September 1990

The Use of Volunteers by Governmental Social Services in Israel

Ram A. Cnaan
University of Pennsylvania

The Use of Volunteers by Governmental Social Services in Israel*

Ram A. Cnaan

University of Pennsylvania
School of Social Work

This article studies an important aspect of coprovision in social service agencies. It focuses on how social welfare departments utilize the resources of volunteers. An indepth study of 14 Local Departments of Social Service (LDSS) in Israel identifies several issues regarding the use of volunteers that have theoretical and practical implications not only for social services but also for other government service organizations engaged in coprovision.

Many public agencies over the last fifteen years have had to face a new challenge of how to provide more services with a strained budget. The problem began in the early 1970s when allocations to governmental services in general and social services in particular started to level off. As a result, agencies began to examine alternative and innovative methods of financing services. One significant solution, advocated both in practice and in professional literature, was coprovision (Ferris, 1984; Brudney and England, 1984). Coprovision (coproduction) may be defined as an arrangement by which citizens cooperate with governmental agencies to produce required goods or services. The citizens' contribution can be that of time, money, expertise, or general support. Thus coprovision enables public agencies to serve a larger number of clients and/or provide higher quality services even though their budgets remain constant. Duncombe (1985) noted that in the United States, a majority of the states have volunteer coordination programs. Furthermore, 72.6% of the American cities had official volunteer programs in a variety of areas.

The use of volunteers is not a new social phenomenon. Yet, it is only in the last ten to fifteen years that government agencies have begun to realize that volunteers are a scarce resource – one that should be well organized, wisely managed, and systematically used and one that requires planned investments. This is a new dimension to the use of volunteers and the essence of coprovision (Brudney, 1985; Scott & Sontheimer, 1985).

While there has been considerable interest in using citizen volunteers to help local governments deliver a variety of public services in police (Sundeen & Siegel, 1986) and fire departments (Lozier, 1976), libraries (Walter, 1987), recreation programs (Duncombe, 1985), and medical settings (Anderson & Clacy, 1987), there has been little interest in using volunteer help in public social welfare services except for senior citizen centers. It may be that social services, which had their origins in volunteer associations, did not keep pace with the new systematic management of volunteers. Wood (1980) noted that volunteers are generally used in social service delivery for the following purposes: to enhance the diversity of services, to provide more individual time, to increase public involvement and commitment to service, to create means of directing innovation and enthusiasm, and to increase flexibility. Volunteers may also have better interpersonal relationships with clients and may enhance communication between professionals and clients. That volunteers can play an important role in providing services is well accepted. Nevertheless what an agency should do to best utilize the volunteers' potential, and how it should be done are issues still open to question. Since there is little empirical knowledge on how to manage volunteers in social welfare services, their full potential has yet to be realized.

The purpose of this article is to fill the void in our knowledge regarding the use and management of volunteers by social service agencies. The article first outlines several major issues identified in the literature as relevant to the use of volunteers by human service organizations. It then describes the study setting, i.e., Israeli Local Departments of Social Services (LDSSs). The study method is described and the findings are presented within the context of the issues identified in the literature. These are followed by discussion and conclusions.

Literature Review

Four important issues in the management of volunteer programs are examined; (a) Who are the volunteers? (b) What services do they perform? (c) What kind of support does the professional staff offer? and (d) To what extent is the staff trained to work with volunteers?

Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Volunteers

Several authors have argued that background characteristics are of secondary importance to the motivational and psychological characteristics of volunteers (Gidron, 1984; Kemper, 1980; Miller, 1985; Rubin & Thorelli, 1984). This study, however, focuses on the social services and their use of volunteers, therefore only sociodemographic characteristics are discussed.

A consistent finding in many studies is that women volunteer more than men (Ball, 1978; Cambre, 1984; Chartoff, 1976; Morgan, Dye, & Hybels, 1979). Several explanations for this finding include: availability of time, traditional sex roles, opportunity to gain experience prior to formal education or employment, and a role substitute when children are no longer at home. Luloff, Chittenden, Kriss, Weeks, and Brushett (1984) found that men volunteer more often for boards and civic duties but less frequently to help the poor and needy. The two age groups found to be most involved in volunteerism are the young (usually school children) and the old (usually retired people). Among the elderly, volunteerism may provide a substitute for role losses and for continued feeling of meaningfulness and worthiness (Sainer and Zander, 1971; Chambre, 1984). For young people, volunteerism is often part of an educational program and a means for socialization (Fitzsimmons, 1986; Kelley and Kelley, 1985; Hanks and Ecklund, 1978; Schram, 1985). Gidron (1984) found that in Israeli community centers most volunteers were 18 years of age or younger.

Studies have found that people with high levels of educational achievement tend to volunteer more than people with low levels of educational achievement (ACTION, 1975; Chambre, 1984; Pearce, 1983; Vaillancourt & Payette, 1986).

