

Volunteer Management as a Means of Civic Empowerment

Galit Yanay-Ventura P.h.D

gality@yvc.ac.il

Department of Human Services

The Max Stern Yezreel Valley College, Israel

Abstract

We propose three novel models for volunteer management: (i) *business management* that follows the nature of managing people in the industry; (ii) *flexible management* that accentuate the diverse methodology for motivation tailored for volunteers; and (iii) *sensitive management* that is based on providing volunteers with comprehensive psychological response. Based on the thesis that volunteer management should be utilized to empower and nurture the volunteers as social entrepreneurs, we interviewed 34 volunteer managers regarding their management techniques and philosophy for empowering volunteers. We show that paradoxically, autonomic management and enabling the volunteers to participate in decision making can frighten them and lead to complications. Finally, we discuss the role of volunteer management in encouraging autonomy and social activity, alongside with weaknesses that result from over-autonomy and self-management among volunteers.

Introduction

Activating volunteers within the regular organizational system is among the potential sources of capital for Third Sector organizations. Properly activating volunteers can provide a crucial foundation in the establishment and development of civic society. The volunteers' willingness, expressed in the basic motivation to donate their time, is perhaps one of the first signs of their involvement as citizens and of the potential embodied in their future contribution. Thus, efficient volunteer management is important not only from the organizational aspect of human resources but also on a wider dimension of civic empowerment. When operated correctly, volunteer management can foster activists with civic consciousness who wish to deepen their civic action and contribute to social change.

The literature describes volunteer management that is unlike management of paid employees and therefore requires a separate knowledge base in the area of organizational management of volunteers. There are those that think that this separate research constitutes an important and basic phase on the way to turning volunteer management and Third Sector organization management into a profession (Haski-Leventhal, 2007; Shin & Kleiner, 2003). Such management includes coping with: volunteer planning, recruitment, screening, training, good quality integration in their job, developing a professional identity, functional evaluation and feedback (Stedman & Rudd, 2004). Does this mean that volunteer management resembles ordinary management in an ordinary workplace, using ordinary tools? If so, what then is unique about volunteer management? It would appear that such a system could provide an appropriate framework only after the conditions for working with volunteers are profoundly understood: the needs, dilemmas, difficulties and operative tools that aid in working with volunteers. The present study will deal with these questions, with an emphasis on the experience of managers in the field.

Literature on Volunteer Management

Discourse on volunteer management has been developing in recent years. When comparing the studies, there are several prominent issues dealt with in most studies: recruitment, screening, motivating volunteers, supervision, control, and terminating a job, whose intention is to guide managers and create a normative management framework.

Locating, recruiting and screening volunteers are among the first common areas to be presented. As a general rule, recruitment and perseverance are interrelated and therefore recruitment requires unique attention. An uncontrolled or low quality recruitment process could bring unsuitable volunteers to the organization, leading to dropping out and the necessity for new recruitment efforts. High-quality recruitment allows the resources to be devoted to actual management of the active volunteers (Wymer & Starnes, 2001). In the recruitment process, the accepted conception is to treat volunteers as the organization's customers and dedicate great efforts to identifying the target population and adapting the right recruitment tactics (Bussell & Forbes, 2007). A positive image contributes to recruitment. Such an image can be developed through good relations with volunteers who spread the word to others about recruitment and by having the local press cover the organization's events (Choudhury, 2010; Shin & Kleiner, 2003). "Bring a friend" method is among the most common and effective ones reported among voluntary organizations (Kaufman, Mirsky and Avgar, 2005). The examination is mutual (Haski-Leventhal, 2007) and Contrary to the commonly accepted notion among managers and their fear of being left without volunteers, the "elite unit effect" [method of screening candidates] has a positive impact on volunteers' motivations and their willingness to become better assimilated in the organization later on (Haski-Leventhal, 2005).

Volunteer compensation has been discussed widely with vast agreement among researchers. Many researchers stress the importance of creating a work environment that is pleasing to the volunteers, interesting and providing agreeable volunteering conditions (Chacon, Vecina & Davila, 2007; Brudney, 2000). Such an environment creates confidence, fulfills personal needs and enhances organizational commitment (Gay, 2000). Volunteers' unique needs should be clearly determined and given maximum response (Ellis, 1996). Emphasis was also placed on giving them autonomy, which includes providing an opportunity for volunteers to voice their opinions, listening to their advice and acknowledging their ability to propose directions of action within the organization (Adams & Shepherd, 1996; Bidee, Vantilbortgh, Pepermans, Huybrechts, Willems, et al. 2013). Organizational culture and relationships with volunteers also have a major influence over volunteer motivation and should be based on keeping promises, shared values and expressions of mutual commitment (Rentschler, Radbourne & Carr, 2002).

