The Right Stuff:
New Ways of Thinking About
Managing Volunteers

Meta Zimmeck

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the findings of exploratory research carried out by the Institute for Volunteering Research with the support of the Baring Foundation. It uses simple tools: a review of the literature and consultation with practitioners – to explore predictions about the future development of volunteering[1] first assayed by the Royal Society of Arts' Redefining Work Project.[2] It has simple aims: to foster better appreciation of the complexities, ambiguities and contradictions inherent in volunteering, and to provoke frank debate about how volunteering might be better nurtured.

Why this need for better understanding and frank debate when these matters are so familiar, even trite? To a certain extent, familiarity is the problem. Most people think that they know all they need to know about volunteering. Most have volunteered or are volunteering or know a man (or woman) who does. Most also think that they know all they need to know about nurturing volunteering. Most assume that 'good management' will do the trick, and if pressed to elaborate, would describe 'good management' as 'modern management', the sort of thing they experience in their everyday lives as employees.

But while 'modern management' is appropriate for many – even most – spheres of activity, it may not be appropriate for all, and in particular it may not be appropriate for all volunteers. Within organisations volunteers, with their 'great symbolic power to represent freedom from coercion', play an uncertain or ambiguous role. They work, but they are not employees: they do not have to do what they do; they do it in more episodic, circuitous and idiosyncratic ways; they are not paid for doing it; and, if they do not feel that they are properly involved, supported or cherished, they will walk away. Yet 'modern management' glosses over these fundamental differences between volunteers and employees and treats volunteers like employees, albeit not very good employees: Without the concrete crutch of 'working for a living', volunteers are suspect: they are too autonomous, and, therefore, cannot be made reliable; they have no visible 'payoff' and, so, are not predictable; they must have hidden, 'selfish' reasons for working and, so, are hypocrites.[3]

Surprisingly, then, given this contradiction between nature and 'good practice' nurture, there has not been any debate, however discreet, about how and to what extent volunteers and employees differ and how and to what extent their management should reflect this difference. Instead - whether from lack of recognition of the problem, lack of knowledge of choices or lack of gumption - the only response has been acquiescence to the 'inevitable', the all-in application of 'modern management' to volunteers.

This report starts with the assumption that nothing is inevitable and considers alternative ways of managing volunteers, especially the voluntary and community sector's 'home-grown' methods. In particular, it focuses on the paradoxical relationship between theory and practice, how good theory does not always make good practice, and how good practice often has no theory at

all. It has three sections. The first section surveys the current state of volunteering and, in particular, the linkages between environmental pressures which have pushed 'good practice' towards 'modern management' and caused problems with the satisfaction and supply of volunteers. The second section looks at two different theoretical models for managing volunteers. The third section assesses the applicability of these models to the multifarious reality of volunteering – to different sorts of volunteers, different sorts of activities and different sorts of organisations – and invites debate about how managing volunteers might become more sensitive, flexible, dynamic and effective.

'THE WAY THE MODERN WORLD IS GOING':[4] THE CURRENT STATE OF VOLUNTEERING

Volunteering contributes significantly to the well-being of society, as the former Home Office minister Paul Boateng testified, when he noted that if all volunteers simultaneously stopped what they were doing, the country would grind to a halt.[5] It produces value for the economy: in 1997 volunteering contributed to organisations in all sectors work which was equivalent to that of about 2.4 million full-time workers and worth about £40 billion.[6] It produces value for organisations and their clients: it extends resources, makes connections to and within local communities, provides innovative services, assists 'normalisation' of client groups and offers the 'personal touch'. It produces value for government: it fills gaps caused by the downsizing of the welfare state, mops up unemployment, works for social inclusion and jump-starts active citizenship at the grassroots. And finally, it produces value for people: it allows them to experience opportunities, freedoms, satisfactions and pleasures that are unavailable to them anywhere else.

But despite the importance of volunteering, most people have taken a fairly cavalier approach to it. They have tended to view it either as wallpaper – something that is just there and needs no attention – or as an instrument – something that is there for some other, presumably greater, purpose. This means that, in a time of rapid change, they have given too little consideration to what they can do for volunteering and too much consideration to what volunteering can do for them. Rather than evaluate what methods of management are appropriate and effective in helping volunteering to meet new challenges, they have simply gone with the flow in the direction of 'modern management'.

What, then, is 'modern management'? It is neither monolithic nor static. Depending on the fads and fashions of lecture-circuit and business-school gurus, it has presented itself in a number of different guises, and these, in fact, have evolved over time. Despite this appearance of change, however, at a fundamental level it has remained the same.[7] As it is generally understood in the voluntary and community sector and applied to volunteers (and it is clear that this sector is following, often at some distance, rather than leading other sectors), 'modern management' has three components: standardisation, formalisation and 'professionalisation'.

The management of volunteers has become increasingly standardised, governed by monolithic and prescriptive guidance, which is set out in policy statements, how-to manuals, codes of conduct and syllabi of courses for volunteer managers.[8] Whereas organisations traditionally employed shaggily individualistic and *ad hoc* styles of management, which evolved in response to their own internal requirements, they are now operating in an environment which is pushing them in the direction of 'managerial correctness', imported from bureaucratic organisations in the private and government sectors and aimed at satisfying the external requirements of funders and regulators. Whereas once there were nearly as many ways of managing volunteers as

9

there were organisations with volunteers to manage, now all that remains is the 'right way' and the 'wrong' way, the 'tradition of "amateurism" ... [which is] fading rapidly'.[9]

The management of volunteers has become increasingly formalised - that is, defined by adherence to standard practices and procedures. In 1997 a national sample of 'current' volunteers (who volunteered at least once in the preceding year) involved in all types of organisations and all types of activities showed moderate but increasing levels of formalisation: 17 per cent reported that they had job descriptions (up from 12 per cent in 1991); 14 per cent, that they had been interviewed before starting (up from 7 per cent); 9 per cent, that their references had been taken up; 8 per cent, that they had been asked to disclose criminal convictions; 5 per cent, that they had been asked for permission for a criminal records check; 18 per cent, that they had received training and 6 per cent that they were already trained (up from 17 per cent and 2 per cent, respectively); 22 per cent, that the quality of their work was monitored; and 20 per cent, that their expenses had been reimbursed in whole or in part (up from 15 per cent).[10] However, in 1998 a survey of 547 large volunteer-involving organisations in all sectors showed high levels of formalisation: 80 per cent reported that they had a dedicated volunteer manager/co-ordinator; 85 per cent, that they had policies on volunteering (up from 65 per cent in 1993), equal opportunities and health and safety; 85 per cent, that they used application forms and interviewed volunteers; more than half, that they had put in place formal systems for recruiting, supporting and supervising volunteers; 92 per cent, that they reimbursed their volunteers for travel expenses.[11] In 1999, 84 per cent of 118 volunteer managers in all sectors reported that they interviewed volunteers before starting; 82 per cent, that they supplied job descriptions; 43 per cent, that they provided copies of disciplinary procedures; and 35 per cent, that they formulated person specifications.[12] Such has been the sea-change in views on formalisation that devices such as job descriptions – which ten or fifteen years ago were regarded with hostility as alien, intrusive and inappropriate – now appear to be 'just part of the furniture'.[13]

