

A Comparison of Volunteers' and Coordinators' Perspectives on issues of Volunteer
Management of Women in Human Services in New South Wales, Australia

Authors: Rosemary Leonard, UWS, Jenny Onyx, UTS & Helen Hayward-Brown, UWS

Contact r.leonard@uws.edu.au

The project is funded by an Australian Research Council SPIRT grant with partner investigators, NSW Premier's Department, Department for Women and NSW Council of Social Services.

Note that the interpretations presented are not necessarily those of the investigators other than the authors.

Abstract

Recent changes in Australia such as the new public management and National competition policy have affected the way that human services are provided and complicated the role of volunteer coordinators. However, because the volunteers are free to choose their level of contribution, it is the volunteers' perspective that is the ultimate yardstick against which their coordination is assessed. The aim of the research was a deeper understanding women volunteers' and their coordinators' views of their work. The research was conducted within a qualitative paradigm, employing individual and focus group interviews. The analysis identified eight areas of concern for volunteers around their management. The analysis of the coordinators' interviews revealed three coordination styles, horizontal, nurturing, and managerial, of which the managerial was most in conflict with the volunteers' perspective.

The present research focuses on volunteer management from the perspective of both the volunteers and their coordinators. In a survey of non-profit administrators, Dolan (2002) found that, after “fundraising” and “grant-writing”, “volunteer administration” was the third most frequently reported area of training need. Further, it is unlikely that those training needs can be addressed by reference to texts designed for profit driven companies. The freedom of a volunteer to leave a position without financial loss is the most significant difference between their management and the management of paid workers. Not only can volunteers leave entirely but also they can refuse to do particular tasks or work at particular times. The coordinator does not have the control that is assumed in for-profit management texts. Organizational attempts to control volunteers may lead to a decline in willingness to volunteer (Pearce, 1993). It is essential therefore if high levels of volunteering are to be maintained, that there be some congruence between the coordinator’s and the volunteers’ attitudes to their management. Further, because the volunteers are free to choose their level of contribution, it is their perspective that is the yardstick against which their coordination will be assessed.

In the literature on volunteering, most attention has been given to the substantial economic contribution of volunteers and to their motivations. For example, in terms of economic contribution, Bridgeman (1998) estimates the contribution of US volunteers to be 20.3 billion hours every year. Across Australia the hours spent in formal volunteering in human services is the equivalent of 50,000 paid employees (Industry Commission, 1995). The literature on volunteer motivations is large and complex however most studies of volunteer motivation have focused on the “private goods model” and the “skill development model” (Govekar and Govekar, 2002). For example, Clary, Snyder & Stukas (1996) developed a Volunteer Functions Inventory. Similarly, Moen, Dempster-McLain and Williams (1992), Herzog & Morgan (1993) and Simon

(1997) focus on the value of volunteering to people at a time of change in their life course. The literature therefore focuses on what brings volunteers in and what they produce but says little about how volunteers should be treated within the organization from the volunteers' perspective.

Recent changes in the way human services are funded and delivered affect the role of volunteer coordinators. In Australia, as in other western countries, human services have been provided by private, government or community/ non-profit sectors but traditionally the values and priorities among the three sectors have differed. The for-profit sector is concerned with profitability and therefore with efficiency and minimizing costs. Governments have been associated with a concern for policy and procedures. Policy sets out the goals and procedures set out, often somewhat inflexibly, the proper method for achieving those goals. There is a major concern with accountability to Ministers, parliaments and ultimately the public. The community sector has traditionally been dominated by the charity model, with organizations, often with religious affiliations, whose concern is with the moral value of giving and caring for the needy. However, over the last thirty years the community management model has emerged with values of responsiveness to local needs, flexibility and local input (Darcy, 2002) and more politically aware groups have focused on empowerment of the oppressed. Volunteering was traditionally associated with the community sector and it would be expected that volunteers and their coordinators would share the values of their organization (whether charitable, community or political).