Supervision is the next area, comprising one of the most conflicted issues discussed in the literature. Supervision includes the ability to create clear boundaries, monitor, oversee, guide and enforce volunteers' behavior. Apparently, many managers feel that placing demands on volunteers and enforcing them is inappropriate (Ben David et al, 2004). In their view, volunteers invest time and energy of their own free will and therefore cannot be exposed to the kind of sanctions imposed on paid employees. Other researchers share this concern, claiming that supervision and control strategies which include punishment and sanctions are ineffective in regard to volunteers (Adams & Shepherd, 1996). In fact, this makes it difficult for managers to set clear-cut, unequivocal boundaries. On the other hand, some believe that supervision and control do not necessarily pose a threat. Reviewing volunteers' achievements, presenting these achievements and advising them on their actions can create a

sense of belonging and a positive interest in their work and their personal ability (Anderson, 2011; Choudhury, 2010). Supervision by superiors and personal monitoring can also grant a sense of confidence under unfamiliar circumstances when undertaking a new post (Kaufman et al, 2005). As a general rule, it is advisable to use strategies that minimize the threat to self image and support a positive image. An example of such a supervisory method includes support, expression of esteem and display of affection (Adams & Shepherd, 1996). Within the context of volunteer management, performance review may be systemic, not just quantitative, examining program outcomes against declared objectives and tasks. This process is characterized by revealing, assessing and improving performance, and therefore has the power to cultivate and foster the volunteers' capabilities (Brudney, 2000).

Leaving the organization. The literature discusses two directions of ending a job: volunteers who drop out (at their own initiative) and those that are dismissed (at the organization's initiative). The latter is the final, unbridgeable result of a lack of conformity between the volunteer and the job and/or organization. Such lack of conformity might include defective performance by the volunteer or providing a service that hurts customers and infringes on organizational objectives and ethics (Friedman-Gamlieli, York, Kaplin and Silberman, 2005). Additional causes of dismissal are related to volunteers' mental health problems that were revealed in retrospect and got in the way of their activities, as well as extreme cases of criminal offenses or forbidden relations with customers, i.e. the beneficiaries of the organization (Ben David et al, 2004). If and when such a process is required, the recommendation is to carry out dismissal gradually: first enforce discipline, a verbal warning, a written warning, a leave of absence, temporary suspension and only then outright dismissal (Rehnborg, 2005). Such dismissal must be based on a well-known and soundly-based policy for volunteer dismissal and, in any case, must be handled respectfully.

Managing a log might facilitate an objective presentation of examples of dysfunction and help the volunteer to understand the circumstances which led to his dismissal (Nidel-Shimoni, 2007).

In summary, the discourse on volunteer management has begun to develop in recent years and includes a clear division into areas, each with its own principles and guidelines. Alongside this development, several drawbacks also emerge: Firstly, the principles applying to volunteer management mainly emphasize the volunteers' viewpoint. Even though this is important, the viewpoint and working conditions of the managers are lacking. Secondly, it seems that beyond guiding principles and recommendations on various aspects, a unique and inclusive theoretical model is missing which would provide a "super view" of volunteer management and enable systemic understanding of the organizational framework for managing volunteers. Thirdly, although the field of volunteer management has begun to discern the nuances that set volunteer management apart, how it differs from paid employee management has not been discussed openly and substantially. The question of organizational behavior concepts (recruitment, screening, review, supervision, monitoring) exists, but less conceptualization or use of unique terms has been made. The present study attempts to answer these needs and ascertain what efficient management is, from the managers' viewpoint. At the same time, a preliminary management model that expresses positions presented by managers will be introduced and an inquiry will be made as to whether the initial model can provide an overall viewpoint for management. Finally, a discussion will be held as to whether volunteer management is similar to, or different from, managing paid employees and on what lines.

Theoretical framework

Scrutiny of the different theoretical frameworks proposed for volunteering shows that the unique viewpoint of volunteering influences the proposed theory. For example, the social-psychological viewpoint on volunteering and analysis of volunteering in terms of *pars of exchange* has led to a wide theoretical base that investigates volunteers' expectations, motivations and the various rewards they can expect (Chinman & Wandersman, 1999; Clary, Synder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas et al. 1998; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Thomas, Newell, Baral, & Byanjankar, 2007; Raser, 2007). Viewing volunteering as a framework of *employment* for all intents and purposes has resulted in relying on different organizational theories that examine the extent of volunteer satisfaction, maintenance, burnout etc (Bennett, Ross & Sunderland, 1996; Claxton, Catalan & Burgess, 1998; Finkelstein, 2008; Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Ross, Greenfield & Bennett, 1999). Treating voluntary organizations as *enterprises* with growth goals and objectives has also led to theoretical use of terms from the fields of marketing, recruitment and human resources (Bussell & Forbes, 2007; Dauglas & Rollins, 2007; Vantilborgh, Bidee, Pepermas, Willems, Huybrechts et al. 2011; Wymer & Starnes, 2001). The approach to volunteering proposed in this paper is **civic action**. Such a view regards volunteer work as an act of civic participation. I thus rely on the theoretical framework proposed by Gidron (2011) who claims that the organizational structure and management of Third Sector organizations must be of the type that promotes their social mission. Since the social mission of Third Sector organizations is development of civic society, the normative management framework should encourage social consciousness and a sense that volunteers are capable of contributing to society. This kind of management should reflect inclusive management and enable participation in the organization's decision making process. Vital management principles, according to this approach, include encouraging involvement, autonomy, partnership, freedom and the ability to initiate social processes.

Research Questions

On the foundation of the theoretical and empirical background, the study explores the normative ideological framework for volunteer management. Does volunteer management resemble management of paid employees or does it differ? What are the challenges, difficulties and dilemmas facing volunteer managers? What do managers see as efficient recruitment? For example, how is the screening process conducted, and is it the product of a predefined rationale? What is the optimal relationship that should exist between manager and volunteer? These questions help us understand the different types of practice and the political milieu within which managers operate.