The management of volunteers has become increasingly 'professionalised'- that is, 'skilled in the theoretic or scientific parts of a trade', 'engaged in for money', 'engaged in by professionals (as distinct from amateurs)'.[14] On the one hand, outside professionals (personnel or human resource managers, social workers, nurses) have moved into the field and managed volunteers in accordance with their respective disciplines (and with somewhat mixed success[15]). On the other hand, people working in the field have sought to establish the profession of volunteer management, classically by designating requisite knowledge/experience, putting in place specialist training programmes and admitting candidates to membership by means of measuring and certifying their intellectual mastery and their fitness to practise. While professionalisation in the UK lags behind that in the USA – where the Association of Volunteer Administration has a large and influential membership, its own journal and bespoke training/certification[16] – nevertheless 'the forces . . . are massing'.[17] In 1963 the first two volunteer

managers were appointed in the NHS; by 1975 there were nearly three hundred employed in the NHS alone; by 1980 there were over a thousand employed by the NHS, local authorities and volunteer bureaux; and the numbers have continued to grow.[18] Training is more widely available, and qualifications (certificates, diplomas, NVQs) are more generally recognised. The various sectional groups of volunteer managers – National Association of Voluntary Service Managers, Association of Hospice Voluntary Service Co-ordinators, National Volunteer Managers Forum and Scottish Association of Volunteer Managers – are moving gradually towards the formation of a trade body. Significantly, prime movers for professionalisation have been volunteer managers outside the voluntary sector, particularly in the NHS, who early on felt the need for enhanced status in order to compete with other professional groups for scarce resources.

Why has 'modern management' been incorporated into the 'national ether'[19] and why has it achieved such dominance in the voluntary and community sector? Obviously it has a natural constituency – and has made considerable headway – among large, bureaucratic, 'progressive', staff-run organisations. But environmental pressures – to be 'businesslike', 'equal', 'risk free', 'on message' and 'accountable' – have enhanced its brand recognition and provided both stick and carrot for its adoption by a wider constituency, potentially all the volunteer-involving organisations in the sector.

Volunteer-involving organisations have been under pressure to be 'businesslike', which many have interpreted as becoming businesses:

> *Now we have Mr Hucker, chief executive of Orbit HA, telling us, after attending a nine-week course at Harvard Business School in the United States, that we are 'just another business with a multi-million pound turnover' and that there are 'too many housing associations'.*
> *. . . If Mr Hucker is right and we should be taking lessons from the corporate giants, then perhaps he may find himself replaced by a business-based, private sector CEO.*
> (John Russell, director, Harewood Housing Society, letter to editor, *Housing Today*, 11 May 2000, 13)

In the outsourcing of the welfare state volunteer-involving organisations have inherited new responsibilities, and in the aftermath of cuts in public spending they have developed new methods of funding - contracting for the provision of services, using private finance for capital development, 'vendoring' to cross-subsidise core activities and increasing donor income through mass marketing. As a consequence they have had to fit form to function, initially in cutting-edge activities and then, by a process of trickling down, in other activities. They have had to place greater emphasis on the bottom line and to keep the bottom line in the black – by reorganising structures, cutting costs, adopting new systems (corporate-style accounting, information technology, quality assurance), tightening controls and hiring in expertise. Some organisations have been either so fearful of losing out to their competitors or so gung-ho to

be in the vanguard that they have 'adopted practices which were more radical than any business'.[20]

Volunteer-involving organisations have been under pressure to be 'equal', to implement – and be seen to implement – the principles of equal opportunities. They have had to formulate and scrutinise policies and procedures in all areas of their operations – governance, recruitment and retention of employees and volunteers, use of suppliers and contractors and services to clients – in order to comply with legal requirements and best practice. They have, for example, had to shift their attention from the volunteers they already have to those they do not have - 'under-represented' groups such as women, young people, people from ethnic minorities, unemployed people and people with disabilities. They have also had to downplay informal (though highly effective) methods of recruitment such as word of mouth, because these cannot be sufficiently well documented and because they tend to produce the same sorts of volunteers as the organisations already have.

Volunteer-involving organisations have been under pressure to be 'risk free'. They have to operate in a less forgiving and more litigious climate. People know their rights as citizens and consumers, expect high (and higher) standards of performance, have access to information about targets and the locus of responsibility and are willing to take action if they are not satisfied. Organisations in the voluntary sector have less experience than organisations in other sectors of public exposure and large payouts, but they are particularly sensitive to such risks because of the vulnerability of their client groups and their need to maintain the trust and support of the public. They have therefore had to adopt procedures for risk management which, if they do not prevent mishaps altogether, at least lay off part of their liability (better to have had procedures which failed than not to have had procedures at all). Risk management is subject to fits and starts, sudden disaster-fuelled drives to greater regulation - for example, the current hot-button issue of criminal records checks for persons in contact with vulnerable clients. Given the urging of client welfare organisations that 'all applicants for posts should be treated as having the potential to be abusers'[21] and government's threats of penalties for organisations that employ abusers,[22] it is no wonder that organisations feel the need to batten down the hatches.

Volunteer-involving organisations have been under pressure to be 'on message'. In the last two decades they have become important players in political projects, initially as the acceptable (non-state) face of welfare provision and more recently as a source of social capital: 'the capacity to get things done, to co-operate, the magic ingredient that makes all the difference'.[23] While governments have raised the profile of organisations through the negotiation of compacts, allocated to them an important role in flagship initiatives such as New Deal and Single Regeneration Budget and highlighted volunteering through programmes such as Make a Difference, Millennium Volunteers and TimeBank, such opportunities have costs. At this level, inclusion in policies has required voluntary organisations to follow the 'message' and follow the funding; and this in turn has required them to

massage their priorities, work in complex environments with a mixed bag of partners, engage in elaborate rituals of consultation with stakeholders and buff up their administrative and promotional capacity.

Volunteer-involving organisations have been under pressure to be 'accountable'. As they have become more 'businesslike', more committed to being 'equal', more determined to avoid risks and more aware of the benefits of being 'on message', they have become more 'accountable' jointly and severally to funders, politicians, clients/users of services, members, staff, volunteers and society generally. 'Accountability' is a complex process of specification, monitoring, verification and reporting back. The greater the magnitude of the thing they are accountable for and the number of different stakeholders they are accountable to, the more hoops voluntary organisations have had to jump through - prioritising formal procedures, information management systems, relevant skills, reliability and good communications.

However, in the voluntary and community sector the rise and rise of 'modern management' does not seem to have enhanced either the supply or the satisfaction of volunteers. Between 1991 and 1997 the number of 'current' volunteers in formal settings fell by 1.4 million, from 23.2 to 21.8 million; and the level of participation of adults in volunteering, from 51 per cent to 48 per cent. The level of participation fell particularly steeply among certain groups - from 55 per cent to 43 per cent of people aged 18-24 and from 50 per cent to 37 per cent of unemployed people. Shortages of volunteers have arisen in certain fields (youth and children, health and social welfare, elderly people), in certain activities (serving on committees and providing direct services, notably the heavy end of community care)[24] and in certain organisations, including a number of 'household names' for which this is a novel experience.[25] Whatever may have happened in the past (and there was clearly no golden age of plenty), shortages are now big news, as evidenced by media coverage of 'trustee dearth' and 'volunteer slump' and weird and whacky ways of souping up the image of volunteering.[26] Shortages are also big politics – or the subtext to big politics – as evidenced by headline programmes such as Millennium Volunteers, TimeBank and the Experience Corps, which are aimed at increasing recruitment, particularly from among 'under-represented' and 'problematic' groups.