Over the last ten years, however, the distinct orientations of private, public and community sectors have become somewhat merged so that it is no longer obvious which orientation is appropriate for the coordination of volunteers. A major factor in the intertwining of the orientations of the three sectors has been the rise in status of managerialism. Adcroft and Willis

(2002) identify the three main characteristics of managerialism as a focus on efficiency, the centrality of management as explaining the success or failure of a venture and the belief in the transferability of management practices across all industries and sectors. Although Adcroft and Willis argue that resources may be more important than management for organizational success, many governments, including British and Australian, have been persuaded that a managerialist orientation will provide better services for less cost. However they have not abandoned their orientation towards accountability, and fairly rigid procedures.

Because most non-profit organizations providing human services are highly dependent on government funding, government changes in attitudes can have profound effects on their practices. In the past, governments funded organizations run by boards or community management committees who operated on the assumption that their local knowledge and direct experience was central to the discovery and analysis of local needs and also the design of services to meet these needs. The recent changes due to the adoption by the public sector of private sector values and practices have been so marked that they have been labeled 'the New Public Management' (George and Wilding, 2002). The dominant policy discourse in Australia (and in most other Western nations) now incorporates a model of citizenship that is dependent on the 'citizen' participating in the marketplace, that is, making an exchange for services (McDonald and Marston, 2002). National Competition Policy, in particular, has wrought changes in the practices and expectations of the government agencies that provide funding. These changes are primarily characterized by mechanisms to ensure increased accountability for measurable service outcomes, such as business plans and performance indicators, which are built into purchase of service agreements and contracts, and also in some cases entail competitive tendering mechanisms. This quasi market discourse positions the community organization as a

seller of services. The government purchases these services on behalf of the client. As, effectively, the sole purchaser, or 'customer' for these services, government agencies are thus responsible for defining needs and specifying the nature of services, which they are prepared to purchase.

Not only has the State maintained its orientation to policy procedures and accountability, it goes further than any real market customer could in that they often specify exact procedures and staffing for the services they purchase. Further, in an effort to guarantee standards, legislation related to incorporation, public health, public liability and occupational health and safety has been introduced which affects paid workers and volunteers alike. This legislation has put pressure on many non-profit organizations with demands for more stringent selection, training and supervision of volunteers. (Onyx, Leonard & Hayward-Brown, 2001).

Given the reliance of many non-profit, human service organizations on State funding and the State's use of a mixture of private and public sector values, managers within non-profits could be excused for some confusion as to whether their focus should be efficiency, adherence to government procedures, or the values of their organization. A clash of orientations could become acute in the direct supervision of volunteers who can choose not to comply with a particular requirement or to leave the organization altogether.

The present research starts to address the absence of volunteers' perspectives on their management by directly asking the volunteers about their perceptions of good coordination and organizational practice. It also asks volunteer coordinators how they approach their task. It employed a qualitative paradigm to reach a deeper understanding of women volunteers' perspectives on their work and then to compare them to those of the coordinators. The focus on women reflects their position as the majority of volunteers involved in the direct delivery of

human services. Men tend to be involved in transportation for human services or other voluntary activities such as sport or civic engagement (ABS, 2001). With a small-scale in-depth study, it was more productive to focus on the majority group.

A previous qualitative analysis of the focus groups of volunteers revealed 'Efficacy through Caring', 'Social Connection', and 'Recognition not Exploitation' as the dominant themes in all the groups, which seemed to represent how these women constructed their voluntary work. The metaphor of the gift, which appeared to encapsulate much of the women's perspective, did not fit easily with the constructions of governments. It is inappropriate to demand gifts of a certain type or training for the gift givers (Leonard & Hayward-Brown, 2002). In the present analysis, the focus is turned to dynamics within the organization as the volunteers' views on their management are explored and compared to the management styles of the coordinators.

