VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Volume III Number 4

WINTER 1969

Published by
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
Center for Continuing Education
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

A quarterly journal devoted to the promotion of research, theory, and creative programming of volunteer services.

MANUSCRIPTS: Address all correspondence concerning manuscripts to the Editor, VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION, Center for Continuing Education, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Subscriptions are $4.00 per year. Checks should be made payable to Northeastern University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Many have attempted to produce a title for the dynamic period of social change through which man is passing. All have failed, because each in turn has attempted to bring it into focus through his personal system of lenses. Truly, it is a period of searching, where man is seeking deeper meanings in life. And it is through these inquiring efforts, culminating in an ever broadening recognition that the true meaning of life—God's kingdom on this earth—can be found in man helping his fellow man through volunteer service, that this period will eventually be recorded in history as one in which Man Discovered Man."

Northeastern University
Center for Continuing Education
ALBERT E. EVERETT, *Dean Emeritus*

NEW ROLES FOR VOLUNTEERS IN ACTION-RESEARCH SETTINGS

by
Alan S. Meyer, Ph. D. and Lee Novick
Socio-Medical Research Division
The Burke Rehabilitation Center
White Plains, New York

Volunteers fulfill important service functions in a variety of community agencies but have rarely been utilized as research interviewers. Paid interviewers are generally preferred even when money is short.

Our experience in a rehabilitation hospital in using 17 volunteers as research interviewers suggests that such non-traditional use of volunteers can constitute a valuable resource. These volunteers successfully administered 825 patient interviews thus providing valuable data which otherwise could not have been collected.

We will examine the conditions favorable to the use of volunteer interviewers and the characteristics of the more successful volunteers.

The Burke Rehabilitation Center in White Plains, N.Y., is a 150 bed hospital for physical rehabilitation and convalescent patients. In January, 1966 the Center, with the support of the Public Health Service, launched an exploratory study into "Community Influences on the Patient Care Process."[1] With a limited budget, the Center's sociologist assembled a small staff for a new socio-medical research program.

One project aim was to obtain data on the social characteristics of the patients. With Medicare due to start in six months, we wanted urgently to collect baseline data on admissions before that event. Since Center staff were not available for interviewing patients, volunteers were our only hope. Fortunately, a strong volunteer program was responsible for operating many hospital services. With some misgivings, we established the Patient Interview Project in which volunteers would assume responsibility for interviewing all admissions, about 18 per week, for at least 5 months.

RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING

Fifteen women fitting our job description were recruited by the Chairman of Volunteers and others. The training was tightly organized and the importance of objectivity was emphasized. Those who felt uncomfortable were encouraged to withdraw. Accordingly, 4 of the 15 women did not return after the first session. Within two weeks, 11 trainees had completed an 8 hour training program of 3 sessions. These included

1. This investigation was supported by Public Health Service Research Grant No. CH 00220-02 (Division of Community Health Services.)

discussions, demonstrations, written materials, role playing, and practice interviews.

Our first goal was to interview every admission from February through June of 1966. Ten of the eleven original interviewers completed the first 5 month period and then volunteered to continue through the summer. To meet contingencies we trained 4 more volunteers in May and 2 more in October. Thus reinforced, the group agreed to complete a full year.

The 17 women who stayed with the project for at least two months can be described as middle and upper middle class suburban women. Half were college graduates. Five had retired from long careers. Most were in their 40's and 50's. All were married, except for one widow and 3 single ladies. Thirteen had children—mostly of school age and older. All functioned as homemakers. Three-quarters of the group had been volunteers for at least 5 years and over half had given prior service to Burke.

The most difficult aspect of the training was the inculcation of basic principles of friendly neutrality, of standardizing questions, and of probing appropriately. Initial resistance to our early emphasis on neutrality and objectivity was partially counteracted by emphasizing friendly interest and personal rapport. Many trainees, however, continued to feel cross-pressured. While they desired to master this new, sometimes discomfitting skill and to accept the standards set for them, they also empathized with patients, and were frequently frustrated by their inability to help them.

The problem tended to be resolved in three ways: (1) the staff built in several procedures by which volunteers could help patients; (2) several volunteers integrated their research role with the more familiar helping role, with little conflict; and (3) for the substantial number who experienced role conflict, the staff moderated its expectations.

MAINTAINING MORALE

The volunteers displayed a generally high level of motivation and morale. This was confirmed by their answers to a questionnaire at the end of the project. Certain aspects of our approach appear to have contributed to the team's morale.

Our approach to volunteers can be described as respectful, appreciative and professional. (1) We tried to respect the needs and motives of the volunteers to help patients as well as to do research. (2) We made it clear to the volunteers that we were grateful for the contribution they were making to the success of our new research program. (3) We expected a great deal from our volunteers and set professional standards. We expected them to utilize our supervision constructively, maintain strict confidentiality, and deal professionally with patients and staff.

We anticipated the volunteers' need to serve a helping function by defining the interview as an important part of the hospital's welcoming process. The interviewers also derived satisfaction from knowing that the questionnaires were placed in the patient's chart for staff use. Finally, the interviewer was given an opportunity to suggest that a patient with a problem be referred for help. Some interviewers, however, were disappointed that immediate help was not always forthcoming. If the interviewers' desire to help patients was only partially met by the interview process, how was morale sustained? The answer apparently lies in the individual supervision and group support provided.

Each interviewer was closely supervised on an individual basis. Team spirit was fostered by three meetings which served (1) to keep the interviewers informed of the progress of data analysis; (2) to give them opportunity to exchange views about improving the questionnaire and (3) to obtain their suggestions for improving patient care.

VOLUNTEERS VIEW THEIR EXPERIENCE

Sixteen volunteers assessed their experience by means of a special questionnaire. They consistently rated their experience a good one. They described it as interesting, out-of-the-ordinary, informative, worthwhile, meaningful, and helpful. With one mild demurrer, the group felt the project fit their needs well.

The women emphasized satisfactions from helping and being in contact with patients. Fifteen cited these as their greatest satisfactions. Most felt that the interviews had been of immediate help to the patient aside from their research value.

One interviewer summed up the general sentiment succinctly:

> For many of the patients the interview is the only touch with the outside world. Many felt that they could tell us their troubles, hopes, etc., and they did. These people felt that the professional staff were too busy for such trivial talk. They were made happier by the visit of the interviewers.

Yet the interview was not helpful enough to satisfy most of the group. Just over half reported their greatest frustration was in feeling constrained by impersonal aspects of the research role or in not being able to help patients more. Difficulties cited most often among a list were "finding time to give to the project" and "giving the project priority over other commitments." About a third found it somewhat difficult to be in contact with so many chronically ill and disabled patients.

Typical was the following comment:

> I had never seen chronically ill and disabled persons before and I found it depressing. I felt that sometimes I was able

> to bring them a little cheer but underneath and afterward I felt sad and depressed to think of the poor outlook of so many of these persons . . .

Four-fifths of the group reported one or more difficulties. We believe that more ladies would have dropped out if it weren't for their capacity to respond to the professional way in which they were treated, and to handle their frustrations accordingly.

The volunteers were generally challenged by the high standards and professional climate sustained by staff. Most surmounted frustrations by deriving immediate gratifications, not only from the feeling that the interview itself helped, but also from the process of personal growth.