Why, at a time when volunteering is so successful and so prominent, are volunteers voting with their feet? Some are doing so, of course, for personal reasons which are outside the control of organisations (moving house, going back to work, shouldering responsibilities as parents and carers, taking up opportunities for education and training and the like). Some, however, are doing so for reasons that are well within organisations' control. There are clear indications that volunteers are dissatisfied with the way they are managed and that such dissatisfaction may lead to their departure from particular organisations and, in some cases, from volunteering altogether. In 1997 a staggering 71 per cent of 'regular' volunteers (those who volunteered at least once a month) expressed dissatisfaction with the organisation of their work (up from 68 per cent in 1991). Even higher proportions of volunteers in

particular activities – 88 per cent of those in representation; 83 per cent in providing advice, information and counselling; and 80 per cent in secretarial/administrative/clerical work, transporting and providing other direct services – reported dissatisfaction. Although volunteers increased their average weekly workload by nearly half between 1991 and 1997, they were still more than twice as dissatisfied with the organisation of their work as with demands on their time (up from 25 per cent to 31 per cent) and pressure of work (up from 19 per cent to 20 per cent).[27]

To which features of the organisation of work do volunteers object? The short answer is that there is no definitive answer, because there is no definitive research on what volunteers think about what they do and how they do it. Some volunteers, however, have given their views anyway about what annoys and demotivates them:

You don't want people interfering. It depends on the work – [but] you don't want someone always watching you, on your case. You don't want a boss.
(Young volunteer interviewed by Katharine Gaskin, 'Vanishing volunteers: Are young people losing interest in volunteering?', *Voluntary Action*, 1, 1, Winter 1998, page 39)

There is, firstly, the waste of resources – particularly people skills. Secondly, there is the growing introduction of 'professional' management, often people with inappropriate knowledge and abilities. Finally, there is the increasing cost of such people, which means we spend an increasing amount of our volunteers' time on fund-raising rather than the work we set out to do.
(Peter Minton, 'Why volunteers are leaving in droves' [letter to the editor] *Third Sector*, 5 February 1998, page 10)

As long as people . . . suspect the motives of genuine voluntary members, yet need to impress people with qualifications instead of ability or personality, there will always be a shortage of able volunteers. Let us bring this argument into the open. Is a person's worth directly proportionate to their wage packet or to whichever professional body that they belong? If this is the case, then the only useful function for voluntary people, like myself, is menial and untaxing work which then allows the true professionals . . . to manage and do the thinking for everyone.
(Mel Grant, president of the Derwent Residents Consultative Committee and committee member of Derbyshire Association of Residents and Tenants, 'What is it worth?', [letter to editor] *Housing Today*, 24 June 1999, page 17)

I think people can get too involved with policies and volunteer rights. People volunteer because they want to, not to get expenses or a parking place. Volunteering is supposed to be enjoyable and rewarding and something people want to give.

(Anita Sabin, former volunteer and now volunteer co-ordinator, Bath Churches Housing Association, 'The Doctor Stuart Interview: Anita Sabin', *Volunteering* 48, May 1999, page 15)

These complaints from volunteers – about lack of autonomy, inability to put knowledge and skills to best use, conflicts with 'professionals' and other staff, second-class status and 'the swelling overburden of regulation'[28] – are complaints about bad management. But ironically, they are not complaints about just any old bad management – not about the rather *laissez-faire* management native to the voluntary sector – but about 'modern management', with its structures, systems, procedures, experts, good practice and checklists, imported into the voluntary sector to bring it up to scratch.

MOLEHILLS OUT OF MOUNTAINS: MODELS FOR MANAGING VOLUNTEERS

Volunteer-involving organisations are virtually uncountable (perhaps 500,000) and infinitely varied. They differ *inter alia* in their sectoral locations (private, government, voluntary), spheres of operation (international, national, regional, local and neighbourhood), structures (from complex to simple, from hierarchical to flat, from tight controls to loose controls), resources (from the income of a small country to no income at all), funders (from externally-funded to self-funded), cultures (from corporate to collectivist), functions or 'industries', size in terms of employees, size in terms of volunteers, size in terms of members, employee/volunteer/member mix, types of clients or end users (from the robust to the sensitive and vulnerable) and types of opportunities on offer to volunteers (from total control to envelope-stuffing).

The sheer number and protean nature of these organisations are daunting, and there have been attempts to impose a degree of order by using various systems of classification. Most of these focus on the structures and functions of organisations. For example, Horton Smith, responding to the US regulatory context, divides the organisational universe into 'bright matter' (those larger, more complex, bureaucratic organisations run by employees and visible to regulators such as the Internal Revenue Service) and 'dark matter' (the smaller, simpler, non-bureaucratic grassroots organisations run by volunteers and largely invisible).[29] Kendall and Knapp, for the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, place voluntary organisations in the UK in structural/operational industries in accordance with the International Classification of Nonprofit Organisations.[30] Hems and van Doorn for the National Council for Voluntary Organisations group organisations variously by annual income, primary functions and fields of activity/industries (the latter two in accordance with the Charity Commission's guidelines).[31]

Finally and most interestingly, Billis, along more metaphysical lines, explores not the sharply delineated but the blurred. He describes interlocking worlds of activities - the personal, the associational and the bureaucratic (itself composed of two interlocking sub-worlds of business and government). He locates voluntary organisations largely within the associational world but explores the 'zones of ambiguity' where, as it were, worlds collide and organisations mutate. In particular, he focuses on two types of organisation in those zones which encompass the contradictory characteristics of two worlds. The first, in the zone between the personal and associational worlds, is 'unorganised groups', the 'first step' to organisation, where 'people just come together on an informal basis to resolve their own or others' social problems' and act partly as groups and partly as friends and neighbours. The second, in the zone between the associational and bureaucratic worlds, is 'voluntary agencies', which include government-orientated, profit-orientated and entrepreneurial associations.[32]

Some systems of classification, however, concentrate on the person power of organisations. For example, Hems and van Doorn pragmatically define

'worker types' by their method of pay, from 'paid at market rate'/'paid below market rate' through 'salary sacrifice'/'honoraria'to 'general expenses'/'actual expenses' - that is, from properly paid employees to properly unpaid volunteers.[33] Cameron, following Billis's analysis, populates her worlds - the personal with individuals; the associational with members; the bureaucratic with employees; and the zone between the associational and bureaucratic with volunteers, who share the characteristics of both employees and members. Differences between employees; volunteers and members, she says, are 'a matter of degree rather than clear-cut distinctions': 'Some volunteers will be treated very like employees, with job descriptions, formal training and set hours. Other volunteers might be expected to behave more like members, defining the work they will undertake and seeing how it fits into the overall task of the organisation.'[34] In addition, Schmidt and Rochester examine the administrative settings of a substantial sample of organisations and describe in concrete terms what volunteers do and how they relate to both structures and other people in their organisations. Allowing for differences in location, orientation and methodology, their findings show considerable similarities, although Rochester's are, given the larger number of variables he employs, more complex and capable of supporting strategies for action.