The literature regarding the association between occupation (i.e., availability of free time) and volunteerism is ambiguous. Hadley and Webb (1975) found that a large group of volunteers had leisure time, i.e., were not full-time workers. Vaillancourt and Payette (1986) found that, in Canada, people who work part-time tend to volunteer more than those who work full-time and those who do not work at all. Chambre (1984) found that the most active volunteers were the better educated and the more affluent who did not work. Morgan et al. (1979) and AC-TION (1975) found a higher likelihood of volunteering among working people than among retired and housewives. These contradictory findings can be attributed to those studies which did not control for the impact of education and income on volunteering.

In summary, the literature shows that more volunteers are women, have above- average education, and are either young or old. The question is to what extent do these characteristics correlate with those of the volunteers who assist Local Departments of Social Services (LDSSs) in coprovision of welfare services in Israel?

Activities Performed by Volunteers

Lauffer and Gorodezky (1977) and the NASW (1977) used four broad categories to describe volunteer activity in social services: policy making, administration, advocacy, and direct service. Each of these categories can be subdivided as Sieder and Kirschbaum (1977) did in the *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. The literature related to the psychic rewards of volunteerism distinguishes between extrinsic benefits (e.g., status, contacts, and improved resume) and compensatory activity to satisfy personal growth needs (Perry, 1983; Rubin & Thorelli, 1984). In this context, it is generally assumed that policy making and administration are more suitable in providing extrinsic benefits, while advocacy and direct practice are better suited to meeting psychological growth needs.

Traditionally, in direct service, more volunteers help the needy elderly than any other disadvantaged goup (Ferris, 1984; Perry, 1983; Taylor & Chatters, 1986; Vinokur-Kaplan, Cibulski, Spiro & Bergman, 1984). The research question is what range

of activities and target population are covered by volunteers in coprovision of welfare services in Israel.

Management of Volunteers

Ellis (1985) noted that, although society has always had volunteers, volunteer program management is less than 20 years old. Pierucci and Noel (1980) and Turner (1972) found that situational variables are relatively more important than personal variables in determining volunteer retention and commitment. Thus the management of volunteers takes an added importance. The management of volunteer programs can be divided into two major elements: (a) recruitment and administration, and (b) professional support. The first deals with attracting new volunteers and assuring compliance with administrative regulations; the latter assures the most effective use of volunteers over time. This distinction is also evident from studies which note that a person's motives in becoming a volunteer may differ considerably from the motives that cause him/her to remain in volunteer work (Gidron, 1984; McPherson & Lockwood, 1980; Rubin & Thorelli, 1984).

The first element in volunteer management programs refers to recruitment, orientation, supervision, protection of volunteers' rights, and maintenance of records of volunteer activities. A Gallup study of volunteers in general revealed that volunteers frequently learn about local volunteer opportunities through informal networks (Gallup Organization, Inc., 1982). Recruitment of volunteers by word-of-mouth is clearly undesirable and costly as many appropriate volunteers are not recruited as their knowledge of the program is limited. Lafata (1980) suggested a variety of methods such as using informal networks or the mass media to recruit volunteers. Christianson (1986) reported one successful recruiting effort that used clients' relatives and retired employees as volunteers in social services that assisted unattractive client groups. Blumenfield and Rocklin (1980) provided an extensive list of recruitment options which will be utilized in this paper.

Recruitment is also associated with screening. This is often a sensitive issue, as screening may discourage people from volunteering when they are threatened with a possible rejection.

Nevertheless, not all volunteers are appropriate to all agencies (Ellis, 1985). Scott and Sontheimer (1985) suggested that most inappropriate volunteers withdraw by their own volition. However, should it be necessary to reject a volunteer, the agency should advise the person of the reason for the rejection and refer him/her to another agency. Salmon (1985) and Pierucci and Noel (1980) argued that, once volunteers are available, the agency should orient them in the actual service setting. Orientation may include verbal presentations, tours of the agency, meeting with clients, meeting with staff members, and receiving manuals and all written information about the agency and the volunteer's expected role. Lafata (1980) and Sainer and Zander (1971) emphasized the importance of routinely recording activities performed by volunteers. Reimbursing volunteers for out-of-pocket expenses can be an important factor in recruiting and retaining volunteers. Finally, there is the issue of who is responsible for the volunteers? Is it a special person, i.e., volunteer coordinator, or is it any agency employee chosen at random to coordinate volunteers? The former indicates greater agency concern for volunteers than does the latter — *ceteris paribus*. Other important issues which are not covered by this study are contracting with volunteers and termination of the volunteer's work.

The second element in volunteer management concerns activities designed to increase job satisfaction, provide intrinsic rewards, and enhance organizational commitment. Gidron (1984) found that, of the four intrinsic variables associated with retention vs. turnover, three — task achievement, task identity, and social contact — were considered important by Israeli volunteers. The fourth variable, preparation, i.e., supervision and orientation, was not considered as important. Daily (1986) found that the four best predictors of organizational commitment among volunteers are: job satisfaction (i.e., task significance, skill variety, and task identity), work autonomy, feedback, and feeling of achievement. The volunteers' commitment is also expected to increase when their work receives recognition, such as certificates, ceremonies, verbal acknowledgements, and symbolic rewards (Gidron, 1984; Salmon, 1985; McClam & Spicuzza, 1983). The professional management of volunteers also includes

the careful matching of volunteers with clients or activities (Sainer & Zander, 1971; Salmon, 1985; Miller, 1985).

