27 volunteers and 2,931 hours of training and work. In 1976, by contrast, saw 126 volunteers involved in 8,307 hours of training and work. Although initial efforts of the Friends were reluctantly accepted, today the vital contributions of the Friends to the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court are continually recognized. As a past presiding judge has observed:

> *The third powerful factor affecting our Court: (is) the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court...Of all expressions of concern for the Court's problems, the most gracious and gratuitous has been the formation of the Friends. Words cannot express the admiration and gratitude which the Court entertains for them. This independent organization, which exists solely for reinforcing the Court in accomplishment of its mission, exemplifies the tremendous surge of public support for the citadel of confrontation with juvenile crime and delinquency constituted by the Court and its associated services; and is a marshalling ground for the concern and prowess of the public in the conflict. Invested with the sustained and tremendous labors of the Friends, its distinguished membership, its implacable fortitude and its gracious and indomitable spirit, the implementation of the mission of the Court and its associated services has been vastly enhanced (Martin, 1976,6).*

Obviously, the effectiveness of volunteers is somewhat dependent upon the amount and quality of training received. While the Friends provide a limited amount of training, they felt the need to expand it. Further, since a major goal of the Friends involves efforts to educate the community to the needs of the Juvenile court, they sought a way to utilize the extensive resources of one of the local universities. Expanded training at the university level, then, could also help meet the goal of community education. The Friends approached Old Dominion University with the proposal that a credit course be offered to meet these needs; the course was designed by a member of the sociology department.[2]

Unique in concept and presentation, the course surveys the juvenile justice system, focusing upon areas particularly

beneficial to students who may wish to pursue careers in juvenile justice, either as volunteers or as professionals. The content was designed from the perspective of what volunteers should know, fitting the needs of the volunteer program, while maintaining respectability as part of the sociology curriculum. Essential to its success is the course's solid sociological framework. Not only does the course illustrate worthwhile use of academic knowledge, it also demonstrates the relevance of sociology to practical life situations. For example, one perspective presented in the course is symbolic interaction. After exploring ways in which some of the concepts, including "looking-glass self" and "self-fulfilling prophecy", may affect students in their own lives at various times, the relationship of these concepts to delinquency, especially in the form of the labeling theory, is discussed. Conflict theory, differential association, and other deviance theories are considered in similar fashion.

Once the conceptual framework is established, an overview of the criminal justice system is presented. The focus then shifts to juveniles and class members examine basic concepts of developmental psychology, as well as the role of the adolescent in society. Next, attention is directed to the juvenile justice system, the legal status of the child within that system, and the responsibility of the community in providing alternatives to the system.

After a solid structure and conceptual base has been laid, the emphasis of the course shifts to the practical skills useful in relating to juveniles and their families. Sessions dealing with self-awareness, values-clarification, communication skills, and counseling techniques are presented. The course usually concludes with a group discussion among the students, a panel of volunteers and their juvenile "clients", and the Coordinator of Volunteers for the Friends discussing the volunteer in the court setting.[3]

The course makes use of the expertise of specialists in a number of areas which it covers. Locating and scheduling speakers, providing media presentations, and planning field trips are essential tasks of the course instructor. At the same time, the instructor insures course continuity through organization and the vital comments at the beginning and end of each class period, providing transition from one speaker or field experience to another, and to the overall purposes of the course.

The numerous state and local experts who address the class are invaluable to the success of the course. Juvenile court judges, court administrators, probation officers, and training officers from the Regional Office of the State Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services are among the dedicated professionals who address the class. The Director of the Criminal Justice Program at Old Dominion University, the juvenile delinquency specialist from the University's sociology department, and the Director of Services from Virginia Wesleyan College regularly participate. Other guest speakers have included a staff attorney from the American Civil Liberties Union Children's Rights Project, a juvenile public defender, the Director of Attention Homes, Inc., in Charlottesville, Virginia, as well as experienced volunteers and the youth probationers with whom they work.[4]

To illustrate basic concepts, extensive use is made of the media. Films[5] and video-tapes, many of which are produced by the Volunteers in Probation Division of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, add significantly to the course. This past fall, Family Service/Travelers' Aid of Norfolk and the Norfolk Theatre Center presented a play from their "Plays for Living: series entitled "#291048367", which dramatized the issues of plea bargaining and the inequities within the criminal justice system. Student response to each media presentation is collected by having them complete an evaluation form. (See Appendix B).