Having surveyed more than eighty volunteer-involving organisations in Israel, Schmidt describes five 'ways to build a volunteer project'. Her categorisation draws on organisational types (from bureaucratic to collective), methods of management (from dedicated staff to self-management by volunteers) and volunteers' motivations (from altruism to self-fulfilment). In the 'do-it-yourself' type, volunteers are deployed in ways which best satisfy the organisation's need for free or cheap labour. This type allocates full responsibility for volunteers to volunteer managers who rely on both volunteers' altruism and an unending supply of fresh recruits to keep the show on the road. In the 'one-plus-one' type, volunteers pair with professionals to carry out highly skilled tasks. This type uses both specialist 'matchmakers', who perform the crucial task of matching volunteers to professionals, and volunteer managers, who play an arm's length supervisory role. In the 'agent runner' type, volunteers work in, and in some cases manage, projects or parts of projects. This type uses project managers, who have overall responsibility for the conduct of projects, to manage volunteers. In the 'one plus ten' type, teams composed of one employee and a number of (say ten) volunteers carry out the work. This type is designed specifically to take 'paraprofessional jobs away from possibly over-qualified professionals'. In the 'activist cadre' type, which recognises the desire of volunteers for different levels of involvement – long-term and intense or more intermittent and casual – volunteers are completely responsible for organisations or projects. In this type, volunteers gravitate either to inner circles, which lead and administer, or outer circles, which carry out the work.[35]

Taking the plunge into the 'dark matter', Rochester examines 'small voluntary agencies' (those with no more than four employees or their full-time equivalents), which are, in Billis's schema, doubly ambiguous, in the zone between associational and bureaucratic worlds and, within that zone, 'on the

cusp between the association that is entirely dependent on the voluntary efforts of its members and the fully-fledged non-profit agency where the great majority of work is undertaken by paid staff'. He describes four different 'organisational contexts' which are produced by the interaction of organisations' functions, the respective roles of volunteers and employees in carrying out those functions and the various motivations and expectations that volunteers and employees bring to those roles. In the 'service delivery' type, skilled and highly motivated volunteers, who are recruited, trained, deployed and supported by employees and rewarded by the attractiveness of the work itself and the enhancement of their skills, carry out the 'lion's share' of operational activities. This type has 'unambiguous organisational arrangements' and clear separations between clients, service delivery volunteers, employees and management committee members. In the 'support role' type, volunteers, recruited by informal means and willing to take on work in exchange for the chance to acquire new skills and gain confidence in their abilities, support and supplement the work of employees. This type contains an element of uncertainty, in that the distribution of work between volunteers and employees is 'a product of the fit between the tasks the agency needs doing and the ability of the volunteer to undertake them which is negotiated between the two parties'. There may be some overlap between support volunteers and management committee members. In the 'member/activist' type, volunteers (who form inner circles of more committed and active volunteers, motivated by 'instrumental and expressive personal motives', and outer circles of less dedicated and active volunteers, motivated by a 'deeper set of values about the importance of active citizenship and the idea of the community') undertake all activities. This type has 'high levels of organisational ambiguity', since its emphasis is on offering volunteers the opportunity to make whatever contribution they are able to make. In the 'co-worker' type, volunteers, motivated by a strong commitment to the mission and collective style of the organisation, support and supplement the work of employees. This type also has areas of organisational ambiguity, since the division of labour is subject to negotiation between the parties.[36]

Although the multifarious types of volunteer-involving organisations ought logically to have generated multifarious models of managing volunteers to suit their portfolios of characteristics, they have not. Indeed, mountains have produced molehills, and there are but two main models, best understood in the light of Weberian sociological theory – the 'modern' and the 'home grown' – in general use to provide an overview of this complexity.

What, then, are the general characteristics of these models? The 'modern' model of managing volunteers springs from traditions external to the voluntary sector and alien to volunteers. It is a hybrid of 'scientific management', developed for managing employees in industrial process work and then adapted for those in administrative process work (from the assembly line to the typing pool to the call centre), and 'new public management', developed to ginger up the state's service delivery. 'An integrated, comprehensive approach to moving the whole organisation',[37] it is strategic and works from the top down. In the voluntary sector, it has been most warmly

embraced by large, complex, national, metropolitan, 'forward-thinking', staff-run organisations – those 'voluntary agencies' (government-orientated, profit-orientated and entrepreneurial) in Billis's zone of ambiguity. It is expressed primarily as procedures in hearty heuristic texts rather than as theory, since this might appear to the 'caring and sharing' as unpalatably instrumental. Its vanguard includes, inevitably, management consultants and 'professionals'.

The 'home grown' model has developed organically and somewhat shambolically to enable the great majority of organisations within the voluntary sector to manage their employees and/or their volunteers. Indeed, virtually all organisations, whatever their current stage of development, started out small and run by volunteers and thus conformed to this model. 'Less a formal process than a stream of decisions within the context of organizational life,'[38] it is the composite of experiences, aspirations for improvement, some empirical research and a small leaven of theory from such 'rare and extreme cases'[39] as feminist collectives and producers' co-operatives. It is most firmly entrenched in small, unstructured, volunteer-run grassroots organisations. It is expressed primarily as principles, as its practices have not been systematically recorded and must be inferred – with some difficulty – from a range of sources. Its vanguard includes a small number of 'alternative' theorists and a larger number of practitioners, those dedicated to 'getting on with it'.

Because neither of these models is comprehensively set out and fully articulated,[40] it is helpful to use Weberian theory to provide an organisational context and to fill in any gaps. Weberian theory locates different models of management, including the management of volunteers, within different types of organisations – including, for present purposes, the bureaucratic and the collectivist-democratic – and it analyses their differences in the following way. In bureaucratic organisations, authority descends from the top and is distributed in accordance with rank or expertise; in collectivist/democratic organisations, it arises from the centre and is shared by all members. In bureaucratic organisations, rules and procedures govern activities and relationships to the greatest possible degree; in collectivist/ democratic organisations they govern to the smallest possible degree. In bureaucratic organisations, control is exercised directly through supervision and/or indirectly through 'voluntary' compliance with written rules and procedures; in collectivist/democratic organisations, it is exercised through the interpersonal dynamics of a relatively homogeneous group of people. In bureaucratic organisations, social relations are impersonal, partial and instrumental and flow from functional roles; in collectivist/democratic organisations, they are personal, holistic and valuable in themselves and flow from the membership of the collectivity. In bureaucratic organisations, criteria for recruitment are paper-based (professional status, qualifications); in collectivist/ democratic organisations, they are value-based (shared ideals and interests, friendships, personalities). In bureaucratic organisations, the primary incentives to performance are extrinsic (remuneration, career advancement); in collectivist/democratic organisations, they are intrinsic (expressions of values, enjoyment of social relationships). In bureaucratic organisations, rewards reflect hierarchical status and take the form of large pay differentials; in

collectivist/democratic organisations, they are more equitably distributed and take the form of equal pay or small pay differentials. Finally, in bureaucratic organisations, tasks are segmented, demarcated and specialised; in collectivist-democratic organisations, they are entire, shared or rotated and generalised (or, if specialised, at least demystified through training and support).[41]