In summary, the management of volunteer programs, although a new field, requires competence in recruiting and retaining volunteers. The relevant research question is what is done by LDSSs to maintain coprovision.

Professional Training

According to Israeli regulations, most service providers in LDSSs are social workers. Scheier (1977) argued that professional staff do not support volunteers. Feinstein and Cavanaugh (1976) added that most professionals are neither equipped nor willing to deal with volunteers. Haeuser and Schwartz (1980) and Demoll (1983) attributed this nonsupport to professional training that fails to value volunteerism and therefore fails to teach skills in using volunteers.

Not suprisingly, Stubblefield and Miles (1986) found that 32.6% of the volunteer coordinators have an educational level of less than a baccalaureate degree, while an additional 38.6% have only a baccalaureate degree. The authors found that only about 30% of the volunteers coordinators indicated that they had completed the Association of Volunteer Administration (AVA) certification requirements or were working toward completion. Thus, the relevant research question is to what extent are the social workers and volunteer coordinators qualified to manage and utilize volunteers? An additional question is what are the attitudes of both social workers and volunteer coordinators towards the use of volunteers in the LDSSs.

The Use of Volunteers in Israel

Israeli law requires that each municipality establish a local department of social services (LDSSs). The LDSSs are supervised and financed to a large extent by the Israeli central government through the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. Although the LDSSs are public agencies, there is strong emphasis on the use of volunteers to complement the work of professional social workers, i.e., coprovision.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Services, although a formal government organization, encourages community development and coproduction. For example, as early as 1953, the Ministry initiated a Department for Community Organization. This department finances the salaries and trains more than 90% of the community organizers in Israel who are employed by LDSSs (Cnaan, 1987). In the mid 1970's, the Ministry established a Department of Volunteerism. The department has the responsibility of encouraging and monitoring volunteers employed by LDSSs. Regional supervisors of the department have the task of ensuring that an increasing number of LDSS activities are performed by volunteers.

Official statistics of the Department of Volunteerism indicate a wide use of volunteers. In 1977, LDSSs in Israel had 1,743 volunteers (Orlev, 1978); in 1983, 10,066 volunteers, i.e., nearly a ten-fold increase (Jano, 1984). However this growth in the number of volunteers may not necessarily indicate that volunteers are used wisely and effectively by LDSSs. It is possible that the new national department did not effect any real change in the use of volunteers by LDSSs.

No other chain of social service agencies in Israel, whether private, voluntary, or governmental, uses as many volunteers as the LDSSs. However, their client population, which is among the neediest, is often the least attractive to volunteers. Were volunteer action to be ranked on a continuum of status and power ranging from leading nonprofit organizations to informal local help, LDSS volunteers would be ranked near the latter. They are what Kelley and Kelley (1985) called the "agency volunteers". Using Lauffer and Gorodezky's (1977) typology of volunteer activity, these volunteers are primarily engaged in direct practice.

In Israel there are a few programs that offer courses on the use of volunteers, and these are available to social workers. The Department of Volunteerism provides one program through the Institute for Training of Social Workers. This is a free annual one-day-a-week course designed for those who work with volunteers in LDSSs. York (1987) reported a few courses for volunteer coordinators that are presented in a university. These courses which attract mostly those with little academic education, are geared towards paraprofessionals. Two schools of

social work offer courses in volunteerism. In one school (the smallest in Israel) the course is required. The other school offers the course as an elective. The Schwartz Program which trains managers for community centers and is under the auspices of the Hebrew University (Gidron & Levy, 1980) offers a course in volunteerism, although graduates of this program are not likely to work in LDSS. The relevant research question is how many social workers who interact with LDSS volunteers completed either of these, or other, courses on the use of volunteers?

Major studies on volunteers in Israel have focused on the attractive, middle-class oriented agencies. For example, there have been studies of the effectiveness of an *oldster to oldster* program carried out by the Israeli Social Security Administration (Vinokur-Kaplan, Cibulski, Spiro, & Bergman, 1981) and of the retention and turnover of volunteers in three Israeli Community Centers (Gidron, 1984). One study surveyed members of various voluntary organizations to determine who volunteers were, and why (Peres & Lyn, 1975). Yet, volunteer work in LDSSs, Israel's most significant social service organization, has never been examined from the perspective of the LDSSs themselves.

Study Design

Method

The data presented in this paper were taken from a larger study of the structure and functions of LDSSs in Israel (Cnaan, Korazim, Meller, & Rosenfeld, 1988). A random stratified cluster sample was used to select 14 LDSSs from Israel's central region. All 14 selected LDSSs agreed to participate. They represent the range of small LDSSs (those with 14 social work positions or less) as one stratum and large LDSSs (those with 21 social work positions or over) as the other stratum.

