

*Under funding from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation*

**The National Center for Voluntary Action Announces**

# **INTERNSHIPS**

## **for Volunteer Leaders and Administrators**

Are you a volunteer or paid administrator in a leadership position with a volunteer program, voluntary agency or nonprofit organization? Or perhaps a student planning a career in volunteer administration? If so, you now have an opportunity to participate in a unique learning experience while working on a project of your own design as a resident intern at the National Center for Voluntary Action.

You may spend from several days to several weeks with us, depending on the nature of your project. An NCVA staff member will assist you in refining your project design, creating a detailed work schedule, and planning your actual internship period. Once your project is completed, you may choose any format you wish for a final report reflecting your accomplishments as an intern.

In order to be considered, your application must include:

1. Your resume.
2. A description of your proposed project, specifying
  - ▶ the specific goals and objectives of the project
  - ▶ human and informational resources you expect to use at NCVA and in the Washington, D. C. area
  - ▶ estimated length of time required to complete the project and two alternate starting dates
  - ▶ exact amount of financial support you will need from NCVA to cover expenses for travel to and from Washington and for subsistence while in residence. (Room, board and miscellaneous travel expenses within the Washington area average \$43.00 per day.)

**Submit application to:**  
**Ms. Mary Catherine Cameron**  
**Special Programs Administrator**  
**Education and Training Dept.**  
**National Center for Voluntary Action**  
**1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.**  
**Washington, D. C. 20036**

Projects will be undertaken in the NCVA national office in Washington and, as resources allow, in the NCVA Western Office in San Francisco.

**research (Continued from p. 11)**

ernment leader or bureaucrat sit up and take notice. Moreover, these figures we have just given represent only the tip of a much larger iceberg; they refer only to organized volunteer work. There is every reason to believe that if unorganized and informal volunteer work (for people outside one's family) were adequately counted, the total hours and dollar value would be anywhere from twice to five times as large! Then, too, the total hours of volunteer work seems to have grown markedly in the past decade. However large the voluntary sector is now, therefore, it will probably be much larger next year and in the next decade.

Another economist, Marnie Mueller of Wesleyan University, used the Census-ACTION data to investigate discrimination against women in the voluntary sector as compared with the business sector. This discrimination is evident, in part, in what is called "occupational

**If you want to recruit  
more volunteers to give time  
to your group . . .  
begin with those people who are  
already giving money.**

segregation"—*i.e.*, the relegation of women to lower-level service jobs while men hold the higher-level managerial jobs. She found that this kind of discrimination against women does exist in volunteer organizations and programs, just as in business and government. However, the degree of discrimination seems to be quite a bit less in the voluntary sector. Women still have not achieved full equality, therefore, even in voluntary action; but at least there is more equality for women in voluntary action than elsewhere. Comparison of the 1974 data with similar data from 1965 showed that there has already been measurable reduction in discrimination against women in voluntarism. Let us hope that other surveys in the future show continuing improvement in this as well as other kinds of discrimination.

Other scholars working with the Census-ACTION data presented analyses of the variations in voluntary activity rates among metropolitan areas and the variations in volunteering among individuals, but we have not the space here to go into it. Let us instead shift to the results of some other national studies.

The study by Morgan and Hybels referred to earlier made another interesting finding—*i.e.*, for most people the contribution of *time* to a voluntary group and the contribution of *money* go hand in hand. People do not generally give significant amounts of time to one organization and significant amounts of money to another. Where they give time, they tend also to give money, and *vice versa*.

This finding has vital implications for recruiting and fund-raising by volunteer groups and programs of all kinds. It suggests that if you want to recruit more volunteers to give time to your group, you should begin with those people who are already giving money. Conversely, if you need more money to support your group or program, you are most likely to get additional support from those people who are already volunteering their time. A simple way to sum this up is to say that you are most likely to obtain both time *and* monetary support for voluntary action from among the same set of committed people. Conversely, if people feel no commitment to what you are doing, you are unlikely to obtain either time or money in significant amounts from them. This seems to be true regardless of the type or size of group involved, since the study was based on a national survey of people in all types and sizes of groups. (The main exception is that you may occasionally get very large gifts from donors who give little time).

Two other economists, Burton Weisbrod of the University of Wisconsin and Stephen Long of the Franklin and Marshall College, have performed a different kind of national study, surveying voluntary or non-profit groups themselves rather than their members. They used as a source of information the records of the Internal Revenue Service, which requires annual reports of all registered tax-exempt organizations. Based on a small sample of I.R.S. reports selected carefully and then extrapolated statistically, they estimated that the total revenues (cash flow, more or less) of all non-profit U.S. organizations for 1973 was over \$500 billion. This double-counts many dollars that pass from one non-profit to another, however, and includes all non-profit hospitals, colleges, museums and the like as well as the more volunteer-based groups and associations. Nevertheless, it is still another indication that the voluntary sector is

much larger than anyone had previously thought—and thus deserves much more attention than it has so far received.

