

Editor's Note:

Volunteer/Staff relations are the focus of considerable concern for many administrators of volunteer services. Arty Trost carefully analyzed the attitudes of social workers towards direct service volunteers. Her findings were enlightening and should be considered carefully. Of necessity, this article has had to be extensively edited for inclusion in 'Volunteer Administration'. Ms. Trost has graciously agreed to supply a copy of her study in its entirety to interested readers for \$10.00, to cover postage and duplicating. Interested persons may write to: Ms. Trost, 43434 Southeast Tapp Rd., Sandy, Oregon 97055

.... Sarah Jane Rehnborg
Editor, Research Translation

MSW Attitudes Toward Direct Service Volunteers

By L. S. "Arty" Trost

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Problem

In recent years the field of voluntarism has rapidly expanded to include services previously provided by professionally trained social work personnel.¹ In many social service situations the role of the MSW has become one of coordinating and facilitating the efforts of "delivery of service" teams composed of themselves, volunteers, and paraprofessionals.

The traditionally clear distinction between the role of the professional and the role of the volunteer is becoming ambiguous as volunteers are utilized in positions that require direct contact with clients, often in stressful situations. As the widespread utilization of volunteers in more significant roles increases, professional tension and resistance develops.²

At present, while there are many statements made about professional resistance to volunteers, and many discussions about staff-volunteer relations, there is a paucity of research in this area. Questions such as the following, if answered, would be help-

ful in beginning to understand the relationship between professional social workers and direct service volunteers.

1. *What are MSW perceptions of, and attitudes toward, direct service volunteers?*
2. *Do MSWs employed in public agencies have different perceptions of and attitudes toward direct service volunteers than MSWs employed in voluntary agencies?*
3. *Is there a correlation between previous personal experience as a volunteer and present attitudes and perceptions of volunteers?*
4. *Is there a difference in perceptions and attitudes between those MSWs who work directly with direct service volunteers and those who do not?*

Purpose and Method of Study

The purpose of this study was to describe attitudes and perceptions of MSWs in public and voluntary agencies toward direct service volunteers. Data were collected from MSWs working in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties in

Ms. Trost is an MSW, consultant and trainer specializing in volunteer program management. She is Vice President of Accreditation for the Association of Volunteer Bureaus.

California by two instruments, a five point Likert scale with twenty items and a seven point Semantic Differential scale with ten items. (Appendix A). Data were analyzed by a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for material obtained on the Likert scale and an analysis of variance for the Semantic Differential. Demographic data were also collected.

A list of 465 MSWs was obtained through the assistance of NASW and human service agencies in both counties. The test instruments were mailed to a randomly selected sample population of 160 MSWs. Six sub-sample groups of twenty MSW were formed on the following basis:

MSWs employed full time in a public agency who:

1. have had both personal experience as a volunteer and direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years;
2. have had either personal experience as a volunteer or direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years;
3. have had neither personal experience as a volunteer nor direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years.

MSWs employed full time in a voluntary agency who:

4. have had both personal experience as a volunteer and direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years;
5. have had either personal experience as a volunteer or direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years;
6. have had neither personal experience as a volunteer nor direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years.

Basic Hypotheses

There are three working hypotheses:

1. *As a group, MSWs in both public and voluntary agencies will tend to view direct service volunteers in a negative manner.*

2. *MSWs in voluntary agencies will have less positive attitude toward direct service volunteers than MSWs in public agencies.*
3. *These negative attributions may be modified by familiarity with the role of the volunteer.*

Sub-hypothesis: MSWs in both public and voluntary agencies who have had both personal experience as a volunteer and direct contact professionally with volunteers within the past seven years will view direct service volunteers in a more positive manner than will MSWs without either personal experience or direct contact.