Method

Because the aim of the research was a deeper understanding the volunteers' and coordinators' views of their work, the research was conducted within a qualitative paradigm, employing individual and focus group interviews. Although the research was shaped by broad topic areas, it was important to use open interview schedules so as not to predetermine the types of responses the volunteers and coordinators might give. It should be emphasized that the sample was small and purposive, not random. The purpose of the study was not to generalize but to explore the dynamics of volunteers work in relationship to their organizations. Such exploratory research requires qualitative analysis of in depth discussion for a limited number of people. It is

likely that the social mechanisms so identified may well have broad applicability, though this will have to be established in further research.

Participants. The research involved 10 focus groups and 20 individual interviews with women volunteers in human services and 21 individual interviews with coordinators. Roughly half the participants came from an urban and half from a rural region of New South Wales, Australia.

Volunteers. The 120 women who attended the focus groups ranged in age from teens to eighties (Mean = 57 years). A third of the urban volunteers but only 4% of the rural volunteers came from a non-English speaking background. The 20 volunteers, who were individually interviewed, ranged in age from 20 to 78 years (Mean = 53 years). Only two came from a non-English speaking background. On average the volunteers worked approximately nine hours per week.

Coordinators. Of the 21 coordinators interviewed, 11 worked in South-West Sydney and 10 in the Central west of NSW. Their ages ranged from 28 to 75 years (Mean = 49.6 years). Three were male. Five were unpaid. Sixteen were Anglo-Australian, 4 were Anglo-Celts from other countries and one was Chinese.

The volunteers and co-ordinators worked for organizations which provided a range of human services in palliative care, home maintenance, family support, disability, cancer support, migrant education, day care for frail aged and drug abuse, migrant support, prisoner welfare, youth services, health services and auxiliaries, school activities, respite care, country women's associations and breast cancer support.

Participants were recruited through newspaper advertisements and mainly through the use of community handbooks for telephone canvassing. Volunteers were also recruited through coordinators.

Procedure.

Focus Groups - Each focus group followed the same format, with the same facilitator, and one other member of the research team. A standard set of questions and accompanying prompts was adopted in each case. The topics relevant to the present analysis were the positives and negatives of volunteering for the volunteer and advice to organizations about what they “should” and “should not” do when employing volunteers.

Individual interviews with volunteers - were interviewed individually at a time and place suitable to them. The interviews were semi-structured with topics similar to those for the focus groups.

Individual interviews with coordinators – Coordinators were interviewed individually at a time and place suitable to them (usually their office). The interview topics relevant to the present analysis were:

- 1) The coordinator’s role of support and problem solving
- 2) Responses to focus group results. For example, in the focus group research, we found that volunteers particularly valued flexibility, creativity, autonomy and respect in their work so the coordinators were asked about these aspects.

Each focus group and individual interview ran for two hours. Discussion was audio-taped and transcribed.

Analysis. A grounded inductive approach was taken to the data analysis with codes being developed as the data was interrogated (Glaser, 1992). For the volunteers, the transcripts were coded for their key issues within the organizational structure. For the coordinators, the focus was on the extent to which their approach to coordination complemented the position of the volunteers. N*VIVO was used to assist the process of documentation.

Results

The grounded analysis identified eight areas of concern for volunteers around their management (listed in Table 1). The analysis of the coordinators' interviews revealed three coordination styles, horizontal, nurturing, and managerial. The perspectives of the volunteers on each of their eight areas of concern were then used as a yardstick to assess the three coordination styles.

Volunteers. The most important work issue for the volunteers was the value of the work itself, including the value of interesting work and the ability to achieve something. The next most frequently occurring concept related to flexibility of hours and attitude. In the individual interviews, volunteers spoke of the value of flexible hours to manage child-care and other family responsibilities but also flexibility in the type of work they did. In the individual interviews and focus groups, volunteers were particularly keen to experience as little 'red tape' as possible, detesting increased paperwork and inflexibility. Closely following issues of flexibility in importance was a desire to have input into decision-making. Even if this privilege was not utilised on a frequent basis, they needed to know they could influence if necessary.