Method

Sampling

The sampling method was deliberate, with the purpose of sampling managers of volunteers. This sampling method is not random and is intended to encompass a population of those who have experienced the phenomenon under study and fulfill criteria that characterize this population (Shkedi, 2003). Emphasis was placed on the sampling of cases representing important theoretical aspects of the studied subject (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Accordingly, in order to present a wide variety of viewpoints for volunteer management, managers from two management "fields" were sampled: volunteer department heads (in municipalities and district councils) and volunteer managers in social organizations

In fact, the sample included 34 managers of volunteers – nearly half (45%) being volunteer department managers in city councils and the remainder (55%) volunteer managers in social organizations and nonprofit associations. Of the 25 women and 9 men from among the managers interviewed, most (61%) belonged to the 40-60 year age group and the others to the 27-40 age group (23%) and 60-75 age group (16%). 85% of them had

attained a college education in social work, education, psychology or criminology. Approximately one-third (35%) had a graduate degree, and one manager was working on her PhD. One-third of the respondents (35%) stated that they were doing their job as volunteers, one-fifth (20%) as a second job alongside their day job, and the remainder (45%) worked in volunteer management as a full-time job. Most managers (60%) have been working at their job for over two years and the others (40%) have been doing it between six months to two years.

Research Tools

The study used a semi-structured in-depth interviews run by an experienced interviewer. At first, the managers were asked to tell about their organization and the essence of the role of volunteer management. The interview started off with an open question that asked managers to tell about themselves and their experience in managing volunteers. While answering this question, they were asked to specify the various events, situations and decisions which they believe to be pertinent to correct management of volunteers. Then, they were asked several uniform questions pertaining to management areas, such as: recruitment, screening, training, reward, performance review and motivation. In each area, the managers were asked about strategies they use and concerns they have regarding these strategies. Finally, the interviews touched on the ideological framework of volunteer management and the norms they believe to be desirable.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed according to the constant comparison method of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). During the three stages of data analysis, relationships between various characteristics of volunteer management were identified, common themes were formulated and, finally, four major categories emerged, comprising the cornerstones of the model. These are: volunteer management as ordinary management, volunteer management as flexible management, volunteer management as sensitive management and the politics of volunteer management.

Findings

Volunteer Management as Business Management

Most managers constitute a full expression of business management. It requires, in their opinion, the same kinds of work and skills that managing paid employees does: managers need to initiate, supervise, recruit, train, teach and sometimes also dismiss volunteers. Most managers said that if managers have the know-how to run their organization properly, they will naturally succeed in working with volunteers too.

"He must, first of all, be a good manager of the organization; a person with executive management skills. I mean, if he knows how to manage the organization he will also know how to place the volunteers in the right jobs."

Part of the perception of business management, in the managers' opinion, includes the familiar tools of supervision, performance evaluation and feedback to motivate volunteers. Performance review was presented as an additional supervisory tool, but its designated goal was somewhat different than usual. While in the world of paid labor, a performance review is perceived as an evaluation of the employee's work in relation to defined goals and for the purpose of improved performance, here managers put an emphasis on examining the

volunteers' satisfaction and placing him in another function if necessary. The performance review they described was more in the form of rewarding the volunteers.

Here is an example of the thought process of a manager regarding the "performance review" tool:

"The right thing to do is an interim review, feedback, evaluation, asking – are you satisfied? Dissatisfied? Want to continue but in something else? It's important for the volunteer department to notice that... the volunteer is, let's say dissatisfied, and to immediately offer him something else, so he won't run away."

It is apparent that, while in the world of paid labor the evaluation tools provide managers with the ability to measure "performance", volunteer managers use the same tools to measure "emotion". Managers wish to examine the volunteer's perceptions and satisfaction with volunteering, not necessarily his strengths and weaknesses. The manner in which managers declared the possible outcome as "renewed placement" supports the estimation that this managerial tool is being used differently. Although we would expect managers to wish to improve the conditions (work, skills) that cause volunteer dissatisfaction, they prefer to "convert conditions", exchange or replace the volunteering action. This pattern may indicate managers' fear of losing volunteers. From this aspect, they prefer to change the volunteers' function, thereby increasing the likelihood of their satisfaction at the expense of slow improvement that does not ensure enhanced skills and abilities. Here one can see that the unique reality of volunteer management creates the "borrowing" of concepts from the labor world but actually uses them differently, in a manner that suits their designation.

The third conception in business management pertains to the perception of volunteers as paid employees for all practical purposes. Managers support the claim that volunteer management requires ordinary management tools, on the one hand, while demanding commitment and professional conduct from volunteers, on the other hand. They expect

volunteers to become professional, gain skills and capabilities that conform to their activities and exhibit a high level of commitment. This commitment includes meeting deadlines, paying attention to detail, responsibility for executing the work and interpersonal ethics. Managers regard volunteers as an inseparable part of the staff and they might, therefore, be dismissed if their skills and integration in the professional team are unsuitable.

"My criteria (for volunteers) are just like... for professionals. They must be responsible, professional in their field, an interested party that wants to promote their project. Everything I expect from an employee of mine, I expect from volunteers, clear and simple. I do not cut corners with volunteers."

The perception of volunteers as ordinary employees is also expressed in the high degree of autonomy expected from volunteers. Managers believe volunteers must be responsible for their tasks, act with high personal initiative and use as much discretion as possible in their job. At the end of the day, said the managers, practice also creates reality, and managers lack the real ability to oversee volunteers and monitor them constantly.

