

File? S. BAKER

HISTORY - CLASSIC

GIFT OF NANCY JANE
Baker

The Economic Role and Value of Volunteer

Work in the United States: An Exploratory

Study*

AUSTIN, TX

by

Harold Wolozin
Department of Political Economy
University of Massachusetts/Boston

*For presentation at the annual meeting
of Association of Voluntary Action Scholars,
Denver, Colorado, September 1974.
Research on this project was supported by
the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The Center For Creative Community
P. O. Box 2427
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

A. History

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Hours of Volunteer Labor Worked in 12 Months (Labor Survey)	Page	30
Table 2	Major Structural Factors Contributing to Percentage Change in Volunteer Work, 1929-1965	Page	37
Table 3	Average Hours Worked Per Week by Vol- unteers in Several Volunteer Organiz- ations.	Page	41
Table 4	Rates of Growth of Volunteer Service in Several Organizations	Page	43
Table 5	Imputed Value of Volunteer Work -- Organized Only	Page	61
Table 6	Imputed Value of Volunteer Work -- Organized and Informal (unorganized)	Page	61

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A The Survey Questionnaire	66
Appendix B Organizations or Groups	
Using Volunteers Classified	
According to Response to	
Information Request	69
Appendix C Index Issue, December 1966,	
<u>Volunteers' Digest</u>	72
Appendix D Statistical Appendix	84

Introduction

Each year millions of American men, women and children - like their counter-parts in Europe and Asia - serve as unpaid volunteers and contribute a significant volume of uncounted production to the national welfare. This uncounted output spans a considerable portion of the wide range of services - some of which are themselves imputed - included in the Personal Consumption Expenditure component of the United States Income and Product Accounts.¹ On the income side of the accounts, the

¹U.S. Income, and Output, Table 114, 115, pp. 150-151 U.S. Department of Commerce. Washington D.C., 1958.

imputed value of volunteer activities may be viewed as an addition to labor compensation. In terms of income and product originating by industry, the bulk of volunteer activity represents an addition to the services sector.

If volunteer activities are as important to American Society, as recent evidence would seem to indicate, it is puzzling that, with the exception of first step Labor Department's surveys of hours work, there has been no systematic, large-scale attempt to measure the extent or value of volunteer activities and by inference their contribution to the welfare and growth of the American economy.

In attempting to derive estimates, imputations of the value of this output conservatively estimated at \$15 billion in 1966 and over \$25 billions by 1974 this paper ventures for the first time to come to grips with the proposition that voluntary services make a significant contribution to economic welfare

in our economy. If only substantial disagreements over the probable magnitude of such services were to be resolved by this undertaking, it would serve a useful purpose. But the development of increasing pressures in our society for government to provide and increase the many health, welfare, and civic services which have, traditionally, been supplied by voluntary association - a drive toward the welfare state - is sufficient justification for undertaking this task difficult as it is. The need is to develop quantitative measures of the role of volunteerism in national production and its contribution to the quality of life in the U.S. This interest in expanding the role of government in improving the quality of life in the U.S. is implicit for example, in the conclusion of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress that 5,300,000 useful jobs, mainly unskilled, could be filled in providing health, education, and recreational services if funds were available to local agencies. (Cited by Daniel Bell, The Public Interest; Spring 1966, p.5). Unfortunately, the Commission apparently did not specify whether it felt that a proportion of these needs are already being met, in part, by volunteer labor or whether it was concerned with comparable services up and beyond these are already being provided by volunteers. This is a relevant question which may be raised.

In a very fundamental sense this goal - to lay the grounds for arriving at concrete estimates of volunteer product - delineates my research problem. We must explore the state of our knowledge of the supply, the demand, and the characteristics of volunteer services;¹

¹We are sailing virtually uncharted waters, for there have been few systematic attempts made to estimate either the size of the volunteer labor force in the U.S. or the number of man-hours of work contributed

annually by volunteers. Consequently, there has been no reliable statistical basis for estimating the implicit value of the services output of volunteer labor. This is a significant omission in existing estimates of the output of the service sector of the economy. However, it is not surprising that volunteer services have been neglected in the measurement of Gross National Output and Product; for the measurement of product even in that part of the service sector which is within the market economy has been a considerable source of difficulty to social accountants. Viewed on an industry basis, the service sector encompasses a group of industries distinguished, according to many economies, by inability to measure their output accurately. (Fuchs, Victor R., Productivity Trends in the Goods and Service Sectors, 1929-1961, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1964, p.2.)

the latter providing job classification information essential to the realistic valuation of volunteer services, upon which we can base estimates of the value of volunteer output. The problem of pricing these services is a critical one requiring in particular that we investigate, on the demand side of the equation, the uses to which volunteers are directed so as to ascertain the kinds, qualities, and the relative weights of volunteer services actually produced.

To begin with, we must ascertain what we do and do not mean by volunteer labor. As will be seen, there are significant differences in current definitions which raises serious conceptual difficulties, as illustrated by the results of two recent surveys of volunteer work; one, a limited study of volunteer work by the University of Michigan Survey

Research Center for the year 1964,¹ and the other, a nationwide study

¹J.N. Morgan, I.A. Sirageldin, N. Baerwaldt, Productive Americans, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1966.

by the Department of Labor for 1965.² These studies are pioneering

²Americans Volunteer, Division of Labor Force Studies, U.S. Dept. of Labor, April 1969. As I write this, the Labor Department is compiling, for Action, the results of a resurvey taken in April 1974.

attempts to measure the magnitude of volunteer work in the U.S.

Once we resolve the knotty definitional problems raised by the differing definitions adopted by these surveys and settle upon what is in our opinion, the more relevant definition, we will be in a position to evaluate the findings of these two approaches to the study of volunteer labor on the supply side. Supplementing these results, I have also compiled selected historical data and surveyed a representative group of volunteer organizations - private and public - who utilize volunteer labor. This data provides some initial information on the demand for and employment of volunteers by these organizations. They also suggest the nature of trends in recent decades in the utilization of volunteer labor. Finally, I have made a fairly extensive study of the annals of voluntarism.

The principal goal of this study therefore is to ascertain (1) the nature of the data which will be required on a continuing basis and (2) the further research which should be undertaken to derive more reliable bench marks for the imputation of Volunteer services to the GNP. I will suggest future survey work which might be directed toward this end. Certain refinements and extensions in surveying volunteer labor on the supply side, combined with parallel research on the demand side (along the lines I have embarked upon in this paper) promise to produce fairly reliable imputations of volunteer services.

An Inclusive Definition of Volunteer Service

In defining volunteer work I propose to include any non-compensated service which has a market counterpart and which is contributed to someone outside the immediate family. To those categories accepted by the Labor and Michigan surveys which I shall describe below, I would add many of these excluded in one or the other of the definitions. This would mean that in addition to work done under the auspices of or for a voluntary agency the definition would include such activities as fund raising, union activities, including picketing, political activities, teaching Sunday School, singing in church choirs and other church related work, helping friends and relatives, neighborhood projects, and any other activities which require expenditure of time and effort for the benefit of a third party not of the immediate family. This broad definition

¹Referred to by Elizabeth T. Simpson as "assistance given persons outside family" in her work on unpaid household services. In letter to me, May 29, 1969.

makes considerable sense if we are looking for an all inclusive measure of output produced by volunteer manpower; for their activities involve effort and skill, comparable to accepted labor force activities. Although this definition would exclude services directly rendered to one's own household, this does not imply that these could not be imputed under separate categories, as my colleagues are presumably doing. Among these are "do-it-yourself" work, the work of housewives, etc.

Volunteer Work and its Market Counterparts

The drawing of a parallel between volunteer work and its market counterparts raises another issue which I must consider in defining the

scope of volunteer output. I stipulated above that it is service contributed without pay. This does not imply, however, that these services would necessarily have been purchased if they had not been available through voluntary contributions although the possibility is certainly not precluded and in many cases likely. For example, in the absence of volunteer workers the approximately 10 million man hours of services contributed by over 100,000 workers in 1966 to the Veterans' Administration would probably have had to be provided for to a considerable extent by hiring additional employees. Furthermore, it is correspondingly probable that some of the volunteer workers would not have been willing to work for pay if their services as volunteers per se were not desired.

Volunteer Work as a Special Category

This raises still another possibility; that to an undetermined and perhaps significant degree volunteer workers are uniquely volunteers; they would not be interested in offering for "pay" those particular skills and labor which they willingly supply without compensation. If this is true, then it is reasonable to infer that a significant share of the volunteer labor pool is a concrete addition to, an extension of, the labor force, at present an uncounted addition. There is also evidence that in certain fields such as mental health, volunteers provide a unique service whose therapeutic value is, in some way, dependent upon its being voluntary and untied to "market incentives." In this respect it should be emphasized that my definition also would not stipulate that volunteer services would necessarily have been sought or could even be duplicated in the regular labor market if volunteers were not available or desired.

Voluntary Work as a Leisure Activity

One issue which should be disposed of is the contention that volunteer work is leisure activity rather than "productive" work and that many volunteer activities are in reality, therefore, a form of recreation rather than actual production work. This, it seems to me, is a complete lack of comprehension of the economic measurement of output. It would seem to me that what is relevant is the fact that volunteer work is a service, contributing as much utility or satisfaction as its paid counterpart. Whether the act of contributing was pleasurable or not would seem beside the point. It seems that to attempt to draw such a line creates an almost hopeless classification problem: furthermore, it would seem no more logical than paying more to the paid worker who dislikes his job than to the paid worker who enjoys the same work. In my opinion the question of motivation is irrelevant to the problem of classifying such activities: it is advisable to stick to the straight forward stipulation that an activity is qualified for classification as a volunteer service if it involves effort and time on the part of the volunteer and there is some roughly comparable market counterpart. In this way, some few activities may be missed but many more will be counted in a consistent and systematic way, with a minimum of arbitrary exclusions.

Definitional Biases

As I will describe in detail in a later section, there are significant omissions in definition and scope which impart a downward bias to both the Labor Department and Michigan findings. The Labor Survey's definition is, in particular a narrower one than I prefer. It included only unpaid volunteer work performed through the auspices of an organization serving in the broad areas of health, education and social welfare services. We shall discuss the implications of this constraint as well as other significant exclusions when we discuss the findings of the two

surveys below.

Why Measure Volunteer Activity?

The case for measuring the activities of volunteers in the American economy can be summarized simply as follows: (1) they are economically significant i.e. they are economic activities, (2) their imputed value can be estimated, at least roughly, at present (one of the goals of this study is to suggest ways to improve and refine the data base), (3) my calculations indicate that the imputed value of volunteer services is statistically significant and (4) the imputations of volunteer services will have important analytical uses. As I interpret it, these meet most objections to imputing the value of volunteer services; for according to social accounting conventions, the basis for rejecting candidates for imputation in the social accounts has historically been: (1) they are non-economic activities, (2) they are, as non-market activities, too difficult to measure and value (3) they are statistically insignificant, or (4) the imputations would serve no useful analytical purpose.¹ Let me expand

¹Yanovsky, M., "Social Accounting Systems," Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, Illinois, 1965, pp. 20-28.

a bit on these points.

Are Voluntary Services Non-Economic?

It is apparent that volunteer work is a widespread activity not confined to isolated groups or strata of our society: it appears to be furthermore, a pervasive characteristic of the American scene. All

evidence indicates that a significant proportion of the population - in as well as out of the work force - gives and historically has given, of its labor without pay in a wide range of services encompassing an equally wide range of skills. These services, demonstrably essential to the functioning and well being of the American community, are provided by men, women and youth in and through government agencies, private voluntary organizations, unions, businesses, and unaffiliated and unorganized ad hoc groupings of citizens, sometimes members of the very groups being served, i.e., the indigenous volunteers. Pitching in to help raise your neighbor's barn dates back to Colonial days. We have its present day counterparts.

Interest in voluntarism goes all the way back to de Toqueville's bemused wonder at the unique proclivity of Americans to join voluntary associations and contribute their brains and brawn to social and community causes without pecuniary reward; but there has been surprisingly little research devoted to the economic and social aspects of voluntarism, particularly its contribution to society, its growth, its productivity, its organization, its composition and its economic and social impact. One of the valuable by-products of this paper will be, I hope, to stimulate work on these complex problems.

Although my work in this paper is concerned primarily with the measurement of volunteer output, this does not reflect a judgement that other questions on the nature and role of volunteers are less important. One intriguing aspect of volunteer work is, for example, that the motivation to work is not the conventional utilitarian one assumed by economic theory; it is not a promise of monetary reward. The implications of

this for the conventional theory of consumer behavior and income distribution are worthy of separate exploration; for the prevalence in this economy of "noneconomic" or non-pecuniary work adds interesting and increasingly important dimensions to both economic theory and public policy.

It is sometimes alleged that the work done by volunteers is a form of recreation, leisure time activity of a "recreational character." This, it is maintained, means that the volunteer services are non-economic, in the same category as any other form of leisure activity. I have already mentioned the existence of impressive evidence of the wide range of volunteer services; most of which could hardly be called "recreational" activities. These cover the gamut of service activities ranging from unskilled to professional services. As I held earlier, to argue that these services are non-economic because they substitute for recreational activities seems indefensible to me. That they are performed gratis, often on the weekend or after the day's work is done, and give pleasure in their doing, is no grounds for overlooking the fact that the end product of these activities is generally a valuable service, one for which there is often a market counterpart, and one which might have to be purchased in the market if the volunteers were not available. Furthermore, to the recipients, the volunteer's services are of indisputable value even though they may have been undertaken primarily because they give satisfaction to the man performing them. In other words, to maintain that the satisfaction or utility produced for the recipient of unpaid work is by definition unproductive, i.e., no contribution to national output, is a contradiction in itself.