Another important aspect of the course is the field trips to local facilities. A number of such trips are scheduled and students may choose any seven. For example,

this semester the students could choose from 19 scheduled trips to 16 different facilities, as well as individual visits to approved, non-scheduled places. Shortly after each visit, students are required to complete a form describing and evaluating the facility (see Appendix B). Field trip opportunities include visits to local group home facilities, detention homes, half-way houses, juvenile courts, police youth bureaus, city jails, probation field units, as well as to state and regional facilities. The Friends are of great assistance in this aspect of the course. They schedule both group and individual field visits for the students, help provide transportation, and write follow-up letters of appreciation to people at the facilities visited. Students frequently cite field trips as one of the most valuable aspects of the course.

At the present time, the course meets for two hours one night a week, with the field trips scheduled at other times. This summer the class will meet two hours each day for four weeks and the field trips will be held during the regularly scheduled meeting time. The interests of the students are taken into consideration when scheduling the class and it is important to remain flexible to this demand. Many of the students at Old Dominion maintain full or part-time jobs, and/or have families, and thus find it difficult to attend the required number of field trips. With these individuals in mind, the course, which normally is offered for three credits, is also offered for two credits to anyone who chooses not to participate in the field trips.

At the end of each semester, students complete an extensive course evaluation (see Appendix D). The results of this data are used in planning course content for the succeeding semester. While it is necessary to remain flexible with regard to content, limits are set on this flexibility by the goals and expectations of the Friends, the sociology department, the instructor, and the needs and interests of the students.

We find that most of the people taking the course are full-time students, rather than volunteers or community people interested in volunteering. In fact there has been little effort to recruit students from the community, as the full-time students tend to fill the class during registration. One of the reasons for the attractiveness of the course to the traditional student is that it deals with the academic discipline of sociology in a relevant fashion by relating it to a specific social need. Criminal justice majors report that the course provides an excellent background in their efforts to understand the criminal justice system, particularly as it relates to juveniles.

Effects of the course on participants and on the Friends are difficult to measure. Many students become involved volunteering in other places, and at later times, making follow-up difficult. We do know that interest in the course has been considerable, with the enrollment steadily increasing from 21 students registered the first semester offered, to 41 students registered during the current semester.

No one expects that every student will become a volunteer, although many have. Students who subsequently do not become volunteers are, nevertheless, better informed concerning the courts and their needs. These students undoubtedly assist the courts informally simply by disseminating information to others who may be interested in volunteering. For example, parents of several students are now active volunteers. In some cases, student contact with civic and business groups provides assistance to the Friends. In this connection, a local P.T.A. representative, after having taken the course, scheduled a number of speaking engagements for the Friends' Volunteer Coordinator at local chapters of the P.T.A. These engagements resulted in the recruitment of a number of high quality volunteers.

There are numerous other examples of how the students from the class have been directly responsible for volunteer efforts in the local courts. Although empirical analysis is difficult, it appears that exposure to a course of this nature fosters not only awareness of, but sensitivity to, the problems of the juvenile justice system.

For example, an attempt to locate a group home in the neighborhood of a former student would likely meet with less neighborhood resistance than otherwise would be the case.

In the final analysis the purposes of the course are four-fold. The course attempts to meet the relevant needs of our two sponsoring organizations, Old Dominion University and the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court, as well as those of the student participants and the surrounding community. Although it is difficult to determine empirically whether all of these needs are being met, continual reassessment suggests that we are approaching their fulfillment.

FOOTNOTES

1. For the sake of brevity, the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court, Inc., hereinafter will be referred to as the Friends.

2. Joy Reed, Executive Director of the Volunteer Office of the Friends, approached the Sociology Department and the School of Continuing Studies at Old Dominion University. The course was designed by Laurie Newman DiPadova, in consultation with Mrs. Reed.