Significance of the Study

The subject of manpower in human services appears to be a crucial one at this time. On the one hand there is the continuous expansion of the need for social services. On the other hand there are cutbacks in federal, state, and local funding for provision of these services. In the past decade much has been written about the acute shortage of professional social workers. There was a general consensus that graduate schools of social work would not be able to train enough social workers to fill the service needs.³ In the early 1970's, this problem was compounded by the lack of funds to hire professionally trained social workers.

At present, additional manpower in the social services comes from two sources: the paid paraprofessional and the volunteer. During the past three administrations there has been a great emphasis on citizen and consumer participation in the social services: informed laymen who can participate with professionals on agency advisory boards and committees and nonprofessionals who can provide direct services which complement and supplement professional services to agency clients.

It appears that the human services field is faced with a dichotomy. There appears to be an oversupply of MSWs, as new graduates are unable to find employment and others are losing positions due to funding cutbacks. Yet, there is a shortage of MSWs in terms of the ratio of MSWs to clients and potential clients -- a shortage which probably would not be alleviated even if all persons with an MSW degree were fully employed.

If we accept the idea that there is indeed a critical manpower shortage in terms of services provided, and that it can be partially alleviated through the judicious utilization of volunteers, then it will be necessary for the professional to take another look at attitudes and actions toward direct service volunteers. It will be necessary for graduate schools of social work to add to their curriculum courses in volunteer administration and for agencies to offer similar seminars and workshops for their staff, in order that volunteers may be utilized to the optimum extent possible.

Definition of Terms

MSW: *an individual who has received a master's degree from an accredited school of social work. For the purpose of this study, the word "professional" will be used as a synonym for MSW. It is important, however, to note that "the antonym for volunteer is 'paid,' not 'professional' ...4*

Volunteer: *an individual who freely contributes his services without remuneration to a public or voluntary agency or organization. An "indirect service volunteer" is one who provides ancillary services such as office help, fund raising, membership on boards or committees, etc. A "direct service volunteer" is one who works directly with agency clientele.*

Public Agency: *a governmental agency financed by public funds which is engaged in preventing, controlling, or ameliorating the affects of social, physical, or mental health problems experienced by individuals, groups, or communities.*

Voluntary Agency: *an agency financed by voluntary contributions and/or fees which is engaged in preventing, controlling, or ameliorating the affects of social, physical, or mental health problems experienced by individuals, groups, or communities.*

Background of the Study

Today's volunteers in social welfare are carrying on a great tradition in American life. Voluntarism has been an accepted part of community life ever since the barn raising activities of the early colonists. The contribution of time and energy to help others, to organize and serve in community and religious causes has been an historic factor in the growth of the United States.⁵

As one observer noted,

The pioneers in social welfare were

volunteers. Before the caseworkers, before the group workers, before the medical specialists, there were the laymen who saw unmet human needs in their own communities and moved to meet them.⁶

These volunteers, motivated by religious precepts and humanitarian concerns, established and operated settlement houses, children's homes, services for individuals and families, and many other agencies of assistance. They laid down the foundation for the social work structure which we know today.⁷

As the problems of industrialization and urbanization multiplied, these early agencies began to employ facilitating staff. But while "agents," clerks, and bookkeepers were given some delegated responsibilities, the volunteers continued to supply most of the direct services. As pressures continued to mount, the trend toward delegation of responsibility to paid staff continued. There were those who were concerned about this trend and Mary Richmond suggested that the "professional worker" could not become the "complete and satisfactory substitute" for the volunteer.⁸

As the concept of social welfare expanded and became more institutionalized in voluntary and public agencies in the early 1900's, participation of the volunteer in direct service declined as professionalism emerged. The volunteer withdrew from the client and served on boards and committees, making policy and planning decisions. The professionalism of social welfare agencies accelerated during the 1940's and 1950's and "...protected the client from direct contact with volunteers."⁹ Professionals soon forgot the contribution of volunteers to social welfare and began to talk of the "damage" that unskilled people could do to a client in stress.