One woman, who responded to supervision to improve her early interviews, said:

> I find working with and under the supervision of serious minded people tends to make me more serious about the job I am doing—this, in turn, tends to make me do a better job than I ordinarily might do and if I think I'm doing a good job, I am self-rewarded . . .

Most of the volunteers rated professional aspects of the project, such as supervision of their work and participation in research as at least fairly important gratifications. Another aspect of personal growth cited by most was the development of greater insight into the problems of older, sick and disabled persons. Nearly half saw implications for their own lives.

One lady spoke for at least half the group stating that:

> This was an infinitely more professionally-oriented kind of experience than any other volunteer job I've ever done. I felt that the professional staff set good standards for us, trained us adequately, and had respect for us as volunteers. I really felt that I was part of a team and that what I did was important to the overall project. There was none of the "Lady Bountiful" aspect to this project.

VALUE OF VOLUNTEER INTERVIEWERS

From our point of view, profits from the volunteer project clearly outweighed losses. Of 935 patients interviewed, volunteers interviewed 82%. Staff interviewed the rest. The data suffer somewhat from the lack of sophisticated probing for complete, clear and relevant answers. While these data would not meet standards for an experimental test of specific hypotheses, the data was very adequate for our exploratory purposes.

Our volunteers were at least as dependable over a long period of time as

paid interviewers would have been. Nine women stayed with the project to the very end. The average duration for all 17 women was 7.7 months. They contributed an average of 46 interviews per person.

Several dividends were unexpected. Cheating was not a problem as it can be with paid interviewers. Then, at the end of the project, a group of our ladies helped conduct 100 special pre-discharge interviews. Another dividend was the assignment of vocational workshop trainees to our program as coders and statistical clerks.

Using volunteers provided invaluable pre-Medicare baseline data which could not have otherwise been collected. The $2500 it would have cost was not available. A more fundamental value was the impetus the project provided for establishing the research program as a continuing unit. Data collected by the volunteers was utilized in preparing two grant applications, one of which was funded.

The institution also benefitted. The presence of volunteer interviewers provided a free welcoming service for patients. Their non-judgemental posture may have served to reinforce the professional ideals of treatment. One effect of our project remains—a face sheet routinely used by social service. We believe that the efforts of the Director of Volunteers to expand the areas in which modern "special volunteers" can make a meaningful contribution has been enhanced.

FACTORS CONDUCIVE TO SUCCESS

The need to obtain research data before financing can be arranged is the basic circumstance calling for volunteer interviewers. Other necessary conditions include one or more staff persons available for supervision, a reservoir of volunteers, and a cooperative administration.

Other circumstances can help insure success. The availability of our secretary to interview when no volunteer was present was important. Screening can discourage volunteers ill-suited for interviewing. Team spirit and group loyalty can help sustain the morale of women with diverse interests.

Only 2 interviewers failed to make a significant contribution. While the quality of interviewing varied, it was not a major problem among those who stayed. A more practical measure of performance was dependability—how long did the volunteer stay with us and what was her monthly rate of interviews? By comparing the most dependable with the least dependable we can identify characteristics of volunteers which appear related to high performance.

While 16 volunteers is a small number on which to base conclusions, the differences between the high and low dependability groups seem to hang together consistently. The findings suggest the influence of three factors: availability of time, perseverance and organizational loyalty,

and the ability to gain satisfactions from an action-research role in spite of frustrations. These conclusions are supported by 3 sets of findings.

First, the women who delivered the most over the longest period of time were more likely than the less dependable group: to be over 55; to be single or widowed; to have no children under 14; to have retired rather recently; and to experience little difficulty in finding time for the project even though they were more likely to be volunteering elsewhere. In short, the more dependable women seemed more likely to have fewer homemaker responsibilities, and to be able to give what time they had more easily.

Second, the more dependable were more likely: to have had careers; to have volunteered at Burke before; to consider it important that their volunteering was credited to the civic organization they represented; and to have been part of the original group of 11 trainees. The more dependable group appeared more likely to have developed habits of perseverance and loyalty either in lifetime careers or in their organizational ties including those to Burke and to the project.

Third, the more dependable women were more likely: to mention that doing research was satisfying; to consider a research project at least as desirable as an action project; and to experience less difficulty handling the research role and less frustration over not being able to help patients more.

The more dependable group was also more likely to consider work with older patients at least as desirable as work with younger patients, even though they were more likely to report negative reactions to so many chronically ill and disabled patients. They were more likely to feel that helping patients was the most important thing they gained from the project. They were apparently better able to combine the satisfactions of helping with the satisfactions of research.

Strongly suggestive of this group's dual definition of their role as a helping researcher is the following: while the more dependable group was most likely to cite research as satisfying, they felt that the patients saw them not as a researcher but as a social worker or friendly visitor. In contrast, virtually all of the less dependable group, which preferred an action role to the frustrations of research, felt patients saw them as a researcher.

Our experience has, nevertheless, shown the value of forming a somewhat heterogeneous group. While they varied in background, in preferring research or action, and in their dependability and capability, all were interested in meaningful work, and almost all made a contribution. Busy, enthusiastic mothers with young children and talented women considering a return to school or work, are assets even though they may leave the project sooner.

SUMMARY

We have learned that volunteers can successfully complete a long term research mission in a sensitive action setting. Our experience indicates that selected volunteers can also serve as adequate coders. Community agencies with research or demonstration components can reap significant benefits from developing such innovative roles for modern volunteers.

Perhaps the greatest potential area for using volunteers in new action roles is that of meeting the social and emotional needs of patients and clients. Volunteers could assist overburdened social service staff and render crucial help to patients adjusting to institutionalization. Volunteers who bring the outside world into institutional life are especially helpful for the elderly, for those whose socio-economic resources are limited, and for those whose ties to community are tenuous.

The traditional role of friendly visitor can be broken down into several important functions which might better be served by specific new roles. These include admitting hostesses, supportive counseling aides, recreation aides, and information and referral aides. The need is for more volunteer specialists from all educational levels, whose sensitive interpersonal skills and specialized knowledge can be effectively utilized. These pre-professional roles for volunteers can be organized and supervised so as to select and prepare participants for possible return to professional training. Volunteers can help to develop models for new careers through participation in research and demonstration.

Such projects can attract volunteers to work with neglected groups like the chronically ill, institutionalized children, and the aged. Three of our volunteers were 65 and older themselves. The fact that all three were among the most dependable volunteers points up the potential of our untapped reservoir of healthy aging persons to make their experience count.

In summary, "Lady Bountiful" is fast disappearing. As the modern volunteer emerges into more meaningful activities, however, there remains a gap between the ideal of the responsible volunteer as member of the team and the resistance by staff and volunteer alike to breaking through the traditional barriers between them. To fill the gap we need to develop new creative roles in which more volunteers are trained, supervised, and trusted to do the specialized tasks which are vital for the continued humanizing of our bureaucratized institutions and agencies.

THE VOLUNTEER ON A SPECIAL KIND OF TEAM*

by
Cynthia R. Nathan
Director, Office of Citizen Participation
Social and Rehabilitation Service
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

I am honored to be your first speaker in this exciting three-day workshop on volunteers and to bring you the view from the Federal perch.