3. See Appendix A for a copy of the current syllabus.

4. Using funds provided by the Friends, guest speakers are occasionally offered an honorarium in addition to their travel expenses. The honoraria are modest and serve as a token of appreciation. When no funds are available, these same individuals usually still are willing to participate.

5. Films used include "Children In Trouble" produced by the John Howard Association and based on the book by the same title; "Eye of the Storm", the ABC film illustrating the effects of labeling; which portrays the third-grade class in Iowa in which children were divided into "blue-eyed" and "brown-eyed" categories and discriminated against accordingly; "Bill of Rights", available through the Justice Department, exploring differences in legal treatment of adults and juveniles; and "Cipher in the Snow", a film of the National Education Association's 1964 award winning story by Jean Mizer portraying a true account of the tragic effects of labeling on a child (available through Brigham Young University).

REFERENCES

Hoult, Thomas Ford. Sociology For A New Day. New York: Random House, 1974.

Leenhouts, Keith (Executive Director, Volunteers in Probation of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency). Address, Volunteering in the Juvenile Justice System class, Old Dominion University, 18 September, 1975.

Martin, James G., IV. "The Impact of Volunteers Upon the Juvenile Justice System, As Exemplified by the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court". Unpublished paper presented to Volunteering in the Juvenile Justice System class, Old Dominion University, 6 November, 1975.

Sieghart, et al. "The Social Obligations of the Scientist". Hastings Center Studies, 1, No. 2 (1973), 7-16.

Steinfels, Peter. "Values, Expertise and Responsibility in the Life Sciences" Hastings Center Studies, 1, No. 2 (1973), 3-6.

APPENDIX A

SYLLABUS

VOLUNTEERING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Textbooks:

Richette, Lisa Aversa: The Throwaway Children, Dell Books, 1969.
Sanders, William B.: Juvenile Delinquency, Praeger Publishers, 1976.
Glasser, William: Reality Therapy, Harper and Row, 1965.
Fox, Vernon: "A Handbook for Volunteers in Juvenile Court", National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, University of Nevada, 1973.

Course Outline and Reading Assignments:

Date	Class Topics	Assignments
1/20	Coordination and Orientation.	
1/27	Juvenile Correction. Film "Children in Trouble". Guests: Susie Sasser and Judy Spong, former counselors at Bon Air Learning Center. Film: "Eye of the Storm".	Richette pp. 1-278
2/3	An Overview of the Criminal Justice System. Guest: Dr. Leonard Dobrin, Director, Criminal Justice Program, Old Dominion University. Juvenile Legislation in Virginia. Guest: Mrs. Betty Adams, Resource Officer, Norfolk Juvenile Court.	Sanders ch. 1,7,9
2/10	Problems Juveniles Face. Garland White, Sociology Department, ODU Film: "Cipher in the Snow:.	Sanders ch. 2,3
2/17	Values Clarification. Guest: Mr. Fred Mason, Trainer, Regional Office--Division of Youth Services.	Sanders ch. 4,5
2/24	Communication Skills. Guests: Laurie DiPadova, Board of the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court, and Mrs. Minor Thomas, Volunteer Coordinator of the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court.	Sanders, ch. 6,7
3/3	A Child Goes Through the System. Guest: Ms. Chris Boyce, Director of Court Services Norfolk Juvenile Court.	Sanders, 8 ch. 8
3/10	SPRING VACATION (no class)	

Date	Class Topic	Assignment
3/17	Prevention and Diversion. Guest: Pam Kelley, Prevention Coordinator, Regional Office--Division of Youth Services. ***TAKE HOME MID-TERM GIVEN OUT***	Richette finish
3/24	The Juvenile Justice System in Virginia and Tidewater. Guest: Judge Lester Moore, Norfolk Juvenile Court. ***(7:00 P.M. TAKE HOME EXAMS DUE)***	Glasser
3/31	Children and the Law. Guest: Ms. Virginia Cochran, Public Defender for Juveniles, Virginia Beach.	Glasser, con't.
4/7	Counseling Techniques. Guest: Mrs. Dora Dobrin, Director, Human Services, Virginia Wesleyan College, Norfolk.	Glasser, finish
4/14	Alternatives to the System. Guest: Gary Duncan, Director, Community Attention Home, Inc., Charlottesville.	Fox, half
4/21	The Volunteer in the Court Setting. Guests: Mrs. Minor Thomas, Coordinator of Volunteers of the Friends of the Norfolk Juvenile Court, and Mrs. Annie Lou Gurtin, Volunteer Coordinator, Virginia Beach Juvenile Court. Additional Guests: Volunteers and Clients - TBA.	Fox, finish
4/28	Final EXAMINATION. On entire course.	