"When a volunteer actually enters the organization I cannot follow this, at the end of the day. I mean, the volunteers pretty much have to cope with things on their own, and if there is some problem of course I am at their disposal, but handling the volunteer work and the organization is done by the volunteer on his own." (012)

"There are a lot of dynamics here and it is extremely difficult to monitor volunteers... you need to listen more, to hear more."

The managers' words raise a duality: On the one hand, they emphasize volunteer management as "ordinary", like managing paid employees for all practical purposes, and on the other hand, the volunteer management they present suffers from a lack of supervision and resources. That was the most conflicting point in the interviews. On this point managers laid out their major managerial challenges. From the outset, managers said, volunteers

expect to receive feedback from their direct supervisor but the managers are not always able to keep in contact with them. Sometimes, they are not placed correctly or have just undergone a difficult shift, and again, awareness, diagnosis and even a change of placement might be required. Such placement is the simple managerial solution, but without being able to monitor the volunteer and to identify his personal needs, the result could turn into management insensitivity, a missed opportunity and, in some cases, the loss of the volunteer.

"They sometimes leave frustrated... When they leave their volunteer work, they don't feel like volunteering again. And if we were to ask, 'would you rather do some other [kind of] volunteer work? Do you need another month to think about something else?'"

Managers tend to emphasize the need for early diagnosis and the value of personal supervision. Here, too, the high degree of autonomy they expect does not mesh with the managerial needs they express in regard to personal guidance. In light of the dilemmas that came up, managers were asked, "How is self management beneficial to volunteers?" In response to the question, most of them again presented the challenges they face: problematic organizational structure, lack of organizational resources and high training costs. A few of them said outright that self management does not benefit all volunteers, but they survive by the natural selection principle. "Since reality dictates a lack of time to guide every volunteer personally, those that are suitable stay on, in any case, and those that don't stay were probably unsuitable in the first place."

"I believe it would be appropriate to meet all volunteers periodically and hear what they are pleased with, what they are dissatisfied with (...) what their needs are. Currently this is not what's happening. They go to their place of work. They do something. If it's good, that's good. If it's not good, they're out of here."

Now ambivalence exacts a high price: losing some of the volunteers. The explanation for this loss is poor survival of the volunteer and his weaker "natural" suitability for volunteer work. Managers emphasize the bond with the volunteers as a management asset but claim that a lack of resources takes this function off their desk. In their perception, the bond with the volunteers is work in itself that cannot be temporary or sporadic. In the future, managers would designate this job to an outside functionary, the volunteer coordinator. In their opinion, these are two separate niches: while coordinators have to maintain contact with the volunteers, managers must place the boundaries. While coordinators are expected to focus on the here and now (the volunteer and his problems) managers must extend the organizational vision by looking to the future (e.g. initiating projects). These are two complementary functions requiring a completely separate, different approach. Within this reality, volunteer autonomy remains a managerial tool with advantages and drawbacks when managing volunteers.

Volunteer Management as Flexible Management

The second dimension of volunteer management is "flexible management". The main feature of this strategy is its ability for flexibility, coordination and diversity. In their opinion, managers must be able to improvise, discern and select the methods at hand and adapt them to the situation. They must listen to the volunteers' needs and create a match between the person and the method. This matching is a means of organizational economizing, management efficiency and also constitutes an important strategy in preventing volunteers from dropping out.

"Preventing dropouts is only if you give, find for each volunteer precisely... what he needs, what he wants, and you know how to operate him correctly, you know how to

keep him. If you neglect him or give him something that doesn't suit him... then you'll lose him."

Managers believe that flexible management is expressed also in their ability for accurate placement of volunteers and in their willingness to change placement. Such placement reflects efficient management, enables optimal functioning of the volunteers and increases their satisfaction. In this context, managers believe, the ability to identify the personal needs of different volunteers is necessary, along with management flexibility, to propose organizational alternatives. Managers must allow volunteers to transfer after a while from one activity to another, if they wish. Flexibility should also include organizational openness to allow volunteers to work on projects that do not exist in the organization and build, from scratch, a framework that enables them to volunteer.

"The requests are extremely diverse... The sky's the limit... When a volunteer comes to me wanting to volunteer in some area I don't have, I say that for me the sky is the limit and I am open to pursue all sorts of projects, even new ones."

The major significance that emerges here is the managers' fear of losing volunteers. In their view, a flexible management vision includes motivation to make the most of their volunteers under given conditions. While wanting to benefit the volunteers, flexibility also includes the conception that people come to volunteer with a solidly-formed personality and one should therefore accept what they bring with them, without attempting to change them through volunteering.

Volunteer Management as Sensitive Management

Most managers in the present study share the perception that personal contact is of the utmost importance when managing volunteers. This contact is expressed in a personal approach and personal supervision of volunteers as part of the managers' everyday

management activities. Many emphasize the fact this trait is natural, simply a part of their being human. This contact expresses affinity and love of the volunteers as people who have come to contribute their time and good will. In their opinion, appreciation for volunteers and sensitive management must include an egalitarian management approach without outward expressions of an organizational hierarchy.

"First of all regard, regard the volunteers as human beings of equal standing, neither above nor below."

Practically speaking, the managers described a string of actions they take to express esteem for volunteers: marking special events at organization assemblies, attending family celebrations and keeping abreast of their personal lives. For the most part, managing these relations is expressed in telephone contact, but not only. Going out to "the field" is another means of creating contact and includes manager visits to the volunteers' work sites. In their view, the surprise involved in the manager's arrival and his/her personal investment in making the actual visit are of great value to the volunteers and have a positive impact on the intimacy formed between them.