I want to share with you the accomplishments and hopes, the programs and objectives, the philosophy and plans, of the Office of Citizen Participation. I want to talk about orientation and services.

Your chairman has asked me to speak with honesty and candor. I shall not sweep problems and frustrations under the rug,but at this moment I am filled with expectant hope and confidence that volunteers, like shorter skirts, will be in vogue for some time to come.

Whenever a new Administration takes the reins of office, staff in the various Departments of the Executive Branch wait with anxiety for some indication of the probable fate of the programs they have nurtured. The Office of Citizen Participation has been very fortunate. Moments after being sworn into office, the new President said in his inaugural address, "Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government, to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed."

That was on Monday. Less than one week later, on Sunday, January 26, Washington's leading newspaper carried the headlines, "Nixon Seeks Social-Aid Volunteers." The story was not buried on the woman's pages. It began boldly, on page one, proclaiming, "The Nixon Administration is preparing a Government-wide and Nationwide drive to pit millions of citizen volunteers against the country's social ills. Some presidential aides say this program of government-encouraged 'voluntary action' will be 'a central theme' of the new Administration."

Now both the sun and the spotlight shine on the social agency and the volunteer. The questions now are whether the professional will invite the volunteer to share the stage, and what role the volunteer will play. We can only hope that some professional leaders who have been fearful, unconvinced, and overprotective will begin to work as hard at including the volunteer, as they have worked in the past at excluding him. We can only hope that agency leaders will make an all-out effort to keep the volunteer on board with useful duties and will ease the restrictions and caveats which have encouraged the volunteer to look for the nearest

*Prepared for presentation to the Child Welfare League of America—South Pacific Regional Conference, Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California, Monday, February 24, 1969.

debarkation point and to regard his agency captain as a restricting captor.

The theme of this workshop is "Volunteers—On the Sideline or On the Team?" If we are thinking of the team as one thinks of a team of horses, then let the volunteer be on the sidelines, walking, riding his bicycle, or driving his car, for a characteristic of the best team of horses is that each pulls with equal weight and matched step. On such a team individuality and differences are repressed and all must function in the same way. If we are thinking of the team as a baseball team, and if we concentrate on that phase in which each player moves up to the same plate and swings at the same ball, then let the volunteer sit in the stadium and root for victory or hoot for defeat, as his prejudices or whims dictate. But if we can think of that same baseball team in which one is pitcher, one is catcher, one is out-fielder, and one is first-baseman, then make way for the volunteer, because he belongs on that team. The point is that the volunteer has an important contribution to make, but it is a unique contribution. It neither parallels nor duplicates the tasks, the functions, or the methods of the professional. If the professional seeks to make the volunteer over in his own image, he will kill the warmth, the individuality, the neighborliness, the nonprofessional assets which the volunteer can bring to the team effort. The volunteer is not a substitute professional. His task is to complement, to supplement, not to supplant.

Frustration and disappointment can only result if the volunteer is viewed as an understudy or pinch-hitter for an under-staffed office. Neither psychiatrist, social worker, nor psychologist can be pinch-hitters for the other. Yet together, they form a unique team, in which the end product is greater than the sum of its parts.

What then, is the unique contribution which the volunteer can make? First of all, he is of the community. He will always symbolize to the clients of an agency the commitment and concern of the citizenry. He comes, not to be paid in salary, but to be paid in satisfaction and in accomplishment. He hopes that through his efforts, the whole world, or an infinitesimal part of it, will be better because of his efforts to make it so.

We must then assure that his identity as a volunteer is made known to client and staff alike. It is ego-building for clients to know that someone is investing his most precious commodity, time, the only dimension of life, in his behalf. It should be comforting to staff to know that at least part of the community is with them, in a very real and corporeal sense, at least.

The volunteer can make a unique contribution as an aware and vocal citizen, working for the general betterment as he perceives general needs through exposure to individual unmet needs. He can reach his own

particular publics in a personal and effective way. Friends, neighbors, blood brothers and soul brothers, fellow-parishioners and fellow-club members, are more likely to accept what the volunteer says because he is one of them, because he reports first-hand observations, and because he is obviously not paid by the establishment. He is not suspect nor should he be.

Have we, in our orientation programs, encouraged the volunteer to understand that speaking out is among the valuable services he can render? I think we may wish to consider this point together for a moment.

I have scanned many orientation outlines for volunteers. They all include caveats about confidentiality. It is only right that they should, because we would not want neighbors to point at Mrs. Jones and say that her adopted baby was illegitimate, nor to point at Mr. Smith and say that he really was not away on business but was serving a prison sentence. We are so fearful that a non-professional may gossip or play the game of "Guess Who!" that we sometimes neglect the importance of reporting and of adapting the game of "Show and Tell."

We have long oriented the volunteer to his duties and responsibilities in social agencies by telling him that he must observe well, so that he can report to the caseworker. We have told him he must listen well and attentively so that the client may gain release. But, we have also sometimes immobilized him by overemphasizing that what he hears and sees must be kept in the strictest confidence.

I would have the volunteer understand that he must look well, so that he will also tell what he saw to neighbors and to legislators. I would have him listen so that he will also tell what he heard to his ill-informed brothers. I would have him pay attention so that he can become a link in the atrophied art of communication between people, too many of whom have stopped hearing, even when they listen.

My orientation would be not only to the importance of silence when it comes to identifying any client by name, but also to the obligation for identifying and seeking to correct through citizen action, the social ills he would never have seen, but for his service as a volunteer.

Typically I scan the orientation outlines and look in vain for the part which says, "Take up the challenge, for yours is the right, if not the obligation, to tell it like it is, to communicate to others what your senses have communicated to you." Speak out about the smells of uncollected garbage in the ghettos, the fearsome sound of a rat scratching in a wall, the sight of a mother's anguished face, when she is dispossessed. Do your part as a citizen and with the knowledge gained through service, share your insights with other citizens, so that opportunities may be opened, injustices corrected, and equality achieved.

If we, as the new Administration plans, are to "pit millions of citizen volunteers against the country's social ills," then we must identify these ills. As child welfare workers, we must face them in all their horror, for they are an inescapable part of the world which the maturing child will encounter. The air he breathes is being poisoned. The rivers in which he will swim are being polluted. The cities in which he must live are decaying. Rodents and riots are part of ghetto life. The generation gap has widened to a chasm. Walls of misunderstanding separate black from white, migrant from homeowner, slum dweller from suburbanite, student from trustee. Illegitimacy mounts. Venereal disease spreads. There is hunger in a land of plenty.

It is my unshakeable conviction that these ills are tolerated only because the large majority of the citizenry does not know the real meaning of these evils in a personal, intimate, emotional sense. I can force this captive audience to listen to a recitation of facts, but this will entice few of you to action. I can tell you that 12% of AFDC families, according to a study just concluded, do not have even one sheet and one blanket for each bed and that 30% do not have one bed per child. "Too bad," you say and mean it. I can report to a group interested in preserving family unity that one out of four AFDC families cannot sit down together for any meal because they lack sufficient chairs. "Too bad," you say and mean it. I can tell those among you who pour cream into your coffee or carefully measure the low calorie substitute, that half the AFDC mothers in this nation said they could not always buy milk for their children, because there was no money. Does it stir you who pay $21 a night for a hotel room to know that the average AFDC payment is $42.15 per person per month? There were five million, six hundred thousand persons receiving AFDC payments in July, 1968. Five million is a figure that is too large to be impressive. Five million makes less impact than the direct sight of one child measuring his portion of beans against that of his brothers. Six hundred thousand makes less impact than the tears of a single child who cannot accompany his class to the zoo because the 50 cents to do so would mean no dinner. And a hungry child can neither grow nor learn.