Grading and Policies:

1. Semester grades will be calculated from the mid-term test and from the final exam. A total of 300 points is possible for the course: mid-term - 100 points and the final exam = 200 points.

2. Students taking the course for 3 hours credit should turn in their visit forms during the class meeting following their visit to the facility.

3. Students taking the course for 3 credits must choose 7 units of field trips. This includes one required visit to the juvenile court. With the exception of the Richmond trip, these visits are planned for 1 hour and count 1 unit. The Richmond trip counts 3 units.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS ASKED ON MEDIA EVALUATION

1. Name of student and date of evaluation.
2. What was the point of the tape/film?
3. Would you recommend that this tape/film be used again? Why or why not?
4. On a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), how would you rate this tape/film?
5. Please make any further comments in order to clarify your evaluation.

QUESTIONS ASKED ON A FIELD VISIT REPORT

1. Name of student and date and time of visit.
2. Name of facility.
3. Description of premises.
4. What personnel associated with the facility did you encounter during the visit?
5. Do you think that the facility is fulfilling its purpose? Why or why not?
6. How did the visit enhance your understanding of the juvenile justice system? Limit your response to no more than three specifics.
7. Please make any further comments in order to clarify your report.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE TEST
VOLUNTEERING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

TRUE-FALSE QUESTIONS. Answer the following questions on the answer sheet provided. (2 points each).

1. We confidently can rely on crime statistics to tell us if crime is increasing or decreasing.

2. Values-clarification refers to a training procedure whereby we discover which values are right and which values are wrong.

3. Glasser maintains that, if at all possible, we must discover the reasons for our emotions and behavior before we can hope to change.

4. Unlike traditional therapists, Glasser recognizes the necessity of the therapist's maintaining an attitude of non-involvement with the client.

5. "Eye of the Storm" showed children behaving in conformity to what was being expected of them at the time.

6. According to Sanders, a juvenile does not have to commit delinquent acts in order to be considered a delinquent.

7. The social deprivation theory relates delinquency to a juvenile's being deprived of socially acceptable, law-abiding, non-delinquent friends and having, instead, to associate with socially non-law-abiding peers.

8. A juvenile who has been labeled as a delinquent is <u>less</u> likely to commit delinquent acts than the juvenile who has not been so labeled because the labeled delinquent knows better - he fears being locked up again.

9. Juvenile status offenders end up in a detention setting for longer periods of time than do juveniles who have committed criminal offenses.

10. The main distinction between delinquent youth and non-delinquent youth is that the former engage in delinquent activities while the latter does not.

11. There are no co-educational juvenile facilities in the city of Norfolk.

12. According to Dora Dobrin, reality therapy as described by Glasser is the most effective treatment modality now being used.

13. Penitentiaries were invented by the communists.

14. In Virginia, there is absolutely nothing the courts can do if a child's parent refuses to participate in family counseling.

15. There are currently no places in Virginia where it is legal for a single person to be a foster parent.

16. Adventure Bound is the name of a local Virginia Beach program aimed at correcting behavioral problems of children between the ages of 6 and 12.

17. Judges are the only people in the legal system that have the power of discretion when dealing with juveniles.

18. Starting January 1, 1978 status offenders in Virginia may no longer be detained in the same secure facilities as juvenile criminal offenders.

19. Proponents of reality therapy argue that it is very important to diagnose types of mental illness before actual therapy begins.

20. Intake officers in Virginia now have the option of refusing to file a petition against a juvenile if they feel it is unjustified.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS. Answer <u>two</u> of the following. (20 points each).