Table 1: Two models of organisations – a quick summary

	Bureaucratic	**Collectivist-democratic**
Distribution of authority	hierarchical: to individuals by virtue of rank or expertise	egalitarian: from collectivity as a whole
Form of authority	formal and universal: maximum application of rules and procedures	informal and *ad hoc*: minimum application of rules and procedures
Control	direct by supervision, indirect by adherence to rules and procedures	interpersonal relations within socially homogeneous groups
Social relations	impersonal, partial, instrumental, role-based	personal, holistic, valuable as such, membership-based
Criteria for recruitment and advancement	paper-based: professional status, qualifications	value-based: shared ideals and interests, friendships
Incentive structure	extrinsic: remuneration, career advancement	intrinsic: expression of values, enjoyment
Reward structure	large pay differentials	equal pay, small pay differentials
Construction of tasks	maximum division of labour (e.g. between 'intellectual' and 'mechanical')	minimum division of labour
Construction of expertise	specialist	generalist

Similarly, and by extrapolation, Weberian theory suggests a comprehensive overview of the differences between the 'modern' and 'home grown' models of managing volunteers which are based on these different types of organisations. The 'modern' model has two interlocking aims: to structure/restructure organisations along bureaucratic lines and to enable such organisations to function as efficiently as possible. It regards volunteers and employees as factors of production, 'human resources' to be deployed to achieve organisational imperatives, and it mandates treating them on the basis of parity:[42] [Volunteers] are different from the paid workers in a non-profit only in that they are not paid. There is less and less difference between the work they do and that done by the paid workers – in many cases it is now identical.[43]

20

But, all other things being equal, in the cut and thrust of daily practice it subordinates volunteers, who have no rightful place in formal hierarchical structures, to employees. It advocates the extension to volunteers, frequently the last bastion of *laissez faire*, of the tight controls and the full panoply of rules and procedures already applied to employees. It concentrates on controlling volunteers' 'functional' relationships, those with their managers and their paid co-workers. While recognising that volunteers have different incentives than employees, it focuses on those that are most employee-like, such as payment of expenses and access to training. Finally, it advocates the greatest possible division of labour and differentiation of functions and tasks, in particular between volunteers and employees.

Table 2. Two models of managing volunteers – a quick summary

	'Modern'	**'Home grown'**
Aim of organisation	most perfectly structured and efficient bureaucracy	fullest expression of core values
Form of authority	formal and universal: maximum application of rules and procedures	informal and *ad hoc*: maximum application of values
Role of volunteers/employees	equal (both 'human resources')	different in principle but potentially equal in practice
Distribution of authority between volunteers and employees	hierarchical, with volunteers subordinate to employees	shared, with volunteers and employees as partners
Control	direct, formal	indirect, loose
Social relations	functional relations with managers and employees	permeable boundaries: personal/functional relations between and among volunteers, managers, employees, clients, members, etc
Criteria for recruitment and advancement	process-based: equal opportunities, risk management	intuitive: shared ideals and interests, friendships
Incentive structure	intrinsic, with emphasis on most employee-like (expenses, training)	intrinsic, with emphasis on fulfilment, enjoyment
Construction of tasks	maximum division of labour (e.g. between 'intellectual' and 'mechanical')	minimum division of labour
Construction of expertise	specialist	generalist

The 'home grown' model has but one – and a very different – aim, to enable organisations to express most fully their core values in what they do and how they do it. Whereas the 'bureaucratic' model regards managing volunteers as the means to an end, the 'home grown' model regards it, in effect, as both means and end. The 'home grown' model recognises the differences between volunteers and employees but treats them as partners in joint enterprise, who participate in decision-making by consensus and exercise shared authority. Therefore it does not cram volunteers and employees into hierarchical relationships. It shows consistency in the application of its values to individual situations rather than in the application of its rules and procedures to all situations. It is thus able to accommodate risk-taking and making intuitive

leaps, for example, by letting people 'have a try'. It values all kinds of personal relationships, not just those which are, strictly speaking, job-related. It promotes good performance in managing volunteers without creating artificial barriers or putting particular expertise on a pedestal. It offers non-material incentives – achievement, autonomy, recognition, belonging – to volunteers. It cherishes the unique status of volunteers as willing and unpaid workers and rejects attempts to blur the boundary between volunteers and employees. Finally, it seeks to minimise the division of labour and endow both volunteers and employees with a large measure of control over their work and a fair share of the organisation's work, including the most and the least desirable.

The following extracts give a practical demonstration of the differences in style and content between the two models. The 'modern' model emphasises clarity of purpose, predictability, equal opportunities and the boundaries between staff and volunteers:

Why have a job description?
.... Although it is important not to over-formalise volunteering, the use of job descriptions for volunteers is becoming more common, and can be useful for the following reasons:

- Volunteers need to be clear what their brief is and where the boundaries of their role lie: a job description can help clarify those issues.
- A job description can help clarify a volunteer's distinctive role and how it differs from that of paid staff – helps avoid job substitution.
- A job description provides a clear framework within which the person interviewing can make an assessment of whether the volunteer is right for that role.
- Assessing an individual's ability to carry out the tasks listed in a job description is fairer than assessing them against a subjective idea of what constitutes a 'good volunteer'. It is part of good equal opportunities practice to limit the possibility of making a biased judgement.
- Volunteers will be covered by insurance if they keep within their brief: it is easier to prove that they did so if the 'brief' has been detailed in writing.
- A written description of the role can help volunteers if that is what they want to do.
- A job description can add status to the volunteer role.

(Wandsworth Volunteer Bureau, *Key Elements of Good Practice in Working with Volunteers*, third edition, Wandsworth Volunteer Bureau, 1997, page 4)

The 'home grown' model celebrates ambiguity, mucking in (literally) and serendipity:

Any spare time I had if the day centre was open, I was there . . . . I don't know why. I just fell in love with it all. It gave me a purpose really. Because I

knew that Ravenscraig was finishing, and I knew that I had to get the experience that I needed, I suppose that all inspired me. Once I showed a wee bit of initiative at the day centre they were keen to let me get involved as far as I needed to go.

('The Volunteer Viewpoint (1): Interview with Peter McGinn [ex-steel worker], Volunteer, Alzheimer's, Scotland', in Murphy, C. (ed), *Volunteers and People with Dementia*, Dementia Services Centre, Department of Applied Social Science, School of Human Sciences, University of Stirling, 1994, page 9)

Your great strength with us, if you come, is that you do what is needed, because what is needed is your job, and that is your job description: You will have sherry with the Bishop and you will clean up the vomit from the floor; you do both or you do neither.
(Wilkes, E., 'Volunteers in a hospice: a ten year review', in Hodson, H. (ed.), *Volunteers In a Professional World: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of the International Association for Volunteer Effort, Oxford, England, 5th-11th September 1982*, Volunteer Centre, 1983, page 117)

When I moved into the area in the early 80s, I went into the Centre to ask about social security benefits and Peter Cowen asked me to hold the phone. Peter went off to the pub and didn't come back – and I've been here ever since.
(Interview with George Watt, quoted by Virginia Berridge, 'A brief history of West Hampstead Community Association', MS of paper given to 25th AGM, 1998)

Thus while the 'modern' and 'home grown' models are ideal types 'at the limits of organizational reality',[44] they are capable of describing in part or in full, implicity or explicitly, the policies, practices and attitudes of volunteer-involving organisations which operate in the real world and in real time.

THE CHALLENGES OF APPLICABILITY: 'HIGH TECH AND CHEWING GUM'[45]

Whatever the conceptual elegance or market status of the 'modern' and 'home grown' models, of greatest importance is their applicability. Are they able to guide volunteering into the new worlds of work and active citizenship? Are they sufficiently robust to cope with variation and change? Do they actually work? Will they stem or speed up the exodus of disgruntled volunteers?