I would orient every volunteer by exposure to society's ills. I would require every volunteer to visit the homes of welfare recipients, in home visitation projects, such as have been undertaken with great success, for community leaders, in a variety of cities, because every volunteer must become a community leader in his own way. Many sincere and devoted professionals still recoil at the idea of allowing a layman to accompany a worker into the client's home, fearing that this may violate privacy and constitute a betrayal of confidentiality. I value privacy and respect confidentiality. So does the venerable professional State Charities Aid Association of New York. Yet this voluntary agency lent its prestige to

help in initiating home visitation. Then in its booklet entitled *Is It Safe? Is It Right? Is It Wise?*, it answered all three questions in the affirmative.

To guard against the possibility that there may still be conscientious objectors to my militant advocacy of this effective method, I have fortified myself with sample testimonials, and offer them here, not only from New York, but from a voluntary agency in Michigan and a public agency in New Orleans.

The Michigan Welfare League, a participating agency of the Michigan United Fund, aided by photographs from the respected Family Service Association of America, produced the pamphlet, *The Inside Story*, which urges each citizen to learn about poverty for himself, "not on sightseeing tours through the slum sections of town, but by accompanying a caseworker" on "regular visits into the homes of the poor."

The Louisiana Department of Public Welfare together with the Orleans Parish Department of Public Welfare published *The Great Untapped Resource*, reporting on results when community leaders were brought "into the homes of public assistance recipients so that they could form their own judgements of the need" and "then try to determine the causes of what they had witnessed and collectively seek remedies."

Says the report, "the visits to the homes transformed images into human beings." It "raised the curtain on a way of living" of which there had only been awareness. It helped the citizen to say, "there but for the grace of God go I." Said one participant, "I could not believe such dire poverty existed." Said another, "I've read about it but I've never seen it." I have heard of no instance in which a client regarded this as an invasion of his privacy, rather he was pleased at the opportunity to tell it like it is to an outsider.

There are other devices I would use for orienting volunteers to the social ills which are the concerns of the social agency. I would ask them to go directly from the wide halls and well-lit rooms, the ample play-yard of a suburban school, which is surrounded by private homes with wide halls and well-lit rooms and play-yards, to an inner city school with its crowded halls and dingy rooms and postage stamp sized play-yards, surrounded by dwellings whose hallways are narrow, whose rooms are dingy and which have no play-yards.

I would have them park their cars near a client's home and by public transportation make their way to the nearest hospital, to the welfare office, and by footpower alone do the day's shopping for their own families, noting well the differences in the quality and prices of their purchases and carrying these purchases without help to the client's front door. I would have them seek housing, by foot, and attempt to stay within the welfare allowance. Then, and only then, will there be meaning in the knowledge that the average monthly AFDC payment for

rent, light, heat, gas, clothing, transportation, recreation, incidentals, and food is less than $1.50 per day.

I would give honor to necessity for supporting the casework plan, but like the TV networks, I believe I would give equal time to pointing out that millions of casework plans for millions of individual clients have eradicated neither hunger nor rats, have produced neither enough decent and low cost inner city housing units nor inner city day care centers. I would point out that only the citizen's involvement, the American sense of fair play, and the generous neighborly heart which has always been characteristic of Americans, can alter these ills. Americans will respond as they have always responded, if they are given the opportunity to know and the invitation and challenge to overcome specific social ills.

I have spoken of home visitation and of a client's eye view of transportation and shopping, but only as part of orientation. The volunteer has rendered such an endless variety of valuable services with reliability, responsibility, and profit that a mere enumeration of methods and accomplishments could not be crowded into a volume the size of a mail order catalogue.

In our own agencies, the development of volunteer services is best characterized as uneven. No two States and no two counties within any State utilize volunteers in quite the same way. Most, by far, have neither a volunteer coordinator or director, nor even a volunteer program. This, in spite of the fact that the 1962 Amendments to the Social Security Act provided that 75% of all costs of volunteer services could be borne by the Federal Government. A few States did undertake demonstration projects when we agreed to pay 100% of the costs, and some local departments have long had volunteer programs. But five years after the 1962 Amendments, public welfare departments and their child welfare services were still largely closed to citizens who wished to volunteer their services, without cost. Then came the 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act requiring each State to develop by July 1, 1969, a plan for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in every one of its public assistance programs. This includes not only Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, Old Age Assistance, Medicaid, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children, but also the children's programs with which you are all familiar, Maternal and Child Health, Crippled Children's and Child Welfare Services.

We have already required each State to establish a position for a State director of volunteer services with July 1 of this year as a deadline. We have asked each of our nine Regional Offices to designate a person who will serve as liaison with the HEW-SRS Office of Citizen Participation, in Washington. The gates are about to be opened. We hope for no less

than a million persons, rich and poor, young and old, men and women, to become members of a VOW Corps, as Volunteers of Welfare.

I am often asked why the "carrot before the horse," which the 1962 Amendments offered, was not hungrily devoured. I think it was partly because so many carrots were offered at once, that even a famished horse would have wound up with indigestion. The biggest carrot was certainly the offer to raise the Federal share of salaries from 50% to 75% if casework services were added. The homemaker services carrot looked very attractive; so did social group work, home economics, services to alcoholics, services to the retarded. Another possible explanation for the withered carrot designed to encourage volunteer programs is that the welfare horse was so exhausted from the tremendous load he was carrying that he could not muster up that 25% of energy necessary to claim his 75% prize money.

Fortunately, however, thanks to the few demonstration projects, thanks to the many, many local stimulants provided by the independent sector, and thanks, too, to the foresight and conviction of some leaders and innovators within the ranks of public agencies, we now have a smorgasbord of effective services for communities to sample. All are valuable. All are proof that volunteers bring a plus quality to client services which can be obtained in no other way.

So wide is the gamut, so varied the contribution, that ours is truly a before the cradle to after the grave operation, in which volunteers help to disseminate birth control information and leave in their wills body organs as well as funds for those in need.

We set no age limits. The very old have served well. And even infants play their part as decoys and icebreakers. It was an infant in the family to family program who broke an awkward silence in the first meeting between a recipient and non-recipient family by reaching out to a responsive toddler. And I was amused to note that one of the national winners in the recent Lane Bryant Volunteers Awards was a young suburban mother, who with others, did her bit in crime prevention by using her baby to avoid suspicion. Wheeling her carriage, ever faster and faster, she tracked down the leaders of an organized crime ring. Of course, one could argue that technically her baby was more a draftee than a volunteer.