However, by the early 1960's, the pendulum began to swing back, and more and more service volunteers were recruited to strengthen agency programs. Wolozin calculated that, when estimated at the lowest possible wage scale, volunteers provided more than \$14 billion of services for voluntary agencies in 1970 alone.¹⁰

Considerable impetus to the voluntary action movement has been given by the federal government. In the 1962 Social Security Act amendments

Congress made volunteer services an integral part of the national policy by providing 75% matching federal grants-in-aid to states for support of statewide plans of volunteer service.¹¹

When states were slow to respond to this "carrot," the 1967 Social Security Act amendments mandated the use of volunteers in state public welfare plans by July 1, 1969.

Nixon, in his inaugural address, said:

*We are approaching the limits of what government can do alone. Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government, to enlist the legions of the concerned and committed. What has to be done has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all.*¹²

He followed up on this statement by establishing the Office of Voluntary Action, which was to "encourage and stimulate more widespread effective voluntary action for solving domestic problems."¹³ The parallel branch to the public Office of Voluntary Action at HUD became the non-profit, non-partisan National Center for Voluntary Action, financed solely through voluntary contributions. Both are enjoined to inform, educate, and assist individuals and groups about the possibility of volunteer service.

But today's resurgence of voluntary action has its problems and the conflict between professional and volunteer is one of them.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The shortage of manpower in the helping professions has been extensively documented.¹⁴ Service which is provided by a relatively small group of specially trained professionals is a viable method for limited programs but cannot be effective in programs which hope to provide massive benefits. This is especially true at a time when our country's aspirations for health, educational, and social services are rising more rapidly than the usual channels can accommodate. The needs for human service go far beyond the economic potential for paid services, especially now when we are seeing a reluctance at the federal level to fund services even at previous levels. This constitutes a challenge to the social work profession to explore, develop, and utilize all available manpower resources in the interest of extending services to as many as possible.¹⁵

Volunteer service has long played an important role in health, welfare, education, and recreation agencies. It is a means of expanding programs, bringing special skills to the programs' enrichment, and effectively interpreting the agency's programs to the community. Volunteers can provide services to those people who might otherwise "fall between the cracks" of the eligibility requirements of public assistance programs.

The direct service volunteer movement is growing rapidly, and more and more types of work which were formerly labeled as professional are now being entrusted to skilled volunteers. The human services sector utilizes hundred of thousands of volunteers in a wide variety of direct service positions. Volunteers work in governmental agencies such as welfare, probation, social security, and rehabilitation; in hospitals, psychiatric institutions, and treatment centers; on hot lines and in character building agencies, to mention only a few.¹⁶ Throughout the country there is a wave of positivism and optimism of what can be accomplished through volunteer manpower.¹⁷

Unfortunately, along with the enthusiasm for well-trained, well-placed volunteers, there is an increasing awareness of the problems which can and do develop between volunteers and professional staff members. In discussing "The Professional and the Volunteer in Corrections: Truce or Consequences," the Volunteer Courts Newsletter states that the "big block to Court Voluntarism is not volunteer recruiting; it is not training of volunteers; it is not lack of communications or poverty of funding. It is the corrections professional."¹⁸ Dorothy Becker writes that "there has been little exploration of the roots of the unexpressed but determined resistance of the social work profession to extending the use of direct service volunteers."¹⁹

Resistance to change is not a new concept; many books on organization theory deal with it. While this study will not attempt to analyze the effect of volunteers on an organization, it should be obvious that volunteers do bring changes in the system. As most MSWs are employed by various types of organizations, it is appropriate to discuss the theory of resistance to change and how it applies to professional resistance to volunteers.