Lacking definitive evidence (and the sort of research that would produce it is rocket science, or at least the voluntary and community sector's equivalent), it is not possible to make out a case for the general applicability of either model on its own (or indeed for any other single model at an intermediate stage between the two).

A number of factors, some internally-generated and some externally-generated, limit the applicability of the 'modern' model. The first is that it carries on regardless: it is a total system and has no boundaries to the scope and intensity of its application – potentially every organisation and every feature within every organisation. The second is that it is a closed and self-perpetuating system: it carries on whether it produces desired outcomes or not:

It can be presented as an objective approach for achieving what is best for an organization and its clients. The 'validity' of interpretations 'discovered' will be confirmed by 'expert opinion' from resource providers, consultants and internal managerial types. Specialists who appear as knowledgeable and rational will control strategic management processes, strategic choice, and the specification of associated lower order decisions. As strategic management processes acquire authoritative status, alternative interpretations of social reality are excluded. Participants' perceptions of what is possible are changed, as are individual self-conceptions and shared definitions of who and what is valuable. We have a different organizational culture in which long-established ordinary social competencies of persons, beliefs about work processes, valued characteristics of persons, and the identity and purpose of the organizations are undermined.[46]

The third is that it alienates many volunteers – whether they be counter-cultural ideologues, constitutional free spirits, control freaks or escapees from office hell – who deprecate efforts to make volunteering 'just like work'. For example, women volunteers at a women's health centre in West Yorkshire opposed the introduction of quality management systems, even though they 'had nothing against the new procedures per se', because they felt that it would cause 'the loss of magic', the loss of 'productive' time and 'the loss of their own worth'.[47] Older volunteers recruited to a mentoring project for primary school children in Morecambe were so put off by the necessity of undergoing rigorous induction training – which, they felt, would make them 'like teachers rather than like parents or grandparents' – that they faded away.[48]

Similarly, a number of factors limit the applicability of the 'home grown' model. The first is that it is messy and unwieldy. Collective or non-hierarchical decision-making and task-sharing are time-consuming, frustrating and difficult to sustain long-term, as the experiences of collectives and co-operatives have shown: 'Many collectives have concentrated on sharing out the swabbings of the Titanic's deck but forgotten to post a lookout for the icebergs'.[49] The second is that, in the absence of checks and balances, it may allow corruption to creep in, in any number of unpleasant ways, from peculation to racism and sexism: 'The complainant [about the housing co-operative's allocations policy] received the most points . . . which measured housing need, but those were ignored by the majority in the allocations group because two of them wanted the other applicant as a neighbour.'[50] The third is that without devices for structuring access to power and the visibility of power, it may become elitist and exclusive, as those in inner circles gain control: 'As long as friendship groups are the main means of organisational activity, elitism becomes institutionalised.'[51]

This would suggest, then, that problems of robustness and efficacy cannot be solved by an either/or choice between the 'modern' and the 'home grown' models. One size clearly does not fit all, and even two sizes do not stretch. Volunteering is too big and too multifarious to be contained in this way. Rather, it requires an infinite range of possibilities from 'bureaucratic' to 'home grown' and all sizes in between – as dictated by the particular requirements of particular volunteers, particular activities and particular organisations.

Although nearly half the adult population of the UK volunteered in formal settings and nearly three-quarters in informal settings in 1997, volunteers are a peculiar group of people, not entirely representative of the population as a whole. Men and women participate in equal proportions, but other groups do not. Groups with lower than average levels of participation include young (18-24) people; older (55 plus) people; people from ethnic minorities; people with low incomes, manual occupations and low educational attainments; people resident in Northern Ireland, Wales and England's north and midlands; people not integrated into their local communities; and people outside the labour market (the unemployed, the retired, the sick and the disabled). Groups with higher than average levels of participation include people aged 25-54 (especially those aged 45-54); white people; people with high incomes, professional, managerial and other non-manual occupations and high educational attainments; people resident in Scotland or the south of England; people already integrated into their local communities; and people already in the labour market.[52]

Volunteers have different motivational 'packages' (different elements arranged in different priorities) which change over time. These were initially classified into simple dyads – intrinsic/ extrinsic, altruistic/egotistic – but there are now far more complex typologies based on multiple variables.[53] For practical purposes, the list might include the following: values (expressing and acting on important values); enhancement (engaging in psychological

development and improving self-esteem); social (fitting in and getting along with others); understanding (increasing knowledge, developing and practising skills); protective (coping with inner anxieties and conflicts); career (gaining experience which will benefit careers).[54] So, for example, some volunteers want outlets for their altruistic impulses; some, a chance to socialise or to cope with bereavement; some, experience and training which will help them in the job market; some want all of these at the same time.

Volunteers have different requirements as to the duration and intensity of volunteering in order to reflect their degree of engagement and to fit in with other demands on their time. Some are stayers, who want to make a long-term commitment to a particular organisation or cause; others are passers-through, who, while they may have a long-term commitment to volunteering generally, make only a short-term commitment to a particular organisation or cause (cf. Schmidt's and Rochester's 'inner' and 'outer' circles).

Volunteers gravitate to different activities in accordance with their motivations, interests and practical requirements, and many activities have their own unique demography. Men are more likely to be involved in committee work, transportation, provision of advice/information/counselling and representation; women, in raising and handling money and providing direct services; young people, in raising and handling money; middle-aged people, in organising events, providing direct services, transportation and representation; older people, in committee work, visiting and transportation; people from low income groups and manual occupations, in committee work and representation; and people from higher income groups and non-manual occupations, in committee work, representation and transportation.[55] Put simply, some people want to be challenged; some, to be surprised; some, to 'have a go' without having to think too much about it; and some, to sample different experiences.[56]

Volunteer-involving organisations are very diverse and offer volunteers a wide range of different opportunities in different settings. Although this organisational diversity is perhaps the most powerful factor in determining both volunteers' experience of volunteering and organisations' experience of managing them (or not, as the case may be), there has been (with the honourable exception of Rochester) insufficient consideration of the sorts of administrative settings which lie between full-on bureaucracies, home of the 'modern' model, and full-on non-bureaucracies such as collectives, home of the 'home grown' model. Without an appreciation of what is going on in this middle ground, it is extremely difficult to determine what should be going on.

Where are we now? This report has surveyed: the current state of volunteering; different models for managing volunteers; and pressures which are leading to the institutionalisation of one of these models, the 'modern' model, imported from other sectors and applied willy-nilly to volunteer-involving organisations, and the denigration of the voluntary and community sector's 'home grown' model:

From: Jordan Management Consultants

Thank you for submitting the resumes of the 12 men you have selected for management positions in your new organisation. All of them have now taken our battery of tests and we have run the results through our computer. We have arranged for each to have personal interviews with our psychologists and vocational aptitude consultants. The complete profile of each is included.

It is our staff's opinion that most of your staff nominees are lacking in background, education and vocational aptitude for the type of work you are undertaking. They do not demonstrate a team concept. We would recommend that you search for persons of experience with managerial ability and proven capability.