Let me single out, merely because one must give body by example, the services offered in the District of Columbia to institutionalized children. These are well-developed and continually expanding. Leaders in child welfare have long deplored the practice of placing infants in institutions, pointing out that a child must have the stimulation which comes from personal interaction. At Junior Village, as in many other large institutions, the public payroll provides no time for hard-pressed staff to hold and cuddle a tiny baby. The difference that volunteers make is the

difference between the arrival of an impersonal bottle at feeding time, and a volunteer's soft arms to hold an infant when he nurses and a volunteer's encouraging hands to help the baby expel his elusive burp. Volunteer service makes the difference between the unnatural and frightening silence one often finds in a ward full of babies who have learned that crying brings no response and the chorus of cries which signify trust and reliance on the outside world. In Children's Village, volunteers find the time to click and coo, and to cuddle society's rejects. In Children's Village, babies cry. Volunteer service knows no barriers and one may see white volunteers holding black babies in a reversal of the long-familiar Mammy role.

At Children's Village, college students are among those who invade the quarters of the preschooler, sparking them to life with countless diversions. They swing them round and round till they are dizzy, throw them into the air, roughhouse with the energy which only the young possess, tell stories, read, count, identify colors, play games, and replace monotony with growth and proof that someone cares.

Summer-time which is often a time of institutional doldrums, with schools closed, is an exciting time at Junior Village because hundreds of volunteers serve daily, transforming the institution into a summer camp. They organize regular trips to expose the children to the cultural resources of a great metropolitan center. Adult volunteers are joined in the summer by an army of youngsters. Their presence makes the difference between the prison pallor one so often sees in institutionalized children and the sparkle of the toddler who is wheeled outside for fresh air and sunshine, the difference between the vacant look which comes from staring at blank walls and the alertness which comes from watching a robin tug at an earthworm. There are dramatics, swimming, an arts and crafts program, trips to the zoo, the aquarium, the public buildings. There are picnics and competitions. There is tennis taught by a pro. There are even discussions on politics to emphasize the exciting potential of life in a capital city.

It is hard to count all the gains, but we know that more than the children profit. The volunteers, recruited from the ghetto schools as well as the high income areas, swim with the children, and learn crafts even as they teach. Rich and poor, black and white teenagers, learn to know each other as partners, without the artificiality of busing, and with a common goal of giving and sharing talents.

And what of the staff? Well, of course, there were resistances. There always are. In discussing the *"Professional and the Volunteer in Corrections: Truce or Consequences,"* the Volunteer Courts Newsletter of February 1969 states, "The big block to Court Volunteerism today is not volunteer recruiting; it is not training of volunteers; it is not lack of communications or poverty of funding. It is the corrections profession-

al, the one who has not yet tried volunteers." I am a professional myself, and I know that when you care you fear that someone else may not do the job as well as you might. When you are overburdened, you are reluctant to add to your responsibilities, knowing that planning, and supervision, and availability are essential ingredients to a successful volunteer program. We have gone through resistances to volunteers with the trained nurse and the trained teacher. Why should the trained social worker be any different? We must simply accept this as a fact of life, a difficulty to be overcome. It is worth the struggle. Let me tell you about one worker who had grave professional doubts about the advisability of promoting the family to family program, because she feared volunteers might do more harm than good. One year later, she still had professional doubts about the program, but the new doubts were because it did not seem quite fair to offer this wonderful service only to some clients, because it could not yet be made available to all clients.

And in passing, I cannot help but observe, that unlike the accused criminal, the volunteer seems to be regarded as guilty until proved innocent, and to welcome a long period of service once his innocence is established.

Volunteers have proved their value at Junior Village for years and the staff sings their praise. But there was great resistance to the idea of including fourteen and fifteen year olds in the recent summer volunteer program. There were special and valid reasons for their inclusion. The long, hot summers in Washington are dismal. One must be at least sixteen to participate in work programs, including the Youth Opportunity Campaign. Yet, fourteen and fifteen year olds are successful junior counselors in private camps. The Junior Village staff, reluctantly agreed to try and found that these youngsters can indeed be patient, helpful, reliable, and devoted. Staff has now invited them, along with older volunteers, to help to plan next summer's activities.

Many of the Children's Village volunteers are from AFDC families. They could never have served without help to pay their carfare. As volunteers, they accumulate valuable experience. They are exposed to the world of work. They develop the confidence which comes only from successful doing. And because careful records are kept on their contributions, they can give a reference, often the only reference, which will help them to obtain paid employment in the future. They have proof both for themselves and for the world that they are capable of contributing to society. And a person who is allowed to play his part in building up will be less inclined to tear down.

Let us agree that giving service is ego-building. Let us agree that the persons who are in financial need require proof of their worth as much as, if not more than, others. Let us agree that it is the privilege

and right of every person to serve and that the expenses necessary to giving service should not constitute a bar to the opportunity to serve as a volunteer. By July 1, 1969 we require that State plans make provision for partially paid volunteers, so that the poor as well as the affluent may serve.

I am often asked how one can distinguish between a sub-professional and a partially paid volunteer. I would call attention to profound differences in three areas at least. The sub-professional is an employee. He receives a salary based on the position he occupies. A beginning homemaker is paid a fixed sum for beginning homemakers, which may be different from the fixed sum paid to a translator-interpreter. The volunteer, on the other hand, receives a sum which is based not on the job he occupies, but on his costs of giving service. The retired teacher living on an inadequate pension would receive the same reimbursement for carfare as the needy student.

The sub-professional enters a career ladder. After a stated period of service, he will receive additional pay based on longevity. He will also look forward to promotion to a position requiring higher skills, which also carries a higher salary. The volunteer advances in skill, but he is rewarded not with higher payments but with a greater challenge.

The sub-professional performs duties which the agency has recognized are a part of its basic responsibility. The volunteer performs duties which are not now, or not yet, a recognized obligation of the agency. Thus babies must be fed by staff but not necessarily held while being fed. Children must attend school, but not necessarily given individualized coaching.

And of course, the volunteer, who represents the independent sector, is freer in exercising his independence because he is not dependent on salary for his very existence. This means that the volunteer will remain only when his service is satisfying, and to be satisfying, it must be realistic.

Let me give you an example of a highly realistic program, which was undertaken under Red Cross auspices by a Mennonite group of volunteers. They offered a specially-tailored course on infant care to those who were actually caring for the babies of migrants. Their students? Children as young as six. Said the director of the very successful project, with great modesty, "We were only being realistic. It is these young children who care for the babies while the mothers work in the fields." Now lest there be any misunderstanding, my strong endorsement of these volunteer programs means neither that I favor institutional care for children nor that I believe it is right for a first or a third grader to be responsible for the day-long care of an infant, but until such time as we close down our institutions and provide more suitable

provisions for migrant children, we must do everything we can to promote the physical and emotional health of children.

It is not only the young who should be liberated from institutional confinement, but the old as well. In a project supported by our rehabilitation service, young volunteers from both Harvard and Radcliffe take up residence in a half-way house, helping psychiatric patients, many of whom have been confined for more than a decade, to return and to adjust to the outside world of reality. In Boulder, Colorado, a project supported by our Office of Juvenile Delinquency has sparked a national movement for volunteers in every phase of court work, so that youngsters and adolescents will not have to be sent to correctional institutions. We know that in many areas caseloads of astronomical proportions make probation a mockery. We now see the difference in lowered rates of recidivism when volunteers bring their efforts to bear on correcting the causes of crime, and take a day-to-day personal interest in the juvenile who has run afoul of the law, sometimes agreeing to serve as foster parent, in the face of knowledge that the child has been adjudicated a delinquent. In Utah, a fraternity "adopted" a delinquent. In Kalamazoo, Michigan, the welfare agency recruited college volunteers for youngsters who are returned to AFDC families after discharge from training schools. The college students have less difficulty in establishing rapport than do adults because the age difference is not great and it is easier to make a beginning while you pitch ball and go on hikes.