This raises still another related point; namely the generalized and unsubstantiated opinion that the productivity of volunteer workers is low compared to paid workers doing similar tasks. The following two diametrically opposed evaluations of actual experience with volunteers taken from the Manchester Guardian illustrate the wide differences on the productivity of volunteer workers:

"They just come prancing in here like Lady Bountifuls; they expect us to stop our work to tell them all about it, and by the time they leave we have more work than we had before."

"They bring a new spirit into the ward - we can't do without them now."¹

¹Manchester Guardian, article by Nesta Roberts, "Voluntary Work in the Hospital," June 9, 1966, p. 16.

The writer presenting the quotes comments: "They, in both quotations, are voluntary workers in hospitals. The first comes from hard pressed ward staff who had suffered a good deal from undirected benevolence. The second is the consensus of opinion at Fulbourn Hospital, Cambridge, after a couple of year's experience of voluntary work on a considerable scale and in great variety. The difference lies less in intrinsic quality of the volunteers than in the word 'undirected.'"²

²Ibid

To determine whether volunteer labor is comparatively less efficient than comparable paid-for labor would be extremely difficult. There are those who argue that it is more efficient because of the very fact that it is volunteered, without any expectation of compensation or pressure to conform to group norms, limits or quotas.

I think it is defensible to take this position that the yardstick of productivity while it might have important analytical uses is irrelevant as a criteria for determining whether volunteer labor is or is not an economic activity. But even if it were, and we need to learn much more about volunteer labor, I suspect that the facts demonstrate that, taken as a whole, it is not less productive than comparable market services. Perhaps, in certain cases, it is more productive per unit of input than the comparable compensated service might be.

Another objection which might be made is that volunteer activity is non-economic because "monetary value cannot possibly serve as a criterion for measurement."¹ I cannot take this anti-imputation argument

¹Yanosky, Ibid. p. 20 ff.

seriously either. As I have pointed out most volunteer services generally have paid counterparts, services for which there are market prices and which run the gamut of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled tasks utilized by health, education, welfare, civic, and other programs in our complex society. It is, therefore, questionable that volunteer services should be any more difficult to assign values to than those services already imputed in the social accounts. As a matter of fact, it may turn out

to be a relatively more tractable statistical area than some already included in the GNP of the United States.

Lack of Data on Volunteer Work

I also do not consider the paucity of systematic data on the activities of volunteers now and in the past a valid argument against attempting to derive estimates. In the service of a more liberal approach to imputation, I have chosen to treat this data obstacle as a challenge, rather than a basis for rejection; a secondary, but important goal of this study is to explore and suggest ways in which to improve the data base. Furthermore, it is demonstrable that absence of systematic data has not inhibited imputations in many sectors of the social accounts; even the "directly" estimated items themselves do not often rest upon statistically "pure" grounds. Data sources are secondary and many of the "firmer" estimates depend upon static benchmark relationships.

Statistical Significance

It should be beyond dispute that if the quantity of volunteer services in the economy were insignificant, then the case for going to the effort of imputation would be a weak one. Immediately, however, we are faced by the fact that by present imputation standards, it is not. In 1965, the total of all of the imputations included in the National Income and Product Accounts totalled only 7.3% of the total GNP, or 49.6 billion, and several of the individual items were less than \$1 billion. Even on an a priori basis alone, to suggest, therefore, that the millions of volunteer workers in the U.S. economy do not generate sufficient output to meet the minimum quantitative standard for inclusion seems unwarranted. You will see below moreover, that the conservative estimates offered in this paper are significantly larger

than some of the present imputations already included in O.B.E. GNP accounts.¹ On balance it would appear that the arguments for excluding

¹It is apparent that adding such estimates of volunteer service to the GNP would probably significantly increase the services sector as a share of total output. This may be the basis for a less obvious argument on the part of some social statisticians, specifically social accountants which swell the total output of the services; namely, a reluctance to add further to this growing services sector.

volunteer services on quantitative grounds are less than persuasive.

Analytical Uses.

It should be clear from what I have already said about the significance of volunteer services as economic activities that their imputed value could have significant analytical uses. The direction in which analytical work involving the accounts has taken in recent years is cogent reason for incorporating them. There has been a growing concern with redefining, restructuring, and expanding the accounts so to serve more adequately the need for analyzing the nature of economic development and particularly the analysis of economic growth. Throughout the Western world/a shift in emphasis and use of accounts, and a refocusing from exclusive preoccupation with the trade cycle and short-term determinants of income to problems of longrun growth, development and resource use and distribution, 1) as well as a growing interest in the use of leisure time.

¹See Andrew Schonfield, "Modern Capitalism," Oxford, N.Y. 1965

This increasing emphasis on the longer run analytical uses of the true output potential G.N.P. over time, of any economy as well as the short-run needs for accurate all-encompassing measures, is a powerful argument for incorporating ^{in the G.N.P.} the resources of labor and brain power manifest in volunteer activities. Furthermore, "volunteer output" is closely related to other unpaid activities in our economy either already being imputed or under study for inclusion in the accounts.

The expanding analytical interest in the social accounts has resulted in an increasing discomfort over certain anomalies in the accounts. The toil of the housewife, done willingly but without monetary compensation, is ignored as is the work of "do it yourselfers" and full time students, whereas the accounts include such items as the labor implicit in the value of farm products consumed at home and the owner maintenance services implicit in the imputed rental value of owner-occupied residences.

It is also apparent that as income levels have risen and the average work week has declined over the century, the voluntary labor pool has become an increasingly important share of the nation's labor resources. As I have written elsewhere, manpower and employment policies encompassing increasingly sophisticated "incomes" policies, and the growing utilization of volunteers in all forms of health, education, and welfare programs, strenghtens the case for incorporating the volunteer sector into our national accounts.¹

¹Wolozin, H. "Volunteer Manpower in the U.S. Economy", Federal Programs for the Development of Human Resources, Vol.1, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, D.C., 1968, pp. 203-214.

Mounting questions over the impact of accelerated technology and automation on the economy , the challenges implicit in these for the effective use of our labor resources in the 21st century and the uncertain implications these might have for changes in the organization and structure of our capitalist society in the years ahead are further reason for increasing all aspects of our knowledge of volunteer activities in our economy during the twentieth century. The changing role of government in our society, and its increasing assumption of responsibility for welfare services, some traditionally dependent in significant degree on volunteers, raises still another set of problems.

Although the evidence at hand indicates that the role of volunteers in our society has been qualitatively and quantitatively important for a long time, there is another interesting aspect of certain types volunteer work, mentioned earlier which may present a growing challenge to the conventional economic model of behavior, namely, that the value of certain kinds of volunteer services depends in part upon the very fact that the reward is non-monetary and "non-manipulative" , in other words, that the motivation to do the work is not materialistic and "gain" induced.

An example is the singular role that volunteers play in mental health programs as well as in school programs. Both of these, I am sure you recognize, are growth areas in our economy. This "non-pecuniary" value

also may characterize certain civic and recreational service activities of volunteers, as well as some of the volunteer work in and by industry and business; activity, incidentally, which may well increase productivity in industry. The role of business leaders in promoting the development of their communities and environmentalists in protecting renewable resources and the environment are further examples of such activities.

Another point of analytical significance is that estimates of the presently uncounted value of volunteer services would have to be included if statisticians were to attempt to include in the accounts presently uncounted transfer payments which are playing an increasingly important role in the modern "transfer" economy, to use Kenneth Boulding's characterization. This is particularly important in assaying the impact of economic policies, government fiscal policy in particular, on lower income groups which often are major recipients of volunteer services, although upper income groups certainly are also affected.

Finally, Victor R. Fuchs' work on the services sector raise important analytical questions about trends in the volunteer services sector. Study of the volunteer labor force and its contribution to national output may provide a comparable basis for analysis and some indication of whether trends in the service sector described by Fuchs are consistent with or diverge from those in the volunteer sector.¹

¹To the extent that "differential change in the quality of labor may have been an important factor accounting for sector differences in the rate of growth of output per man," observable characteristics of the volunteer labor force could account for similarities or differences in

trends between these sectors. Fuchs, op.cit., p. 23.

Even on the basis of our preliminary explorations, it would appear that these are both similarities and dissimilarities in behavior. Ostensibly they are attributable to differences between volunteer labor force characteristics and other labor services, comparable to those singled out by Fuchs as an accounting for the trend differences between services and goods sector of the Economy exist. One extension of my analysis of volunteer services imputations might be to provide the basis for ascertaining whether trends in the volunteer sector diverge from the services sector as a whole or are largely analogous.

It is apparent, on the basis of my preliminary studies, that the volume of services produced by volunteers is significant, and, as I have pointed out in an earlier paper,¹ these services are an integral and essential part of community life. In other words, volunteer services

¹
Wolozin, Harold, op cit.

are both an extension of and an indispensable supplement to the existing labor force. On the basis of selected data it further appears, as you will see, that the volunteer labor force and the concomitant employment of volunteer labor experienced a period of rapid growth during the first half of this century, particularly in the period just preceding and including World War II. There is also good reason to suspect on the basis of fragmentary information and my reading of the annals, that our nation is entering upon another period of expansion in the utilization

of volunteer labor. In sum total there seems to be good reason to attempt to expand our knowledge of this increasingly important sector of the economy, to improve our statistical intelligence, and to devise a reliable method for estimating the contribution of volunteer labor to the national output.

Plan of This Study

As described in my introduction, in this study I define volunteer services broadly so as to encompass both organized and unorganized or "informal" volunteer services. The basic approach is to explore, on the basis of the limited evidence available, the supply and the demand for volunteer services. My imputations of the volunteer product for the base year will be based upon the former, while the information on the demand side will provide the basis for applying trend factors to the bench mark estimates.

On the supply side, I have the findings of the two surveys of volunteer work cited above (referred to hereafter as the Michigan and Labor Surveys).¹ On the demand side, I have gathered data on the average number of hours volunteers worked for a small but representative sampling of volunteer organizations, plus qualitative evidence from the annals of volunteerism.

Even though the size of my sample of organizations is not sufficiently large to warrant any but the most tentative conclusions, my data on the average number of hours worked by volunteers in these organizations are a useful supplement to the figures based on the two volunteer surveys, particularly the Labor Department Survey upon which I base my bench mark imputations.

The experience of the voluntary organizations in my sample unlike the Labor and Michigan Surveys covers a considerable span of years. The results can provide a valuable indication of the nature of trends in volunteer work over recent decades. Furthermore, and this is vital to

1. The Labor Department Survey has been recently updated by a resurvey similar to the original survey. The results will be released by Action.

the statistical judgement required in the valuation of volunteer services, my organizational data can provide significant qualitative insight into the nature of the diverse work done by volunteers: the kind of jobs, at what levels of skills, etc.

I then review the relevant average earnings data by appropriate occupation or industry categories. Combined with the Michigan and Labor Survey information on volunteer characteristics, this information on the kinds and types of work done for organizations in my sample will provide a firm base, along with our findings on average earnings data by appropriate occupational or industry categories for "pricing" i.e. valuing volunteer work. Once the basis for valuation¹ has been determined, the final and critical step in deriving estimates of the value of total volunteer product can be taken. Finally, I will discuss briefly my estimating procedures and assumptions and present my results.

1. Ideally corresponding to the measurement of product in the services, estimates of volunteer product should be based on employment data in the "volunteer industry", supplemented by survey data on hours of work contributed. One of my goals is, therefore, to suggest the nature of research and further surveys required to establish firmer benchmarks for imputing the value of volunteer services.

Benchmark for Organized Voluntary Labor - The Labor Department Survey

The Department of Labor Survey of volunteer work contributed during and the year the week of November 7-13, 1965, serves as the benchmark for my estimates of "organized" volunteer manhours. It is however, incomplete in that it excludes unorganized volunteer work and exhibits certain other biases which I shall discuss below. Although the Michigan survey did include such unorganized volunteer work it had other serious shortcomings, including a serious downward recall bias inherent in asking respondents without firm records to recall/their volunteer work over a period of 12 months rather than the one week. On balance, therefore, the data on volunteer work during the week provided by the Labor Surveys appear to be most representative. A blowup factor can be applied to these figures to provide estimates of unorganized volunteer labor.¹

¹Neither the Labor or Michigan surveys attempt to estimate the total volunteer labor force which, following Labor Force definition, would include, logically, "the Unemployed" volunteers as well as the "employed" volunteers; the former being those volunteers willing and able to do volunteer work but not "working" or "utilized" - i.e. unable to find assignments or seriously under-utilized. Many of those close to the field have conjectured that the number who might be drawn into the volunteer labor force - the potential volunteer labor pool - is sizeable; therefore, estimating this "potential" would be more than an idle statistical exercise and would certainly help us in appraising the importance of the volunteer sector to national manpower policy. It would be valuable to obtain data on the total volunteer labor force comparable to existing labor force data - hours, occupations, skills, employment

rates, education, etc. Were such data available, imputing the contribution of volunteers to national output would be made easier, particularly if statistics of volunteer labor force were maintained on an annual basis.

The Labor Survey

designed

The Labor Survey was/ by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research of the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor and the enumeration was done by the statistical arm of the Federal Government, the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The survey is described as a pilot study to determine "whether information on volunteer work could be obtained from a nationwide sample survey of the population through the use of a 'self enumeration questionnaire,' and was filled out by each member of the household 14 years of age or older either at the time it was hand delivered or returned by mail. In the latter case, it became tantamount to a mail questionnaire. The questionnaire, itself a supplement to the Monthly Labor Survey made by the Bureau of the Census for the Labor Department, concentrated on "unpaid volunteer work done during the week November 7 through 13". Although it also asked for the total number of hours devoted to volunteer work during the 12 month period, November 1964 to November 1965, the difficulties inherent in asking people to recall hours contributed over a 12 month period, i.e. the recall fact, may have resulted in a downward bias in the annual survey. I am informed by sampling experts that understatement rather than overstatement is to be expected as a result. (See description of questionnaire in Appendix A.) Even though the number of

households surveyed was almost double that of the Michigan survey, about 4,000 households amounting to about 9,800 persons covered by the Survey,¹

¹Americans Volunteer, Labor Survey, p.40.

the Labor Department statisticians felt that the sample was relatively small and that as a result sampling variability "very large".² This may

²Ibid. p. 4

have aggravated the bias of the "recall factor".