Volunteers generally reported very good relationships with their coordinators. Volunteers repeatedly emphasized the importance of coordinator availability, their ability to listen, provision of flexibility and regular contact. Other issues, such as the coordinators' organizational skills, were not discussed frequently by volunteers. Leadership was raised as an issue by some of the volunteers in the context of the importance placed on teamwork, and the need for a competent leader, who is also not too 'bossy'. In the individual interviews, five volunteers said that

autonomy was an important motivator for choosing volunteering. Volunteers had problems with those who tried to order them about. They reported that if someone is too controlling then volunteers get fed up and leave.

It is just that the person that runs that group thinks that he is really something and that he decides everything without consulting any of his volunteers. That will not work that way. Like I said, it is team effort and working together is the key, is the success. That is why I left the organization. (Volunteer)

Doing more valuable work often means taking more responsibility. One focus group was highly vocal about the lack of opportunity for responsibility. Although two volunteers valued a freedom from responsibility, the general consensus was that volunteers could take more responsibility. It should be noted that about a third of the participants were involved in management committees as well as service delivery.

I think in our organization, although there is a hierarchy, if you have an idea, it can go up the chain, and even if they ignore your idea you at least get the respect you need. But it is actually a bit more difficult with our (Drug & alcohol service) because it is a church run organization so it goes through so many safeguards. ... It makes it almost impossible to do anything serious. (Volunteer)

In the discussion of 'What organizations should do for volunteers', the most salient issue was the provision of opportunities for social connection among volunteers. There were many

positive references to team spirit, friendship, and social events from a simple “cuppa-and-a-chat” to large, organized outings and celebrations. Connections with clients were also highly valued, often being described as “more like family”. Most of the women valued formal and informal opportunities for skill development and general education when they could see its value for their work. Training which is seen to be unnecessary and more related to demands for control than quality volunteering is likely to be resisted.

These issues for volunteers grouped into eight broad topic areas as listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1. A Comparison of Volunteers' Positions on Issues of Management with the Three Coordination Styles

Management Issue	Volunteers	Coordinators		
		Horizontal	Nurturing	Managerial
Work allocation	Want to “make a difference” – valuable interesting work	Volunteers’ work is respected & facilitated	Volunteers’ work is highly valued & openly praised	Volunteers restricted –often to a marginal helping role.
Flexibility	Flexibility of work schedules, type, and practices is important	Volunteers’ needs and interests are a priority. Rules can be bent	Volunteers’ needs and interests are a priority. Rules can be bent	Strict adherence to policies and procedures. Processes are formalised
Hierarchy	Teams preferred. Hierarchy resisted. Volunteers will leave a bossy organization.	Hierarchy avoided. Coordinator not above doing the same work as the volunteers	Uses her position to help volunteers. Offers direction/ encourages independence	Hierarchy promoted. Volunteers clearly lower than paid staff
Communication	Open two-way communication. Coordinator availability valued	Feedback actively sought. Open door policy	Feedback actively sought/ Open door policy	Coordinator protected by staff
Input into decision-making	Value being able to influence the organization	Volunteers involved in the organizations’ plans	Suggestions are respectfully considered	Decision-making is better done by professionals.

Responsibility	Most felt they would like to be allowed more responsibility	Volunteers able to organise themselves and manage a program	Coordinator monitors volunteers to give them the level of responsibility they can handle.	Volunteers strictly supervised by paid staff
Relationships	Personal relationships with other volunteers, clients and coordinators are valued	Personal relationships between volunteers and with clients and coordinators are valued	Personal relationships between volunteers and with clients and coordinators are valued	Close relationships of volunteers with clients or coordinators are discouraged
Training & personal development	Volunteers are willing to train to improve their effectiveness. They learn from each other and their clients.	Volunteers given space and encouragement to develop new skills and try new roles. Volunteers learn from each other	Volunteers nurtured into new skills and new roles by coordinator	Pragmatic view to volunteer competence – eg training - just what the volunteers need to do their job.