Simon Peter is emotionally unstable and given to an offensive temper. Andrew has absolutely no qualities of leadership. Brothers James and John, the sons of Zebedee, place personal interest above company loyalty; frankly they are 'mama's boys'. Thomas demonstrates a questioning attitude that would tend to undermine morale. We feel it is our duty to tell you that Matthew has been blacklisted by the Greater Jerusalem Business bureau. James, the son of Alpaeus, and Thaddeus have definite leanings towards the radical and register high on the manic depressive scale.

One of the candidates, however, does show great potential. He is a man of ability and resourcefulness, meets people well and has a keen business mind. He is highly motivated as well as ambitious and responsible. We recommend Judas Iscariot as your controller and right-hand man.
(Kay Burkhill, chairman, Leicester Housing Association 'The gospel truth?', [letter to editor], *Housing Today*, 30 September 1999, page 13)

This report has also proclaimed the necessity of going beyond the narrow confines of such models to more sensitive, flexible, dynamic and effective ways of managing volunteers.

But what is the way forward? The first step is to give honest consideration to the issues: how to balance the by-no-means compatible requirements of volunteers, volunteer-involving organisations and the operating environment. Volunteer-involving organisations, in particular, should admit their disquiet about the slavish application of principles and methodologies which they do not believe are appropriate or effective. 'Rules are there to be broken'[57] is a dishonest motto, and stratagems for looking good and looking 'modern', such as obtaining quality certification by excluding the training of volunteers (or other areas where there are difficulties) are perverse and ultimately counterproductive.[58] The second step is to explore what actually works: 'tools not rules'.[59] This can take place in a number of ways. On the one hand, it can unfold through commissioning research to test various hypotheses and to explore burning issues such as the nature of volunteers' dissatisfaction with the organisation of their work. On the other hand, it can unfold through gathering, collating and discussing information already in the hands of

volunteer-involving organisations in order to find some consensus on 'this is what works for us'. Such honesty and sharing of information are the right stuff, the way in which volunteers and volunteer-involving organisations can face the future with dignity and confidence.

REFERENCES

1. Volunteering is 'any activity which involves spending time, unpaid, doing something which aims to benefit someone (individuals or groups) other than or in addition to close relatives, or to benefit the environment'. It takes place in both formal (organisational) and informal settings. Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998, pages 13-14.

2. See Zimmeck, M., *To Boldly Go: The Voluntary Sector and Voluntary Action in the New World of Work*, RSA, 1998.

3. Pearce, J.L., *Volunteers: the organizational behavior of unpaid workers*, Routledge, 1993, pages 4, 9.

4. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 20 September 1999.

5. In his speech to the National Volunteering Convention, Blackpool, 31 August 1999.

6. Davis Smith, J., 'The Economic Value of Formal Volunteering', factsheet, Institute for Volunteering Research, 1998. This has been calculated by applying an average hourly wage rate of £9.13 to figures taken Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998, pages 22-23.

7. For example, one view is that the current vogue for 'empowerment' is less about maximising employees' satisfaction and more about reducing the costs of managing them: that is, convincing the mice to discipline themselves so that the cat can be 'delayered'. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 27 September 1999. For a useful overview of developments in management theory, see Brooks, I., *Organisational Behaviour: Individuals, Groups and the Organisation*, Financial Times, 1999.

8. Although there is no consensus on job title, for the sake of consistency this report uses the term 'volunteer manager' throughout. In 1975 the Volunteer Centre noted, 'It is astonishing that so many changes can be rung within a title that contains basically two concepts' and allocated titles to six families, of which the most prominent were 'voluntary service organiser'/'organiser of voluntary services' and 'voluntary service co-ordinator'/'co-ordinator of voluntary services'. Even after twenty-odd years nothing much has changed: Lishman and Wardell found nineteen job titles among their sample of seventy-two community care-providing organisations in Edinburgh and Highland, only three of which included the word 'volunteer'. However, when these titles were similarly allocated to families, the most prominent (in descending order of frequency) were 'co-ordinator', 'manager', 'organiser' and 'worker'. This problem of nomenclature is clearly significant and deserves further analysis. *Volunteer Service Co-ordinators in the Health Services 1975: A Statistical Analysis and Directory of Posts*, Volunteer Centre, 1975, page 7; Lishman, J., and Wardell, F., *The Role of Volunteer Co-ordinators*, Central Research Unit, Scottish Office, 1998, pages 11-12.

9. *Unit One, Voluntary Studies*, Managing Volunteers, Personal Development Unit, Department of Continuing Education and Information Management, University of Wales, Lampeter, page 4.

10 Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998, pages 69-87.

11. Sibley, M., 'Issues in volunteer management: findings from a survey', unpublished report, and *Issues in Volunteer Management: A report of a survey*, Institute for Volunteering Research, 1999, pages 1-2.

12. Gay, P., *Delivering the Goods: A report of the work of volunteer managers*, Institute for Volunteering Research, 2000, page 17.

13. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 22 September 1999.

14. *Oxford English Dictionary*.

15. Outside professionals, particularly social workers and nurses, have tended to take a more instrumental and authoritarian view of volunteers. Pearce notes that the greater the insecurity of these professionals (subordination to other professional groups, fear of replacement by volunteers), then the greater their hostility to volunteers and their inability to manage them successfully (page 144). A participant in one of the Focus Groups (20 September 1999) confirmed this: she noted that when her rapidly-growing organisation, which provides services complementary to the National Health Service, employed managers who had worked in the NHS, there was 'blood on the floor', because they were unable to understand the culture of volunteering.

16. Brudney, J.L., Love, T.G., and Yu, C., 'The Association for Volunteer Administration and Professionalization of the Field: Suggestions from a Survey for the Membership', *Journal of Volunteer Administration*, Fall/Winter 1993/1994, pages 1-22.

17. Green, T., 'Professionalisation: Pros and Cons', *Volunteering*, 31, October 1997, pages 12-13. He estimates that the professionalisation of volunteer management is about ten years behind that of volunteer fundraisers.

18. *Volunteer Service Co-ordinators in the Health Services* 1975, page 3; Gay, P., and Pitkeathley, J., *Mobilising Voluntary Resources: The Work of the Voluntary Service Co-ordinator*, Volunteer Centre/King's Fund, 1982, page 11. Gay and Pitkeathley found a total of 63 volunteer managers (two-thirds paid and one-third unpaid) in Berkshire.

19. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 22 September 1999.

20. Report of research conducted by Simon Lilley, in 'Sector criticised for being professional', *NCVO News*, April 1999, page 3.

21. Fair Play for Children, 'A Code of Practice on Child Protection', *Child Protection in a Playwork Setting: A Practical Guide for Playwork Projects, Employees, Volunteers and Managements*, Fair Play for Children, [1997], page 7.

22. Forshaw, R., 'Massive fines likely for employing child abusers', *Housing Today*, 5 August 1999, page 6.

23. Blair, T., 'Third Sector, Third Way', transcript of speech to NCVO's Annual Conference, 21 January 1999.

24. Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998, pages 19, 26, 35, 42-43 and 40.

25. For recruitment problems in the Scouts, Guides and St John Ambulance, see Brindle, D., 'You, you and you, please', *The Guardian*, 'Society' section, 10 March 1999, pages 6-7; see also Nichols, G., 'Volunteers in the

Guide Association: Problems and solutions', *Voluntary Action* 1, 1, Winter 1998, pages 21-31.