In their book Management and Organizational Behavior, Hodge and Johnson list eight areas of change where resistance usually occurs.²⁰

1. *Changes that are perceived to lower status or prestige.*
2. *Changes that cause fear.*
3. *Changes that affect job content and/or pay.*
4. *Changes that reduce authority or freedom of acting.*

5. *Changes that disrupt established work routines.*
6. *Changes that rearrange formal and informal group relationships.*
7. *Changes that are forced without explanation or employee participation.*
8. *Changes that are resisted because of mental and/or physical lethargy.*

To understand better the underlying factors in social workers' resistance to volunteers, it will be helpful to examine these areas, which often overlap. The following descriptions of each of the areas suggest variables for measurement, and have been the basis for the selection of measurement instruments used in the study.²¹

Changes that affect job content and disrupt established work routines. A main area of concern on the part of the professional is about the quality of service rendered by volunteers, and the potential danger to clients from insensitive and unskilled helpers.

Changes that are perceived to lower status or prestige. The idea that volunteers with relatively brief training can be expected to do some of the things that the professional spent years getting trained for is a threat and a source of genuine professional concern.

Changes that cause fear. The term "fear" is equated here with uncertainty and hesitation, in relation to the role changes social workers undergo with the implementation of volunteer programs.

Changes that reduce authority or freedom of acting. On the one hand, volunteers increase a professional's authority and responsibility, but volunteers may also reduce his authority and freedom to act in relation to his clients. The volunteer may question the social worker's judgment about a particular client. Since volunteers do not belong to the professional culture, they are more likely to challenge its basic assumptions. One assumption that professionals fear volunteers will challenge is the tradition of confidentiality.

Changes that rearrange formal and informal group relationships. Some professionals feel that the need for more manpower can be better met by paraprofessionals than by volunteers. They feel more comfortable with paraprofessionals who know their place in the organizational hierarchy and are ready to take supervision as paid staff members. Professionals feel that volunteers do not fit

as readily into defined role relationships and are less predictable in terms of commitment to supervision.²²

Changes that are forced without explanation or employee participation. Many authorities agree that there is a direct relationship between the amount of employee participation in change and the degree of employee acceptance of change.²³ Unfortunately, professionals are often not consulted or involved in planning volunteer programs.

This section has attempted to relate professional resistance to volunteers to organizational theory on resistance to change. There are, of course, many more facets that this study has not attempted to deal with, such as how formal and informal organizational structures are altered by the inclusion of volunteers, how volunteers perceive the organizational structure, and how volunteers perceive professional social workers, to mention only a few. As the volunteer movement continues to grow, so does the scope of the literature.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Are Volunteers Here to Stay?

One of the reasons that this particular topic was selected for a master's essay is that the whole picture of voluntarism in the social services is changing rapidly and will probably continue to change in the 1970's and 1980's. These changes have and will continue to affect the service professions, professional education, and professional practice, as well as the function of agencies and institutions. These changes--and the response to these changes--need to be known and dealt with.

Professional MSWs seem to be very aware of the new climate of voluntarism and the rapid acceleration of volunteer activity, whether they welcome or resist it; whether they are excited or upset by it; whether they see it as a challenge to their creativity or a meddler in traditions. The extremely high response to the mailed questionnaire (91.8%) is an evidence of their interest in the subject matter. Not only did 91.8% take time to respond, but of that number 10% took time to add additional comments, sometimes a page in length. Their comments show how aware they are of the changes taking place in the social services, in part due to the national developments focusing on volunteers. Some were particularly interested in the outcome of this study as they felt that professionals were being unfairly maligned for resistance to volunteers.

MSW Attitudes Toward Volunteers: An Overview

The statistics gathered in this study show that the respondents are neither positive nor negative in their overall view of volunteers. They are very close to neutral when summarizing over the 30 scales, and so a sweeping hypothesis such as "MSWs . . . will tend to view direct service volunteers in a negative manner" will have to be rejected. As one respondent wrote:

I have found that the success of this depended entirely on the personal quality of the volunteers. I have found that some volunteers could be trusted with nearly the entire responsibility of therapy while others could not be counted on to mix paints or sharpen pencils.