Coordinators. A grounded inductive approach was used to explore the ways in which the coordinators managed their volunteers. Three clearly different styles could be identified; a horizontal style, a nurturing style and a managerial style.

The horizontal style classified together a number of ways in which the coordinators worked with a flat structure, allowing considerable autonomy amongst the volunteers. The key characteristics were, open communication, flexibility in work schedules, decision-making by volunteers, self-direction, mutual empowerment by volunteers, the coordinator works at the 'grassroots' level with volunteers. There is reciprocity between the organization and the volunteers.

They are involved in making decisions. Once the program is developed, we have volunteer leaders who may have a coordinating role. So we offer leadership roles for volunteers and we take advice from them. (Coordinator - Horizontal style)

Through actually getting connected to the Centre and to other women, increasing self-confidence, etc. they actually wanted to start doing extra things. They basically said they wanted to try drumming. They wanted to start a magazine for the Centre. They wanted to do some fund-raising activities for the Centre, as the Centre needs money. They found a lot of social support through doing that. (Coordinator - Horizontal style)

The nurturing style was the one used most frequently by coordinators, as measured by pages of coded transcript. This style includes all those activities whereby the coordinators act

like “good mothers” to the volunteers. They balance the encouragement of independence with the offering of direction.

The ability to be able to offer them more, to offer that growth, to offer the challenges and to offer the right level of challenges too, I think. I mean if you offer difficult challenges you are going to lose them aren't you, but you need to be offering those little challenges all along the way. (Coordinator - Nurturing style)

They encourage close relationships and good communication, including conflict resolution and mediation. They are conscious of their volunteers' needs, offering debriefing or counselling.

If you are here at any time, you will find the volunteers will quite often come out and tell you “That happened to me when I was out”. So they will normally just come and tell you and if it is something we cannot deal with, we will have to go to (another service) (Coordinator - Nurturing style)

Coordinators using the nurturing style take a flexible approach to management. Nurturing requires a positive attitude to volunteers with respect, and acknowledgment of their achievements.

The managerial style had a major concern with efficiency and effectiveness where they are defined in terms of managerial processes rather than a personalised concern with specific outcomes for specific clients. This coordination style was marked by the use of managerial discourse such as being “funding ready” “forward planning”, “quality control”, “centralised

recruitment selection and screening processes”. There was a strong emphasis on the development of formal policy and procedures and strict supervision of volunteers by paid staff to make sure they follow the correct procedures. Coordinators did not want volunteers “to get the idea that they are virtually as good or better than paid staff”.

You have got to be really clear -- you have got to have job descriptions and agreements and things, because as a volunteer you are performing the role that you have been asked to do. Then we have to have processes in place for us to say 'No', you know, there are certain ways that things that they might do that have automatic dismissal. There might be things where there are warning processes in place. (Coordinator - Managerial style)

Close relationships between volunteers and clients are seen as unprofessional.

I would always encourage volunteers to keep it strictly client based and try to discourage any more personal relationships than that. But, yes, they did build up a rapport and basically when it came to an end the volunteer would just say "How much they enjoyed working with the people" and then they would go their separate ways. (Did the children cope with that O.K?) Yes most of the time. (Coordinator - Managerial style)

Even from these brief descriptions, it can be seen that the three coordination styles would differ in the degree to which they complement the volunteers' perspective. Table 1 compares the three styles to the perspective of the volunteers using seven concepts related to their management that emerged from the volunteers' interviews and focus groups.

The Table clearly illustrates the differences among the coordination styles and the volunteers' perspective. The horizontal style matched most closely the volunteer's perspective on their management. Volunteers were also comfortable with coordinators using a nurturing style especially as there was genuine concern for their welfare. Clearly there is a difference in attitude on each of the eight issues between the managerial style on the one hand and the volunteers and other coordination styles on the other.