Foster family care offers a less explored area for volunteers, although they are used in such activities as recruitment, shopping, transportation for medical and dental services and observation of child behavior. There are two projects in Chicago which I wish every community might copy. They are Operation Talent, in which a volunteer undertakes to help a child in foster care to develop an identified talent. The volunteer provides both the enriching exposure, for example, by outings to museums, to the theatre or ballet, and also arranges for special lessons to develop the child's talent. In the other program, as I understand it, every child in foster care who enters the senior class in high school gets a special volunteer who helps him with career planning. It is recognized that most foster parents, who are really partially paid volunteers themselves, have enough to do too in providing for the physical needs of children placed in their care, and lack the capacity for the painstaking exploration essential in the selection of a college, or trade school, in filing for scholarship aid, or in choosing a career. Any parent who has helped his own child through this process knows that it almost assumes the proportions of a full-time job, a job which cannot be done by the high school advisor nor by a caseworker responsible for an entire caseload.

I have mentioned only a few of the services provided for children who are institutionalized or in family foster care. There are also outstanding

volunteer programs in AFDC. Many waiting rooms now contain a children's corner operated by volunteers. Sometimes the volunteers are students as in St. Paul where they run a free soda bar. Sometimes the volunteers are recipients, as in Kingsbridge, in the Bronx, and sometimes they conatin a mix representative of the community. All have one characteristic in common. They provide a growing experience for children who would otherwise sit and fidget. They provide scissors and paste for a child who might otherwise cut up. They provide paper and bright paints for a child so that the world will not have to color him an angry or frustrated red. There is indeed no limit to the services youngsters give. In Cincinnati, Ohio, junior high school students work alongside adults preparing and delivering meals to aged persons living in their own homes. In Pennsylvania, teenagers paint and repair the homes of aged recipients.

I have deliberately avoided mention of the volunteer who serves on the traditional team, taking part in staff conferences, providing increased insights about the client, and giving supportive therapy to the client because I know that later speakers will do so.

I want merely to indicate that we will conquer social ills only when we give the volunteer the chance to know social ills and when we encourage his participation in eradicating social ills. Remember that the volunteer cares and works only because he cares. Remember that his only reward is success. And because he is that unique citizen who works only because he cares, we must count on him to attack our nation's social ills with vigor and success. Let's welcome him to the child welfare team.

THE CHALLENGE OF VOLUNTARY ACTION*

by

A. WRIGHT ELLIOTT

Member, President's Task Force on Voluntary Action

Representing the President's Task Force on Voluntary Action, it is a real honor and privilege, and a welcomed opportunity, to be with you today. As you know, many exciting things happened this week including the appointment of Max Fisher to chair the President's program for Voluntary Action.

Few beliefs receive so warm a reception, and such universal agreement, in America, as the very basic premise that people—individually—and in groups—should participate in making as many decisions as possible, concerning their own lives. Paradoxically, however, there seems to be a universal doubt within our society that grass roots, voluntary action is really possible on a meaningful scale, particularly when we look at the myriad of complex problems confronting us.

But, in spite of this doubt, in recent months we have witnessed a phenomenal resurgence of thought, not only that voluntary action is once again possible; but even more important, a resurgence of belief that voluntary action holds the very key to the solution of many of our pressing social ills. These sentiments have been echoed by the President himself; by several Cabinet officials; and by leading private citizens across the country.

Let us set aside, for a moment, then, the nagging doubts that so many have already expressed, as to the viability of voluntary action; and simply state that this resurgence of thought, in itself, could lead to a basic reorientation in national thinking, in national policy. One parenthetical comment, by the way of introduction, before moving into the three major areas, that I wish to discuss this morning.

Briefly, I am deeply concerned about those "prophets of doom" who are, even before the race has begun, already declaring "voluntary action" the loser. I believe that many of these statements, a large number of which have already been made through the national media, are being made out of a spirit of defensiveness—being made by people whose ideologies, indeed, even whose institutions, are severely threatened by the very prospect of testing the voluntary sector's ability, to impact upon the grave societal problems confronting us.

Admittedly, the very notion of revitalizing our instinctive historical

*A Keynote Address presented at the Massachusetts Assembly on Volunteer Services, May 9, 1969, sponsored by The Center for Continuing Education, Northeastern University.

response to problem solving—voluntary individual action—may sound implausible, anachronistic and even quixotic, particularly in a society where technological development has advanced so rapidly and where change is not the exception, but the norm.

But, let me say, and say imperatively, in this regard: that the task before us is too great; and the stakes involved too high, for any responsible citizen to prejudge, and even condemn, an effort—whose impact may be great—for reasons that might well be less than objective.

Now, to the three major points that I would like to cover this morning: First, a look at the problem of defining voluntary action. Second, a discussion of some of the specific recommendations that emerged from President Nixon's Task Force on Voluntary Action. Third, some projections as to what future developments might emerge in this critical area.

1. To the first point, and an admittedly difficult one, i.e., that of definition. What do we really mean by "voluntary action"?

This is not to discuss definition, for the sake of definition. This would not only be pointless, but would, worse, be a waste of your valuable time. But, as the 16 members of the President's Task Force—split almost evenly between the three sectors of our society—wrestled with defining our terms, we felt that we gained general understanding, and many specific insights.

Perhaps the simplest way for me to attempt to do this, is to discuss in rather traditional terms, the three sectors in our society.

It is admittedly oversimplistic to discuss these three sectors—(1) governmental, (2) non-profit, and (3) for-profit—as if they were totally separate and independent. For it is quite obvious that, in fact, they are very much interrelated; and inextricably so.

But, in a quest for definitional clarity, let me purposely oversimplify, and discuss them as three separate entities.

First, the public, or governmental sector:

It is quite clear that the public, or governmental sector, until the last two or three years, has been assigned, by the majority of our citizenry, as that sector whose task it was to solve our serious social problems. One only need read closely both the literature, and the speeches made, by public officials, for the past several decades, to see that there was truly little real mention, little real expression of faith in either the non-profit, or the "for-profit" sectors, as potential social problem-solvers.

But, somehow, in the past three or four years, a substantial change has occurred. Traditional critics of public sector programs, have now been

joined by many others, who also insist that the public sector, acting singularly, is incapable of solving such problems. Peter Drucker, in his truly remarkable recent book, *The Age of Discontinuity,* suggests that the key role for the governmental sector—under a new division of responsibilities—would be that of planning what should be done, while leaving the "doing" to non-governmental institutions. Drucker's analogy would have government, performing the role of the orchestra-conductor, assisting and guiding all of the instruments as they play in concert, but, playing none itself.

There are, quite obviously, many people, both within the governmental sector, and without, who would quarrel with this concept. But let me suggest that, the mere demand for non-governmental action, because it is now supported both by leading liberals and conservatives, has had, and will continue to have, a profound impact on national policy-formulation.