A. It has been proposed that another state institution for juveniles be constructed at a minimum cost of 20 million dollars. Supporters of this proposal cite the rising rate of juvenile delinquency as rationale for this investment. Present a thorough, detailed and well-organized argument for <u>or</u> against the proposed new institution.

B. Consider the relationship of juvenile delinquency to class, status, and power and discuss the influence of these three factors on the labeling and treatment of children by the juvenile justice system.

C. You are given a one hour appointment with a new, untrained volunteer in the juvenile court. In that time you are to provide this person with as much meaningful information and training as possible to prepare him/her for an initial "one-to-one" meeting with a client. List 15 specific items or concepts which you think would be of MOST benefit to the new volunteer. Explain why you consider these items/concepts to be important.

In addition answer the following question (20 points).

D. You are being asked to design a course to introduce students and members of the community to volunteering in the juvenile justice system. This course is to be given at another local college. Which of the guest speakers that you heard this semester would you try to get for your course. List the three you liked best and cite two new insights you gained from each of the three. Which speakers would you omit and why? What new things would you add to your course? Be specific.

APPENDIX D

COURSE EVALUATION

VOLUNTEERING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Instructions: Please respond to the following as carefully, honestly and completely as possible. Your responses will not be examined by the instructor until your semester grades are turned in to the Registrar's Office. However, your opinions will be considered very carefully in planning next semester's course. Answer the following items on the reverse side of this sheet.

1. Briefly state the (a) MOST valuable aspect of this course for you, and (b) the LEAST valuable aspect of this course for you.

2. If you were instructing this course, what changes would you make?

3. If you were instructing this course, what aspects of it would you be sure NOT to change?

4. Please evaluate the items listed according to the following code. Darken the appropriate space on the answer sheet provided.

   Code: A = Excellent. Should be used again.
   B = Good, but needs to be related to the course by additional comments from the course instructor.
   C = OK if you cannot find any replacement.
   D = Definitely omit for next time.
   E = Cannot comment, as I was absent that night.

Course Content:

1. Film: "Children in Trouble".

2. Guests: Susie Sasser and Judy Spong, former Counselors at Bon Air State Learning Center.

3. Awareness games (lst class), Mrs. Coyle.

4. Guest: Dr. Leonard Dobrin - "An Overview of the Criminal Justice System".

5. Guest: Betty Adams - "Juvenile Legislation in Virginia".

6. Guest: Dr. Garland White - "Problems Juveniles Face".

7. Film: "Cipher in the Snow".

8. Guests: Laurie DiPadova, Minor Thomas, and Cathy Dickinson - "Communication Skills".

9. Guest: Chris Boyce = "A Child Goes Through the System".

10. Guest: A Delinquent Juvenile Girl (better known as your instructor).

11. Guest: Pam Kelley - "Prevention and Diversion".

12. Guest: Fred Mason - "Values Clarification".

13. Guest: Virginia Cochran - "Children and the Law".

14. Guest: Dora Dobrin - "Counseling Techniques".

15. Film: "Eye of the Storm".

16. Guest: Gary Duncan - "Alternatives to the System".

17. Guests: Volunteer Coordinators - Minor Thomas and Annie Guertin.

18. Guest: Judge Lester Moore, Jr.

19. Instructor: Mrs. Coyle - overall comments and instruction.

Books:

20. Richette, The Throwaway Children.

21. Sanders, Juvenile Delinquency.

22. Glasser, Reality Therapy.

23. Fox, "Handbook for Volunteers in Juvenile Court".

Field Trips: (Use "E" if you did not go to that trip)

24. Juvenile Crisis Center - Norfolk
25. Norfolk Detention Home
26. Regional Girl's Home
27. Norfolk Jail
28. Chesapeake Regional Boy's Home
29. Stanhope House
30. Richmond Trip
31. Portsmouth Boy's Group Home
32. Pendleton Project
33. Crisis Home - Virginia Beach
34. Tidewater Detention Home
35. Lake House
36. Hampton House.
37. Court Visit
38. Intake Visit
39. Probation Field Unit

Volunteer Bureaus — Priority Solutions

By Charles B. Spencer

During 1976, The Association of Volunteer Bureaus, (AVB), developed a comprehensive plan for its second twenty-five years of service. A core element of the plan is the strengthening and expansion of central services to member-organizations, and to the field. The precise form these services were to take was to be determined by member perception of service needs, this to be established, in part, by survey.