Finally, psychologist Mary Ann Hoff reported on the results of a national survey of about 180 non-political, national voluntary organizations. With her colleagues, she has been examining the distinctive characteristics of about 40 of the best programs operated by this set of organizations, based on extensive evaluations of program quality.

Here are some of the features of really high quality voluntary organization programs that they have discovered: a sense of mission and organizational identity; capacity of the organization to expand and contract with the realities of funding and changing needs; outstanding, charismatic leaders; a set of well articulated and highly differentiated roles for volunteers; provision of training and self-development opportunities for volunteers; presence of a definite set of financial supporters for the program, usually users (as opposed to being dependent on United Way or foundation funding, for instance); use of internally devised but simple ways of measuring their own success; awareness of similar programs elsewhere and exchange information with them; perception by the clients that the organization is really providing a service to them; a good referral system for clients if the organization cannot deal with them; and clear changes in the character of the program over time, including changes in who "owns" the program—*e.g.*, local people or outside initiators.

By contrast, the poorest quality programs were characterized generally by the following features: lack of accountability in a variety of ways (to boards, clients, staff, volunteers, donors); distortion of mission to suit funding source(s);

**Discrimination against women  
does exist  
in volunteer organizations  
and programs, just as in  
business and government**

lack of adequate information flow and openness to the outside; over-attentiveness to fund-raising and public relations (rather than client needs); inability to change programs over time because of being too locked into a particular organizational image and fund-raising approach; over-professionalism in some

areas and under-professionalism in others; inconsistent eligibility requirements for clients in different places; general lack of foresight and planning in programming; need to recruit even more clients because the institution and its buildings are too big and need to be supported; need to recruit volunteers very actively (as opposed to their being attracted routinely by the presence of a good program of which the public is aware).

On the other hand, some factors that you might think are characteristic of either a very good or a very bad program were *not* important—i.e., they were neutral and non-discriminating: the number of volunteers involved with a group; the number of people in the population with a particular need addressed by the program; the administrative overhead level; the number of paid staff; the degree of social change orientation of the program; the ratio of professional staff to other staff; whether the program was supported by government funds or United Way funds; whether there were multiple funding sources or a single one; board composition; and other indicators.

Although these findings pertain principally to the quality of the programs of national voluntary organizations and programs, the results also seem to make a good deal of sense for smaller and local voluntary groups. And while a single study does not finally establish or disprove the truth about anything, the methodology and sampling of this study (so far as we know it now) suggest that its results are likely to be a much better guide to running your program than contrary "seat of the pants" conclusions derived from personal experience with only one or a few programs.

Overall, it is fair to say that a number of recent national empirical surveys have advanced our knowledge of the composition of the U. S. voluntary sector. Many of the results of such studies will be published in more detail in another year or so in a review volume sponsored by the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS); still others will appear from time to time in *AVAS' Journal of Voluntary Action Research* or will be reported at future AVAS conventions. If you are interested in keeping fully informed on these and other kinds of voluntary action research, join AVAS (write to Box G-55, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167).

**Table 1**

**Table 2**

**Table 3**

**Table 4**

**Table 5**

**Table 6**

**Table 7**

**Table 8**

**Table 9**

**Table 10**

**Table 11**

**Table 12**

**Table 13**

**Table 14**

**Table 15**

**Table 16**

**Table 17**

**Table 18**

**Table 19**

**Table 20**

**Table 21**

**Table 22**

**Table 23**

**Table 24**

**Table 25**

**Table 26**

**Table 27**

**Table 28**

**Table 29**

**Table 30**

**Table 31**

**Table 32**

**Table 33**

**Table 34**

**Table 35**

**Table 36**

**Table 37**

**Table 38**

**Table 39**

**Table 40**

**Table 41**

**Table 42**

**Table 43**

**Table 44**

**Table 45**

**Table 46**

**Table 47**

**Table 48**

**Table 49**

**Table 50**

**Table 51**

**Table 52**

**Table 53**

**Table 54**

**Table 55**

**Table 56**

**Table 57**

**Table 58**

**Table 59**

**Table 60**

**Table 61**

**Table 62**

**Table 63**

**Table 64**

**Table 65**

**Table 66**

**Table 67**

**Table 68**

**Table 69**

**Table 70**

**Table 71**

**Table 72**

**Table 73**

**Table 74**

**Table 75**

**Table 76**

**Table 77**

**Table 78**

**Table 79**

**Table 80**

**Table 81**

**Table 82**

**Table 83**

**Table 84**

**Table 85**

**Table 86**

**Table 87**

**Table 88**

**Table 89**

**Table 90**

**Table 91**

**Table 92**

**Table 93**

**Table 94**

**Table 95**

**Table 96**

**Table 97**

**Table 98**

**Table 99**

**Table 100**