Now, on moving to the second, to the non-profit sector. I would personally insist that a rather clear distinction be made between the non-profit, and the for-profit institutions. They cannot, I would argue, because of the different basic rationales underlying each, be lumped together as one, as "private"; or "non-governmental."

For, the non-profit institutions are unique because they are a third force between the governmental and the commercial sectors. These institutions are most familiar to those of you in this room and to identify only a few: the private, social service, health and welfare agencies; foundations; professional organizations; youth organizations; fraternal, and religious organizations.

Literally hundreds of thousands of such institutions exist today in this country, and it is my firm assertion to you that, in a negative sense, these institutions have been, until very recently, overwhelmed by massive governmental programming. In a positive sense, however, let me suggest that the "unfreezing," or the "freeing up," of these institutions, offer to us a potentially unique opportunity to bring hundreds of thousands of individual Americans into the fray in new and meaningful ways.

And now, to the third sector, the "for-profit" sector. There is no question in my mind (although I would admit there are serious questions being raised by many individuals in both the governmental and non-profit sectors) that profit-making institutions have, are currently, and will continue to play an accelerated role in social problem-solving, in the years ahead.

There is an unmistakable, growing sense of urgency that has aroused the deep concern of businessmen across this nation. Commitment, which was the first step, is now being translated into reality. And, in my

biased opinion, our ability as a nation, to achieve real progress, depends to a measurable extent on our ability to effectively mobilize both the economic and creative resources of the profit-making sector, on a totally unprecedented scale.

Finally, and still with regard to the for-profit sector, I strongly believe that profit-making institutions can and must be brought into this battle with a uniquely different rationale. Namely, I believe they must be brought in as profit-makers.

As radical as this may seem to many, I am convinced that real breakthroughs are to be achieved, if we are only ingenious enough, to convert social problems into market opportunities. As an example, when we figure out ways to construct low-income housing, so as to truly be profitable for major corporations, then, and perhaps only then, will the houses that we so desperately need, be built within the time-frame required. (This, I think, parenthetically, is the basic assumption underlying Secretary Romney's announced plans in the field of housing.)

By way of summarizing, as to definition: effective voluntary action requires the participation, in different ways, of all three sectors. First, in a new set of important collaborative relationships, whereby they join together to conceptualize and program in cooperative ventures. In some of these cooperative efforts, one sector may be supportive, the other active. In other instances, these roles will most certainly be reversed. Flexibility must be paramount.

Second, and perhaps paradoxically, institutions within the three sectors will at times become vigorous competitors, attacking the same problems, but using different strategies, and different technologies. This does not bother me; indeed, I would welcome both patterns.

Let us actively seek collaboration where we can, and where there is mutuality with regard to goals.

But where the problems are most difficult, when it is desirable that we develop new models, on a competitive basis, let us not shy away from the heat of honest competition, for we shall all, I would assert, derive the benefits of such.

My last comment is simply this. Whether, at any given time, competition, or collaboration, is the "name of the game," we must allow for—and build in—a respect for the autonomy of each sector, and the respective institutions therein. We cannot, must not, over-structure, or over-centralize. Unless we are to suffocate the freedom that must mark voluntary action.

II. Now, to the second section of my remarks, namely, to share with you the major recommendations of the President's Task Force on Vol-

untary Action. I will comment, moreover, as to which of these recommendations have already been acted upon.

Essentially, our recommendations called for three action phases, with a series of specific steps to be taken within each phase.

Phase One, first step: a Presidential letter to all executive agencies, asking each to submit to him, within six months, a report of what their agencies can and will do, as catalytic agents to stimulate voluntary action. Much of this is now being carried forth by the President's Urban Affairs Council, composed of key domestic Cabinet officers. Four of the six key agencies have already responded.

Second step: a recommendation that the President name an Assistant for Voluntary Action, and last week, Mr. Nixon designated Max Fisher of Detroit, head of the New Detroit Committee and a noted volunteer leader, as a Special Consultant, to the President, on Voluntary Action. Mr. Fisher's is a dual role, reporting both to the President and to Secretary Romney of HUD, the Cabinet official having been already assigned the primary responsibility for stimulating voluntary action.

The third step, and still part of the first phase of our report, called for the creation of a public committee on voluntary action, which is at this moment being organized by Mr. Fisher. Fourth, and finally, there was a recommendation for a White House Conference on Voluntary Action, which Mr. Fisher is currently in the process of designing.

Now to the second action phase: we recommended the creation of a National Foundation of Independent Service, two functions of which would be as follows: (1) to organize a nationwide, computer-based system, that would both collect and disseminate information to all interested organizations, as to voluntary programs that have actually worked, with specific descriptions of the methodologies used and under what conditions. A national, automatic "consulting service," in effect. The President has directed the establishment of such in the new Office of Voluntary Action to be located in HUD.

A second major function of the Foundation would be to conduct experiments of all types, the purpose being to legitimate non-governmental approaches and techniques, to problems traditionally relegated to public agencies.

The third action phase of the Task Force's recommendations, called for the creation of an Office of Independent Alternatives, to be located within the Bureau of the Budget. This office would require each Executive Agency to identify specific areas where it would literally legislate itself out of business, when and because non-governmental agencies had demonstrated proven capacities to more effectively solve specific problems. This is now under consideration by the Urban Affairs Council.

Our Task Force also submitted, along with its major recommendations, a list of possible projects that we urged the President to support, but which ultimately called for action on the part of voluntary organizations. I will describe but a few.

(1) Voluntary organizations indigenous to the ghetto might pledge to capitalize and consult with the management of black-owned enterprises, that would produce and distribute goods and services used by ghetto residents;

(2) Church organizations might pledge to care for the pre-school children of disadvantaged parents; i.e., create their own private Head Start Program;

(3) A group of profit-making companies, each representing a specific area of expertise, might come together in a consortium, to design and implement a comprehensive and systematic program to upgrade all living conditions in a given area, to include: housing, education; medical care; employment; transportation; recreation; and information services;

(4) A women's organization might pledge to teach the poor how to manage their money; i.e., develop their own consumer-information effort;

(5) A group of the largest private foundations might pledge to invest a substantial amount of their resources in programs designed to make a major impact in the reduction of drug addiction among young people.

These are only a few, of a long list of ideas that were submitted, many of which might never work, and others of which might, but will never see the light of day. Nonetheless, we felt obligated to submit, if you will, a "laundry list" of potentially "doable projects," because each of us on the Task Force had one very firm conviction: that there were no "pat answers;" that every possible alternative had to be tried.

III. Now to my final comments. I would like to make some specific projections and passing comments as to the future of voluntary-action efforts.

1. I think first, there need be a national commitment to fail. At first glance, this seems rather absurd and is admittedly an over-statement, but what I mean to convey is simply this: I think the very highest of priorities must be assigned to innovation and experimentation. Old problems have simply not yielded to old solutions; and I would postulate that the future of this effort will not only require, but indeed, will demand, an innovative spirit.

However, there is a price that need be paid for innovation. If we are to successfully innovate; if we are truly to take the large risks that are required to succeed; if we are to truly encourage "social entrepreneurship" (and with high risks, come the concomitant high pay-offs); then, we must be prepared, and I say again, indeed, even committed, to tolerate a rather high degree of failure in some of our program efforts.