Last year's preliminary survey was designed to identify and prioritize issues affecting members in their conduct of community-based volunteer mobilization programs. As reported in Volunteer Administration, (Fall, 1977, "Volunteer Bureaus - The Critical Issues"), the top-priority issues proved to be: training needs; relations with public; United Way and community power structure; tax deductions and insurance for volunteers; volunteer experience on job applications; and increased citizen participation in government decision-making.

The question of how best to deal with the identified priorities was addressed in a follow-up survey conducted in Spring, 1978. The results are summarized in this article.

Charles Spencer is a board member of the Association of Volunteer Bureaus (AVB), and AVB's Vice President for Special Projects.

Methodology - The AVB questionnaire provided (vertically) three alternative "solutions" for each of the priority-issues identified in the preliminary survey, plus additional space for a write-in solution of choice, (see Appendix). Members were asked to rank these solutions numerically in order of potential effectiveness. Solutions receiving 50% of the number-one choice vote were considered significant preferences.

Secondly, in order to determine constituency's views as to the direction AVB support-service should take, respondents were asked to rank, for all solutions, four "support possibilities", with additional speace again provided for an alternate write-in of choice. The support possibilities were provided horizontally, and here, those receiving 35% of the number-one choice vote were considered significant.

The dual intent of the survey necessitated a relatively complex format. Accordingly, to minimize misconception as to the manner in which the questionnaire was to be filled out, an annotated sample answer was included in the instructions, (see Appendix). Subsequent examination of returned questionnaires indicated that the instructions had been understood and correctly interpreted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although this survey required considerably more time and effort to complete than the 1977 "Issues" survey, 65% of membership responded - 84 Volunteer Bureaus (VBs) and Voluntary Action Centers (VACs). Results, as summarized below, were considered statistically significant.

Seventy-four percent of respondents wrote in a total of 169 alternate solutions and 81 AVB alternate support possibilities. In view of both the quantity and quality of response, AVB has concluded that respondents recognized the practical intent and applicability of the survey and expected practical use to be made of the conclusions.

Training. As practitioners of community volunteer mobilization, Volunteer Bureaus and Voluntary Action Centers (VACs) accept primary responsibility for self-training. With regard to the training of volunteers, they see their primary role as indirect, via helping agency staff working with volunteers to better perform the training function. In all areas of training, and in relations with public and community power structure as well, they believe that the most potentially effective form of Association support would be in the development, or improvement, of special instructional materials.

Tax Deductions for Volunteers; Insurance for Volunteers; and, Increased Citizen Participation in Government Decision Making. These three priority-issues are seen by VB/VACs as being resolvable only on the national level, and as requiring concerted, inter-organizational collaboration. Here, AVB's strongly-favored support role is in the promotion of and participation in such collaborative effort.

Volunteer Experience on Job Applications. To accomplish this objective, the direct approach ("sell local corporations, public & private agencies:), is favored over either legislative advocacy or development of community support for the concept. However, despite the fact that this issue is seen as requiring local initiative, the form of support felt to be the most productive is helping to secure a national mandate through advocacy.

Survey Use. *AVB is constituency-based. It considers that its practitioner-constituency, collectively, is the ultimate authority on its own problems, (and by extension, the problems of all VB/VACs). AVB believes that the 1977 and 1978 surveys have correctly identified the critical issues, developed workable solutions and provided clear-cut direction as to the central support most needed to bring about these solutions. Accordingly, the Association plans to devise appropriate responsive measures and include them in its central services provision.*

SUMMARY DETAIL

Training Needs. In an introductory question, training needs were identified and prioritized. Considered most important is "training for agency staff using volunteers", (50%). Training for board members was rated most important by 11% of respondents, which as a write-in, was considered significant. Regarding training of agency staff, the most effective method, according to 58% of respondents, is by group seminars conducted by local VB/VACs.

Relations with Public. Four out of five members feel that regular media announcements of volunteer job opportunities is their most essential public relations vehicle. 50% of all respondents feel that assistance in this area should take the form of special instructional materials.