Although I use the Labor Survey week data for as the benchmark for my estimates, the Michigan survey is nevertheless a valuable source of additional material which provides the basis for expanding the Labor data on "organized volunteer work to encompass "unorganized" activity.

Let us now continue the discussion of the Labor Survey. The questionnaire asked, also, for the following:

(1) the type of activity,¹

¹There were six classifications plus a catch-all -, 1. hospital or clinic, 2. other health or medical, 3. social or Welfare agency, 4. recreational, 5. educational, 6. civic or community action, and 7. other.

(2) the kind of work done (hospital aid, clerical, scout leader, etc.), (3) the name of the organization for which the work was done, (4) the volunteers' primary occupation and finally, (5) the "main reasons for doing unpaid volunteer work" in which the volunteer was engaged.²

²See Appendix A.

The concentration of the Survey was on volunteer work during the Survey week, November 7 to 13, although it also asked for the total number and frequency of hours contributed by volunteers during the 12 month period ending November 1965. Respondents who worked during the 12 months but not during the survey week were not questioned on the kinds of volunteer work they contributed. Also, the fact that the Survey distinguished between religious as opposed to non-religious volunteer work resulted in significant omissions and certain ambiguities in the data.

The Labor Survey reports that during the week of November 7 to 12 volunteers amounted to 6.7 million persons 14 years or older,¹ who contri-

¹Labor, Table 2

uted 5.6 hours of "non-religious" work per volunteer during the week. An additional 2.7 million persons were engaged in "religious" volunteer work.

A total of 21.7/^{million persons}were reported to have volunteered during the year ending November 1965 according to the findings of the Labor Survey.²

²Ibid, p.21.

The difference between this total and that reported for the survey week can be interpreted as indicating that volunteers do not work regularly or/and that the demand for their services is seasonal, with the various kinds of activities reaching their seasonal peaks at offsetting times over the 12 months. This is an area which should be looked into in any future work done on volunteer labor. However, even my limited knowledge of volunteerism suggests that there are offsetting seasonal fluctuations on the part of the many varied classes of demands for volunteers. This, in turn, could explain the above differences between the total for the week as opposed to that for the year. Yet, there is also evidence that many committed volunteers work a 12 month work year, although often for several different organizations. This could, and in many cases appear to, display the seasonal patterns suggested above.

As I mentioned above, the Labor survey concentrated principally on volunteer activities for the November Survey week; however, their

questions on work done over the preceeding 12 months are a useful supplement even if they but suggest that the survey week totals may be on the conservative side if it were to turn out that the seasonal variations are not as conveniently offsetting as we assume. They are also useful in evaluating the findings of the Michigan Survey.

However, to be comparable and truly representative, the labor totals must be adjusted upwards to include religious volunteer work as it was defined by the Labor Department statisticians. Additionally they must also be adjusted to reflect unorganized or informal as well as organized work. At this point, however, I shall be concerned only with the organized sector. The initial total consists of 14.9 million persons who worked sometime during the 12 month period but not during the Survey Week plus the 6.7 million volunteers working during the Survey Week - 21.6 million in all. The number of volunteers reportedly working during the 12 months but not the Survey Week, according to the Labor Department, probably included some work contributed to religious organizations, the category which was strictly differentiated in the Survey Week totals. For my purposes, the more meaningful total, and certainly the more logically consistent one, would include the 2.7 million respondents who were ineligible for inclusion in the survey week total, on the grounds that they were doing only volunteer work of a "religious " nature. Incorporating these volunteers raises the total to 24.3 million.¹ This expanded total undoubtedly missed some volunteers

¹A sizeable standard error of 656,000 was reported by the Labor survey. "The chances are about 2 out of 3 that a complete census would

have shown a figure between 6,054,000 and 7,366,000." Americans
Volunteer, p.46.

whose work was confined to activities related "to church ritual and
precepts", for the Labor Department discussion of their questionnaire
suggests that it was concerned primarily with
"non-religious" volunteer work.

Some volunteers working for religious organizations during the 12 month
period but not during the survey week might well not have responded at
all. Is it not reasonable to conclude, therefore, that a truly represent-
ative census of volunteers in the nation would uncover a total larger than
the adjusted total of approximately 24 million emerging from the findings?
However,
as a first approximation, the 24 million can be accepted
as a conservative total for the survey year.

Although the Survey does not estimate the average annual hours
worked by these volunteers over the 12 month period, it did compute a
percentage distribution for the number of hours of volunteer work done
during the 12 month period¹ by class interval. It is possible to estimate

¹Ibid, Table 17

by assuming the midpoints of the class intervals, the average number of
hours worked per volunteer for the 12 month period. The calculations are:

Table 1

Hours of Volunteer Labor Worked in 12 Months

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Non-Religious	All	Hrs. of Work	(2x3)
	(Millions)	(Millions)	(Midpoint) ^(a)	
%	21.7	24.4		
46.2	10.03	11.27	12.5	140.88
32.7	7.10	7.98	62.5	498.75
16.8	3.65	4.10	200.0	820.00
4.4	.96	1.07	650.0	695.50
Total				2155.13
Average				88.42

Computed from Table 17, Labor Survey

(a) These are the midpoints of the class intervals except for the last which was open-ended, i.e. 300 hours or more.

Interestingly enough, the number of hours worked annually by each volunteer averages a little over 88 hours per year, less than 2 hours per week per volunteer. This must be contrasted with the Michigan findings which I shall discuss further at a later point, of 87 hours per week on an average for all families in the nation. This works out to 150 hours per volunteering family calculated on the basis of the Michigan researcher's assumption that 1/2 of the nation's families do some volunteer work. The Labor Survey implies a significantly smaller total at 2 volunteers per family; an average of only about 12 million families is implied. Unfortunately, the Labor Survey does not present its data by family or household, but rather by individuals; this was reported to me as a constraint imposed by the nature of the Labor Force Survey. However, only if following my hypothesis above, I assume that "volunteering" households in the Labor Survey contributed two volunteers per family, a husband and/or a wife or child, is the hourly average per family close to that of the Michigan Survey; but there is no basis for resolving this difference in the number of volunteer families implied by the surveys.

Even though both Surveys omitted significant categories of volunteers and volunteer work, this difference between them is large - the Michigan findings implying a significantly higher total volunteer man hours per year. Granted a downward bias in the overall findings of the Labor Survey, which makes it more difficult to interpret the divergence between the average weekly estimates based on the annual averages and the reported 5.6 hours worked per week by the average volunteer worker during the November survey week of the Labor Study, one reasonable implication is that volunteers do not work a 50 week year. On an *a priori* basis as well as from my study of the annals this can be explained as a

reflection of seasonal fluctuations in both the supply and demand for specific volunteer services according to the type of activity. There is good evidence that, like seasonal patterns in the economy, these fluctuations vary significantly according to the type of organization or activity.

Characteristics of Volunteers

Volunteer labor, like any human effort, is a function of a complex number of variables. The relatively more quantifiable of these would include such variables as the actual leisure time available (itself in part a function of the length of the work week) and a number of other relevant economic and demographic characteristics. The more significant of these would appear to be the level of income of the head of the household, the volunteers' level of education, and the area of domicile, urban or rural. The problem is complicated because there is evidence that existing relationships and patterns have been changing over the last two decades. In particular, within the last ten years, increasing numbers of younger people have turned to volunteer work either as extra curricular or full-time pursuit; and since the early sixties, the very poor, rising from their resignation and apathy, are beginning to find out that they can work together to improve their communities and lot in voluntary association (often spontaneous) with their neighbors. In the business world and among the military, participation in community affairs has gained status and urgency, especially evident among males. (Women have traditionally been volunteers in their communities.) The Peace Corps, the Job Corps, and the Poverty Program's VISTA volunteers now incorporated in Action are examples of the widening of the scope of volunteer workers and its tapping of new sources of volunteers exhibiting different economic and

demographic characteristics than those : traditionally associated with volunteers.

There is little research on the question, but the Labor Survey did elicit selective information on economic and demographic characteristics of the volunteer and his work which may give us some new insight into longer term trends in volunteerism; these included such items as family income, level of education, sex, marital status, race and family size. This information on the structure of the volunteer labor force, however, given the nature of the survey, must be interpreted as describing trends in "organized" volunteer numbers and hours relative to the U.S. population fourteen years of age and over. As a starting point, one would expect these trends in "organized" volunteer numbers and hours to parallel the growth in population and changes in its structure, which form the basis for my moderate trend variant in estimating volunteer labor. In Appendix A, I discuss the Labor Survey findings on characteristics of volunteers. On the question of trends in "unorganized" volunteer work, the Labor Survey can throw no light.

However, some insight into the trends of total volunteer man hours, incorporating "unorganized" work is provided by the Michigan Survey. It is not surprising

that volunteer work was highly correlated with education and income. In fact, these were singled out by both /surveys as the two most important determinents of volunteer work, although they differ as to their relative importance. Whereas the Labor Survey emphasized level of income, reporting that the typical volunteer worker most frequently comes from a family with an income of \$10,000 or more (it was also noted that he is generally a white collar worker, and someone who had attended

college),¹

¹Labor, op. cit., p. 6

the Michigan Survey ranked income high but concluded that education "is more basic".²

²Michigan, op. cit., p. 144

For the purposes of this paper, it should be noted that the close relation between level of education and income level in our economy makes the difference in emphasis attached to the two variables by the two studies relatively less important for purposes of this study. What is significant is that rises in real income and education levels are consistent with trends in volunteer work over the past 35 years. I will describe ^{these} below. It is quite clear that even though there may not have been significant shifts in the distribution of income, there has been a pronounced increase in real incomes, a shift upward in the whole distribution of income and a steady increase in levels of education which have apparently brought with them a corresponding secular growth in volunteer work force and hours contributed. To anticipate my discussion

below, this is, I suggest, in keeping with rapid growth in volunteerism over recent decades. I must caution the reader, that given the tenuous nature of the information in the Surveys, my hypotheses are only tentative in nature; for neither of the Surveys provides adequate data to develop reliable predictors of growth. For example, even though the Michigan

Survey did employ multivariate analysis to attempt to explain hours of volunteer work, the "best predictor" turned out to be neither income nor education but ownership of automatic home appliances, namely washer, dryer, or dishwasher and "being settled."¹

¹Ibid. p. 146 and 162

The authors of the Survey attributed this to the fact that the ownership of automatic home appliances is "a proxy or poor substitute variable for a large number of other factors, whose combined effect is more powerful than any one of their separate effects, "namely higher income, education, marital state and married residence in very small urban places."¹

Ibid. p. 146

At this point a word of caution may be in order in respect to the use of data based on crosssectional surveys such as the Labor and Michigan undertakings. The relationships singled out as explaining the behavior in question might not appear to be as important as characteristics which might be identified if data based on the behavior of panel survey respondents over time were available. This is of course the same problem encountered in the construction of consumer prices indexes utilizing market baskets based upon cross-sectional consumer expenditure surveys at points of time as opposed to continuous panel surveys. In panel surveys, the importance of shifts in other institutional variables in our

society might be of equal importance with income and education. The entry of youth and the poor into the volunteer labor force are examples of this. Unfortunately, however, prospects that panel surveys on a national basis will be used in the future are not bright. This does not detract, however, from their attractiveness; for they would, in our opinion, provide much more reliable information on the determinants and scope of voluntarism than cross-sectional studies. This would enable us to construct more reliable bench marks for estimating the value of volunteer services in the economy.

However, given the limitations of cross-sectional as apposed to continuous panel data, it is possible on the basis of the Labor Survey results and some limited data from the Michigan Survey to derive rough estimates of the magnitude structural factors that appear to explain¹ percentage changes in volunteer work over the period 1929-1965: these are presented in Table 2.

¹ When the 1974 labor resurvey is published these can be estimated for the later period 1965-74.

Table 2

Major Structural Factors Contributing to Percentage Change
in Volunteer Work, 1929-1965¹

	Annual Percentage Contribution	
	No. of Volunteers	No. of Manhours
Education (1940-1965) (survey week data) ²	1.29	1.69
Sex and labor force status (nonreligious vol. work only)	-0.07	-0.08
Marital Status	0.08	0.11
Race (1930-1967)	-0.06	-0.07
Size of place of residence (1930-1960) ³	0.04	0.04
Mobility ³	--(indeterminant)--?	
Age	-0.13	+0.00
Shorter workweek	+?(indeterminant)+?	
Total	+1.15	+1.69
Addenda:		
Family Income	1.46	1.60
Education (1940-1965) (survey year data)	0.875	1.145

¹ Assumes constant volunteerism over time within demographical groupings; calculations based on the Labor Department survey week results, unless otherwise indicated, and Census Bureau demographical breakdowns. The structure changes are over and above any due to change in the size of the population age 14 and over.

2 Contribution for number of manhours based on the Labor survey
year ratio for manhour contribution to volunteer contribution.

3 Based on scanty data from the Michigan survey. Computations
by J. Rowley.

Data from Voluntary Organizations

In order to develop some insight into the demand for volunteers, I have studied the experiences of a small but representative number of national organizations, private voluntary and governmental, using volunteers. Hopefully this can help explain the differences reported in estimates of the between the average hours worked/in the Labor Survey week and the/annual average. If the organizations tended, on the average, to use volunteers periods closer to the Survey weeks average, than seasonality on the supply side is implied; if closer to the annual average, than the alternate hypothesis is suggested. I cannot caution too strongly on the tentative nature of the findings based on this sample of the voluntary organizations even though I have eliminated a number of organizations whose statistics seemed most conjectural and the truth of the matter is that most voluntary organizations don't keep good statistics. However, in a few cases, some of these organizations, governmental and non-governmental, maintained surprisingly detailed data on their use of volunteers. This, it should be noted, biased our findings in favor of the experience of established organizations, which by and large may not have grown as rapidly over the last decade as some of the newer organizations. On the other hand, some few of these old line organizations appear to have extensively utilize volunteers relatively more / than some of the newer organizations. The American Red Cross and the Veterans Administration are two outstanding examples of this.