The study was the focus of an advanced research seminar. Each of the 14 students in the seminar was assigned to collect data in a specific LDSS. On the average, the students visited the LDSSs 12 times. Information was collected through interviews, observations, and recorded analysis. The data were gathered in late 1984 over a four month period. One of the major areas

of study in this research was the management of volunteers by
LDSSs. The individuals interviewed on each LDSS for this study
were one volunteer coordinator, or in the absence of such a po-
sition, the LDSS manager, and three social workers. It should
be noted that community organizers in the LDSSs were not in-
terviewed. Thus the data may not provide understanding of the
use of volunteers in locality development and citizen represen-
tation.

Instrument

Most data were collected through interviews. The instru-
ment was a questionnaire which consisted of the following sec-
tions: (a) socio-economic background of the subject, (b) back-
ground information regarding the specific LDSS, (c) number
of volunteers, (d) background characteristics of volunteers, (e)
recruitment, (f) activities performed by volunteers, (g) popu-
lations cared for by volunteers, (h) LDSS's activities to sustain
volunteers, and (i) satisfaction with volunteers and future plans.

In some instances, additional data were added through anal-
yses of records and nonparticipant observations. Since these
data were available only in some LDSSs and were not uniform,
they were not analyzed. These data however were useful in val-
idating data from the questionnaires and helped in interpreting
data when subjects in one LDSS made contradictory statements.

Findings

Each of the 14 LDSSs in the study uses volunteers. The mean
number of volunteers per LDSS is about 200. The range is be-
tween 30 and 600. Approximately one third are ad hoc volun-
teers. In one LDSS, 500 volunteers are used once a year for an
ad hoc activity. While only three LDSSs do not use ad hoc vol-
unteers, all LDSSs regularly use volunteers who serve at least
one hour biweekly. The remaining findings are grouped under
five major headings. All but the last (Satisfaction of Staff and
Plans Regarding Volunteers) correspond to the headings of the
literature review section.

Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Volunteers

Interviewees were asked to rate which of four sociodemographic characteristics represented the mode (highest frequency) in their assigned LDSS (Table 1). Not surprisingly, most volunteers were women. This overrepresentation of women was also found by Gidron (1984) among volunteers in Israeli Community Centers. In 11 LDSSs, there were more women volunteers; in 3 LDSS, men and women were equally represented among volunteers, most of whom were under 20 years of age. These young volunteers were generally high school students or members of youth organizations such as scout groups. Six LDSSs had primarily young volunteers; five had old volunteers. Among the latter, most volunteers in two LDSSs were 41 years and over; in three LDSSs, most were 61 years and over. The other LDSSs were reported as using equal numbers of young (< 20) and old (61 >) volunteers. In other words, no LDSS had its largest volunteer representation among those aged 21 to 40 years. These findings are consistent with those of Haeuser and Schwartz (1980) who observed that social work professionals tend to work more effectively with older adults and teenagers. Haeuser and Schwartz claim that this trend stems from a desire for control and the avoidance of a conflict with successful competent adults.

Data regarding education were also affected by age. For example, nine LDSSs reported that the majority of volunteers did not complete high school. However, this is due to the fact that six of these LDSSs used mostly young volunteers, while two other used young and old volunteers equally. When students are considered, education can be equated with the highest grade attainment by age. Under this criterion, most youth volunteers have a high level of education. For 4 of LDSSs, the most frequent level of education among volunteers was 13–15 years (i.e., full of partial undergraduate or professional program); for 2 LDSSs, the most frequent level of education was 16 or more years (i.e., some graduate school). These data indicate that the level of education among older volunteers is equal to or greater than that of the general population but possibly less than that of most social workers.

Table 1

Volunteer Functions in LDSSs

Lauffer and Gorodezky's typology	Sieder and Kirschbaum's typology	No. of LDSSs in which volunteers perform each function				
		Most of the time	Fre- quently	Some- times	Seldom	Never
Advocacy	1. Reaching out and identifying people in need.	-	-	-	6	8
	2. Acting as advocates of the poor and misfortunates	-	-	1	1	12
	3. Protest and public action	-	-	-	-	14
Direct Practice	4. Providing direct services	14	-	-	-	-
Admini- instration	5. Fund raising	-	-	-	-	14
	6. Acting as spokesman for the agency	-	-	3	3	6
	7. Reporting/ evaluating community reactions to programs.	-	1	2	5	6
Policy Making	8. Collaboration in community planning activity	-	-	-	5	9
	9. Developing new service delivery system	-	-	-	2	12
	10. Policy making	-	-	-	-	14

It was found that the volunteers were mostly high school students in six LDSSs, mostly retirees in three LDSSs, and mostly housewives in two LDSSs. Only one LDSS had volunteers from all these categories as well as working persons. Thus, the data concerning occupation indicated that the majority of volunteers are not in the work force.