Relations with United Way. With most Bureaus and VACs funded in part or totally by local United Ways, development of this relationship is considered critical. The best way to bring this about, according to 50% of respondents, is by encouraging United Way of America to endorse this development, and communicate the endorsement to its member-organizations.

Relations with Community Power Structure. While obtaining partnership in community

planning and establishment of corporate relationships are also considered important, half of AVB members believe the best solution lies in getting community leaders to serve on VB/VAC boards and advisory committees. There is no clear-cut AVB support preference.

Tax Deductions for Volunteers, Insurance for Volunteers. Both of these issues, while clearly vital to increasing local volunteer recruitment, are considered incapable of resolution except nationally, and only by collaborative, inter-organizational legislative advocacy. AVB members want the Association to help bring about the necessary collaboration.

Volunteer Experience on Job Applications. While a third of member-organizations think legislative solutions would be most effective, more than half believe that the issue must be addressed directly, by "selling" corporations and other private and public agencies on the idea that it is in their own self-interest to recognize the professional relevance and applicability of pertinent volunteer experience. While assumption of an advocative role is viewed as the most helpful form of central support, analysis of comments suggests that the advocacy referred to is not legislative but rather a matter of consciousness-raising in all segments of the community, including that of volunteers themselves.

Increased Citizen Participation in Government Decision Making. Though again a local as well as national concern, three out of five members believe that the place to begin is on the national level--via advocacy of consumer representation on governmental committees. Comments on this issue reveal that whether viewed as a national or local priority, a collaborative effort is considered necessary to secure results.

AVB SURVEY # 2 - PRIORITY SOLUTIONS

Instructions for Completing the Questionnaire
(The circled numbers in these instructions correspond to the numbers in the sample form below)

A. Each form below deals with a specific PRIORITY which was identified by AVB members in the 1977 AVB Priorities Survey. "Training for Volunteers" ① is the Priority in the sample form below. For each Priority three solutions ② are offered, plus a space for you to write in an "other" ③ solution that you think would apply to the Priority need.

RANK EACH OF THE SOLUTIONS IN THE ORDER OF THEIR IMPORTANCE. Use 1 as the most important and 4 as least important. WRITE IN THE NUMBERS IN THE BOXES TO THE LEFT OF THE SOLUTIONS. ④

B. Methods which AVB can adopt to assist you in achieving the solutions are listed across the page under AVB SUPPORT POSSIBILITIES ⑤ (Individual Consultation, Regional/National Workshops, Special Instruction Materials, National Advocacy, Other).

FOR EACH SOLUTION, RANK THE AVB SUPPORT POSSIBILITIES IN THE ORDER OF THEIR IMPORTANCE TO YOU. If you feel that AVB should use a method other than the four possibilities given, please specify the "Other" support possibility in the space provided on the right. ⑥

① TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS

2 SOLUTIONS (Rank "Solutions" in Boxes Below)		⑤ AVB SUPPORT POSSIBILITIES (Rank for Each Solution Horizontally) Individual Consultation	Regional/ National Workshops	Special Instruction Materials	National Advocacy	Other	⑥ Specify "other" Below on Correct Line
3	In Curriculum - Schools, Colleges, Graduate Schools	2	3	1	4	-	
4	Seminars by State Volunteer Commissions	-	-	-	2	1	AVB Direct Approach to State Volunteer Commissions
1	Workshops by Local VBs/VACs	3	1	2	-	-	
2	Other (specify): Better Training by Agency Volunteer Supervisors	3	1	2	4	-	

④

③

CHURCH VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION:
Similarities and Differences

By Janet Richards

In an article which appeared recently in VOLUNTARY ACTION LEADERSHIP, Alice Leppert refers to voluntarism in the church as a 'half-awake giant', with churches and their members emerging as change-agents in community affairs. Ms. Leppert also mentions that "there is a volume of activity within the typical congregation which rightfully can be called volunteering". I would like to speak to that contention. Based on two years as a Coordinator of Volunteers in a church and many more years as an active church member, I have readily observed that there is a notably unrecognized need for coordinating the services freely rendered by the membership in the programs of the church.