This data on the use, or demand, for volunteer labor by this group of private and governmental agencies are especially useful because

they are time series covering a considerable span of years

In contrast to

the Michigan and Labor Surveys,

they give us insights into

long run trends in the utilization of volunteer labor in our nation.

This sample of voluntary organizations, using a large number of volunteers, represents an extensive and varied number of organizations and groups utilizing volunteers in our nation. My sample however, is small, approximately 50 organizations of which a sub-sample of only seven supplied more than cursory estimates of average number of hours spent by their volunteers each week. Even some of these are uncomfortably imprecise. Yet, ^{even} these few organizations, employed over 5 million volunteers throughout the country in 1964. Other organizations in our sample were able only to estimate the number of volunteers they utilized. They were unable to provide any acceptable estimates of hours worked.

Within these limitations of my sample, I have computed a weighted average, using the number of volunteers for each of my sub-samples of organizations as weights. (Table 3) According to ^{my calculations} the approximately 5 million volunteers in the sub-sample, covering 7 national organizations using or contributing volunteers, worked on average, 4.6 hours per week during 1964.

It is difficult to appraise the representativeness, let alone the accuracy of this figure; but on the basis of the information I have been able to gather, it appears to be not too far off. I attempted to guard

Table 3

Average Number of Hours Per Week Worked by Volunteers
in Several Volunteer Organizations - 1964

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Average Hours Per Week</u>
A	10.0
B	3.0
C	2.5
D	4.0
E	5.0
F	3.7
G	<u>3.0</u>
Average ¹	4.6

¹Weighted by numbers of volunteers

Source: Computed on basis of data
supplied by the seven or-
ganizations which included
the following listed alpha-
betically:

- American Red Cross
- Boy Scouts
- General Federation of
Womens Clubs
- Girl Scouts
- Jaycees
- League of Women Voters
- Veterans Administration
- Volunteers

against over statement by taking the lower of figures in those cases where a range was given by the voluntary organization. Had I an adequate and truly representative sample, however, I would not anticipate a markedly different figure. As the reader will note, this estimate lies between the Labor estimates for the week of November and the annual average, and considerably above the Michigan estimate. But given the downward biases, described above, in both of these surveys, this figure seems not unreasonable, r

Another point which I mentioned earlier, and which was also suggested in the Labor Survey, is that a good number of volunteers may serve more than one master. If this be so, the estimate based on my organizational data of 4.6 hours per week per volunteer would have a downward bias as would estimates of the total number of volunteers serving the group an upward bias. My inclination is to posit that my information on hours from the demand side of the equation, namely the reported experience of these volunteer organizations, supports in general the Labor estimate of average hours worked during the sample week; and that the assumption of approximately 5.6 hours per week per volunteer is not unrealistic as a first approximation.

My studies and data on the voluntary organizations in my sample suggest that the rate of growth in numbers of volunteer workers and their hours has been high over the past several decades. In fact, it may well have been in excess of the rate of growth of the general labor force. I have summarized in Table 4 growth data for 5 organizations reporting in total approximately 3.5

Table 4

Rates of Growth of Volunteer Services in Several Organizations

<u>Organization</u> ¹	<u>Annual Growth per Year (in %'s)</u>	
	Hours	Number of Workers
A		
1949-64	5.1	
1955-64	3.9	2.5
B		
1923-64	--	4.7
1948-64	--	1.4
C		
1921-64	--	7.7
1948-64	--	2.0
D		
1930-64	--	1.8
1948-64	--	2.9
E		
1954-64	14.1	--

¹Organizations include the following, listed alphabetically:

Department of Agriculture

Illinois State Mental Institutions

League of Women Voters

Red Cross

Veterans Administration

Source: Computed from data

supplied by the organizations.

million volunteers. This is even smaller sample of organizations than I present above, not necessarily representative, and must, therefore, be used with caution; as merely suggestive ^{of} what the record might show. However, my study of the annals of voluntarism suggests that these figures may not be too far off from the actual experience. The behavior they suggest is entirely consistent with what has been happening in services in the first half of the century; for, in the period 1929-1963, the total number of service workers grew at exactly twice the rate of "goods" workers, 1.8% per year against .9% per year and an annual population growth of a little over 1%, using Victor Fuch's figures for "adjusted" goods and service workers.

My figures in Table 4, even though they are based upon data from only a relatively small sample of organization and must, therefore, be treated only as indicative, do represent a wide spectrum of voluntarism. To give one example the volunteer program of the Veterans Administration, draws their volunteers from a number of volunteer organizations including various Veterans groups and other national voluntary organizations across the country, It is, furthermore likely that the experience of the V.A. (organization A in indicating a rapid growth in the number of Veteran Administration workers is fairly representative. Volunteer workers for the V.A. rose at an annual rate of 2.5% per year over the period 1955-64 with the average number of hours they contributed rising even faster at 3.9% per year. According to these figures, the V.A. increased their utilization of volunteers over this period. Over the longer period 1949-1964, the growth in the hours worked per year was even greater, 5.12%. It is interesting that in three of the four organ-

izations for which the figures were available, some overlap was reported; for example, between the V.A. and Red Cross. In summary, the fastest period of growth seems to have occurred in the 25 year period up to and including the years of World War II. After that there seems to have been a leveling off in the rate of growth in the volunteer work force in these organizations. However, these represent older more established activities in a later stage of their growth cycle. More rapid growth may well have been occurring in new activities designed to become institutionalized. There may also have been a transformation of old activities, such as the experience of the National Foundation (formerly the T.B. Association.)

The question which arises is whether this growth pattern, even though it represents over three million volunteers from these organizations is typical? Unfortunately, not only was our sample of organizations for which data is available too small (it represented the only minimally reliable data available from the approximately 50 organizations we surveyed), but, as I mention above, the organizations exhibiting this growth pattern are the established "old line" volunteer organizations. The case of the V.A. presents another problem; for its volunteers come in part from the other organizations in the sample particularly the National Red Cross. As a consequence there is some double counting implicit in the organizational data. It may also well be possible, and perhaps likely, that the somewhat different experience of the League of Women Voters is typical of the many organizations which were either established or initiated major expansions in their volunteer programs since World War II. In such cases the period of most rapid growth is obviously post World War II.

This suggests the possibility that there has been over the past two decades a significant shift in the patterns of growth of volunteer activities, with new organizations and groups and new programs of established voluntary organizations growing rapidly. If this be so, then the rate of growth in volunteer activity as a whole, rather than levelling off, could be expected to be closer to the pre World War II experience than the figures in Table 4 would suggest. Furthermore, my study of the annals of voluntarism suggests to me that a more extensive survey of the experience of volunteer organizations than I have been able to undertake with my limited resources ^{would} probably substantiate this hypothesis; for there is considerable qualitative evidence of such rapid growth in many areas of volunteer work, in the numbers of programs and hours contributed since World War II. This is perhaps stimulated and desire to compensate for by growing awareness of/ what Kenneth Galbraith characterizes as social unbalance in our economy - i.e. denial of adequate resources for health, education, welfare and cultural activities in our nation. For example, the American Hospital Association, which made its first national survey of the hospital auxiliaries and volunteers in 1961, reported that the post World War II period has been characterized by an "increasing importance" of volunteers in the nation's hospitals. According to the Association this is in part an attempt, by utilizing volunteers, to cope with a tremendous growth in the demand for hospital services, an ever increasing utilization of hospital services by the community, in the face of a concurrent "lag" in the supply of professionally trained hospital personnel.¹

¹"Hospitals Auxiliaries and Volunteers," Report Series No. 3, American Hospital Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1963, p.1

As a consequence, hospitals have been opening more and more activities to volunteers. In a second survey covering the year 1964, the American Hospital Association reported a "tremendous growth in the number of young people working as volunteers" between 1961 and 1964, a 44% increase in hours of work contributed by these volunteers. Although there was a slight drop in the actual number of adult hospital volunteers, the hours contributed on average by each of these adult volunteers for the year rose sharply, almost 40% from 63 to 87 hours per volunteer so that total hours overall increased substantially.¹

¹"AHA Survey Report", Hospitals, J.A.H.A. March 16, 1968. Vol. 42 p.62

Although it would be unwise on the basis of my limited data to draw too strong an inference as to the increased entry of young people into the volunteer labor force in recent decades, there have been reports of many new programs utilizing increasing numbers of young volunteers. A national survey covering the period of 1910-1966 of student volunteers in state mental hospitals across the nation reported that the decade 1965-66 "marked the greatest period of increase in programs."²

²"College Student Volunteers in State Mental Hospitals" National Institute of Mental Health, PHS publication No. 1752, 1968, p.3

Emphasizing the rapid growth since World War II, another study

singles out five of what it terms "resevoirs" out of which increasing numbers of volunteers workers have been drawn in recent years.

These include teenage youths, college students, retired persons, church groups and low income groups. Although based upon an incomplete representation of volunteer organizations and groups across the nation, the study nevertheless, offers substantial qualitative evidence of growth.¹

¹Johnson, Guion G., "Volunteers in Community Service", Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1967, p.10

The study also reports that the volunteer activities of high school and junior high school students have spread from exclusive participation in programs of the established youth groups such as the 4-H clubs, Y-teens, Boy Scouts, and Girl Scouts to a more general involvement in new community programs which "... has been of enormous benefit to their communities."² Accompanying the development of new youth programs centered

²Ibid. p. 11

around civic organizations, this growth in the youth volunteer labor force also reflects a deliberate formalization and extension of recruiting, particularly in metropolitan areas. In New York, for example, a professionally staffed organization, "Volunteer Opportunities for Teenagers" recruits the young as does, in Philadelphia, a similar organization, "Student Organization Program." Many colleges and universities and many high schools across the nation are beginning to sponsor volunteer

groups.

The evidence of increased youth involvement in volunteer services raises an interesting conceptual problem as to what kinds of student activities can be legitimately classified as volunteer work and, hence, product. Although college students have been long concerned with social welfare problems, youth-serving groups and tutoring, and have traditionally contributed volunteer services to their university communities, the Johnson and other studies indicate that since World War II volunteer activities of college students have increased significantly not only in quantity but in scope. This also raises a problem of classification because some of the increase in student volunteer activity reflects growing concern over the problems of society. In

part, This has taken the form of political activities including sit-ins and other related activities. It is my opinion that to the extent that such activities are analogous to legal lobbying and political activity, sometimes paid for, designed to influence public and private policies and practices, they should be included in any comprehensive definition of volunteer work.

At the other end of the spectrum, the apparently greater utilization of retired citizens and adult church groups (there is obviously a certain overlap) in volunteer programs probably reflects not only an increase in leisure time and heightened awareness of the role volunteers can play in providing for individual and community needs, but an increased sophistication on the part of the users of volunteers in drawing upon potential reservoirs. What may well signify a basic change in the structure of voluntarism is the increase in numbers of volunteers among low income groups, the so called "indigenous"

workers and leaders among the poor. The extent and permanence of this apparently new source of organized activity is a subject for separate study. However, there is good reason to believe that the phenomenon is more than a passing fancy; that the initial stimulation under the stimulation of the Poverty program (O.E.O.) may have opened a swelling source of organized activity in the low income groups, reflecting what the Johnson Study characterizes as a formalizing of the "unique" ability of the poor "to establish instant communication with others of their group."¹

¹Ibid. p. 12

In summary, the evidence on the demand side, fragmentary as it is, suggests that the growth of voluntarism over the past four decades has been significant. These were decades characterized by a rising trend in volunteer services relative to the growth in population. This in part justifies my preference for the high-trend variant to be described below in estimating the value of volunteer service over this period.

Total Volunteer Activity - Unorganized vs. Organized

The Labor survey, as I have pointed out earlier deliberately excluded volunteer activities of an informal nature such as work done for friends and relatives, ad hoc community or neighbor volunteer group projects, etc.; in other words work not done under the auspices of formal voluntary organizations. I have labeled this category of volunteer work "unorganized" volunteer work. Of course, I do not mean to imply that in cases where more than one volunteer is involved some organizing of the program and the activities is precluded. All

that I imply, I must emphasize, is that the work is not initiated and under the sponsorship of an established voluntary organization. Both the work of the Michigan Survey and that by Elizabeth T. Simpson on unpaid household services suggest to me that I should attempt to incorporate "unorganized" work in total volunteer man hours. One approach is to apply a constant raising-ratio to the Labor data on organized volunteers hours.

Although the Michigan Survey excludes volunteer work done by teenagers as well as that of other persons in the family who may not have been either the head of the household or his spouse, its inclusion of unorganized volunteer work apparently affected its results significantly; unorganized work seems to be of a magnitude large enough to suggest the Labor Survey omits a sizeable portion of total volunteer work. The crux of the matter lies in the fact that the Michigan Survey defines volunteer work much more broadly as follows; "Time spent without pay doing work for relatives, church or charity calculated for head of families and wives."¹

¹Ibid., p. 527

In their text the authors of the study make it clear that this work was considered part of a broad range of actions through which people help one another "... through voluntary means like contributing money, goods, or effort (time) to relatives, friends, churches, or other charitable and political organizations." The survey was "... concerned only with voluntary contributions of time, serving people or organizations outside the family unit." The specific questions asked were: "Did you do any

volunteer work without pay such as work for church or charity, or helping relatives? What did you do? Altogether, did this take more than 40 hours last year? About how many hours did it take you?"² This was asked

²Ibid., pp. 139-140, ft. 8

"separately for husbands and wives" through personal interview,³ As I

³Ibid.

have stated earlier, the essential point to be emphasized is that the Michigan Survey was more inclusive than the Labor Survey: it encompassed in addition to "unorganized" work, including helping friends and relatives work done for (1) for political organizations, and (2) of a religious nature.