It should also be noted that the coordinators did not use purely one approach but varied their style across the various topics of the interview. Mixtures of the nurturing and horizontal styles were common, mixtures of the managerial and nurturing styles also occurred and a few used all three. For example one coordinator who was focusing on becoming more and more professional with clear job descriptions and separation of paid and unpaid tasks also said that there were times when everyone just "has to get in and do whatever needs to be done" and that "in terms of individual volunteers it can be a very belonging sort of a place. Sometimes there is not a lot of distinction between who is staff and who is clients. ... I think it's probably beneficial". Those who used only one style had a very strong philosophical commitment, for example, an explicitly feminist organization used only the horizontal style.

Discussion

The results are consistent with the training needs identified by the non-profit managers in Dolan's (2002) survey, particularly managing volunteers and building cooperation. However, while his data suggests complex needs, Dolan's interpretation reflects a managerialist preoccupation with financial matters such as budgeting and procedural efficiency, which from our data, are likely to alienate volunteers. In human services, in particular, coordinators need to consider multiple stakeholders such as clients, workers, government and other funding bodies, all of whom have an interest in volunteers' work. However it is the volunteers who can most easily exercise their option to leave if they are dissatisfied.

Eight broad topic areas were identified in the volunteers' transcripts. Volunteers liked the flexibility of setting their own work schedule and therefore had difficulty with organizations where the rules were perceived as excessively rigid. Some reported positive experiences of decision-making or influencing the decision-making of those higher up in their organizations but the more common experiences were problems of those who are too autocratic. There was a strong belief that volunteers should not be ordered around. Another common experience was that they were not allowed sufficient responsibility. It is telling that most of the discussion occurred in response to the questions about what organizations should not do or why a volunteer had left a previous volunteering position.

The analysis of the coordinators' interviews revealed three different coordination styles, labeled horizontal, nurturing and managerial. The horizontal style of coordination allows the volunteers maximum autonomy and initiative. It had a strong focus on social connections across all levels within the organizations and beyond the organization to the wider community. With the nurturing style, the focus is on the personal development of the volunteers. However this style

does not allow as much autonomy as the horizontal one. The nature of nurturing is that there is an acceptance of the coordinator as the more knowledgeable and more worthy of respect. Volunteers, especially if they have high levels of education or experience in responsible positions, may well feel patronized by a nurturing approach. Unlike the other approaches where the difference is more one of emphasis, the managerialist approach, focussing on control of volunteers with strict adherence to policy and procedures, appears to conflict with the volunteers perception of their work. The results thus support Pearce's (1993) contention that if coordinators are overly controlling, then they are likely to rapidly alienate the volunteers.

Although the current analysis focussed on coordination issues, a previous analysis of the focus groups of women volunteers revealed 'Efficacy through Caring', 'Social Connection', and 'Recognition (versus Exploitation)' as the dominant themes in all the groups (Leonard & Hayward-Brown, 2002). It appears that the three coordination styles may have differential effects on each of these themes. With a horizontal style, exploitation is unlikely and recognition comes through being able to act on one's initiatives. The problems are most likely to occur with the volunteers need to be effective; to feel they are making a difference. Coordinators noted that decreased efficacy may arise from lack of leadership or from informal leaderships causing factions to develop, unclear duties and responsibilities, disorganization, and lack of direction, however, coordinators believed these difficulties could be overcome. With the nurturing style, coordinators demonstrated that they shared with volunteers the value of caring. Exploitation would be the antithesis of this approach and recognition is highly salient. Social connections are also encouraged. With a nurturing approach, there may be a risk of decreased efficacy through excessive attention to the volunteers' personal development and perhaps not enough focus on needs of the clients. The managerialist style supports volunteers need for efficacy but may

contradict their ethic of caring, the need for recognition rather than exploitation and their desire for social connection.