Considering the fact that the number of paid staff in most churches ranges from two to seven or eight and the number of volunteers involved in any week could easily run from 50 to several hundred, perhaps it is time to consider the church as an agency, just as one would consider a hospital, a library, the Red Cross or any of the hosts of other agencies in the community which use volunteers. *The contribution of its members to the life of the church deserves the same fine quality of administration that those other agencies are being encouraged to provide for their volunteers. Churches have survived a long time with their present systems of volunteer involvement. Perhaps the time has come to look at those systems and question whether there is a way to improve them.*

While there are a number of ways in which administering a volunteer program in a church is different, there are many ways in which it is very much the same as in any other agency. With the church's great dependence on a volunteer work force to keep its programs going, the same principles of good administration very much apply. So often churches have been guilty of calling on the same core of members to do the bulk of the work. With a Volunteer Coordinator on staff, the responsibilities can be spread out among many people. Moreover, the

---

Janet Richards is Coordinator of Volunteers, Gloria Dei Lutheran Church, Huntingdon Valley, Pennsylvania.

intentional matching of the tasks to be done and the resources in persons is sharpened and focused.

In my own church of 3000 members, there are 900 jobs where volunteers carry responsibilities in areas such as being choir members, Sunday School teachers, ushers, acolytes, Altar guild, Church Council, executive committees of various church organizations, persons to count offerings, special greeters on Sunday mornings, etc. After a year with a Coordinator of Volunteers on staff, at least 200 more members were involved in the church's internal volunteer programs. For example, the same persons were previously expected to count the offerings for both services, which means being on hand 4 to 5 hours. The Coordinator of Volunteers recruited enough people to make separate teams for each service for each Sunday in the month, thus doubling the number of persons involved in that one responsibility alone. The captains for those counting teams had previously been Church Council people. The Coordinator of Volunteers, with approval from Church Council, recruited other individuals to serve as captains - once more expanding the responsibility among a larger portion of the congregation. This also relieved Church Council to invest more time and energy in the managing of church affairs. (A side benefit is that this involvement of even more members provided a wider field of potential for recruiting Finance Committee people.)

Adhering to the principle of recruiting for a specific period of time, with the continuation in that responsibility being renegotiable periodically, the Coordinator of Volunteers surveyed several different groups to give them an opportunity to be relieved of duties which may have become a burden to them. This meant exposure to the possibility of having to do a mass recruiting if many of these volunteers chose to 'get out'. The opposite happened, however. In one group, out of sixty phone calls, only four asked to be relieved of duty; three said they'd stay with it for another six months; and the balance willingly signed on for another full year. The response seemed to reflect an appreciation for the businesslike approach of negotiation.

Another principle that has been made very clear in this situation is that volunteers have a right to expect assignments equivalent to their abilities. This means letting people know that it is perfectly okay to say "no" when asked to do something they really are not interested in or capable of doing. Many people feel obligated to say "yes" when the church asks anything of them. They also feel very guilty if they cannot do what is asked, even when the reason is legitimate. By promising to call again - and then doing so - the Coordinator of Volunteers has helped people realize that it is perfectly acceptable to be honest about accepting or rejecting an assignment.

One of the tools from the business world which has been applied to volunteering is that of training. In the church setting, volunteers have been recruited for responsibilities with little thought of providing training. Public school teachers often are asked to teach Sunday School; therefore, no training is thought to be necessary. Businessmen are asked to serve on the governing body of the church and it is believed that they will bring their several skills from business into the managing of the church's affairs. The assumption that neither of these groups needs or wants training needs to be checked out. Also, when laymen are asked to be canvassers in the church's annual pledge campaign, what are the skills they bring? Usually their major qualification is a commitment to the work of the church. But communication, interviewing or sales skills are minimal. These canvassers, given training for the job they have agreed to do, achieve a far greater degree of self-satisfaction for themselves, while being even more effective for the church. Opportunities for training to do the work of the church need to be available and varied.

The task of a Volunteer Coordinator in a church has some unique features. The most obvious is the fact that, unlike almost any other setting, the clients and the volunteers are one and the same. Among other things, this means that volunteers are their own bosses, in that the church

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

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