The Michigan Survey finding was that "American families" on average devoted 87 hours in 1964 to doing volunteer work.¹ Although

¹Michigan, p. 140

this is less than two hours per week per family in the United States, I have already pointed out that this does not include the work of the total family but rather only that done by the head of the family and his wife, the only family members enumerated in the survey; furthermore it was a survey of families only.

With 43% of the "families" surveyed reporting no volunteers work done in 1964, it can readily be calculated that those families who did contribute volunteer work, 57% of all families, worked about 150 hours over the 12 month period, or about 3 hours per week, an average per family, and 1.5 hours per volunteer. Yet, on the basis of the following frequency distribution of work by hours, it is also apparent that a relatively small proportion of families, about 19%, contributed an average of 150 or more hours for the year:

<u>Hours of work per year</u> ¹	<u>Percent of cases</u>
None	43
1-40	24
41-120	14
121-240	9
241-1000	8
1,001 or more	<u>2</u>
Total	100

¹Michigan, op.cit., p. 140

Although the Survey estimated the average annual contribution of hours of volunteer work for each family in the United States, it did not present estimates of the total number of actual volunteers. Perhaps this was because the Michigan statisticians, having queried only the head of the family and his spouse, recognized that there may have been other volunteers in the family whom they had not included.

Despite this apparent undercoverage, it may be enlightening to attempt to translate this data on family volunteer work into national

totals, Following the design of the Michigan Survey, we assume a maximum of two volunteers per family of those families reported as contributing volunteer work. Those people whom the Bureau of the Census classifies as "unrelated individuals", namely persons 14 years of age and over who are not living with relatives, were excluded from the Michigan Survey and would have to be, therefore, excluded in global estimates based upon the Michigan findings. On the basis of the number of families and unrelated individuals reported in 1964 by Census, it is possible to infer from the Michigan findings that at least 21 million families and possibly a considerably larger number of individuals contributed volunteer labor in 1964, depending on whether there were one or two volunteers an average per family, (this was approximately the total number of volunteers reported by the Labor Survey). Unfortunately, the Survey did not indicate what proportion of families included both husband and wife as volunteers. The Survey stated, however, that wives in 13% of all families in the Survey contributed work to relatives, this suggests, depending upon whether or not husbands in these families also were volunteers, a significant proportion of two volunteer families in the sample.¹ It is also a direct example of informal volunteer work. However, putting this question aside,

¹Ibid., Table D-31, p.505

^aif/modest estimate: of 87 hours, on average, per family is applied to household figures for the nation, it would indicate that a total of 4158.6 million hours of volunteer labor was contributed in 1964 by all households, and that a significant share of this was unorganized work. How this relates to the "organized" sector is ^{of}critical importance.

Unfortunately, the Michigan data do not give me any firm basis for determining the ratio of the two types for the survey year, let alone establishing any possible trends in unorganized vs. organized volunteer activity. Fortunately some fragmentary data uncovered by Elizabeth Simpson in her work on unpaid household services indicates that the relationship between organized and informal volunteer work may be close to a one to one relationship. (see statistical appendix). Her evidence, however, throws little light on the nature of trends in unorganized vs. organized volunteer activity. Therefore, the logical course remaining would seem to be to apply a constant raising-ratio to the estimates of organized volunteer work for the period.

Pricing Volunteer Hours

The imputation of volunteer product requires that some value be assigned to the estimated manhours of volunteer work. Assigning a price tag to an average hour of volunteer services would present no difficulty if total hours of work could be apportioned among volunteer skills and occupations. These, it is apparent, range from the most menial of clerical and custodial services to highly skilled services of lawyers, doctors and other professionals giving substantially of their specialties. Unfortunately, there is no way of actually arriving at quantities by classification without further extensive research. The lack of data on volunteer work poses a difficult theoretical problem as whether to use the opportunity cost of volunteers as a basis for pricing volunteer labor or to impute market rates for similar work for which hourly rates are available. In other words, the question is whether the work contributed by a volunteer should be valued at what similar work commands in the open market, (the imputed market rate) or whether it should be

valued at the rate which he would command if he were employed in his regular (alternative) occupation instead of his volunteer activity (the opportunity cost). The problem is complicated because the volunteer may or may not be offering his services at the same level of skill or competence as his paid occupation. He may be donating services of a skill level unrelated to the level of skill or expertise demanded by his paid occupation. This could be work comparable to tasks commanding either higher or lower compensation than the payment for his principal occupation. Or he may be retired, drawing on substantial savings, clipping coupons, or living on Social Security. It would, of course, simplify the task if a positive relationship between the paid occupation or level of skill of a volunteer and his volunteer work could be assessed. His contribution could then be valued at its opportunity cost as determined by his level of compensation in the market of his income level. This would assumedly set the price of his offering of volunteer time.

The limited evidence available - qualitative and quantitative -
me to recommend .
does not lead / an "opportunity cost" approach. To be specific, my
the
extensive study of both/annals of voluntarism and the data on volunteer activity as it is described in various studies including both the Labor and Michigan Surveys cast doubt on the practicability or meaning of an opportunity cost approach to valuation. It suggest, furthermore, that any imputation based on market rates for similar work encompasses as wide a range of service as possible for which compensation is available.

Study of the annals suggests that, on the one hand, there appear to be many relatively low skill level jobs performed by high income volunteers, often from relatively high return occupations while on the other hand, there is considerable evidence and many examples of tasks

demanding relatively high skills levels apparently successfully performed by volunteers who by their position in the occupation and income ladders; (in some cases they are not even in the labor force) are not at occupational and skill levels in any way comparable to that required in their volunteer work. The annals of voluntarism are also replete with examples of complex projects, conceived and executed by ordinary volunteers. Their contributions reflect considerable ability and talent as organizers and managers as well as skills of a high order. Such volunteers often displayed talents not used in their regular activities, or at least not compensated for as well.

The scope and variety of volunteer projects is quite impressive.

Among those programs for which we were able to obtain specific information about types of work, a surprising proportion of the work was classified as skilled or professional. The Red Cross, for example, reported that significant proportions of their volunteers in 1964-65 were engaged in instruction, nursing, supervision and other professional or semi-professional activities. Other national organizations made comparable use of their volunteers. The Veterans Administration likewise made wide use of volunteers in a variety of activities, although the average levels of skill demanded may have been lower than that typical of the Red Cross because of the V.A.'s specific exclusion of volunteer physicians; an exclusion which is not typical of the many volunteer programs using professionals as volunteers.

The wide range and extensive variety of volunteer projects reported on a bi-monthly basis by the Volunteer's Digest, the recently defunct national clearing house on volunteer activities, over a period of six years is a rich source of qualitative evidence which not only points

to the uniqueness of the volunteer labor force but more directly, presents impressive qualitative evidence of the skills and expertise often contributed by the volunteer; skills, which as suggested earlier, may in certain categories gain their intrinsic value from the very fact that they are supplied by volunteers working for motives other than pecuniary. This latter distinction has been commented on particularly in respect to mental health programs; but it may well be that there may be a wide range of activities whose value depends upon the fact that the volunteer offers his services without pay, his motivation, non-pecuniary. In addition to the testimony in the mental health field, described above, such activities as fund raising and youth programs come to mind, as other examples.

The impressive variety and number of projects and training programs for volunteers described in the issue of the Volunteers' Digest are persuasive, if not quantitative, evidence that the classifying of work volunteers contribute, the skills they require, and the role of the volunteer in our society is complex. Volunteer assignments sometimes require considerable special training, sometimes on the job. The evidence points to a significant proportion of volunteers engaged in supervisory and management functions.¹

¹See Appendix C for an Index and a sample of reports on volunteer projects, training programs, and conferences taken from the pages of the Volunteers' Digest.

utilize
Even if one were to attempt to / income criteria as the opportunity cost basis for pricing volunteer work, the survey results suggest that this

would
/be a highly unsatisfactory procedure. Even though a large proportion of
volunteers, according to the surveys, come from higher income families
(earning \$10,000 or more per year (1964 dollars) than from lower income
levels and are more highly educated than the general population, other
characteristics weaken the import of this data. For example, women
outnumber male volunteers almost 2 to 1 and of those male volunteers a
high proportion comes from older age groups. Furthermore, ^{as} I point out
above, the young appear to be volunteering in increasing numbers, as
are "indigenous" volunteers from the lower income levels, including the
poverty belt, which were probably undersampled.

The Labor Survey did, however, provide the basis for compiling
data on age, sex, and educational levels of organized volunteers which
could be used to make an opportunity cost valuation for the base period;
a valuation which serves as a check on our market based estimates. The
results, interestingly enough, were close to the imputations based on
similar compensation series. This methodology is described in the stat-
istical appendix to my study.

The price imputations I settled upon for my volunteer product
imputations are based upon a simple average of mean hourly compensation
for employees in a broad services sector of the economy. Hopefully,
this will roughly approximate what the volunteer work would be worth
in the market place. The industries included are (1) wholesale and
retail trade, (2) finance, insurance and real estate, and (3) services.
These industries appear to utilize skills closest to those required in
volunteer projects. The use of a simple average insures that the mix
among industries will not be changed over time although no adjustment
is made for any changes in the job mix within industries. To obtain

a real volunteer output series the composite 1958 hourly compensation figure is utilized for constant dollar imputations over the period 1929-1966. This composite is, further more adjusted for the implied effect on earnings of rising educational attainment. Denison's Index of Quality as affected by education is used for this purpose. It should be pointed out that my series on real volunteer activities is not a true output measure.

Estimates of the Value of Volunteer Activity 1929-1966

With computation of the volunteer value imputations, the final step is to estimate the value of volunteer product. In this section I summarize my methodology for doing this, present my estimates of imputed volunteer product in the base period from 1929-1966. Three trend variants are assumed as a basis for three series of the imputed value of volunteer work for the period 1929-1966; (1) no trend other than population growth, (2) a moderate trend and, (3) a high trend. Let me describe the methodology briefly and summarize the results.

As I indicated earlier a benchmark for my estimates of volunteer manhours is an estimate of man hours of organized volunteer work per person in the noninstitutional population of the United States, age 14 and over. This is derived from the Labor Survey data for the survey week. Three annual manhour series for the period 1929-1966 were constructed: the first assumes no change in manhours worked per persons per year; the second, a 1.7 percent increase per year; and the third, a 3.4 percent increase per year. The second assumes that average hours contributed per volunteer as well as their participation rates remained constant over time for demographical groupings. The third reflects the growth data of my sample of voluntary organizations adjusted for a 1.2 percent annual increase due to population growth. Hourly compensation

for employees in services, broadly defined to include trade, finance, insurance, and real estate, and other services is then imputed. As I pointed out in the section above, the composite 1958 hourly compensation figure, adjusted for changing educational attainment is used for constant-dollar imputations for the period. But up to this point only organized volunteer work is covered. To incorporate the important contribution of informal or "unorganized" volunteer work a raising factor of 2.0 is applied to the series on organized volunteer labor. The size of the factor is based on fragmentary data on the use of homemakers time and the clear indications of the relative importance of this category in the findings if the Michigan survey is compared to the Labor Survey findings on man hours of volunteer work.

In Tables 5 and 6 I present the results of these computations; first, in table 5, the imputed value of "organized" volunteer work for the period 1929-1966 and, second, in Table 6, the value of total volunteer work, both organized and informal, expressed in current and constant, 1958, dollars. The figures are computed for each of the three trend variants described above. Interestingly enough, the three series indicate rates of growth, compared to that of the GNP (a) significantly lower for the low trend variant, (b) somewhat above for the moderate, and (c) significantly higher for the high trend, an increase of approximately sixfold over the period as compared with a roughly three fold increase in the GNP in constant dollars.

It should be clear to the reader that despite the fragmentary nature of the evidence on trends in volunteer work the evidence on the experience of the volunteer organization presented earlier supports the high variant over the others, as does reading of the

Table 5

Value of Volunteer Work - Organized Only 1929-66

(millions of dollars)

<u>No Trend other than Growth</u>		<u>Moderate Trend</u>		<u>High Trend</u>	
Current \$	Constant \$(1958=100)	Current \$	Constant\$	Current \$	Constant \$
1029.8	2582.4	561.3	1407.6	309.0	775.0
1033.8	2645.8	573.1	1466.7	320.8	821.0
1002.9	2701.4	565.4	1522.9	321.8	866.7
921.4	2758.8	528.3	1581.7	305.7	915.3
869.4	2817.8	506.9	1643.0	298.2	966.6
948.4	2877.5	562.4	1706.4	336.4	1020.7
986.2	2941.5	594.8	1774.0	361.7	1078.9
1020.8	3004.2	626.1	1842.6	387.1	1139.3
1096.1	3065.7	683.7	1912.3	429.8	1202.2
1115.0	3130.9	707.3	1986.1	455.8	1278.9
1133.8	3196.2	731.5	2062.0	475.3	1340.0
1152.4	3262.1	690.6	2140.3	499.6	1414.1
1218.2	3296.8	812.9	2199.9	546.0	1477.8
1295.3	3287.6	883.1	2231.0	600.3	1523.7
1385.8	3162.7	937.2	2182.7	664.1	1515.7
1497.1	3168.0	1050.8	2223.6	743.9	1569.8
1658.9	3228.5	1184.2	2304.6	850.0	1654.2
2037.6	3573.5	1479.2	2594.2	1079.5	1893.2
2337.4	3710.4	1725.7	2739.4	1280.5	2023.6
2547.9	3789.3	1913.1	2845.2	1443.2	2146.4
2666.7	3862.7	2036.3	2949.6	1561.9	2262.4
2851.9	3941.9	2214.7	3061.2	1727.1	2387.3
3021.3	3969.9	2386.2	3135.4	1892.0	2486.0
3168.8	4034.7	2545.2	3240.7	2051.8	2612.5
3397.1	4143.4	2775.0	3384.6	2274.4	2774.0
3627.5	4232.8	3013.6	3516.4	2511.2	2930.2
3831.3	4332.3	3237.0	3660.3	2724.5	3101.1
4119.4	4432.0	3539.6	3808.2	3049.0	3280.3
4416.8	4545.3	3859.6	3971.9	3380.2	3478.6
4652.4	4652.4	4134.6	4143.6	3681.6	3681.6
4955.2	4757.7	4478.6	4300.1	4054.5	3892.9
5255.4	4885.7	4830.7	4490.8	4446.4	4133.6
5605.0	5028.5	5239.6	4700.6	4903.4	4399.0
5898.4	5154.7	5607.5	4900.5	5335.5	4662.8
6176.4	5289.0	5971.7	5113.7	5776.9	4946.9
6613.2	5420.0	6502.6	5329.4	6395.8	5241.8
6941.1	5556.6	6941.1	5556.6	6941.1	5556.6
7426.8	5680.7	7553.1	5777.3	7679.3	5873.8