The second hypothesis, "MSWs in voluntary agencies will have a less positive attitude toward direct service volunteers than MSWs in public agencies," must also be rejected. There was absolutely no difference between the groups on the basis of the type of agency they worked in, when the variable of amount of exposure was factored out. There was not even a suggestion of a trend.

The bulk of the findings relate to the third hypothesis: that ". . . negative attributions may be modified by familiarity with the role of the volunteer." MSWs who had no direct professional experience with volunteers nor previous personal contact with volunteers (Groups 3 and 6 on page 15) were significantly more negative on 14 of the 30 scales than were MSWs who had either direct professional contact with volunteers or previous personal experience as a volunteer (Groups 2 and 5). MSWs who had both direct professional contact with volunteers and previous personal experience as a volunteer (Groups 1 and 4) were significantly less negative on 19 out of the 30 scales than were Groups 3 and 6, who had none.

Groups 1, (both) and 4 (both) rated volunteers as significantly more beneficial, good, strong, successful, important, valuable, and helpful than did Groups 3 (none) and 6 (none). There was no significant difference on the other three scales.

Continuing to compare these four groups according to the variable of amount of exposure, Groups 3 (none) and 6 (none) were significantly more concerned about the possible loss of jobs and prestige than were Groups 1 and 4. In areas that affected job content and/or pay they were again significantly more negative, reacting on five of the six scales in this area. Groups 3 and 6 were significantly more reluctant to allow volunteers

access to confidential records, feel that volunteers are less responsive to supervision, have less commitment to agency policies, tend to come and go as they please, tend to become over-involved with clients, and generally are not worth the time and effort involved.

When comparing Groups 2 (either) and 5 (either) with Groups 3 (none) and 6 (none), we do not find them reacting differently on as many scales. Groups 2 and 5 rated volunteers as being significantly more beneficial, strong, important, successful, and valuable than Groups 3 and 6. Again, Groups 2 and 5 were less concerned with the possible loss of jobs and prestige than were Groups 3 and 6. Groups 3 and 6 felt that volunteers tended to make snap judgments, were unable to work in highly sensitive areas, and did not have the skills and knowledge necessary to work with clients, at a significantly higher level than did Groups 2 and 5.

Groups 3 and 6 continued to be significantly more reluctant to allow volunteers access to confidential records, felt that they were less responsive to supervision, and have less commitment to agency policies, tend to come and go as they please, and become over-involved with clients than did Groups 2 and 5.

Increasing the amount of exposure to volunteers does not seem to increase the amount of the favorable attitude, so that there was no significant difference between Groups 1 (both) and 2 (either) nor between Groups 4 (both) and 5 (either). Cross-matching across type of agency also showed no significant differences, e.g., Group 4 (both) vs. 2 (either) and Group 1 (both) vs. Group 5 (either). There is a definite trend for Groups 1 (both) and 4 (both) to be more positive toward volunteers than Groups 2 (either) and 5 (either) but not at statistical levels of significance.

Implications

What does all this mean? What are the implications for the field of social work? We see that MSWs in this study are more favorable to volunteers if they have exposure to volunteers. We also see that there are certain areas of change that are particularly threatening, especially as the addition of volunteers to social services involves changes in job content. The continuous assumption in the literature that professionals will resist volunteers may not necessarily be true. Again, it is important to remember that verbal attitudes are not necessarily congruent with action attitudes. But it appears that

There is reason to believe that MSWs have a more open mind on the subject of direct-service volunteers than has been thought.

It is significant to note that virtually every MSW in the study agreed with the statement: Professionals need training in the skills of conducting successful volunteer programs. *The implication here is that graduate schools of social work should take another look at their curriculum and give serious thought to providing courses in Volunteer Administration. A few schools have begun to do this, but very few. It also means that agencies should endeavor to provide time for training workshops, conferences, and seminars in the field of Volunteer Administration for their staffs.*

Professional and agency functions are changing and will have to continue to change if they are to remain relevant. As the functions of the volunteer continue to expand, volunteer programs cannot continue to develop in the hit-and-miss way that most such programs have been developed so far. Professional social workers must be involved in the planning and ongoing administration of volunteer programs if they are to be utilized to their fullest potential. Professional staff will need training and retraining to work as teammates with volunteers, as they now work as teammates with other professionals. Professionals will need training with volunteers, rather than training volunteers and professionals separately and then assuming that they will be able to work together.