From the literature, the introduction presented a number approaches to the coordination of volunteers, for-profit focus on efficiency, public sector focus on policy and procedures, and the focus on values of many non-profit organizations. The grounded approach to the analysis of coordinators' styles also revealed three approaches, however, there was not a neat match between the two sets. The efficiency ethos of the for-profit sector was not salient in the data but was present by inference in the managerial coordination style. For example, efficiency seems paramount in the managerial emphasis on the focused use of volunteers who are trained in the specific tasks they need to perform, rather than a general interest in volunteers' personal development. Also it should be noted that non-profits might already be highly efficient because of the large amount of free labor. The public sector emphasis on policies and procedures correlated most strongly with the managerial coordination style. The for-profit focus on efficiency and public sector focus on policies and procedures differ and are to a certain extent in conflict, since the monitoring of exact procedures can be extremely resource intensive. Despite this conflict, it was not surprising to find they co-existed in the one style since this is the "Economic reform agenda" of the current Australian and NSW governments, the major funders of community services. The community management model in the literature was consistent with the horizontal coordination style identified in the results, as the divisions between clients, volunteers, workers and management committee are minimal with the emphasis being on mutual help and the embeddedness of the organization in its community. The clearest presentation of this position was an overtly feminist organization, which consciously adopted horizontal practices.

The nurturing coordination style, which was most frequently used by coordinators, does not fit neatly with the positions presented in the literature review. Its identification validates the usefulness of the grounded analysis because it could well have been overlooked if the existing literature had been used as the frame for the analysis. It appears to be consistent with a human relations approach to management (eg Bolman & Deal, 2003) but it is important to recognize that the coordinators did not have formal training in management and would not have been consciously following any particular management theory. Nurturing and the ethic of care, which are shared by many coordinators and volunteers, are also consistent with the charity model with its emphasis on good works. The nurturing style may be consistent with a community management approach as involvement and empowerment of volunteers does take place. However the nurturing role is prey to Gore's (1992) critique of empowerment, which presupposes an agent of empowerment and a notion of power as property. The nurturing coordinator could be seen as the agent who keeps some power, thus maintaining a position of superiority or at least the other's dependency. However, it must also be remembered that the volunteers have considerable power, especially now that organizations have contracts to produce a particular level of service. Volunteers are certainly not dependent and it may be that they accept nurturance only to the extent that they feel it is beneficial. Presumably the experienced nurturer can sense when to back off.

The nurturing style may well be a specific practical response to the particular requirements of volunteer coordination. For example, the horizontal style may not be practical if volunteers lack the ability or confidence to take up a role that requires high levels of self-direction and responsibility. The managerial style of demanding particular standards may also

not be practical for people who are not being paid. The nurturing style offers the volunteer a personal relationship of support in return for their free labor.

It is significant that the coordinators did not use purely one approach. Mixtures of the nurturing and horizontal styles were common, mixtures of the managerial and nurturing styles also occurred and a few used all three. The mixing of coordination styles probably reflects a practical and flexible approach to a difficult task. However with greater managerial accountability being written into government funding agreements, there is likely to be an increase in the use of this style, the very style that is most alien to the volunteers' position. Further there is a risk that coordinators may not recognise the fact that they are using two or three different, and somewhat contradictory, approaches to coordination leading to some confusion for themselves and for the volunteers. For example if coordinators need volunteers to help out in any way when there is a shortage of paid staff then they cannot be adamant about job descriptions and sanctions for not correctly following all procedures.