Table 6

Value of Volunteer Work - Organized and Informal

<u>No Trend other than Growth</u>		<u>Moderate Trend</u>		<u>High Trend</u>	
Current \$	Constant \$	Current \$	Constant \$	Current \$	Constant \$
2060	5165	1123	2815	618	1550
2068	5292	1146	2933	642	1642
2006	5403	1131	3046	644	1733
1843	5518	1057	3163	611	1831
1739	5636	1014	3286	596	1933
1897	5755	1125	3413	673	2041
1972	5883	1190	3548	723	2158
2042	6008	1252	3685	774	2279
2192	6131	1367	3825	860	2404
2230	6262	1415	3972	912	2560
2268	6392	1463	4124	951	2680
2305	6524	1381	4281	999	2828
2436	6594	1626	4400	1092	2956
2591	6575	1766	4462	1201	3047
2772	6325	1874	4365	1328	3031
2994	6336	2102	4447	1484	3140
3318	6457	2368	4609	1700	3308
4075	7147	2958	5188	2159	3786
4675	7421	3451	5479	2561	4065
5096	7579	3826	5690	2886	4293
5333	7725	4073	5899	3124	4525
5704	7884	4429	6122	3454	4775
6043	7940	4772	6271	3784	4972
6338	8069	5090	6481	4104	5225
6794	8287	5550	6769	4549	5548
7255	8466	6027	7033	5022	5860
7663	8665	6474	7321	5485	6202
8239	8864	7079	7616	6098	6561
8834	9091	7719	7944	6760	6957
9305	9305	8269	8269	7363	7363
9910	9515	8957	8600	8109	7786
10511	9771	9661	8982	8893	8267
11210	10057	10479	9401	9807	8798
11797	10309	11215	9801	10671	9326
12353	10578	11943	10227	11554	9894
13226	10840	13005	10659	12792	10484
13882	11113	13882	11113	13882	11113
14854	11361	15106	11555	15359	11748
<u>25540</u>	<u>14428</u>	<u>25982</u>	<u>14675</u>	<u>20117</u>	<u>14920</u>

1966 estimates projected by increase in G.N.P.

annals supports the same conclusion.

Although my data obtained from voluntary organizations shows that among the established old line national organizations the rate of growth in volunteer employment was significantly higher before World War II than after and that their post war growth rate was nearer that of the rate of household formation, the experience of new post World War II organizations confirm what is reported in the annals of voluntarism; namely an upsurge in total volunteer participation and growth rates during the past decade, mushrooming new organizations being the focal point of a high rate of growth, plus a heightened awareness and participation at the "informal" level of voluntarism - ad hoc groups, neighborhood groups etc.

In conclusion, I must reiterate my cautions on the tentative nature of my estimates of volunteer product, based as they are upon incomplete and, in part, fragmentary data; however, they have been estimated conservatively and it may well be that when more comprehensive data become available, it will be apparent that volunteer product is, and has been, even larger than our figures show. The reader should recall that both the estimates of hours contributed and the dollar value I assign them are on the low side. Even a modest increase in the imputed "price" of volunteer man hours would result in a significant upward revision of my estimates.

and Reporting
Proposals for Further Research/on Volunteer Services

My enumerations of the
/ limitations and shortcomings of my estimates
suggest an agenda for future research on volunteer services. Knowledge of the volunteer sector needs to be increased greatly if more reliable imputations of volunteer product than are now possible are to be obtained. Following are some suggestions as to the direction such research might take: (1) a first step would be a national survey of households and individuals based on a broader, more inclusive definition of volunteer work than used in either the Michigan or Labor Surveys. There is a need, in particular, to expand significantly the coverage of activities over those specified in the Labor Survey. In particular, a new survey should adequately represent "unorganized" or informal as well as organized volunteer work. It should include detailed questions on volunteer activities over the year as well as during the survey week; hence, the survey would preferably be conducted by personal interview in order to maximize its reliability. It should also include other questions such as special training, levels of skills required by the work reported etc.

Such a survey might well be a part of the regular labor force survey, and taken at least twice during the Survey year, once in the fall and once in the spring; if only once, then in the Spring, so as to obtain data on households which are not available from the labor force survey conducted in the Fall. If it were feasible, I would prefer an independent survey based upon a broader sample than could be obtained by incorporating the volunteer labor force survey into the Department of Labor's labor force survey which as I have indicated biases the results downward in a significant manner. In Census years, a vol-

unteer labor force section might be incorporated in the National enumeration , although I am well aware of the awesome pressures put on the Bureau of the Census to include questions in the biennial Census. Or optionally, it could be part of a new comprehensive time budget survey.

(2) A continuous panel survey to complement, or if representative enough, as an alternative, to periodic cross-sectional surveys would be valuable. This kind of survey, for much the same reasons as panel surveys have been advocated over cross-sectional surveys of consumer expenditures, would enhance our knowledge of trends and basic relationships. This kind of data would yield predictors of the type which the Michigan Survey attempted to derive through the use of multivariate analysis.

(3) Such surveys as those recommended above would provide the basis for classifying data on hours contributed by level of skill and occupational and job classifications. Also needed is a complementary survey on the demand side; a continuing survey like the survey of manufacturers of a representative nationwide sample of volunteer groups in the private and public sectors, national and local, continuing and/or ad hoc programs. The Index of program reports from "Volunteers Digest" in an Appendix below illustrates the wide range of activities such surveys would have to cover. In such a comprehensive industry survey, I would require detailed questions on hours spent by volunteers according to the type of work and classification, following Census and Labor force occupational and skill classification. I would also suggest that information on hours of services or units of product produced by volunteer agencies be gathered to supplement, and check household panel information on hours contributed.

(4) Equally fundamental, and underlying the gap in reliable figures

on which to base imputations of volunteer services product, is the need and reporting to remedy through new research/programs the over all paucity of knowledge about the role of the volunteer worker and his organization in our society. This is essential for national manpower planning. As I have pointed out earlier, we have no idea of what the potential volunteer hours, the total volunteer labor pool as opposed to those actually "employed", might be. This is a most serious gap in our knowledge of a significant component of manpower in our economy and would be valuable for manpower and economic planning. We need a continuous reporting in detail, a clearing house on volunteer activities, like the now defunct Volunteer Digest.

Finally, I should like to emphasize the potential value of a comprehensive time- budget survey conducted on a national level. Up and above these high priority needs for research on volunteer services, the gap in our knowledge of this sector of economic life marks a more than negligible gap in our overall economic knowledge. To give but one example, in the economics field, there is good reason to suspect countercyclical pressure on the physical volume of volunteer work during recessions, an increased reliance on contributed health, welfare, recreational, and educational services as well as assistance from friends and family (other than immediate family). There may well be a substantial substitution of "unpaid" for "paid work." If volunteer work were to be imputed to the National Accounts, this would, therefore, dampen the magnitude of cyclical variations in the G.N.P. Truly comprehensive research and reporting on volunteer work is long over due.

Appendix A

The Survey Questionnaire

I. The Labor Survey

1. Did you do any unpaid volunteer work for an organization last week, that is, the week of November 7 through 13.
2. Even though you did not do any unpaid volunteer work last week, did you do some during the last 12 months, that is since November 1964.
3. Type of Activity
 - a. Hospital or clinic?
 - b. Other health or medical?
 - c. Educational?
 - d. Social or Welfare Service?
 - e. Recreational?
 - f. Civic or community action?
 - g. Other (Specify)
4. Number of hours worked
5. Describe the kind of work you did
6. Name of organization
7. How often did you do unpaid volunteer work during the last 12 months.
 - a. Nearly every week?
 - b. Nearly every 2 weeks?
 - c. Once a month?
 - d. Several times a year?
 - e. Other (Specify)
8. About how many hours of unpaid volunteer work did you do in the last 12 months?

- a. Less than 25?
- b. 25-99?
- c. 100-299?
- d. 300 or more?

9. What are your main reasons for doing unpaid volunteer work?

10. If you are head of the household:

Check the income group that corresponds to the total income of your family during the past 12 months.

- a. Under \$3,000
- b. \$3,000-\$4,999
- c. \$5,000-\$7,499
- d. \$7,500-\$9,999
- e. \$10,000-14,999
- f. \$15,000 and over

II. The Michigan Survey

1. Questions asked separately for husbands and wives:

- a. Did you do any volunteer work without pay such as work for church or charity, or helping relatives?
- b. What did you do?
- c. Altogether, did this take you more than 40 hours last year?
- d. About how many hours did it take you?

2. Data for multivariable analysis to explain hours of volunteer work:

- a. Number of automatic home appliances
- b. Total family income
- c. Sex and marital status of head of family
- d. Education of head of family

- e. Size of place (town) where family lives
- f. Number of people in family
- g. Age of head of family
- h. Type of structure in which family lives
- i. Number of years lived in present home
- j. Number of rooms in home
- k. Whether country was a depressed area
- l. Race
- m. Hours lost from work in 1964 by heads of families and wives from illness and unemployment
- n. Whether difficult to hire outside help for work around the house.
- o. Age of youngest child under 18 living at home
- p. Whether the family could do some of the work for which it hired help
- q. Number of disabled persons in family

Source: Morgan et al, Productive Americans: p. 140, 146

Appendix B

Organizations or Groups Using Volunteers Classified According
to Response to Information Request

I. Detailed Information

- a. American Hospital Association
- b. Austin Texas Volunteer Recreation Study
- c. League of Women Voters
- d. National Catholic Community Service
- e. Peace Corps
- f. Veterans Administration
- g. Volunteer Community Activities Clearing House

Volunteers Digest

- h. Boy Scouts
- i. Girl Scouts

II. Incomplete Information

- a. American Cancer Society
- b. American Friends Service Committee
- c. Four-H Federal Extension Service
- d. HWC Volunteer Services Study
- e. Kiwanis International
- f. National Travelers Aid Association
- g. Optimist International
- h. Vista Volunteers
- i. Woman in Community Service, Inc.
- i. YMCA

III. Little or No Information

- a. AFL-CIO

- b. American Association of University Women
- c. American Association of Volunteer Corodination
- d. American Legion
- e. American Jewish Committee
- f. American Jewish Congress
- g. Association of Volunteer Bureaus of America
- h. B'nai Brith
- i. Episcopal Church
- j. Federal Council of Churches of Christ
- k. Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations
- l. General Federation of Women's Clubs
- m. Lions International
- n. Lutheran Church
- o. Methodist Church
- p. National Congress of Parents and Teachers
- q. National Catholic Welfare Conference
- r. National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers
- s. National Council of Negro Women
- t. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs
- u. National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs
- v. National Federation of Neighborhood and Settlement Houses
- w. National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods
- x. National Grange
- y. National Jewish WElfare Board
- z. National Health Council
- aa. National Recreation Association
- bb. Pilot Club International

- cc. Presbyterian Church
- dd. Quota Club International
- ee. Ruritan National
- ff. Rotary International
- gg. Soroptimist Federation of America
- hh. Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
- ii. Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
- jj. United Synagogues of America
- kk. Union of America Hebrew Congregations
- ll. U.S. Chamber of Commerce (Junior)
- mm. Walton League
- nn. Zonta International

Appendix C

Index Issue, December 1966, Volunteer's Digest*

I. Beautification and Conservation

Nature Center Offer - March '64 - page 2
National Audubon Society - New York City, N.Y.

Hospital Roof Top Garden - March '64 - page 2
Garden Club - Detroit, Michigan

Gardens in Neighborhood Playgrounds - June '64 page 2
Washington Youth Gardens - Washington, D.C.

Downtown Improvements - June '64 - page 4
YWCA - New Britain, Conn.

Coordinate to Beautify - Oct. '64 - page 5
Owasso Service Club Council - Owasso, Michigan

Citizens Establish Wildlife Sanctuary - Dec. '64 page 6
Lions - Mesick, Michigan

Sears, Roebuck Garden Club Grants - March '65 page 4
Sears Roebuck Foundation - Chicago, Ill.

Garden Club, School Children, A public Park - March '65 -
page 4 - Neighborhood Garden Club - Arlington, Va.

Lions Give Parks, Community Houses, and Work - March '65 -
page 5 - Lions Club - Verona, Ohio

'Do It Yourself' Town - May, June '65 - page 2
Several Organizations - Lafayette, Tennessee

Civic Groups Unite on Community Improvements- Nov. '65 -
page 1 - Several Organizations - Champaign County, Ill.

Start With a Mud Puddle - Nov. '65 - page 6 - Izaak Walton
League - Point Pleasant, Va.

Scouts Include Conservation - Dec. '65 - page 2 - Explorer
Scouts - Omak, Washington

Wanted: Volunteers for Wilderness Study Teams - Oct. '66 -
page 1 - Wilderness Society - Washington, D.C.

*Included by permission of Volunteer Community Activities Clearing
House, Inc., Washington, D.C.

II. Civil Rights

The Whole Community - March '64 - page 1
Many Organizations - Stamford, Conn.

High School Inter-Group Relations - March '64 - page 4
American Jewish Committee - Chicago, Ill.