Activities Performed by Volunteers

Based on Lauffer and Gorodezky (1977) and Sieder and Kirschbaum (1977) typologies, Table 1 clearly indicates that volunteers in the 14 LDSSs are used primarily for direct service. They are not used in policy making, fund raising, and protest or public action. It should be noted that LDSS staff activity in protest and public action is minimal and under clear guidelines set by the government. In most LDSSs, staff are seldom active in advocacy, administration, and policy making. This indicates that volunteers are expected to supplement the work of professionals, as is expected under the terms of coprovision, but that they are not to be involved in activities that are prohibited to staff members.

In dealing with the most frequent volunteer activity — direct service and the LDSS populations served — it is clear that most LDSS use volunteers to assist the elderly (eleven out of fourteen). The LDSSs populations least served by the volunteers are families in need and the handicapped (four and three LDSSs respectively). Other client groups served by volunteers in 8 of the 14 LDSSs were mentally retarded, sick people, and children and youth. The number of volunteers active in each client category may vary among LDSSs due to the extreme variations in size (i.e., personnel and population served) among the 14 LDSSs. However, the areas in which volunteers are used also vary among the LDSSs. The decision to use volunteers in assisting specific client groups reflects local needs and in some cases, the personal preferences of the volunteer coordinator.

Management of Volunteers

As indicated in the literature review, management of volunteers has two aspects: recruitment and administration, and

professional support. Tables 2 and 3 summarize the extent of these activities in the 14 LDSSs in the study. Interviewees were asked to rate the extent to which the LDSS performed each activity listed in the tables. An LDSS was rated as active if three out of four interviewees considered it as "performing this activity to a large extent."

Five areas of administrative activities were studied. All LDSSs used recruitment methods. Those most frequently used were contacting local clubs and groups and informal networking; the least frequent was the use of public media and the telephone. Only eight LDSSs screened volunteers and the only reported method was an interview. Among those who reported no screening of volunteers, the informal judgement of the social workers was the only criterion used to refuse a volunteer. All 14 LDSSs provided supervision, but only 6 provided individual case supervision, whereas the rest provided group supervision. Fifty percent of LDSSs provided initial orientation to the agency. As to administration, most departments kept records of the volunteers and their activities. Ten LDSSs reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses and one even provided some payments to volunteers. Seven LDSSs allocated special social workers to coordinate volunteers. With one exception, these were usually large LDSSs. Thus it can be concluded that, when size permits, one professional is generally assigned the role of coordinating the volunteers with the responsibility of recruitment, orientation and supervision (see Table 2).

As Table 3 indicates, professional support (retention and organizational commitment) for LDSS volunteers received less attention than did administrative functions. The two support areas in which theory and practice differed most widely was in activities aimed at personal growth. Less than 50% of the LDSSs were concerned with task variety, task significance, autonomy, feedback, and educational growth for volunteers. The only exception was task identity which was a concern of nine LDSSs. It is important to note that neither size nor a volunteer coordinator were associated with job satisfaction and personal growth of volunteers. Most LDSSs attempt to match volunteers with clients on the basis of language similarities and clients' needs. The volunteers' interests and skills play an important

Table 2

Number of LDSSs Actively Involved in
Administrative Functions for Volunteers

Activity	Sub-Activity	No. of Active LDSSs
Recruitment*	By telephone	-
	By letters	5
	By contacting organizations (cf. schools, social clubs)	10
	By advertising in media (mostly local newspaper)	2
	By leaflets and brochures	4
	By using informal networks	10
	By posting ads in the area	5
Screening Volunteers	By interviews	8
	By references	-
	By application forms	-
Training and Supervision**	Orientation sessions	7
	Individual Supervision	6
	Group Supervision	8
Bureaucratic work and management	Record keeping of volunteers	14
	Record keeping of activities	13
	Forms for volunteers report	4
	Reimbursement of expenses	10
	Payment (symbolic)	1
	Insurance to cover volunteers	14
Responsibility to coordinate volunteers	Volunteer coordinator	7
	Each social worker	2
	Community organizer	2
	Director of LDSS	3

*Adapted from Blumenfield & Rocklin (1980).
**All 14 LDSSs provided supervision: The difference is in type of supervision.

Table 3

*Number of LDSSs Actively Involved
in Support Programs for Volunteers*

Activity	Sub-Activity	No. of Active LDSSs
Recognition	Thank-you letters	14
	Certificates of appreciation	10
	Trips	8
	Prizes	3
	Ceremonies	9
	Parties	5
	Lecturers	5
	Day Conferences	8
Matching	Matching by language	11
clients with	Matching by volunteer's interests	9
volunteers	Matching by volunteer's skills	9
	Matching by client's needs	14
Encouraging	Report to volunteer on client's	4
personal	progress (feedback)	
growth	Provide supervision per-case	6
	(Educational growth)	
	Delegate responsibility of case	3
	to volunteers (autonomy)	
	Attempt to find challenging	5
	tasks for volunteers	
	(task significance)	
	Attempt to find interesting	6
	tasks for volunteers	
	Attempt to provide volunteers	3
	with variety of activities	
	(task variety)	
	Attempt to enable volunteers	9
	to work with family until	
	the termination of treatment	
	(task identity)	
Encouraging	Consider volunteers as part	6
social	of professional team	
contacts	Encourage volunteers to meet	10

role only in nine LDSSs. All LDSSs have at least one method of recognizing volunteers and ten have at least two or more. Ten LDSSs encourage volunteers to meet as a group and to support one another. Only six LDSSs consider volunteers as part of the professional team.