The results suggest that the conscious and strategic use of all three coordination styles, with limited use of managerial style to satisfy the funding body, some nurturing when needed, and liberal use of the horizontal style may lead to the most satisfactory coordination for volunteers. It also suggests that training for non-profit managers needs to seriously engage with the particular needs of the sector, such as its reliance on volunteers, and not uncritically adopt practices of public or for-profit sectors. However, from this relatively small scale, exploratory research it is too early to make definitive statements for guidance of coordinators. Clearly confirmation from a larger sample is needed and international comparisons would be useful, indeed the resistance to autocracy may be particularly strong in Australia. Also this sample consisted of mainly of middle-aged and older Anglo Australian women, who make up the

majority of volunteers in human services but the needs of significant minorities such as young women, those from diverse cultural backgrounds and men need separate attention. Such research needs to address both the volunteers' perspectives on their coordination, allowing for differences amongst sub-groups of volunteers, and the coordinators perspective to check the usefulness of the typology identified in the present research. Nevertheless, coordinators of volunteers in human services in all countries are likely to experience contradictory demands from differing stakeholders and it may be useful for them to become more conscious of their responses to those pressures and their own preferred styles.

References

- Adcoft, A. and Willis, R. "Looking in the wrong direction" *Critical Quarterly*, 2002, 44(3), 45-49.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics *Voluntary Work, Australia*, (Cat No. 4441.0): Canberra: ABS. 2001.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. *Reframing Organisations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Bridgeman, M. "Volunteers answer call without calling attention to themselves". *Columbus Dispatch* Nov 29 1998, pp1G, 8G
- Clary G, Snyder M, Stukas A. "Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*; 1996, 25(4) 485-505.
- Darcy, M. "Community management: How management discourse killed participation". *Critical Quarterly*, 2002, 44(4), 32-39.

- Dolan, D. A. "Training needs of administrators in the non-profit sector: What are they and how should we address them?" *Non-Profit Management & Leadership*, 2002, 12(3), 277-292.
- George, V. and Wilding P. *Globalisation and Human Welfare*. Palgrave, 2002.
- Glaser, B.G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Govekar, P.L. and Govekar, M.A. "Using economic theory and research to better understand volunteer behavior". *Non-Profit Management & Leadership*, 2002, 13(1), 33-48
- Gore, J. "What can we do for you! What can 'we' do for 'you'? Struggling over empowerment in critical and feminist pedagogy". In C. Luke and J. Gore (eds) *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. 1992, New York ; Routledge.
- Herzog, A.R., and Morgan, J.N. "Age and gender differences in the value of productive activities: Four different approaches". *Research on Aging*; 1993, 14(2):169-198
- Industry Commission *Charitable Organizations in Australia*. Report No 45, Melbourne: AGPS. 1995.
- Leonard, R. and Hayward-Brown, H. "A qualitative analysis of experiences of women volunteers in human services". *Third Sector Review*, 2002, 8(2)
- McDonald, C and Marston, G. "Patterns of Governance: The Curious Case of Non-profit Community Services in Australia". *Journal of Social Policy and Administration*. 2002, 36(4), 376-391.
- Moen P, Dempster-McLain D, and Williams R. 'Successful Aging: A Life-Course Perspective on Women's Multiple Roles and Health'. *American Journal of Sociology*; 1992, 97(6): 1612-1638.

Onyx, J., Leonard R., and Hayward-Brown H. "The Experience of Volunteers in the Provision of Human Services in NSW: A Regional Perspective", *Australian Journal of Volunteering*, 2001, 6 (2), 128-144.

Pearce, J. *Volunteers: the Organizational Behavior of Unpaid Workers*. London, Routledge, 1993.

Simon R. "The Meaning Individuals Attach to Role Identities and their Implications for Mental Health". *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*; 1997, 38:256-274.

The Authors

Dr Rosemary Leonard is a Director of the Research Centre for Social Justice and Social Change at the University of Western Sydney. She is also Chair of Australian & New Zealand Third Sector Research (ANZTSR)

Professor Jenny Onyx is the Director of the Centre for Australian Community Organisations and their Management (CACOM) at the University of Technology Sydney. She is also chief editor of the academic journal Third Sector Review.

Dr Helen Hayward-Brown is a project officer at the Research Centre for Social Justice and Social Change at the University of Western Sydney.