New Patterns - March '64 - page 3 - United Church Women
Lincoln, Nebraska, Springfield, Mo.

Human Relations Fair - June '64 - page 7
Several Organizations - Canton, Ohio

Survey City for Negro Job Opportunities - June '64 - page 5
NAACP - Camden, New Jersey

Providing a Framework - Oct. '64 - page 4 - Urban League
New York City, N.Y.

Scholarship Information for Negro Youth - Dec. '64 - page 5
Urban League - Englewood, N.J.

Good Neighbor - Dec. '64 - page 7 - R.I. Good Neighbor
Federation - Providence, R.I.

Teens Human Relation Workshop - March '65 - page 1 -
Several organizations - Atlanta, Ga.

Virginia Fair Housing Drive - Oct. '65 - page 1 - No. Virginia
Fair Housing, Inc. - Falls Church, Va.

Practice in Incident Control - Oct. '65 - page 1 - Fellowship
House - Washington, D.C.

Community Open Housing Office - Oct. '65 - page 1 -
First Unitarian Society - Albany, N.Y.

Evaluating a Program That Didn't Work - Dec. '65 - page 2 -
YWCA - San Francisco, Calif.

"Step by Step " - May-June '66 - page 3 - Cornell University
Students - Ithaca, N.Y.

III. Disadvantaged

Volunteers become Slum Landlords - June '64 - page 1 - Better
Homes, Inc. - Washington, D.C.

Reading Gifts - June '64 - page 7 - Urban League -
Louisville Ky.

A Way of Working With the Underprivileged - Oct. '64 - page 3
Carla Eugster - Baltimore, Md.

Reading Gifts - June '64 - page 7
Urban League - Louisville, Ky.

A Way of Working With the Underprivileged- Oct. '64- page 3
Carla Eugster - Baltimore, Md.

Neighborhood Groups Plan Summer Program - Dec. '64 - page 3
Urban Service Corps - Baltimore, Md.

"Pairing for Opportunity" - Oct. '65 - page 5 Hudson Guild
Neighborhood House - New York City, N.Y.

Concern - Isolation of Inner City Children - March '65 -page 5
American Friends Service Committee - Chicago, Ill.

Helping A Slum Community Help Itself - May-June '65 - page 1
California Migrant Ministry - Los Angeles, California

Workshops On Applying For Federal Funds - Nov. '65 - page 2
Urban League - Hobson City, Ala.

Educating On Legal Rights - Nov. '65 - page 2 -
Junior Bar Assn. - Washington, D.C.

Building Neighborhood Concern - Nov. '65 - page 3
Several Organizations - Alexandria, Va.

Volunteer Demonstration Project - Y.O.U. - May-June '66 page 1
Y.O.U. - Southport, Conn.

Doll Library for Underprivileged - May- June '66 page 7
Southeast Women's Club - Washington, D.C.

Emergency Homes, Inc. - Oct. '66 - page 1
Christ Congregational Church - Silver Springs, Md.

IV. Handicapped - Retarded

Jaycees Work for Retarded - March '64 - page 1
Jaycees - Hampton Roads, Va.

Follow Through - March '64 - page 2
Lions Club - Eldorado Springs, Mo.

School for Retarded - June '64 - page 5
Pilot Club - Pueblo, California

Interviewing Handicapped - June '64 - page 6
Rotary Club - Sarasota, Florida

Training for Work with Retarded - June '64 - page 7
Kennedy Foundation - Washington, D.C.

School for Retarded,--Community Project - March '65 - page 5
School for Hope - Temple Hills, Md.

Experiment to Aid Retarded Pre-Schoolers - March '65 - page 5
Children's Hospital - Milwaukee, Wisc.

Your City - Is It Open to the Handicapped - March '65 - page 5
Open Doors For The Handicapped - Pittsburgh, Pa.

How Young Volunteers Serve Community Needs - May-June '65 -
page 3 - American Red Cross - several states

Services For the Severely Retarded - May-June '66 - page 2
Central Wisc. Colony - Madison, Wisc.

V. Helping Young People

Work, Study, Travel - March '64 - page 1 - U.S. Nat'l
Students Association - New York City, N.Y.

Action On Safety - March '64 - page 2 -
PTA - St. Joseph, Mich.

Youth Development Committee - March '64 - page 3
Several Organizations - Burlington, Iowa

The Teacher Shortage - March '64 - page 4 - American Assn.
of University Women - Mill Valley, Calif.

Businessmen Help - March '64 - page 4
Kiwanis - Indianapolis, Ind.

New Twisr: Kitchens - March '64 - page 4
Friendship House - Washington, D.C.

Local Scholarships - June '64 - page 2 - American
Association of University Women - Rochester, N.Y.

Youth Training Program - June '64 - page 3
Community Progress - New Haven, Conn.

Creative Holiday Participation - Oct. '64 - page 2
Optimists - Dallastown, Pa.

Night Spot for Teen-Agers - Oct. '64 - page 5
Community Progress - New Haven, Conn.

Citizenship Training for Teen-agers - Oct. '64 - page 5
Lambda Kappa Mu Sorority - New York City, N.Y.

Seven Groups Sponsor Teen Training Conference - Dec. '64 -
page 4 - Various Organizations - San Bernardino, Calif.

Youth Orchestra Pays Off - Dec. '64 - page 5
Rotary - Estes Park, Colo.

Youth Service Opportunities - May-June '65 - page 1
Commission on Youth Service Projects - New York City, N.Y.

Non-Competitive Youth Sports - May-June '65 - page 2
Optimists - Amarillo, Texas

Community Helps Youth - Oct. '65 - page 6
Jaycees - Salem, Oregon

Bike Safety - Nov. '65 - page 7
Optimists - St. Louis, Missouri

Orienting Teens for Social Service - Dec. '65 - page 6
YWCA - Worcester, Mass.

Volunteer Work Leads Teens to Jobs - Dec. '65 - page 6
Eastern State Hospital - Lexington, Ky.

Oregon Youth Councils - Feb. '66 - page 1 - Governor's
Committee on Children & Youth - Portland, Ore.

Boys Club Groom Future Leaders - March '66 - page 4
Boys Clubs - New York City, N.Y.

VI Hospital and Health Services

Civic Commitment Begins - March '65 - page 5
Camp Fire Girls - Washington, D.C.

In Mental Hospitals - June '64 - page 3 - Volunteer
Service - Western State Hospital - Waynesboro, Va.

In Hospital Lobbies - June '64 - page 3 - Methodist
Youth Fellowship - St. Louis Park, Minn.

With Convalescent Children - June '64 - page 3
Senior Girl Scouts - Dayton, Ohio

How to Care For Stroke Patients - Oct. '64 - page 1
Iowa Heart Assn. - Des Moines, Iowa

Junior League Volunteer Emergency Squad - March '65 - page 7
Several Organizations - Morristown, New Jersey

Citizens Start Mental Health Clinic - March '65 - page 7
Mental Health League - Bellefontaine, Ohio

Hospital Library - May-June '65 - page 2
Quota Club - Oklahoma City, Okla.

Menninger Patients as Volunteers - Oct. '65 - page 2
Menninger Clinic - Topeka, Kansas

Volunteer Therapy For Adolescents - Oct. '65 - page 2
Volunteer Service Bureau - White Plains, N.Y.

Volunteers in City Health Department - Dec. '65 - page 1
Municipal Peace Corps - Springfield, Mass.

Pilot Program Prepares Public Health Assistants - Dec. '65
page 1 - Dept. of Public Health - Springfield, Mass.

Study Urges Home Delivered Meals - Dec. '65 - page 7 - Nat'l
Council on Aging - New York City, N.Y.

Volunteer Services Kit - March '66 - page 7 -
Columbia Hospital For Women - Washington, D.C.

Training for Hospital Volunteer Directors - May-June '66
page 2 - Mass. General Hospital - Boston, Mass.

Community Helps In State Hospitals - May-June '66 - page 2
Dept. of Public Welfare - Harrisburg, Pa.

Locating Nursing Homes - Oct. '66 - page 3 - Northern
Westchester Hospital - Mount Kisco, N.Y.

VII Jobs, Work-Training, Vocational Guidance Services

Self-Defeated - June '64 - page 5 - Rotary Club
New Westminster, B.C., Canada

Mature Women - June '64 - page 6
Altrusa Club - Phoenix, Arizona

Youth - June '64 - page 5 - Waseca Youth
Job Center - Waseca, Minn.

High School Seniors - June '64 - page 6
Chamber of Commerce - Everett, Mass.

Service & Vocational Training - Dec. '64 - page 4
Explorer Scouts - Binghamton, N.Y.

"Try Employing Neighborhood Teens "- Dec. '64 - page 4
Community Progress - New Haven, Conn.

Aim: Self-Sustaining Youth Job Service - Dec. '64 - page 4
Kiwanis Club - Ontario, Canada

Teen-age Employment Skills Training - March '65 - page 4
Rotary Club - Cambridge, Mass.

Industry Aids School-Work Plan - Nov. '64 - page 2
Rotary Club - Racine, Wisc.

What Businessmen Are Doing For Their Community - Dec. '65 -
page 3 - Chamber of Commerce - Various Cities

Vocational Help - Feb. '66 - page 7
Rotary Club - Quesnel, B.C., Canada

VIII Library Services

Resourceful Library - March '64 - page 4
Brownies - Athens, Ga.

Library Books For Shut-ins - June '64 - page 3
Boy Scouts - Malden, Mass.

Libraries - June '64 - page 3 -
High School Students - Colonia, New Jersey

Starting A Library - Dec. '65 - page 6 - Business &
Professional Women - Tuckerman, Arkansas

Libraries Offer Books Plus - May-June '66 - page 1
Department of Libraries - Frankfort, Ky.

IX Other Community Projects

Community Improvement Awards - March '64 - page 2 General
Fed. of Women's Clubs - Washington, D.C.

Courts Need Volunteers - March '64 - page 2 Friends of
Juvenile Court - Washington, D.C.

Getting Out The Vote - March '64 - page 3 - League
of Women Voters - Seattle, Washington

Consumer Information - June '64 - page 3
Consumers League - Montclair, New Jersey

Community Conservatory - June '64 - page 5
American Legion - Yreka, California

How To Help International Visitors - Oct. '64 - page 2
International Visitors Information Service - Washington, D.C.

Old Building and Neighbors - Art Center - Dec. '64 - page 2
Northern Va. Fine Arts Association - Alexandria, Va.

Used Books For Underdeveloped Countries - Dec. '64 - page 6
Altrusa Club - Denver, Colorado

Working on Crime Prevention - March '65 - page 3 - General
Federation of Women's Clubs - Indianapolis, Ind.

Community Art Show - May-June '65 - page 3
Kiwanis - Webster Groves, Mo.

Neighborhood Consumer's Bureau - Nov. '65 - page 6 - Citizen's
Planning & Urban Renewal Committee - Milwaukee, Wisconsin

X Pre-School, School, and Tutoring Services

Volunteers In Schools - March '64 - page 1
Knights of Columbus - Nogales, Arizona

Volunteer Tutoring, Chicago - June '64 - page 1 - Chicago
Commission on Human Relations - Chicago, Ill.

"After-School Study Centers" - June '64 - page 2 - Gayle
Janowitz, Hyde Park Neighborhood Clubs, Chicago, Ill.

Night School - June '64 - page 4 - Zonta
Club - Billings, Montana

Day Care Center - June '64 - page 4 - Mt. Pleasant
Baptist Church - Alexandria, Va.

Volunteers Teach, - June '64 - page 6
First Presbyterian Church - Hobbs, New Mexico

What Makes Good Schools - June '64 - page 6 N.Y. State
Citizens Committee - New York City, N.Y.

Planning Parent Programs - Oct. '64 - page 2
Child Study Association - New York City, N.Y.

School Volunteers - New York City - Oct. '64 - page 3
School Volunteers - New York City, N.Y.

Voluntters Renovate Schools - Dec. '64 - page 1
Appalachian Volunteers - Berea, Ky.

Better TV - Continuing PTA Project - Dec. '64 - page 3
PTA - Carthay Center - Los Angeles, California

Children's Theatre - Dec. '64 - page 3
PTA - Elmhurst, Ill.

School Libraries - Dec. '64 - page 7
Federation of Women's Clubs - South Carolina

Clearinghouse Library Service for Better Schools - May-June '65
page 4 - N.Y. State Citizens Committee for Public Schools
New York City, N.Y.

What To Read - Working with Preschoolers - May-June '65
page 5 Bibliography

Working With Disadvantaged Preschoolers - May-June '65 - page 6
Dept. of Psychiatry New York Medical College, New York City, N.Y.

Businessmen Educate on School Tax - Nov. '65 page 6
Jaycees - Houston, Texas

Tutoring Materials - Feb. '66 - page 1
Youth Educational Services - Durham, N.C.

Project Double-Barrel - March '66 - page 1
Project Double-Barrel - Washington, D.C.

Volunteer Services For the Urban School Child March - March '66
page 3 - National School Volunteers - New York City, N.Y.

\$500 Budget Serves 3,000 Children - March '66 - page 5
CACEP - St. Petersburg, Fla.

Optimists Start Reading Centers - March '66 - page 5
Optimist Club - Quincey, Ill..

School Resources Volunteers - Oct. '66 - page 4
SRV - Berkely, California

XI Social Problems - Drop-Outs

"Plays for Living" - March '64 - page 1
Family Service Association - New York City, N.Y.

Alumnae Project: Drop Outs - March '64 - page 3
Delta Sigma Theta - Washington, D.C.

Parents Learn With Teenagers - June '64 - page 3
PTA - Currituck, N.C.

Halfway House For Prisoners - June '64 - page 4
Kiwanis Club - Greenwich Village , New York City, N.Y.

Program Assists Unwed Mothers - June '64 - page 7
Junior League - Scarsdale, N.Y.

Groups Unite on Drop Outs - Oct. '64 - page 5
Women's Intergroup Council - New Orleans, La.