The point is that the volunteer has an important, unique contribution to make--a contribution that neither parallels nor duplicates the tasks, functions, or the methods of the professional. Only frustration and disappointment can result if the volunteer is viewed as a pinch-hitter for an overworked staff. Neither the psychiatrist, social worker, nor psychologist can be pinch-hitters for each other, but together they form a unique team whose end product is greater than the sum of its parts.

Involving the volunteer requires acceptance of change, but resistance to change is normal. Inertia is a recognized phenomenon of the physical world, and we must realize that it operates in the social world as well.

Now the spotlight is on the professional and the volunteer. The question is whether the professional will invite the volunteer to share the stage and what role the volunteer will play. Professional staff who have been fearful, unconvinced, and overprotective of

their clients must now begin to work hard at including the volunteer and easing the restrictions and caveats which have discouraged volunteers from playing a meaningful part in the social services.

Footnotes

1. Jan C. Horn, "Personality Characteristics of Direct Service Volunteers" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, U.S. International University, 1973), p. 1.
2. Eva Schindler-Rainman and Ronald Lippitt, The Volunteer Community (Washington, D.C.: NTL Learning Resources, 1971), p. 43; Charles Grosser, William E. Henry, and James G. Kelly (eds.), Non-Professionals in the Human Services (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969), pp. 45, 101.
3. Perry Levinson and Jeffry Scholler, "Role Analysis of the Indigenous Nonprofessional", Social Work, II, 3 (July 1966), 95; George Brager, "The Indigenous Worker: A New Approach to the Social Work Technician", Social Work, X, 2 (April 1965), 33.
4. Harriet H. Naylor, Volunteers Today (New York: Association Press, 1967), pp. 27-8.
5. Nathan E. Cohen, The Citizen Volunteer: His Responsibility, Role and Opportunity in Modern Society (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), passim.
6. The Volunteer Bureau: Purpose, Organization, Operation (New York: United Community Funds and Councils of America, 1959), p. 3.
7. Violet M. Seider, "Volunteers", Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: NASW, 1971) II, 1528.
8. Mary E. Richmond, "The Case for the Volunteer", The Long View (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930), p. 343.
9. Seider, op cit., p. 1528.
10. Harold Wolozin, "Volunteer Manpower in the United States", Federal Programs for Development of Human Resources Vol. I (Washington D.C.: Subcommittee on Economic Progress Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, 1971), pp. 203-214.