The emotional connection with volunteers is also a professional component. Managers believe that maintaining good, ongoing relations with the volunteers enables a flood of issues and difficulties to rise above the surface during volunteer work. Raising these issues enables volunteers to receive a professional response to their work.

"To be attentive to him, to have guidance talks once a month, to hear what the volunteer is really going through. [To give him] personal attention, appreciation, not to be too rigid, to find the boundary between softness and rigidity, to reward him."

When managers were asked what the traits of an effective manager are, sensitive management was again highlighted. They noted human relations, attentiveness, sensitivity and empathy as traits that express managerial resources, while emphasizing "business"

aspects including knowledge, personal initiative, macro vision and professional know-how as vital resources. Using his social skills, said the interviewees, a manager can drive the volunteers most effectively, but by authority, knowledge and organizational ability he can lead the organization, raise financial resources and advance important projects. "Between gentleness and toughness" said managers, "between rigidity and reward", thus regarding them as the two ends of an elusive and delicate rope. In light of these findings, skills are not divided in a binary fashion. These are three parallel, intertwined approaches; three viewpoints which express the needs of the organization and its volunteers, and three skills for the effective management of volunteers.

Discussion

The study focused on the question of effective management of volunteers, from the managers' point of view. 34 managers of volunteers in social organizations and heads of volunteer departments in district councils were questioned in a semi-structured interview about the essence of their role as volunteer managers, the conditions, challenges and major dilemmas that characterize it and what they believe to be correct volunteer management. This form of gathering data, as well as the relatively small number of interviewees, does not allow for a broad generalization of these findings; however, the findings could be used as a proposal for research work and application (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The aim of the present discussion is to examine how the various aspects of volunteer management can be realized and merged together into a managerial conception and how this conception is likely to foster volunteer empowerment.

Volunteering as a framework of business employment

The preliminary conclusion emerging from the data is that volunteer management is similar to ordinary management. Volunteer managers face many organizational tasks that are not substantially different from managing paid labor. He must have a macro vision, foresee the future and initiate important projects in his field. This means on the other hand that volunteers can be treated like ordinary employees and be presented with a true organizational framework. Consequently, demanding volunteer commitment, discipline and meeting deadlines are also an inseparable part of proper volunteer management. The literature shows that volunteer managers tend to shun away from these actions. Ben David et al (2004) reported that managers, mainly new ones, find it inappropriate to place demands on volunteers and enforce them. They are so grateful for the volunteers' efforts that they tend to make do with whatever they receive from their volunteers. Respecting their spare time, managers find it hard to ask volunteers to put in overtime for training and guidance (Haski-Leventhal, 2007). And indeed, the literature shows that volunteers are not always satisfied with the freedom they are given. They may feel unwanted and not necessarily empowered. They interpret the freedom they receive as a sign of the organization's indifference towards them or as an expression of their poor integration within the organization (Yanay-Ventura, 2004).

The literature on volunteers provides us with several tools for presuming that people come to volunteer in order to have a real work experience; professional motives are among the most significant ones reported (Clary, Snyder & Stukas, 1996; Wardell et al. 2000; Wilson, 2000), and so it is in regard to perseverance: organizational attitudes and variables (work content, challenge, customer relations) predict perseverance more than personal variables (age, residence, education) (Dariham and York 2000; Canaan & Cascio, 1998). People volunteer because they want to develop skills, utilize their capabilities, receive training, undergo

instruction, be in touch with professionals and gain professional experience (Ryan et al, 2000). Often, volunteering is a window of opportunity for realizing aims that cannot be achieved in other frameworks. When volunteering, without an academic degree or professional experience, volunteers may enter an organization they choose, experience the work that attracts them and prove their suitability (Gidron, 1985). All of the above findings imply that the organizational framework is part of a process they wish to try out and discover.

The unique nature of volunteer management

Assuming that volunteers require supervision, the question remains in what ways supervision should be carried out and whether the same techniques used by human resources and paid labor management should be used here as well. Ben Aryeh's article (2006) shows it is not necessarily so. While supervisory procedures for paid employees include periodic quantitative measurements, the supervision in volunteer management may be qualitative rather than quantitative. It can be done using the conversation technique, not evaluation. It may provide a solution to deep problems the particular volunteer has, and not in comparison to others. Supervision may be executed by a mentor or veteran volunteer, not necessarily by the manager (Cox, 2000). The same mentor should meet the volunteer and conduct a process of monitoring and feedback, but his approach should tend more towards instruction and less towards evaluation (Nidel-Shimoni, 2007).

The major significance emerging from this is that, although volunteer management is management in every sense of the word, it requires unique strategy and practice. This is true for other aspects of working with volunteers, e.g., placement, recruitment or performance evaluation, each of which may have a different, unique application. We call this uniqueness

flexible management – in other words, management that is complex, attentive, multi-method and prepared for changes, with maximum compatibility to the designated volunteer. This compatibility is expressed in the manager's willingness to be flexible, in terms of schedules, suggested projects and management methods applied to suit each individual volunteer. Particularly great emphasis was placed on flexible placement in jobs, including willingness to suit the job to the volunteer as much as possible and willingness to **generate** new projects that are not part of what the organization usually offers. The key question that arises is: why is this flexibility so necessary, from the managers' viewpoint, and why is it presented as being unique to volunteer management?