Help For Campus Marriages - Dec. '64 - page 4
YWCA - Berkeley, Calif.

Charm Course for Delinquents - Dec. '64 - page 7
Pilot Club - Atlanta, Ga.

Tucson Clubs Pay For Drop Out Booklet - March '65
page 2 - Community Council - Tucson, Arizona

YWCA Waitress Training Project - March '65 - page 3
Niagara Falls, N.Y.

They Put Offenders In Charge - May-June '65 - page 1
Junior Citizens Corps - Washington, D.C.

Combat Glue Sniffing - May-June '65 - page 2
PTA - Monmouth County, N.J.

Using Park Maintenance To Help Youth - Oct. '65 - page 3
Community Progress - New Haven, Conn.

Churches Launch Wide-Scale Drop Out Program - Nov. '65 page 4
United Presbyterian Women - St. Louis, Mo.

Volunteer Administration, Leadership, Planning

Volunteer Leadership - March '64 - page 3 - Reference
to Paul Ylvisaker address - Indianapolis, Ind.

Volunteer Talent Pool - June '64 - page 4
Volunteer Talent Pool - Winnetka, Ill.

Vista Volunteers Wanted - Oct. '64 - page 2
Vista - Washington, D.C.

What If A Program Fails - Dec. '64 - page 2
Child Study Association - New York City, N.Y.

Maintaining Morale & Interest of Volunteers - Dec. '64
page 6 - Volunteer Bureau - Boston, Mass.

Developing Neighborhood Leadership - March '65 - page 3
Urban League - Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Training Discussion Leaders - May-June '65 - page 2
League of Women Voters - Los Angeles, California

National Training Laboratories - May-June '65 - page 6
NTL - Washington, D.C.

Starting A Volunteer Bureau - Nov. '65 - page 1
Junior League - Marin County, California

Developing A Community Volunteer Bureau - Feb. '66 -
page 3 - South Central Volunteer Bureau - Los Angeles, Calif.

Ideas For Discussion Leaders - Oct. '66 - page 2 - American
Association for Volunteer Services Coord. - Chicago, Ill.

Value of Volunteer Services to the U.S. Economy - Nov. '66
page 1 - Harold Wolozin, University of Mass. - Boston - Boston, Mass.

Working With Older Adults

The Young Visitor - March '64 - page 4
Junior Red Cross - Winona, Minn.

Not Enough Social Workers - Oct. '64 - page 1
Jewish Social Service Agency - Washington, D.C.

How To Care For Elderly Homebound - Oct. '64 - page 1
YWCA - Atlanta, Georgia

Day Center For Older Adults - Oct. '64 - page 1 - Senior
Center (Junior League) - Richmond, Va.

Home For Older Women Of Moderate Means - Dec. '64 - page 1
Zonta Club - Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Services By The Elderly For The Elderly - Dec. '64 - page 1
Henry Street Settlement - New York City, N.Y.

Help In Bad Weather - Dec. '64 - page 6
B'nai B'rith - Cleveland, Ohio

Employment Service For Older People - May-June '65 - page 7
Senior Personnel Employment Committee - White Plains, N.Y.

"Daily Hello" - Oct. '65 - page 3
Volunteer Bureau - Rochester, N.Y.

Starting A Center For Older Adults - Oct. '65 - page 6
Soroptomists - Antioch, California

Retirees Inventory Boston - Oct. '65 - page 7 - Civic
Center & Clearing House, Boston, Mass.

How To Start An Employment Service For Senior Citizens -
Nov. '65 - page 3 - Senior Personnel Employment Committee
White Plains, N.Y.

Elderly Group Gets Housing - March '66 - page 1 - Inter-Faith
Senior Citizens' Advisory Committee - Detroit, Michigan

Over 60 Employment Service - Feb. '66 - page 6 - Federation
of Women's Clubs - Chevy Chase, Md.

Retired Women Form Volunteer Corps - Oct. '66 - page 5
Cortland Senior Citizens Club - Cortland, N.Y.

Little House - Pioneer Senior Center - Oct. '66 - page 3
Little House - Menlo Park, Calif.

Young People Serve

Selected For Service - March '64 - page 4
Catholic Youth Corps - Minneapolis, Minn.

Teen-agers Do Survey - March '64 - page 5
YM-YWHA - Brooklyn, N.Y.

Personal Involvement Needed - March '64 - page 4 - Augustana College Students - Sioux Falls, S.D.

New Use For Teen-Agers - March '64 - page 5
Explorer Scouts - New Holland, Pa.

Filling The Gap - March '64 - page 5 - NAACP
Rutgers University - New Brunswick, N.J.

Building Relationships - March '64 - page 3
Federation of Temple Youth - New York City, N.Y.

Downtown After-School Program - March '64 - page 5
Zonta Clubs - Salt Lake City, Utah

Neighborhood Houses, June '64 - page 3 - National Federation of Temple Youth - New York City, N.Y.

Youth Helps Community - Oct. '65 - page 6 - Future Homemakers of America - Summerville, Ga.

Pick Up Paperbacks - March '65 - page 4
Camp Fire Girls - Minneapolis, Minn.

Students Serve Community - Oct. '64 - page 5
Phillips Brooks House - Cambridge, Mass.

Teenagers Run Center - Oct. '64 - page 5
Chilmark Community Center - Chilmark, Mass.

Scouts Become Museum Aides - Dec. '64 - page 4
Girl Scouts - Toledo, Ohio

Teens Assist School Dental Survey - Dec. '64 - page 4
Future Nurses Club - New Philadelphia, Ohio

Operation Kindness - Dec. '64 - page 5
UCS School Bureau - Boston, Mass.

Teen-Agers Lead After School Clubs - March '64 - page 1
Commissioner's Youth Council - Washington, D.C.

Pick Up Paperbacks - March '65 - page 4
Camp Fire Girls - Minneapolis, Minn.

Training Juniors For Volunteer Skills - March '65 - page 6
Dept. of Parks and Recreation - Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

School and Community - College Volunteer Groups - Oct. '65
page 8 - Tufts, Augsburg, Newark, Pratt - Various States

Youth Helps Community - Oct. '65 - page 6 - Future Homemakers of America - Summerville, Ga.

Appendix D - Sources and Methods for Tables 5 and 6, Description of
by Jennifer Rowley Underlying methodology, by
Column of original work tables.

Table 5--Imputed Value Of Volunteer Work - Organized Only

Column 1--U.S. civilian noninstitutional population age 14 and over:

For 1940-1960, from the Economic Report of the President, 1967, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 236; for 1930-1939, U.S. Census figures on the population under age 14 (Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 311, July 2, 1965) were subtracted from Census figures on the civilian population (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, Series A-3), and the resulting series was linked in 1940 to the subsequent series. The figure for 1929 was estimated from information in all of the above sources.

By limiting the coverage to the civilian noninstitutional population, we, and the Labor Department in its survey, are neglecting as insignificant any volunteer work done by persons in the armed services; children under age 14; and persons in prisons, jails, homes for delinquents and the aged, and medical care institutions. Our coverage, however, does include persons in residence at educational institutions.

Column 2--Annual Manhours of Volunteer Work:

The overall number of average hours worked by volunteers during the survey week was multiplied by the number of volunteers during the survey week*, and the product by 52. The total manhours of volunteer

* The number of volunteers has a standard error of about 84%. We do not know what the standard error is for the average number of hours worked.

work was then divided by the civilian noninstitutional population base (see Department of Labor, op.cit., Appendix A, Table 1). The resulting annual manhours per person was assumed constant from 1929-1966 for the low-trend series and was applied to column 1 to get a total manhours per year series.

Column 3--Imputed Hourly Compensation

In selecting the compensation series for imputation an effort was made to arrive at a fair valuation of what the volunteer work done would be worth in the market place (rather than an opportunity cost.). To test what the general level of the per hour imputation should be, Census median earnings for year-round full-time workers by major occupations groups and sex (see U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, Series P-60, various) were reduced to a per hour basis and allocated to volunteers by sex and type of work done during the Labor survey week (op.cit., Appendix A, Table II). For these tests fund raisers and sales workers were matched with sales workers; organizers or planners, with managers, officials, and proprietors; youth group leaders and teachers or teachers' aides, with professional, technical, and kindred workers; clerical and other white-collar workers, with clerical workers; all service workers, with service workers; and blue collar workers, with laborers except farm and mine.

For the selected recent years for which the matching was done the resulting weighted median hourly earnings tended to be slightly lower than earnings corresponding to the imputation series in about right, or possibly slightly low, for organized work. (IN income distributions, which are generally skewed to the right, medians are expected to be lower than means.) However, when the compass of the imputations series is expanded to include informal volunteer work, it might be maintained

that our compensation series is somewhat too high if one felt informal volunteer work is likely to be less skilled than organized volunteer work.

Incidentally, if we had tried to arrive at an opportunity cost valuation based on the age, sex, and educational attainment of workers in organized volunteer work, approximately the same imputation level would have been indicated. This conclusion is based on the results of matching volunteers by age, sex, and educational attainment (Department of Labor, op.cit.,passim) with Victor Fuch's calculations of 1959 average hourly earnings of nonagricultural employed persons based on the 1/1000 Sample of the 1960 U.S. Census of Population and Housing (see Victor Fuch's, The Service Economy, New York, Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1968, Table-E-1, pp. 221-223).

Column 4--Current -dollar Imputed Value of Organized Volunteer Work:

The product of column 2 and 3

Column 5--Denison's Index of Quality as affected by education:

Denison's index converted to a 1958 base. (See Edward F. Denison, The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternative Before Us, Supplementary Paper No. 13, New York, Committee for Economic Development, 1962, p. 95, col.3.) Straight-line interpolation of Denison's projections for years following 1958 was used to fill in missing years between projections.

Experimentation with crosssectional U.S. Decennial Census data indicated that Denison's index gives a fairly realistic adjustment for the shift effect of the labor force's changing educational attainment on wage and salary income.

Column 6--Constant-dollar imputed value of organized volunteer work:

Column 2 times column 5 times the 1958 value of column 3 divided by 100.

Column 7--Implicit deflator:

Column 4 divided by column 6.

Column 8--Moderate Trend factor:

The appropriate factor to adjust total manhours per person for a 1.7 percent increase per year, expressed as an 1965-based index. The annual percentage change is based on what the per person hours would have been in 1929 if average hours per volunteer and volunteer participation rates had remained constant for population groups subdivided by categories of the following demographical characteristics; educational attainment, sex, and labor force status, marital status, race, size of place of residence and age. Some of the contributions to the total annual percentage change was quite rough estimates due to paucity of basic data. Data for the calculations were drawn from the Labor Department study (op.cit.) and the Michigan Survey Research Center study (op.cit.). see table

Column 9--Current-dollar imputed value of organized volunteer work, moderate annual increase trend;

Column 4 times column 8.

Column 10--Constant-dollar imputed value of organized volunteer work, moderate annual increase trend:

Column 6 times Column 8.

Column 11--high trend Factor:

A 1965-based index which superimposes a 3.4 annaul percentage increase on hours per person. This rate of increase falls within the range indicated by Wolozin's organizational growth data after adjusting Wolozin's figures for a 1.2 percent average annual increase due to population growth.

Column 12--Constant-dollar imputed value of organized volunteer work,
high annual increase trend:

Column 4 times column 11.

Column 13--Constant-dollar imputed value of organized volunteer work,
high annual increase trend:

Column 6 times column 11.

Column 15-17--OBE average annual compensation:

Compensation per full-time employees calculated separately for the following three industries: (1) wholesale and retail trade; (2) finance, insurance and real estate; and (3) services. Obe annual series on employee compensation by industry and on number of full-time equivalent employees by industry were used for the calculations. (see, e.g, U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, Survey of Current Business, National Income Issue, July 1968, 48.7, pp. 41-42, Tables 6.1 and 6.4).

Columns 18-20--Kendrick's average annual hours:

Annual hours per full-time equivalent employee in the same three industries as used for columns 15-17. The basic figures are from unpublished worksheets underlying series given in John W. Kendrick, Productivity Trends in the United States, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press (for the National Bureau of Economic Research), 1961 and to be updated in a forthcoming companion volume to be published by Columbia University Press (for NBER).

Column 21-23--Average hourly compensation:

The quotient of column 15, 16, or 17 divided by column 18, 19, or 20, as applicable.

Table 6--IMPUTED VALUE OF VOLUNTEER WORK - ORGANIZED AND INFORMAL (UN-Organized)

Two times the imputed value series given in Table I. The factor of two is based on fragmentary evidence from Dorothy Dickens, Time Activities in Homemaking, Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 424 (1945) and Elizabeth Wiegard, Use of Time by Full-time and Part-time Homemakers in Relation to Home Management, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Memoir 330 (1954) and unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1953*. These studies indicate that

*We are indebted to Miss Elizabeth T. Simpson of the National Bureau of Economic Research for locating these sources and summarizing their content.

homemakers tend to spend about 2 1/2 times as much time on community activities as neighborly activities (the actual range was from .9 to 4.0), but that only about 30 to 50 percent of community activities might be considered bona fide organized volunteer work, while presumably all activity classified as neighborly activity is assistance to neighbors and family members not living in households. Applying 40 percent to the 2.5 ratio gives a one to one relationship between organized and informal volunteer work. We have had to assume that the same relationship is typical for persons who are not full-time or part-time homemakers.

Another approach to obtaining the factor to use to arrive at figures which encompass informal, as well as organized, volunteer work is to attribute the difference in total volunteer manhours estimated from the Michigan Study (op.cit.,) and the Labor study (op.cit.,) to informal volunteer work. (The Michigan study covered informal volunteer work, while the Labor study did not.) Comparison of estimated manhours

for the survey year from the Labor Department study with the annual manhours indicated by the Michigan study gives a raising factor of 2.62. Comparing the Labor Department survey week manhours with the Michigan result, reduced to a weekly basis, gives a raising factor of 1.85.