26. See, for example, the Kensington and Chelsea Volunteer Bureau's recruitment campaign for 'the nation's second favourite pastime', in 'Carry on volunteering! Jamie Thomas on how the KCVB team's poster put the volunteering world in a spin', *Volunteering*, 45, February 1999, pages 8-9, and TimeBank's funky television advertisements for the youth market, complete with rap music and hand-held camera work.

27. Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998, pages 96, 98, and Lynn, P., and Davis Smith, J., *The 1991 National Survey of Voluntary Activity in the UK*, Volunteer Centre UK, 1991, page 94. The exact categories are 'things could be much better organised', 'it takes up too much of your time' and 'too much work is expected of you'. The National Trust's survey of its volunteers in 1997 confirms this analysis. While nearly all (97 per cent) volunteers were satisfied with volunteering generally, 66 per cent thought that their involvement would benefit from better organisation, 46 per cent from less bureaucracy and 37 per cent from better matching of volunteers to tasks. *Volunteering with the National Trust: Summary of the findings of the 1997 survey*, National Trust, 1998, page 1.

28. Andrew Phillips, speech at Charities Aid Foundation's conference, quoted in 'Sector should adopt business values without damaging the heart of charity', *Third Sector*, 12, November 1998, page 3.

29. He is much exercised by researchers' preoccupation with 'bright matter' and indifference to 'dark matter', which is of much greater magnitude and significance, and characterises their views as 'analogous to pre-Columbian cartographers who portrayed Europe as the centre of a flat earth'. Such behaviour he attributes to the unwholesome dominance of the bureaucratic model of organisations. Horton Smith, D., 'The Rest of the Nonprofit Sector: Grassroots Associations as the Dark Matter Ignored in Prevailing 'Flat Earth' Maps of the Sector', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26, 1997, pages 115, 126 and *passim*.

30. INCPO industries include: culture and recreation; education and research; health; social services; environment; development and housing; law, advocacy and politics; philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism promotion; international activities; religion; business, professions and unions; and a portfolio 'other'. Kendall, J., and Knapp, M., *The voluntary sector in the UK*, Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Series, no 8, Manchester University Press, 1996, pages 22-23.

31. Primary functions include: finance/resourcing; provision of buildings/facilities; provision of services; advocacy, information and research; representation. Fields of activity/industries include: general charitable purposes; education/training; health; social care; accommodation/housing; culture/recreation; religious activities; business; environment and animals. Hems, L., and van Doorn, A., *NCVO Survey of Job Roles and Salaries in the Voluntary Sector 1997/1998*, NCVO, 1998, pages 39-40.

32. Billis, D., *Organising public and voluntary agencies*, Routledge, 1993, pages 158-71.

33. Hems and van Doorn, page 15.

34. Cameron, H., 'Are members volunteers? An exploration of the concept of membership drawing upon studies of the local church', *Voluntary Action* 1, 1, Spring 1999, page 59.

35. Schmidt, S., 'Have You Ever Considered . . . Five Alternative Ways to Build a Volunteer Project', *Journal of Volunteer Administration*, Summer 1993, pages 1-8.

36. Rochester, C., 'One size does not fit all: four models of involving volunteers in small voluntary organisations', *Voluntary Action* 1, 2, Spring 1999, pages 7-20. For a full report of research findings, see Rochester, C., Harris, J., and Hutchison, R., *Building the Capacity of Small Voluntary Agencies*, vol 1, *Final Report*, and vol 2, *Juggling on a Unicycle: A handbook for Small Voluntary Agencies*, Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics, 1999.

37. Walker, J.M., 'Limits of Strategic Management in Voluntary Organizations', *Journal of Volunteer Administration*, July-September 1983, page 41.

38. Walker, page 40.

39. Rothschild-Whitt, J., 'The Collectivist Organization: An Alternative to Rational-Bureaucratic Models', *American Sociological Review*, 44, 1979, page 525.

40. Mike Hudson provides an indication of the difficulties of making visible – let alone articulating models of – managing volunteers: in 390 closely-argued pages he makes precisely three references to volunteers. *Managing Without Profit: The Art of Managing Third-sector Organizations*, new ed., Penguin, 1999.

41. Max Weber's original formulation, 'Bureaucracy' in Gerth, H.H., and Wright Mills, C. (trans. and eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press, 1958 [1946], pages 196-244, is expanded by Rothschild-Whitt, pages 509-27.

42. This is what Davis Smith refers to as the 'workplace model'. 'Should Volunteers be Managed?' in Billis, D., and Harris, M., (eds.), *Voluntary Agencies: Challenges of Organisation and Management*, Macmillan, 1996, page 194.

43. Drucker, P.F., *Managing the Non-Profit Organisation: Practices and Principles*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1990, page 143.

44. Rothschild-Whitt, page 525.

45. Katharine Gaskin, letter to the author, 21 September 1999.

46. Walker, pages 52, 43.

47. Best, R., *Tomorrow's Volunteers: Who and Why. Geraldine Aves Lecture 1993*, Volunteer Centre UK/Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1992, page 20.

48. Boardman, M., Generations in Action, West Lancs EBP Partnership Link, telephone conversation with the author, 14 December 1999.

49. For exposés by shell-shocked refugees from collectives, see Landry, C., Morley, D., Southwood, R., and Wright, P., *What a Way to Run a Railroad: An Analysis of Radical Failure*, Comedia Publishing Group, 1985, page 32, and Freeman, J., *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, Dark Star Press, 1970.

50. 'Independent Housing Ombudsman: Digest of Selected Cases', *Housing Today*, 8 July 1999, page 3.

51. Freeman, page 4. Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998

52. Davis Smith, pages 20, 21, 25-38.

53. For a summary of the current state of thinking, see Horton Smith, D., 'Determinants of Voluntary Association Participation and Volunteering: A Literature Review', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23, 1, Fall 1994, pages 243-63. He lists all possible variables, which include contextual (size of community, nature of organisation), social background/ demographic (sex, age, marital status, number of children, age of children, friendship networks, membership of voluntary groups, health, physical condition, length of residence, income/wealth, employment status, occupational prestige, formal education), personality (internal/external locus of control, empathy, morality, emotional stability, self-esteem, traditionality), attitudinal (perception of effectiveness of group, perception of benefits relative to costs of participation, altruism, self-development, civic duty), situational (personal contacts, personal influence, being asked to join, having friends in the organisation, being an officer) and social participative (neighbourhood interaction, friendship activity, political activity, church participation, informal helping, charitable giving, participation in other voluntary groups). He notes an aspirational methodology, the Interdisciplinary Sequential Specificity Time Allocation Lifespan Model, which would allow 'simultaneous inclusion of relevant variables from all the categories examined in this literature review' and would require, presumably, computing power equivalent to that of NASA.

54. Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., and Stukas, A.A., 'Volunteers' Motivations: Findings From a National Survey", *ibid.*, 25, 1996, page 487.

55. Davis Smith, J., *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, National Centre for Volunteering, 1998

56 K.W., 'Volunteers' Life-Styles: Market Segmentation Based on Volunteers' Role Choices', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 19, 1990, pages 21-31. She found that volunteers in each of four roles in a sample of organisations had different demographic profiles, different inputs of time and different amounts of satisfaction. For example, those in leadership roles were nearly three times as satisfied as those in 'general support' roles (telephone work, mail-outs, maintenance, cleaning, errands).

57. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 20 September 1999.

58. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 22 September 1999.

59. Comment by participant, Focus Group, 20 September 1999.

Institute for Volunteering Researc