The literature shows that volunteer managers often live with a sense of threat that their volunteers might decide to pick up and leave at any given moment (Ben Aryeh, 2006). The data shows that volunteers are most prone to dropping out during the first three months of volunteering, while those that do manage to adapt during that period tend to remain in the organization (Starnes & Wymer, 2001). Loss of volunteers becomes more critical in organizations that depend on their volunteers' skills, that require prolonged training or whose supply of high-quality volunteers is limited (Fischer & Schaffer, 1993). In actuality, volunteers' contribution has significant value if it is conducted for an optimal length of time and as an inseparable part of the service provided. Since volunteers and the beneficiaries of their service may become emotionally attached, their volunteer work is liable to cause more harm than good, should they stop working after a short time (Gidron, 1985).

Therefore, perhaps, the flexibility emphasized by managers derives from their fear of losing volunteers. The value of flexibility in their eyes is in the attentiveness it creates towards volunteers and the ability to make the most of their talents. It is also the acceptance of the volunteers as having a crystallized personality. Instead of expecting volunteers to adapt themselves to the organization, their autonomy and maturity are acknowledged and

they are accepted just the way they are with their given resources. Moreover, the literature shows that the range of volunteers is wide (Cnaan & Casio, 1998; McCurley & Lynch, 1996) and their needs are not uniform (Clary, Snyder & Stukas, 1996; Wardell, Lishman & Whalley, 2000). There for, in the eyes of the managers in this study, from the organizational viewpoint it saves resources. Instead of gathering all the volunteers together in social meetings that would ultimately fulfill the needs of only some of them, the managers believe a more selective approach to resources would be more appropriate: investing in promoting several volunteers, personal visits to others, etc. with regard to the personal needs that arise. Finally, management flexibility may have a good effect on commitment and empowerment. When volunteers were allowed to choose their role in the organization, the commitment to the job they chose increased. Empowerment is particularly important for volunteers with low income, since they do not enjoy the same ability in other life and employment situations (Gooch, 2004). Some take a more committed approach and claim that the volunteer manager's major mission after training is to do as much as possible to make volunteers feel good about themselves (McCurley & Lynch, 1996).

Volunteer Management as a Means of Civic Empowerment

Management style enabling volunteers to express initiative and independence was perceived as more correct management of volunteers. Such management included open communication, flexible schedules and self management of volunteers in their volunteer work. The literature tends to support the understanding that volunteers want to be reassured, in various ways, that they are essential to the organization (Yanay & Yanay, 2008). While management of paid labor is highly motivated by the managers' hierarchical authority, volunteer managers' authority is based on the quality of the bond formed with the volunteers and the good foundation of this relationship (Adams & Shepherd, 1996). Such a relationship

may be formed by reciprocity and keeping promises (Rentschler, Radbourne & Carr, 2002); management on "an equal footing" without emphasizing hierarchy and in a cooperative atmosphere (Ben David et al, 2004). Therefore, social skills are revealed as being effective in volunteer management: a measure of good communication, knowledge, understanding (Shin and Kleiner, 2003), love of man, the ability to identify with him and provide guidance (Dartingo, 1996).

The weakness and the importance of volunteer autonomy

In the present study, managers lacking resources were unable to properly monitor their volunteers. They expected the volunteers to assume responsibility for their job and operate independent discretion. The rationale presented was ambivalent: on the one hand, they expected volunteers to have autonomy yet lacked any real ability to supervise the volunteers, on the other hand. This state of affairs, managers claimed, causes managers to "miss the target" and provide an unsatisfactory response to their volunteers' needs. Thus, since volunteer autonomy is part of the vision and the weakness of the reality of management, how should we relate to autonomy as a theoretical framework for working with volunteers? How can the volunteers' needs be met under the existing conditions described by the managers?

There are more than a few gains presented in the literature regarding volunteer autonomy. Volunteers enjoy assuming responsibility and exerting professional discretion (Choudury, 2010). They expect to be an inseparable part of the professional team and want to see that fact expressed in their practical responsibility (Starnes & Wymer, 2001). Volunteer autonomy is also congruous with the designated values of Third Sector organizations. Since the mission of social organizations is to develop civic society, the management framework has to be the kind that develops ability for awareness and social

contribution. Such management should reflect involvement, autonomy, partnership, freedom and the ability to generate social change (Gidron, 2011). Sensitive management, which encourages initiative and independence, is perceived by managers, in the research field, too, as more correct management of volunteers (Leonard, Onyx & Hayward-Brown, 2004). Third Sector organizations that adopt a cooperative style can improve the organization's decision making processes and positively affect volunteer empowerment, too (Mano-Negrin, 2009).

In spite of that, from the volunteers' point of view, and paralleled to their desire for an empowering management, autonomy can also be a source of apprehension. Following a training course, volunteers tend to feel lonely and somewhat helpless (Skoglund, 2006). Compared to the "honeymoon" and idealism that may characterize the training period, beginning to work and the transition to autonomy may arouse a "backslide" and develop disappointment with volunteering (Starnes & Wymer, 2001). They find it difficult to cope with what they perceive as excessive autonomy and volunteer self management (Leonard, Onyx & Hayward-Brown, 2004). Volunteers do want to experience learning but need confidence when working. Therefore, autonomy should be gradual and adapted to the volunteers' skills and relative to their seniority in volunteer work (Gooch, 2004). This is true when it comes to decision making, too. According to Mano-Negrin (2009), volunteers should take part in organizational decision making. This is part of the volunteers' empowerment and of the organizational partnership. Even if volunteers fail to take advantage of this right, it is important for them to know the option is open to them when they want to have influence (Leonard, Onyx & Hayward-Brown, 2004). Here too, the literature shows that volunteers are not always capable of handling the autonomy and decision making powers they are given. They sometimes feel they don't know how to express themselves properly or do not completely understand the organization's power play

(Gooch, 2004). The researchers conclude that here, too, volunteers should be allowed to choose when they start taking part in decision making and in which tasks they receive autonomy.