Let us be honest, at least, with each other. We simply cannot have it both ways. If we are truly seeking new programs—programs that will signify real breakthroughs, then it must be understood, and communicated honestly and forthrightly, that there will be failures, many of them perhaps miserable ones, along the way.

I am really leading to this. We must innovate, but at the same time, this demands a national climate of trust, surrounding these efforts—a climate that will enable us to accept these isolated failures that must inevitably occur, without pointing the partisan fingers of blame—without generating the useless, and moreover, extremely disruptive conflict, that can only inhibit our forward progress; conflict that would sacrifice the successful whole, on the altar of a few failures, for partisan gain.

2. A second projection. I mentioned earlier in my remarks; namely, that the three sectors—governmental; non-profit; and for-profit—would hopefully collaborate much more closely than in the past. At least it is my firm hope and conviction that such collaboration will occur, while at the same time allowing a high degree of organizational autonomy.

But, I also suggested, indeed, even called for competition between the three sectors, and I think this will have serious, but healthy consequences for our respective institutions—yours and mine—and for that matter, for all of our established social and economic institutions.

For as I see it, the die is already cast. Established institutions must not only "get with it" but "stay with it," or suffer the consequences. Competition will most certainly demand high performance; demand that in critical times, such as these, organizations cannot simply sit by doing things the old way, and watch the world pass in review. For perhaps their very survival is at stake.

Competition demands new responses; new structures; new missions; and rewards those institutions that adapt to change. At the same time, it penalizes those who do not. This competitive element, in my opinion, not only will, but to repeat, should underlie a major part of our experimental efforts in the future.

3 My third and last projection. I am convinced that future program efforts will see the introduction of new technology, on a massive scale. I speak not only of hardware, which in many areas will, of course, be significant; but equally important, of systems technology,

and the widescale introduction of behavioral concepts. We can ill afford not to use this new technology, this new knowledge. Indeed, we must use it, and force it to work in a strong drive to rehabilitate the citizenry's capacity for public service.

My concluding comments, then, are very brief.

I am personally encouraged, excited, and optimistic about the future. We hear far too much today from the "prophets of doom"; we seem to read only about, and to watch on the news, every night—only the despair, only the hate, and the violence; and almost never—the hope, the successes, the love, that does in fact permeate so much of our society.

I believe that voluntary action, which includes all of the three great sectors in our society, is on the brink of a great renaissance. It was, still can be, and hopefully will be, the most vital element in our national life.

I would close by paraphrasing a few words written by Dick Cornuelle, one of the leading figures in this effort, a man for whom I worked, and, most important, a true friend. I paraphrase:

> "I am tired of angry words about America, for I am hopeful. I do not, and will not say, that this country is going to hell. I am saying that, perhaps for the first time in our history, America can, indeed, must go, wherever she wants to go. And in the process of going, each citizen can find himself again—by contributing, in his own way, to the creation of the good society."

This challenge I leave with you—in the hope that each of you will accept it, and act vigorously upon it.

CONFERENCE DIALOGUE

Mr. Herman Hemenway
Office of the Mayor, Boston, Mass.

First of all, I want to thank you very much for inviting me to participate in this very fine conference. I would like to share with you my definition of a volunteer that I heard recently at the School Volunteers at Faneuil Hall that I also had the pleasure to attend and it touched me very greatly and I hope it will touch you.

In asking a child in one of the schools in Roxbury-Dorchester area what the definition of a volunteer was and what a volunteer meant to that particular child whose age I forget right now, but the child responded in this manner. 'The volunteer is a lady that comes to the school to help out and says she will be back tomorrow, and she does.'

I think to a great degree I would just like to make a few remarks before I turn the program over to your discussion leaders and the recorders.

I would like to say that volunteerism itself is going to have to reflect the type of stratum, the type of makeup that we want our society to be. The volunteers themselves are going to have to come from the various classes, the various segments economically as has been stated by our society and particularly in our communities, state and cities, but even more pertinent the agencies that are concerned with the administration of volunteer services as well as other services are going to have to involve themselves in this as well.

They are also going to have to reflect by having representatives of those agencies on the paid staff or non-paid staff, blacks and Spanish people, if this is where the problems that are affecting the city needs the greatest help, and needs the help of the volunteers, and it is going to require this type of dedication as well.

I think we have a long way to go, but I think this is going to have to be an initial, an initial action on the part of the agencies and on the part of some of you that know other people that are involved in other strata that should be involved in volunteer services, and I would like to thank the table leaders, the discussion leaders that would be participating at the tables, and with that very short remark I would like to turn the program over to your discussion leaders and recorders.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

An over-all review of table dialogue would indicate the following issues and concerns were evidenced by the discussion groups:

1. Residents of the problem-inner city communities, mostly low income

people, who live the problems to be solved, should be recruited as volunteers and trained to qualify for positions in the decision-making structure of institutions which affect their lives.

2. People with expertise in economics, legislation, urban development should be channeled for the benefit of low income communities at their request.
3. Volunteerism must be extended to include work in one's own community. Suburban people should be working on a volunteer level in their own communities on problems of legislation, housing for low-and-middle-income people, employment and the elimination of racism in their community and their agencies.
4. The inner-city person should have the same control over his future as the person in suburbia. He should have an avenue for communicating his feelings, as the suburbanite has through town meetings.
5. Proposed governmental voluntary action programs should not become a substitute for on-going anti-poverty programs since:
   a. the proper role of the volunteer is to support not administrate a program.
   b. voluntary agencies have learned over the years the limitations of their support role and recognize that voluntary action cannot take over largely administration or direct functions of program operation.
   c. in his support role, the volunteer must be able to deal informally and in a one-to-one relationship with people.
   d. real citizen participation should not be lost as a community self-help goal.
   e. volunteer tasks cannot be computerized into neat little slots; true service meets the challenge of unmet needs.
6. There is a continued need for support to training volunteer coordinators at all levels. Business Sector has a supportive role in this area; some concern about the "profit" factor in this approach by business.
7. At all levels better coordination of voluntary action programs. Need for clearinghouse and area conferences providing dialogue for volunteer leadership.
8. Need to support programs that are innovative and creative if volunteerism is to be an agent of change and the vision of better community life.
9. Guidelines for voluntary commitment should be relevant and flexible. Pilot programs should be encouraged and financed by all sectors.

10. Conventional agencies are not adequate for voluntarism in the 1970's. Representative participation not necessarily appropriate; current needs call for new participation techniques; no one way for an individual to do "his thing."

11. Youth has a new role in voluntary action and should be received by the "establishment" in open dialogue. Decision-making role should be shared.

12. Volunteers need to be appraised of all public and private agency "new thrusts" so that they can be of real assistance—direct and by referral—to the people they work with. No longer are volunteer programs "institutionalized," they are vital community-center programs. The volunteer at the center of the action is the vision of the community and should be informed of all resources.

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

* New Subscription ☐ Renewal ☐

Payment: enclosed ☐ please bill ☐

*Subscription rate for new subscribers is $5.00 per four issue volume.

Make Checks payable to "VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION"

and send to Dr. Marvin S. Arffa, Editor
Volunteer Administration
15 Pleasant Park Road
Sharon, Massachusetts 02067