Professional Training

None of the 42 social workers who were interviewed had any formal training in work with volunteers. These findings are of special importance in the six LDSSs in which the social workers supervise individual volunteers. The situation is somewhat different with regard to volunteer coordinators. The seven volunteer coordinators and three others who had this responsibility in addition to other duties had completed a special course provided by the Department of Volunteerism in the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. Trained in this field, they also received supervision and support from the department's inspectors/supervisors. This training seems exclusive, however, to the level of volunteer coordinators and does not extend to line workers.

Staff Satisfaction and Plans

As part of the interview, the social workers and volunteer coordinators were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of using volunteers and about future plans in regard to volunteers. Interviewees were first asked to rate their agreement with statements regarding volunteer work in LDSS based on their experience. The rankings were scaled from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). They were then asked to add new ideas or their plans regarding the use of volunteers. The results of the close-ended questions are presented in Table 4.

As in the findings regarding training, there was a two-tiered perspective in staff satisfaction with volunteers. The volunteer coordinators were more enthusiastic about the effectiveness of volunteers. The social workers who work directly with the volunteers reported lower levels of satisfaction with "professional time saved" and "activities performed by volunteers instead of the professionals" than did the volunteer coordinators. The

social workers' overall satisfaction with volunteers was rela-
tively low. However, both groups agreed that the LDSSs need
more volunteers and should invest time and concern in them,
even though volunteers will not replace professionals.
Table 4

Evaluation of Volunteers Work by Social Workers and Volunteer Coordinators in LDSSs*

Issue	Social Workers	Volunteer Coordinators
Overall satisfaction from working with volunteers**	2.7	4.2
Working with volunteers saves professional's time**	3.0	4.4
Volunteers mostly supplement pro-fessionals but not replace them	4.2	4.1
Social workers have to invest a great deal of time in training volunteers to be effective	4.3	4.0
Volunteers do what social workers should but cannot do because of constraints**	3.3	4.4
The LDSS need more volunteers	3.9	4.5

*The reported data are presented as the means of each group on each
issue of evaluation. The range is between strongly disagree (1) and
strongly agree (5).
**Denotes significant differences between social workers and coordi-
nators at the .05 level while utilizing a t-test statistic.

This two-tiered professional view was also evident in the
responses to open- ended questions on future plans for the use
of volunteers. All of the 14 interviewees who served as volun-
teer coordinators mentioned some plans, but only 2 of the 42
social workers did so. The issue, obviously, was of far greater
importance to the coordinators than to the social workers. The
issues raised most frequently by the coordinators were: recruit-
ment of new volunteers (9), the use of clients as volunteers (5),
training in volunteer coordination (4), new recognition mecha-

nisms (4), reimbursement and payment for volunteers (3), and helping social workers to use volunteers more effectively (3).

Summary and Conclusions

It is evident that governmental social services in most modern societies are moving toward an extensive use of volunteers (Ellis, 1985). Whether the motivating factor is traditional community structure (Barclay Report, 1982), the advantages of volunteers as informal links to community (Kelley & Kelley, 1985), the financial saving (Ferris, 1984; Roter, Shamai, & Wood, 1985; Salamon, Musselwhite, & Abramson, 1984), or any combination of these is immaterial. The question is how best to enhance co-provision in social services.

The findings indicate several issues of significant importance. Analyses of the four sociodemographic variables considered in the study indicate that LDSS volunteers most frequently come from subpopulations that are less powerful compared with the general population. Specifically, most of the volunteers are under 20 or over 60 years of age, women, less educated then the social workers, and unemployed. Though people with these characteristics may have the free time to give volunteer work and may reap personal satisfaction from their involvement, another possibility is that social workers, in their selection process, may view these volunteers as a group that is amenable to control. Thus, social workers may prefer to recruit them rather than others. Further studies should investigate the methods by which social workers select volunteers and the role that control and power play in the process.

It was found that LDSS volunteers were used primarily in direct service with the elderly, sick, mentally retarded, children, and youths. Since social workers in the LDSSs are seldom involved in policy making, administration, or advocacy, the use of volunteers in direct service may indicate the agency's perceived mission rather than an attempt to downplay the role of volunteers. That volunteers are seldom used to assist families in need may be due to professional insecurity. A few researchers noted that professionals tend to protect their domain from being taken over by volunteers as to secure their sense of professionalism (Demoll, 1983; Kulys & Davis, 1986; Mitchell, 1986). It is

suggested that this issue merits further in-depth investigation both from the standpoint of volunteers and social workers.