The conclusions arising from the present study are that volunteer empowerment is not an easy or clear-cut issue from a managerial point of view. The managers in the present study emphasized the advantages of one-on-one monitoring of volunteers, but for lack of resources tended to forgo this part of the job in favor of other tasks. In response to the heavy load imposed on managers, the study agrees with the conception that assistant coordinators are an important organizational function that enables proper execution of volunteer management (Bidee, Vantilborgh, Pepermans, Huybrechts, Willems et al. 2013; Bremer & Graeff, 2006). The coordinator's role should focus on ongoing personal work with volunteers (i.e., contact with volunteers, supervision and providing comprehensive psychological response) In this way, volunteer management would be free to deal with the overall management of volunteers: planning volunteer programming, training, instruction, building a rewards system, raising financial resources and promoting inter-organizational collaborations.

REFERENCES

- Adams, C.H., & Shepherd, G.J. (1996). Managing volunteer performance: Face support and situational features as predictors of volunteers' evaluations of regulative messages. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9(4), 363-385.
- Anderson, S. (2011). Managing library volunteers, *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 51, 1, 86-87.
- Ben Aryeh, N. (2006). Managing Volunteers: Does Volunteer Management Require a Different Kind of Management? *Mashabei Enosh*, 19 (217), 12-13. (in Hebrew).

- Ben David, M. Hasky-Leventhal, D., York, A. and Ronel, N. (2004). *Working Volunteering: Findings of a Study on Volunteers and Volunteering at "Hafuch Al Hafuch" Youth Information and Counseling Centers*. Jerusalem: National Insurance Institute and Tel Aviv University. (in Hebrew).
- Ben Meir, D. (1986). *Volunteer Work in Practice in Israel*. Jerusalem, Carta. (in Hebrew).
- Bennett, L., Ross, M.W., & Sunderland, R. (1996). The relationship between recognition, rewards and burnout in AIDS caring. *AIDS Care*, 8, 145-153.
- Bidee, J., Vantilborgh, T; Pepermans, R., Huybrechts, G. Willems, J. et al. (2013). Autonomous motivation stimulates volunteers' work effort: A self-determination theory approach to volunteerism, *voluntas*, 24, 1, 32-47.
- Black B., & DiNitto D. (1994). Volunteers who work with survivors of rape and battering: Motivation, acceptance, satisfaction, length of service, and gender differences. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 20, 73-97.
- Blake, R., & Jefferson, S. (1992). *Defection... why? An insight into the reasons for volunteers leaving*. York, UK: Kestrecourt Ltd.
- Bremer, S., & Graeff, P. (2007). Volunteer management in German national parks. *Human Economics*, 35, 489-496.
- Brudney, J.L. (2000). Volunteer administration, In: S.J. Ott (Ed.) *Understanding nonprofit organizations: Governance, leadership and management* (pp. 329-338). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2007). Volunteer management in art organization: A case study and managerial implication. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 9(2), 16-28.

- Chacon, F., Vecina, M. L., & Davila, M. C. (2007). The three stage model of volunteers' duration of service. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35(5), 627-642.
- Chinman, M.J., & Wandersman, A. (1999). The benefits and costs of volunteering in community organizations: Review and practical implications. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20, 46-64.
- Chounhury, E. (2013). Attracting and managing volunteers in local government, *The Journal of Management Development*, 29, 6, 592-603.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteers' motivation: Findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25, 485-505.
- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A.A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivation of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1516-1530.
- Claxton, R.P.R., Catalan, J., & Burgess, A. P. (1998). Psychological distress and burnout among buddies: Demographic, situation and motivational factors, *AIDS Care*, 10, 175-190.
- Cnaan, R. A., & Cascio, T. (1998). Performance and commitment: Issues in management of volunteers in human service organizations. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 24(3-4), 1-37.
- Cox E. R.J. (2000). The call to mentor, *Career Development International*, 5(45), 202-210.
- Cyr, C., & Doerick P. W. (1991). Burnout in crisisline volunteers. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 18(5), 343-354.

- Dartington, T. (1996). Leadership and management: Oedipal struggles in voluntary organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(6), 12-17.
- Deriham, R. and York, A. (2002). Factors Influencing the Devotion of Volunteers, *Hevra Urevaha* 22 (3), 345-360. (in Hebrew).
- Ellis, S.J. (1996). *From the top down: The executive role in volunteer program success*. Philadelphia: Energize.
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2008). Volunteer satisfaction and volunteer action: A functional approach. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36(1), 9-18.
- Freidman-Gamlieli, S., (2008). *Volunteer Management in Practice*. Jerusalem, Yad Sarah, Van Lear Institute of Volunteer Management. (in Hebrew).
- Gay, P. (2000). Delivering the goods: The work and future direction of volunteer management. *Voluntary Action*, 2(2), 45-57.
- Gidron, B. (1977). Voluntary Work and its Rewards. *Bitachon Soziali*, 14-15. 51-63. (in Hebrew).
- Gidron, B. (1985). Predictors of Perseverance and Dropping-out among Volunteer Workers in Community Centers. *Megamot*, 29, 180-190. (in Hebrew).
- Gidron (2010). Promoting Civil Society in Third Sector Organizations through Participatory Management Patterns *European Management Journal* 28, 403-412
- Gidron, B. (2011). Promoting civil society in third sector organizations through management patterns share, *Civil Society and the Third Sector in Israel*, 2(3), 29-47. (in Hebrew).

- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gooch, M. (2004). Volunteering in catchment management groups: empowering the volunteer. *Australian Geographer*, 35 (2), 193-208.
- Grube, J. A., & Piliavin, J. A. (2000). Role identity, organizational experiences and volunteer performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 1108-1119.
- Hasky-Leventhal, D. (2007). Volunteer Management as an Emerging Profession in Service Organizations. *Bitachon Soziali*, 74, 121-144. (in Hebrew).
- Hasky-Leventhal, D. (2005). *Do or Die: Perseverance and Dropping out Among Volunteers: Case Study at the Jerusalem Center for Sexual Abuse Victims*. Jerusalem: School of Social Work, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (in Hebrew).
- Kaufman, R., Mirsky, I. and Avgar, A. (2005). Factors that Influence Recruitment and Operation of Volunteers and Welfare Services: A case study of a volunteer program at a Jewish community center in Russia. *Bitachon Soziali*, 68, 102-122. (in Hebrew).
- Leonard, R., Onyx, J., & Hayward-Brown, H. (2004). Volunteer and coordinator perspectives on managing women volunteers, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 15, 205-219.
- Liao-Troth, M.A., & Dunn, C. P. (1999). Social constructs and human service: Managerial sense making of volunteer motivation. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 10(4), 345-358.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Mano-Nagrin, R. (2009). *Manage or Lead: Fundamentals of Management, Vision and Success in Israeli Non-Profit Organizations*. Haifa: Pardess. (in Hebrew).
- McCurley, S., & Lynch, R. (1996). *Volunteer management: Mobilizing all the skills in your community*. City? Heritage Art Publishing/Points of Light Foundation.
- Murk, B.J., & Stephan, J.F. (1991). Volunteers: How to get them, train them and keep them. *Economic Development Review*, volume? 73-75.
- Nathason, I.L., & Eggleton, E., (1993). Motivation versus program effect on length of service: A study of four cohort of ombudservice volunteers, *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 19(3-4), 95-114.
- Nidal-Shimony, B. (2007). *Promoting Civic Involvement and Volunteering*, SHATIL, Jerusalem, Community Center Company, Israeli Community Center Co. Ltd. (in Hebrew).
- Omoto, A.M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained help without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 671-686.
- Raser, A. (2007). The Predictors of Satisfaction and Perseverance in Volunteering for the "Civil Guard"? *Sugiot Hevratot BeIsrael*, 3, 76-102. (in Hebrew).
- Rehnborg, S.J. (2005). A few pointers on the unpleasant topic of firing volunteers. Retrieved December 15, 2007, from <http://network.bestfriends.org/news/print.aspx?np=1173>.
- Rentschler, J., Radbourne, R., & Carr, R.J. (2002). Relationship marketing: Audience retention and performing arts organization viability. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(2), 118-130.

- Ross, M.W., Greenfield, S.A., & Bennett, L. (1999). Predictors of dropout and burnout in AIDS volunteers: A longitudinal study. *AIDS Care*, 11(6), 723-731.
- Ryan R. L., Kaplan R., & Grese R. (2000). Predicting volunteer commitment in environmental stewardship programmers. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 44(5), 629-648.
- Shin, S., & Kleiner, B.H. (2003). How to manage unpaid volunteers in organizations. *Management Research News*, 26(2-4), 63-71.
- Shkedi, A. (2003). *Words That Try to Touch: A Qualitative Study – Theory and Application*. Ramot: Tel Aviv University. (in Hebrew).
- Starnes, B.J., & Wymer, W.W. (1999). Demographics, personality traits, roles, motivations and attrition rates of hospice volunteers. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 9(1/2), 97-118.
- Stedman, N.L.P., & Rudd, R. (2004). Volunteer administration: Theoretical dimensions of discipline. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 3(1), 4-13.
- Thomas, C., Newell, J.N., Baral, S.C., Byanjankar, L. (2007). The contribution of volunteers to successful community-oriented tuberculosis treatment center in an urban setting in Nepal: A qualitative assessment of volunteers' role and motivation. *Journal of Health Organization and management*, 21 (6), 554-572.
- Vantilborgh, T., Bidee, J., Pepermans, R., Willems, J., Huybrechts, G. et al. (2011). A New deal for NPO governance and management: Implication for volunteers using psychological construct theory, *voluntas*, 2, 4, 639-657
- Wardell F., Lishman J., & Whalley L. (2000), Who volunteers? *British Journal of Social Work*, 30, 227-248.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 215-240.

Wymer, W. W. & Starnes B.J. (2001). Conceptual foundations and practical guidelines for recruiting volunteers to serve in local nonprofit organization: part I, *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 9 (1): 63-96.

Yanay-Ventura, G., & Yanay N. (2008). The decline of motivation? From commitment to dropout of volunteering. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 19(1), Fall, 68-75.

Yanay-Ventura, G. (2004). *Fading Motivation – Factors Related to Volunteers Dropping Out*. MA thesis, Ben-Gurion University in the Negev, Beer Sheba.