11. Seidner, op. cit., p. 1529
12. Joseph Neuman (ed.), People Helping People: U.S. Volunteers in Action (Washington, D.C.: U.S. News and World Report Books, 1971), p. 14
13. Horn, op. cit. p. 6
14. As mentioned in Significance of Study, p. 15, there is an apparent oversupply of MSWs because of funding cutbacks. The term "shortage" is in reference to the need for provision of services of MSWs.
15. See Brager, op. cit., p. 33; Grosser, Henry, and Kelley, op. cit., pp. 6-7; William C. Richan, "A theoretical Scheme for Determining Role of Professional and Non Professional Personnel," Social Work, VI, 4 (October 1961), 22; Glenn M. Parker, "New Careers in Public Welfare: Creative Possibilities and Some Problems," Public Welfare, XXVII, 4 (April, 1969), 113.
16. Newman, op. cit., passim.
17. Opinion expressed by Wilbur J. Cohen in an address to the Junior League (Volunteers: A Creative Force in America") in Los Angeles, Oct. 10, 1967; Rosemary Morrissey (recorder), "Strengthening Public Welfare Services Through the Use of Volunteers", (summary of material presented by an American Public Welfare Association Institute, Oct. 26-28, 1960, Chicago, Illinois), 16-24; George Pickering, "Voluntarism and the American Way", Occasional Paper #7 (Washington, D.C.: Center for a Voluntary Society, October, 1970), 9-11; and Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, op. cit., passim.
18. "The Professional and the Volunteer in Corrections: Truce or Consequences", Volunteer Courts Newsletter, I (February, 1969), cited by Cynthia Nathon in an address ("The Volunteer on a Special Kind of Team") to the Child Welfare League of America in San Francisco, Feb. 24, 1969.
19. Dorothy G. Becker, "Exit Lady Bountiful: The Volunteer and the Professional Social Worker", Social Service Review, 38 (March, 1964), 57-8.
20. Billy J. Hodge and Herbert J. Johnson, Management and Organizational Behavior (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970), pp. 432-433.
21. Number 21, will not be amplified, as it is self-explanatory.
22. Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, op. cit., p. 41.
23. R.C. Davis, Fundamentals of Top Management (New York: Harper, 1951), p. 200; Gordon L. Lippitt, Organizational Renewal (New York: Meredith, 1969), p. 146; William G. Scott, Human Relations in Management (Homewood, Illinois: Richard Irwin, 1962), p. 232.

Likert-type Opinion Scale

The first section of the questionnaire was a Likert-type opinion scale with twenty items. Each item related to one of the eight areas of resistance to change, discussed on pages 17 and 18. The questions relating to each of the eight items are listed below.

Respondents were given the option of replying "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree" to each statement item. The responses were scored so that a response indicative of a strongly favorable attitude was given a score of "1" while a response indicative of a strongly unfavorable attitude would be given a score of "5."

I. Changes that were perceived to lower status or prestige:

If volunteers are trained to provide services that professionals are now providing, it will mean loss of professional jobs and prestige.

II. Changes that cause fear:

Professionals can best utilize their skills by training and supervising direct-service volunteers, rather than providing services to a more limited number of clients.

The communication gaps and distrust that often arise between professionals and clients don't happen when local volunteers are involved.

Professionals need training in the skills of conducting successful volunteer programs.

III. Changes that affect job content and/or pay:

Personal counseling services should be done by volunteers under professional leadership and supervision.

When volunteers provide direct services to clients, the professional gives up the reward of direct contact with the client.

Volunteers lack perspective and tend to make snap judgments.

Volunteers don't have the knowledge and/or skills necessary to work with clients.

Volunteers are trying to meet their own psychological needs and not the needs of the clients.

Volunteers are able to work with clients in highly sensitive areas.

IV. Changes that reduce authority or freedom of acting:

Volunteers should be given assignments even if they require access to confidential records.

The best delivery of service is by a volunteer-professional team, as each brings different knowledge and skills to serve the client.

V. Changes that disrupt established work routines:

Volunteers, because of their flexible schedules, can offer services to clients outside of professional working hours.

Volunteers don't get paid, so they come and go as they please.

VI. Changes that rearrange formal and informal group relationships:

Volunteers work only a few hours a week and are not as committed as the professional.

Volunteers are as responsive to supervision as paid staff.

Volunteers lack commitment to agency policies.

VII. Changes that are forced without explanation or employee participation:

There were no statement items on the questionnaire that directly related to this area of resistance to change.

VIII. Changes that are resisted because of mental and/or physical lethargy:

Volunteers don't remain with the agency long enough to justify the time and effort necessary to properly train and supervise them.

Semantic Differential Scale

The concept "volunteer" was judged against a ten scale differential consisting of the following bi-polar adjectives:

1. harmful - beneficial
2. healthy - sick
3. bad - good
4. active - passive
5. weak - strong
6. successful - unsuccessful
7. unimportant - important
8. calm - excitable
9. worthless - valuable
10. helpful - hindering