The administration and recruitment aspects of volunteer co-ordination appear satisfactory, since each LDSS has an average of 200 volunteers, two thirds of whom serve on a long-term basis. Less satisfactory is the attention given to the volunteers' personal growth, and use of skills and interests. This raises an issue that deserves further discussion and clarification, namely, are volunteers primarily a tool to assist clients (i.e., a resource to be used), which is the essence of coprovision, or are volunteers themselves a target population (i.e., people who merit professional care and investment?). While there is no evident either/or solution, the question is a challenging one for many social service professionals.

The relationship between formal training in volunteer co-ordination and the degree to which volunteer work is appre-cieated is yet another issue. Findings in this study indicate that coordinators value volunteer work far more than do the line social workers. The question is whether this difference in perception stems from formal training in volunteer coordination, differences in administrative responsibilities, or from the direct interactions of social workers with volunteers. This issue also merits further investigation.

The findings reported here are from the first study ever to consider the role of volunteers in the LDSSs: Israel's major source of social services and its major user of volunteers. Obviously, many issues of interest were beyond the scope of this exploratory study. It is the hope of the author that many more studies of issues related to coprovisioni in social services will follow.

References

ACTION. (1975). *American volunteers—1974*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Anderson, J. & Clacy, B. (1987). Coproduction in emergency medical services. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 16* (3), 33–42.

Ball, M. (1978). *A woman's place?*. London: Volunteer Centre.

Barclay, P. M. (Chairperson). (1982). *Social workers: Their roles and tasks*. London: NISW.

Blumenfield, S. & Rocklin, C. (1980). Senior counselors: Assistants for a geriatric program in a community hospital. *Social Work in Health Care, 6,* 89–100.

Brudney, J. L. (1985). Coproduction: Issues in implementation. *Administration & Society, 17,* 243–256.

Brudney, J. L. & England, R. E. (1984). Towards a definition of coproduction concept. *Public Administration Review, 43,* 59–65.

Chambre, S. M. (1984). Is Voluntarism a substitute for role loss in old age? An empirical test of activity theory. *The Gerontologist, 24,* 292- -298.

Chartoff, S. (1976). *A Comparison of the interests values, personality, characteristics, and past experience with life crises of hotline volunteers, non-volunteered, and selected professional groups.* Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Rutgers University, NJ.

Christianson, B. J. (1986). A unique plan for recruiting volunteers in a county mental health facility. *American Journal of Public Health, 76,* 86–87.

Cnaan, R. A. (1987). The Israeli welfare state: From nation building to establishment of a welfare state. In R. R. Friedmann, N. Gilbert, & M. Sherer (Eds), *Modern welfare states* (pp. 174–207). Brighton, England: Weathsheaf.

Cnaan, R. A. J. Korazim, Y. Meller, and J. M. Rosenfeld (in press). The reform of the local social services in Israel: 1984 compared to 1977." *Social Policy and Administration.*

Daily, R. C. (1986). Understanding organizational commitment for volunteers: Empirical and managerial implications. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15* (1), 36–44.

Demoll, L. E. F. (1983). *Volunteerism and social work practice.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, Houston, TX.

Duncombe, S. (1985). Volunteers in city government: Advantages, disadvantages and uses. *National Civic Review, 74,* 356–364.

Ellis, S. J. (1985). Research on volunteerism: What needs to be done. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 14* (2–3), 11–14.

Feinstein, B., & Cavanaugh, C. (1976). *The New Volunteerism.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.

Ferris, J. M. (1984). Coprovision: Citizen time and money donations in public service provision. *Public Administration Review, 44* (4), 324- -333.

Fitzsimmons, V. R. (1986). Socialization and volunteer work: The role of parents and college volunteering. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15* (4), 57–66.

Gallup Organization, Inc. (1982) *American volunteers — 1981.* Princeton, NJ: Gallup Organization, Inc.

Gidron, B. (1984). Predictors of retention and turnover among service volunteer workers. *Journal of Social Service Research, 8* (1), 1–16.

Gidron, B. and Levy, H. (1980). *Shiluv Mitnadvim besheruitey revaha — Mikraha* (Incorporating Volunteers in Human Services — A Reader). Jerusalem: Hebrew University, the J. Schwartz Program.

Hadley, R., and Webb, F. C. (1975). *Across the generations.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Haeuser, A. A., and Schwartz, F. S. (1980). Developing social work skills for work with volunteers. *Social Casework, 61:* 10, 595–601.

Hanks, M., & Ecklund, B. K. (1978). Adult voluntary associations and adolescent socialization. *The Sociology Quarterly, 19,* 481–490.

Jano, E. (1984). *Gathered data on volunteers in the welfare services.* Jerusalem: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Kelley, P., & Kelley, V. R. (1985). Supporting natural helpers: A cross-cultural study. *Social Casework, 66,* 358–366.

Kemper, T. D. (1980). Altruism and voluntary action. In D. H. Smith & J. Macaulay (Eds.), *Participation in social and political activities* (pp. 306–338). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kulys, R. & Davis, M. A. (1986). An analysis of social services in hospices. *Social Work, 31,* 448–456.

Lafata, L. (1980). *The effective coordination of volunteers: domestic violence monograph series No. 1.* Washington, DC: Administration for Children, Youth and Families.

Lozier, J. (1976). Volunteer fire departments and community mobilization. *Human Organization, 35,* 345–354.

Lauffer, A., & Gorodezky, S. (1977). *Volunteers.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Luloff, A. E., Chittenden, H. Kriss, E., Weeks, S., and Brushett, L. (1984). Local volunteerism in New Hampshire: Who, why and what benefit. *Journal of the Community Development Society, 15* (2), 17–30.

McClam, T., & Spicuzza, F. J. (1983). *The utilization of volunteers: A comparative study of London and New York City.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, DC.

McPherson, J. M. & Lockwood, W. G. (1980). The longitudinal study of voluntary association membership: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 9* (1), 74–85.

Miller, L. E. (1985). Understanding the motivation of volunteers: An examination of personality differences and characteristics of volunteers paid employment. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 14* (2–3), 112–122.

Mitchell, M. (1986). Utilizing volunteers to enhance informal social networks. *Social Casework, 67,* 290–298.

Morgan, J. N., Dye, R. F., and Hybels, J. (1979). *Results from two national surveys of philanthropic activity.* Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

National Association of Social Workers. (1977). Volunteers and social service systems. *Delegate Assembly,* 30.1–30.5.

Orlev, Z. (1978). Gathered data on volunteers in the welfare services. Jerusalem: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Pearce, J. Jr. (1983). Job attitude and motivation differences between volunteers and employees from comparative organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 646–652.

Peres, Y., & Lyn, R. (1975). *Hitnadvut bisrael* (Volunteerism in Israel). Tel Aviv: Center for Voluntary Activity.

Perry, W. H. (1983). The willingness of persons 60 or over to volunteer: Implications for the social services." *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 5* (4), 107–118.

Pierucci, J., & Noel, R. (1980). Duration of participation of correctional volunteers as a function of personal and situational variables. *Journal of Community Psychology, 8,* 245–250.

Roter, R., Shamai, N., & Wood, F. (1985). The non-profit sector and volunteering. In Y. Kop. (Ed.), *Israel's Outlay for human services — 1984* (pp. 181–215). Jerusalem: The Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel.

Rubin, A., & Thorelli, I. M. (1984). Egoistic motives and longevity of participation by social service volunteers. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20,* 223–235.

Sainer, J., & Zander, M. L. (1971). *SERVE: Older Americans in community service.* New York: Community Service Society of New York.

Salamon, L. M., Musselwhite, Jr., J. C., & Abramson, A. J. (1984). Voluntary organizations and the crisis of welfare state. *New England Journal of Social Services, 4* (1), 25–36.

Salmon, R. (1985). The use of aged volunteers: Individual and organizational considerations. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 7,* 211–223.

Scheier, I. (1977). Staff nonsupport of volunteers. *Voluntary Action Leadership, 12* (1), 32–35.

Schram, V. R. (1985). Motivating volunteers to participate." In E. F. Moore (ed.), *Motivating volunteers: How the rewards of unpaid work can meet people's needs* (pp. 68–89). Vancouver, B.C.: Vancouver Volunteer Center.

Scott, K. M. & Sontheimer, H. G. (1985). Road map to voluntarism in justice agencies. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal, 36,* 23–29.

Sieder, V. M. & Kirschbaum, D. C. (1977). Volunteers. In *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (17th ed.) (pp. 1581–1584).

Stubblefield, H. W. & Miles, L. (1986). Administration of volunteer programs as a career: What role for higher education. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15* (4), 4–12.

Sundeen, R. A. & Siegel, G. B. (1986). The use of volunteers by police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 14,* 49–61.

Taylor, R. J., & Chatters, L. M. (1986). Patterns of informal support to elderly black adults: Family, friends, and church members, *Social Work, 31,* 432–438.

Vaillancourt, F., & Payette, M. (1986). The supply of volunteer work: The case of Canada. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15* (4), 45–56.

Vinokur-Kaplan, D., Cibulski, O., Spiro, S., and Bergman, S. (1981). Oldster to oldster: An example of mutual aid through friendly visiting among Israeli elderly. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 4,* 75–91.

Walter, V. (1987). Volunteering and bureaucrats: Clarifying roles and creating meaning. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 16* (3), 22– 32.

Wood, T. (1980). Staff, volunteer and client: Perceptions of the use of volunteers in probation. *Canadian Journal of Corrections, 22,* 206– 211.

York, A. S. (1987). Training volunteer organizers, In R. D. Herman (Ed.), *Politics, public policy and the voluntary sector: Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars* (pp. 423–426). Kansas City, MO.